

CALIBER

**THE GREENBOOK
DEMONSTRATION INITIATIVE**

**Process Evaluation Report:
Phase I (January 2001 – June 2002)**

Prepared by:

The Greenbook National Evaluation Team

Caliber Associates
Education Development Center, Inc.
The National Center for State Courts

February 29, 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF SYSTEMS ADDRESSING FAMILY VIOLENCE	2
2. SYSTEM CHALLENGES TO ADDRESSING THE CO-OCCURRENCE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND CHILD MALTREATMENT	4
3. THE GREENBOOK.....	5
4. NATIONAL GREENBOOK INITIATIVE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.....	9
5. REPORT OVERVIEW	11
II. GREENBOOK PROCESS EVALUATION.....	14
1. OVERVIEW OF NATIONAL EVALUATION DESIGN	14
2. PHASE I PROCESS EVALUATION AND KEY RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	14
3. METHODS AND DATA SOURCES	15
3.1 Data Collection Guide.....	16
3.2 Site Visits and Interviews	19
4. ANALYSIS	19
III. THE GREENBOOK SITES	21
1. KEY COMMUNITY FEATURES	21
1.1 Demographics	21
1.2 History of Collaboration	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

	<u>PAGE</u>
2. THE PRIMARY SYSTEMS	26
2.1 Organization and Capacity of the Systems	27
2.2 A Look at Collaborative Relationships: System Challenges and Needs Prior to Greenbook Implementation.....	43
3. CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	47
IV. MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION.....	50
1. MOBILIZATION (BRINGING PEOPLE TO THE TABLE)	51
1.1 The Draw to Greenbook.....	51
1.2 Mobilization Strategies and Activities.....	52
2. KEY PLAYERS: COMMUNITY SECTOR REPRESENTATION.....	56
3. PARTICIPATION AND POWER SHARING.....	59
3.1 Governance Structure.....	59
3.2 Network Analysis.....	69
4. PERCEIVED BARRIERS AND FACILITATORS TO GREENBOOK MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION.....	73
4.1 Ideological Differences and Trust Among Members.....	73
4.2 Belief in Change Through Collaboration.....	74
4.3 Inclusiveness.....	74
4.4 Resources	75
4.5 Coordination and Leadership of Collaboration Activities	75
5. CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	75
V. THE PLANNING PROCESS	78
1. PLANNING ACTIVITIES THAT SHAPED LOCAL GREENBOOK INITIATIVES	79
1.1 Resource and Needs Assessments	79
1.2 Concept Mapping.....	82
1.3 Logic Models	83

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

	<u>PAGE</u>
1.4 Identified Goals, Outcomes, and Strategies.....	85
1.5 Additional Examples of the Work Sites Undertook During the Planning Phase.....	92
2. CHALLENGES AND FACILITATING FACTORS	94
2.1 Factors Influencing Participation in the Greenbook Initiative.....	95
2.2 Challenges Specific to Planning Activities.....	96
2.3 Facilitating Factors.....	97
3. THE ROLE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, FEDERAL MONITORING AND EVALUATION	98
3.1 Technical Assistance.....	98
3.2 Federal Monitoring.....	103
3.3 Local Evaluation.....	105
3.4 National Evaluation	106
4. CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	107
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS	111
1. OVERVIEW OF HISTORICAL SYSTEM CHALLENGES.....	111
2. GREENBOOK PROCESS EVALUATION.....	112
3. THE GREENBOOK SITES	113
4. MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION.....	114
5. THE PLANNING PROCESS	116
6. LESSONS LEARNED.....	117

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit I-1	Implications of Greenbook Recommendations for Janice and David’s Case	9
Exhibit I-2	Greenbook Initiative Organizational Structure	12
Exhibit II-1	Multisite Demonstration Project Framework.....	17
Exhibit II-2	Process Evaluation Data Sources.....	18
Exhibit III-1	Key Community Features	23
Exhibit III-2	A Cross-Site Look at Child Welfare System Capacities at Baseline.....	31
Exhibit III-3	A Cross-Site Look at Domestic Violence System Capacities at Baseline.....	36
Exhibit III-4	A Cross-Site Look at Court System Capacities at Baseline	42
Exhibit IV-1	Mobilization Strategies	55
Exhibit IV-2	Greenbook Collaborative Representation.....	58
Exhibit IV-3	Summary of Governance Structures of Greenbook Demonstration Site Initiatives	67
Exhibit IV-4	Network Analysis Summary.....	72

I. INTRODUCTION

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes how the *Greenbook* recommendations arose out of the historical contexts of the child welfare system, dependency courts, and domestic violence organizations. The first section of this chapter presents the history of these three systems and the second section discusses how historical system differences created barriers to addressing the needs of families experiencing co-occurrence. The third section describes how these difficulties led community and system leaders to create a list of recommendations, in the form of the *Greenbook*, to improve how the three primary systems address families with co-occurrence. The fourth section discusses the creation and organization of the National Greenbook Initiative Demonstration Project, and the chapter concludes with an overview of this report. The hypothetical case example interwoven throughout the chapter illustrates how a family may experience co-occurrence and why it is important for communities to improve their response to it.

CHAPTER I OUTLINE

1. Historical Background of Systems Addressing Family Violence
2. System Challenges to Addressing the Co-occurrence of Domestic Violence and Child Maltreatment
3. The Greenbook
4. National Greenbook Initiative Demonstration Project
5. Report Overview

Janice and David: A Hypothetical Family

Janice, 27, works at a bank and has two children – Michael, 9, and Carlyn, 5. David, 31, is a salesman. He is also Janice’s boyfriend and the father of her children. The couple has lived together for seven years.

Janice and David have always provided the necessities for their children, but their relationship has been a rocky one. While David has always been controlling, more recently he began denying the children toys and playtime. He also began monitoring Janice’s whereabouts – checking in with her friends and paging her repeatedly until she immediately returned his call. Janice began feeling that she was under constant surveillance, while David would often come home very late. Janice felt threatened and confronted David about his behavior, but he would simply ignore the questions.

One Friday night, David came home at 1:00 am, and Janice confronted him again. They began to argue loudly, and David punched Janice in the mouth, breaking three of her teeth. As Janice screamed, their oldest child entered the room. Michael kicked his father and tried to break up the situation, but David slammed Michael against the wall. Michael’s head hit directly, and he was knocked unconscious. Carlyn stayed in her room under the covers, crying.

Upon hearing the fighting and screaming, a neighbor called the police. By the time they arrived, David had left the house. The police attended to Michael and Janice while she explained what had happened. The police called for support to find and arrest David. Meanwhile, Janice and her children were escorted to the hospital.

A week later, the following is known: David has been arrested, arraigned and is being held in jail because he cannot post bail. Both Janice and Michael are recovering from their physical injuries. Michael has severe recurring headaches and is unable to attend school. He also has become physically aggressive and routinely throws things. In a recent attempt to restrain Michael, Janice accidentally banged his head against the wall. Carlyn cries incessantly and hides whenever she hears a loud and sudden sound. Janice has become very anxious, confused, and protective of her children.

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF SYSTEMS ADDRESSING FAMILY VIOLENCE

The recognition of different forms of family violence¹ as social problems has been evolving over the last century, albeit in a fragmented way. The differing social, historical, and institutional contexts in which these forms of family violence have been conceptualized and responded to has led to tensions among child protection providers and domestic violence advocates. These tensions have hindered efforts to coordinate responses when families endure co-occurring forms of violence.

The galvanization of the child protection movement and the women's rights and, later, the violence against women movements has focused public concern and instigated legislative response to these issues. Although child abuse was formally recognized through many state statutes over 100 years ago², the modern child protection system was not established until Dr. Henry Kempe identified "battered child syndrome" in 1962.³ The "rediscovery" of epidemic levels of child cruelty led to legislation in every state to mandate the reporting of abuse and neglect to child protection authorities and provided funding to create large-scale, public child welfare agencies to respond to these reports. In 1974, the Child Abuse and Protection Act⁴ was passed to provide states with federal funding to identify, prevent, and treat child abuse and neglect.

"Wife abuse"—later referred to as "domestic violence" in order to acknowledge that many battered women were no longer, or never, legally married to their abuser—emerged in the 1970s as a significant social issue through the grassroots efforts of women's and victim's rights activists. Safe-houses or shelters were established by under-funded, frequently marginalized women's organizations to meet the needs of women experiencing intimate partner violence.⁵

The child protection and domestic violence systems were designed with very different philosophies, terminologies, mandates, funding, and goals. As a result, both have approached "how to best protect children in the context of domestic violence"⁶ differently. The modern child protection system is comprised of government agencies, usually called child welfare agencies,

¹ For the purposes of this report, family violence refers to child maltreatment and domestic or intimate partner violence perpetrated against adult victims by their intimate partners. We do not use the term here to mean sibling violence or elder abuse.

² Sagatun, I.J., & Edwards, L.P. (1995). *Child Abuse and the Legal System*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.

³ Kempe, C., Silverman, F., Steele, B., Droegemueller, W. & Silver, H. (1962). The battered child syndrome. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 181: 17-24.

⁴ 42 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.

⁵ The term "intimate partner violence" similarly broadens the scope of the problem in its recognition that women and men in same sex couples experience similar forms of violent traumatization in their relationships.

⁶ Whitcomb, D. (2000). Executive Summary: Children and Domestic Violence: Challenges for Prosecutors, Grant #1999-WT-VX-0001, n.p.

providing public services and contracted community services used to reduce risk and address family problems. The primary service mandate for child welfare agencies is “safety for children.” Its secondary service goal is to seek permanency for children by strengthening the family of origin or to seek alternative permanent families (e.g., adoption) in order to ensure the well-being of children. Through state statute, child protection workers are responsible for monitoring families and offering support services when determined necessary. While child abuse and neglect laws vary by state, all child welfare agencies must comply with the basic requirements established in the following federal statutes: The Child Abuse Prevention & Treatment Act of 1974, The Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978, Adoption Assistance & Child Welfare Act of 1980 and The Adoption & Safe Families Act of 1997.⁷

Janice and David: The Role of Child welfare

Based on the police report and contact, the State Child Welfare Agency(CWA) has contacted Janice to open an investigation of child maltreatment (with David as the focus of the investigation). The CWA has met with Janice, her children, and the police. They have determined that since David is temporarily incarcerated, the children are safe from him. They intend to file a petition of child abuse with the courts against David. However, during their investigation they also discover that Janice has (accidentally) re-injured Michael’s head Janice is now afraid of losing her children. The lead child welfare worker discusses with her supervisor whether to file abuse and neglect charges against Janice.

Janice and David: The Role of a Domestic Violence Service Provider

When the police arrived, they asked Janice if she wanted to meet with a domestic violence advocate. Janice declined but said she might call the advocate later. A few days later Janice called the domestic violence program and asked to meet with an advocate. When they met, the advocate told Janice about a number of options, including obtaining a restraining order in case David was released or met his bail conditions. The advocate also mentioned support groups Janice could attend and that the program had services for her children. Janice said she did not want to take out a restraining order but might consider it if David came back. Janice and the advocate decided they would meet again in a few weeks and if anything urgent came up, Janice would call the program and the advocate.

Domestic violence service providers are not organized as a “system” in the same respect as is the child welfare system. Historically, the guiding philosophy of the battered women’s movement has been to empower women to make decisions about their own lives and, thus, the lives of their children. Woman abuse as a social problem has been conceptualized primarily within the larger framework of the feminist movement which understands patriarchy as a persistent social form

manifested through concrete practices, such as forms of violence against women. Batterers’ instrumental use of violence is understood to be rooted in an attempt to control women and deprive them as individuals and as a group of their social and personal power. Guided by this

⁷ Spears, L. (2000). “Building bridges between domestic violence organizations and child protective services.” Building Comprehensive Solutions to Domestic Violence, Publication #7. National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges Resource Center on Domestic Violence: Child Protection and Custody and Family Violence Prevention Fund, February 2000.

social critique, battered women's advocates have understood their mission as providing women the tools and resources toward empowerment, helping them to protect themselves from assaultive men and from public and community agencies that can revictimize them.

Janice and David: The Role of the Court

The criminal court is scheduled to arraign David on assault charges within a few weeks. Once CWA decides which parent(s) will be filed against, the dependency court will receive the petition within a month. Due to a variety of circumstances, case information exchanged between family court and criminal court is often inconsistent and occasionally incomplete.

Much like the child welfare system, the juvenile court system is a long-established institution that has slowly evolved over decades. The Nation's juvenile court system began in 1899 as a reform movement of specialty courts with a new focus on young people under what we now think of as the court's jurisdiction over delinquency cases. The goal of these new courts was to rehabilitate the youthful offenders who came before them as citizens. The courts had open-

ended jurisdiction through the period of a young person's minority and were intended to prescribe "treatment" in the form of community service, mental health services, time in secure facilities, and other means. Within a few decades, the innovation moved to a version of juvenile courts in all U.S. states. As state intervention in families spread into new areas, including monitoring public child welfare agencies that provide protective services to children, the juvenile and family courts absorbed this responsibility.

In recent decades, a strong trend toward specialized courts has taken the idea of juvenile courts into new directions (e.g., drug courts, family drug courts, youth courts). This trend toward specialized case processing in many areas has extended to domestic violence case processing. With some exceptions, courts began focusing attention on domestic violence cases in the early 1990s and recent estimates hold that over 300 courts have "specialized structures, processes, and practices to address the distinct nature of domestic violence cases and the need for special attention to them."⁸

2. SYSTEM CHALLENGES TO ADDRESSING THE CO-OCCURRENCE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND CHILD MALTREATMENT

The different philosophies and priorities of the three systems described above can create barriers to effectively responding to families involved in multiple systems. Child welfare agencies serve children for a wide range of child protective issues. These agencies are mandated to focus attention on the needs of children. This mandate has necessitated seeing women primarily in their roles as mothers while battered women's advocates have attended to women as

⁸ Keilitz, S. et al. (2000). *Specialization of Domestic Violence Case Management in the Courts: A National Survey*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts.

individuals first and mothers second. Working with battered women and their children, many of whom live in shelter with their mothers, domestic violence advocates have learned that the concerns of battered women are inextricably linked to the welfare of their children and that the safety decisions of these women are typically guided by the needs of their children.⁹ As such, battered women's advocates critique the child protection system's conceptualization of "in the best interest of children" as too narrowly defined and argue that it is in the best interest of children to keep their mothers safe. Prioritizing child safety and well being, child welfare workers, on the other hand, might respond that they do not have time to wait for mothers to empower themselves and concretely reorganize their lives so that they are able to protect their children.¹⁰

Courts face several challenges in dealing with cases of co-occurring domestic violence and child maltreatment. For instance, in most jurisdictions there is not a common database among all the courts working with families. Child abuse and neglect cases are heard by one type of judge and court in one location, and orders of protection for a child or an adult victim of domestic violence are usually heard by different judges in a court in a different location. Divorce and custody cases and criminal domestic violence cases (where criminal charges are filed against the alleged perpetrator) can be heard by yet different types of judges and courts. The multiple points of entry for both child maltreatment and domestic violence cases provide opportunities for identifying and responding to co-occurrence cases, but they also are where such cases are most likely to fall through the cracks. Since domestic violence and child maltreatment are typically dealt with in different courts, a judge's awareness of issues may be limited to either domestic violence or child maltreatment, depending on which court is involved. A family potentially could be involved in multiple courts stemming from issues of child abuse and intimate partner abuse, which create new bureaucracies for families to navigate. Additionally, confidentiality issues are complicated in cases of co-occurrence because ordinarily one of the parties, the alleged batterer, has legitimate access to court files, which could disclose the location of a woman in shelter.

3. THE GREENBOOK

Researchers have known for years that child maltreatment and domestic violence often coexist within families, yet many communities have typically addressed these issues separately. These different and separate responses of the each of the three systems have drawn criticism. Child welfare workers charged with the responsibility to look out for the best interest of the child are often criticized for inattention to the safety of battered mothers – and worse, for *blaming*

⁹ Ibid, p. 1.

battered mothers for a perceived failure to protect their children. In a March 2002 decision of a Federal class action suit in New York City, Senior District Judge Weinstein ruled that removing children of mothers who were victims of domestic violence had violated the mothers' substantive due process rights because the City had not thoroughly investigated whether the mothers committed any acts of neglect prior to removing their children.¹¹ Domestic violence service providers – who see their task as championing the rights of battered mothers – have faced criticism for failing to recognize and address the child abuse and neglect suffered by children of battered women. Dependency courts, meanwhile, have been condemned for failing to establish proper and effective working relationships with child welfare agencies and domestic violence experts. The court system also is criticized for failing to share information internally about families that are seen simultaneously in different courts. The different histories and philosophies of the systems have been apparent for some time, and the tensions have played out for years. More recently, the need to build bridges and collaborate with one another and to collaborate to more effectively respond to families suffering from domestic violence and child maltreatment has become obvious to many who work within those systems. Cases like the hypothetical situation presented above occur daily in our nation's homes, agencies, and communities. Responding to those situations raises many tough questions like the ones presented below.

Questions Raised by the Hypothetical Case Example of Janice and David

- *How should the child welfare agency proceed? Should the child welfare agency file abuse charges against Janice? What safety measures should the child welfare agency suggest or require Janice to take to protect her children?*
- *What information does both the family and criminal court need to know?*
- *Assuming David is charged with assault, what support will be offered to Janice?*
- *If, how, and should the domestic violence advocate be involved? Who should decide that?*
- *What information can and should the courts, child welfare, and domestic violence service providers share about this family?*
- *What decisions should be made by Janice?*
- *Should, and if so how should, Janice be involved in the decision-making process (and/or options) of the courts, child welfare agency, and/or the domestic violence service provider?*
- *Is there a chance that Janice will be re-victimized by how these systems choose to respond? What can and should be done to prevent or minimize her possible re-victimization?*

¹⁰ Schechter, S. & Edleson, J. (June 1994). In the best interest of women and children: A call for collaboration between child welfare and domestic violence constituencies. Prepared for Domestic Violence and Child Welfare: Integrating Policy and Practice for Families, Windspead Conference, Racine, WI.

¹¹ Nicholson v. Williams, 203 F. Supp. 2d 153 (E.D.N.Y. 2003).

Traditionally, the courts, child welfare agencies, and domestic violence advocates have approached the questions raised by the hypothetical case from very different ideological, legal, and pragmatic perspectives.¹² This tripartite view of families like Janice and David's has often led to unnecessary conflict among these three systems, re-victimization and isolation of women and their children, ineffective service provision, little or no accountability for batterers, and in the worst case, removal of children from their home.

Often, the courts have operated or been perceived as isolated, "neutral" institutions whose exclusive interest includes only facts and the law. In cases like Janice's, the courts have not been perceived as a "problem-solving" institution but as an omnipotent, final arbiter of truth and responsibility. Courts are criticized for failing to value mothers as protectors of their children and because judges and court staff do not have adequate information or training about domestic violence.¹³

Child welfare agencies have often had the difficult "choice" between protecting the child's safety by opening an abuse and neglect investigation and demonstrating empathy for the non-offending adult victim.¹⁴ In implementing their state and federal mandates, child welfare agencies occasionally have removed children from homes on grounds of "failure to protect." A mother may be terrified of losing her children to CPS, such as in Janice's case, in addition to the trauma of violence. Many of her choices have been strongly influenced and guided by her fear of losing her children. These fears and realities have often clouded and directed the relationship that child welfare can have with these mothers.

Domestic violence providers have consistently viewed their role as advocates for women like Janice. Their approach is to empower Janice and other victims to make and be aware of their own decisions. Historically, domestic violence providers have ignored or minimized the impact of a child's exposure to violence for fear that they would have to report a battered woman to the child welfare agency. These perceptions, fears, and organizational conflicts have often undermined each institution's mission, reduced their efficacy for working with families of co-occurrence, and limited the family's capacity to gain and reestablish safety.¹⁵

For several years, a group of advocates, policy makers, researchers, and specialists met to discuss issues of co-occurrence. In 1998, through funding by the Packard Foundation, DOJ, OVC, and the Children's Bureau in HHS, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court

¹² Schechter, S., & Edleson, J.L. (1999). *Effective intervention in domestic violence and child maltreatment cases: Guidelines for policy and practice*. Reno, NV: National Council of Juvenile & Family Court Judges.

¹³ Buzawa, E.S., & Buzawa, C.G. (1996). *Domestic violence: The criminal justice response*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

¹⁴ Beeman, S., Hagemeister, A., & Edleson, J.L. (1999). Child protection and battered women's services: From conflict to collaboration. *Child Maltreatment*, 4(2), 116-126.

¹⁵ Ibid.

Judges (NCJFCJ) began to discuss more effective means by which communities could respond to families where domestic violence and child maltreatment overlap, and they convened an Advisory Committee composed of national experts in these fields. The Advisory Committee developed a set of recommendations for policies and practices related to the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence. In 1999, a publication was released entitled: *Effective Intervention in Domestic Violence and Child Maltreatment Cases: Guidelines for Policy and Practice*.¹⁶ This NCJFCJ report, authored by Schechter and Edleson and more commonly known as the *Greenbook*, provides recommendations to service providers, agencies, and courts responding to people like Janice and David.

The *Greenbook* offers communities a framework to develop interventions and measure progress as they seek to improve their responses to families experiencing domestic violence and child maltreatment. The book begins by describing the overall principle of safety, well-being, and stability for all victims of family violence and the need to hold batterers accountable for their violence. The *Greenbook* also describes a series of principles to guide communities in structuring their responses to families who experience dual forms of violence. Finally, the *Greenbook* makes specific recommendations for the three main systems that most often come into contact with families dealing with co-occurrence: the child welfare system, the network of domestic violence service providers, and dependency courts with jurisdiction over child maltreatment cases.

The *Greenbook* sets recommendations for each system in the context of a community collaborative to help each system overcome the distrust and traditions that work against families. The collaborative can serve to develop joint actions across systems, increase available resources for these issues, and sensitize those working in their own realms to the issues, requirements, and practices of other systems.

In its vision, the *Greenbook* would help to change fundamentally the ideology, pragmatics, and approach for communities when responding to cases like Janice's. In the spirit of the *Greenbook*, Janice's case would be addressed very differently. *Greenbook* recommendations would result in a consistent, multi-system response to address the needs of Janice, David, and their children. Exhibit I-1 summarizes problems encountered in the hypothetical situation as the family negotiated through multiple systems, and identifies ideal resolutions based on recommendations set forth in the *Greenbook*.

¹⁶ Schechter, S., & Edleson, J.L. (1999). *Effective intervention in domestic violence and child maltreatment cases: Guidelines for policy and practice*. Reno, NV: National Council of Juvenile & Family Court Judges.

EXHIBIT I-1	
IMPLICATIONS OF GREENBOOK RECOMMENDATIONS FOR JANICE AND DAVID'S CASE	
Current Challenges	Ideal Resolutions Based on Greenbook Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Janice must negotiate through separate court systems that do not consistently share information. ▪ Janice fears that her children may be removed by the child welfare agency on the grounds of failure to protect. ▪ A domestic violence advocate may be available to help Janice negotiate the criminal court process, but the advocate cannot help during the dependency case. ▪ While there are services for Janice's children through the domestic violence service provider, there is no on-going effort to respond to Michael and Carlyn's exposure to violence. ▪ There is little interaction between the child welfare case worker and the domestic violence service provider with which Janice is working. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The criminal, family, and dependency courts share information to determine the best course of action for this family. ▪ The primary emphasis for accountability would be on David and all systems would share the ultimate goal to help Janice and her family gain and re-establish a sense of safety. ▪ Domestic violence advocates can support Janice through all court proceedings. ▪ Domestic violence providers assist Janice in understanding how domestic violence is affecting her children. Michael and Carlyn are thoroughly assessed by a specialist trained to help children exposed to violence, and the children receive appropriate services. ▪ Child welfare agencies work closely with domestic violence programs, perhaps through the utilization of a domestic violence specialist.

4. NATIONAL GREENBOOK INITIATIVE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

The vision of the Greenbook Initiative grew out of the belief that communities can and should do more to address the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment in families in order to avoid outcomes that are damaging and counterproductive to achieving the safety and well-being of non-offending parents and their children. In 2000, a coalition of federal agencies decided to fund several demonstration sites that would prioritize, coordinate, and implement recommended guidelines found in the *Greenbook*. The Federal initiative selected six demonstration sites from over 90 community candidates that applied to be a part of this unique and innovative project. Communities desired to become part of the Greenbook Initiative because they wanted to make improvements to how their systems worked with battered parents and their children, and they wanted to find better ways to recognize and help such families achieve greater safety and well-being.

The sites selected to participate in the Greenbook Initiative include: El Paso County, Colorado; Grafton County, New Hampshire, Lane County, Oregon; San Francisco County, California; Santa Clara County, California; and St. Louis County, Missouri. Each site received its first Federal grant of approximately \$350,000 per year in either December of 2000 or January 2001 to organize and plan a collaborative project to address co-occurrence in their individual communities. Funding for the sites will continue for at least three, and possibly up to five years.

At a minimum, local Greenbook projects must consist of agencies from the three primary systems: the dependency courts, child welfare, and domestic violence service providers. The local Greenbook collaboratives also can include other key organizations identified by each site, such as law enforcement, mental health agencies, community-based organizations, culturally specific organizations, or existing collaborative partnerships. Key individual players in the local initiatives include a project director, a local research partner, and leaders of agencies from the three primary systems, such as a judge, the director of the local child welfare agency, and domestic violence leaders.

Local initiatives began with the goals of the *Greenbook* – to improve the ways the three primary systems work together and with their broader communities to address problems of families with co-occurring domestic violence and child maltreatment. Though each demonstration site will implement *Greenbook* principles and recommendations, local initiative activities depend on unique site-specific characteristics, such as existing local partnerships and resources, community concerns, identified needs and system gaps, and desired outcomes. Particular interventions can include improvements in areas such as screening and assessment, information sharing, cross-training, safety planning, batterer accountability, service provision, and case management. These system changes will provide the foundation for longer-term changes such as increased safety for victims of family violence, a decrease in repeat abuse, and increased batterer accountability.

In addition to the six demonstration sites, the Greenbook Initiative includes the Federal funding partners, a National Technical Assistance Team, and a National Evaluation Team (NET). The Greenbook Initiative's organizational structure is depicted in Exhibit I-2. The Federal Greenbook partners are several Federal agencies within the U.S. Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services who have pooled their resources to fund the Greenbook Initiative. A Federal monitor from one of these agencies is assigned to work with each site on planning, implementation, and administrative issues as they arise.

The National Technical Assistance Team consists of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, the Family Violence Prevention Fund, and the American Public Human Services Association. The National Technical Assistance Team support the sites as they plan

and implement local Greenbook initiatives in their communities by providing peer-to-peer support, individual consultation, and on-site assistance as needed.

The national evaluation offers an opportunity to document the progress of the six demonstration sites towards achieving local as well as Federal goals. The focus of the national evaluation is twofold: (1) to describe how sites interpret guidelines and recommendations and implement their local vision of Greenbook and (2) to assess the effects of implementing Greenbook activities on collaboration and system change. The NET has implemented a multi-level, multi-site comparative research design to study across- and within-system change in the six demonstration sites. The evaluation design includes process and outcome measures that incorporate both qualitative and quantitative data to examine planning, goal setting, implementation, and outcomes of the national initiative. A NET site liaison works with each site and its local research partner to complete data collection and analysis activities.

5. REPORT OVERVIEW

This initial process evaluation provides a description of each of the six national demonstration sites and their planning and collaboration activities from January 2001 through June 2002. The following chapters (and appendices) include a sketch of site demographics, primary system capacities, and organizational structures of the local Greenbook Initiatives. Sites' experiences with mobilization, collaboration, and planning during the first eighteen months of the Greenbook Initiative are also described.

Chapter 2, **Greenbook Process Evaluation**, gives a brief overview of the National Evaluation design and specific information on the first phase of the Greenbook process evaluation. Key research questions, methods, and data sources for this phase of the process evaluation are presented.


Chapter 3, **Community Context**, includes information on the unique community backgrounds and histories of the six sites and information about their primary systems and system capacities prior to the Greenbook Initiative.

Chapter 4, **Mobilization and Collaboration**, details the processes by which sites recruited agencies and people to their local Greenbook initiatives, including specific strategies used to build trust, sustain interest, and maintain viable collaboratives. Local Greenbook initiative governance structures are described, and data concerning factors that hinder and facilitate collaboration at the community level are presented.

EXHIBIT I-2

GREENBOOK INITIATIVE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The *Greenbook* Initiative: Collaborations



Chapter 5, **The Planning Process**, describes planning activities undertaken by the sites during this first phase of the initiative. The processes by which sites conducted resource and needs assessments, prioritized local Greenbook goals, and developed logic models are discussed. In addition, the role of Federal, national, and local capacity building and support for Greenbook are described. Information on training and technical assistance (TA) is provided.

Chapter 6, **Summary and Conclusions**, presents a summary of lessons learned to date.

Site-Specific Reports are attached as appendices to this cross-site document. These site-specific reports present in more detail the six Greenbook sites and their mobilization and planning activities from January 2001 through June 2002.

II. GREENBOOK PROCESS EVALUATION

II. GREENBOOK PROCESS EVALUATION

1. OVERVIEW OF NATIONAL EVALUATION DESIGN

The overarching goal of the national evaluation is to determine whether or not the Greenbook Initiative is successful in meeting the goals outlined by the Federal agencies who fund the project and, to some extent, the goals identified by the local sites. The National Evaluation is a systems change evaluation that will ultimately analyze the extent to which the three primary systems (dependency courts, domestic violence agencies, and child welfare agencies) changed as a result of the initiative in terms of how agencies work with one another and with women and their children. In addition, the national evaluation will determine if and how individuals working in these systems changed their practice in ways that are consistent with the goals of the *Greenbook*.

- CHAPTER II OUTLINE**
- 1. Overview of National Evaluation Design**
 - 2. Phase I Process Evaluation and Key Research Questions**
 - 3. Methods and Data Sources**
 - 3.1 Data Collection Guide**
 - 3.2 Site Visits and Interviews**
 - 4. Analysis**

2. PHASE I PROCESS EVALUATION AND KEY RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Process data provide stakeholders, including decision-makers, with a description and an understanding of what program activities take place and how the activities connect to the results or outcomes of an impact evaluation, if one is conducted.¹⁷ Without such information, replicating programs that “worked” (or avoiding program activities and components that did not work) becomes a difficult task. In the multi-site Greenbook context, where the unique qualities of communities are acknowledged and the sites are encouraged to proceed with implementation activities suited to their individual circumstances, it is even more crucial for a process evaluation to document and describe the nature of the initiative and how it is structured at each site; what needs sites have identified; and what activities sites have chosen to address those needs.

The process evaluation component of the national Greenbook evaluation is designed to provide a description and understanding of each sites’ planning and implementation processes. It is broken up into two phases. This document reports on the first phase of process evaluation activities from January 2001 through June 2002, namely mobilization and planning efforts of local Greenbook sites. Information presented here is more descriptive than analytic and is meant

¹⁷ Patton, M.Q. (1987). How to use qualitative methods in evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

to draw a baseline picture of Greenbook sites, systems, and experiences with collaboration during the first 18 months of the initiative. Later, process data will be analyzed and interpreted in light of further process data concerning implementation activities and ultimately will be tied to outcome evaluation data.

Process evaluations concentrate on understanding the internal operations and dynamics of programs, including strengths and weaknesses and obstacles and facilitators. They focus largely on eliciting the perspectives and perceptions of those with the most intimate knowledge of day-to-day program realities.¹⁸ The process evaluation of the Greenbook mobilization and planning stage describes: *how and why* sites mobilize and collaborate to address problems of domestic violence and child maltreatment; *who* is involved in the planning phase; *what* strategies or activities collaborative members undertake to successfully mobilize and plan their respective initiatives; and *what* barriers and facilitating factors exist that affect collaboration and planning activities.

KEY RESEARCH QUESTIONS GUIDING THE FIRST PHASE OF THE PROCESS EVALUATION

1. **What site-specific characteristics, including background, history, and philosophy of the three primary systems, contributed to the sites' readiness for the Greenbook Initiative?**
2. **How were key agencies and individuals mobilized? How did the sites structure their local initiatives? What factors affected the ability of the sites to mobilize, collaborate, and sustain involvement throughout the course of the initiative?**
3. **How did the sites determine what their initiatives would address? How did they determine and prioritize their needs? What specific planning activities occurred at the sites?**
4. **What strategies did sites choose to fill identified needs? What are the expected outcomes as a result of implementing those strategies?**
5. **How did the sites utilize capacity-building opportunities (e.g., technical assistance, Federal monitoring, and the national evaluation)? What impact did these capacity-building activities have on planning local initiatives?**
6. **What lessons were learned during the planning phase of the Greenbook Initiative?**

3. METHODS AND DATA SOURCES

The challenges of evaluating complex system change initiatives and assessing their effects on individuals are well-recognized. The sites differ in current context, socio-historical background, and the specific Greenbook guidelines and recommendations they choose to implement. Modifications will occur over time as circumstances change, such as new state mandates and changes in the economic climate. The cross-site evaluation of the Greenbook

¹⁸ Patton, M.Q. (1987). How to use qualitative methods in evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Demonstration Initiative is based on a theory of change. This theory of change is represented in the logic model of the national Greenbook demonstration project. The national evaluation logic model (Exhibit II-1) originally was constructed by the NET using the *Greenbook* and the documents submitted by the sites as part of the initial proposal process. Subsequently, the logic model underwent various transformations as part of an iterative process by which the NET met with local research partners, project directors, and the Federal agencies working on the Greenbook to refine and agree upon a theory of change that reflected the goals and activities of all involved parties. This process resulted in a logic model that was representative of an inclusive theory of change, although some variation occurred at the site level in area of emphasis. This approach allows us to identify, explain, and theorize about the steps and mechanisms through which implementation of the initiative brings about changes in agencies and systems, and how their institutionalization within the community impacts the service delivery to battered women and their abused and neglected children.

Qualitative data for the first phase of the process evaluation were collected from several sources, including key stakeholders within the initiative. Quantitative data from two sources, network analysis and concept mapping, are used to supplement this process report. Triangulation of data methods and sources enhances the quality and credibility of evaluation findings. Details concerning data sources, purpose of data collection activities, and the timeframe for different data collection activities are found in Exhibit II-2.

3.1 Data Collection Guide

As a first step in answering the key research questions, the NET developed a data collection guide to collect site-specific data from each site. The guide provides four forms (Community Description; Collaborative Members; Meetings, Actions, and Activities; and Technical Assistance Review) and instructions regarding the data collection and submission process. Further, the guide includes examples of the types of data sites need to submit to the NET and a timetable outlining specific dates by which each site should submit their data to the NET. All forms were to be completed during and/or at the conclusion of the planning phase (through June 30, 2002).


Exhibit II-1

MULTISITE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FRAMEWORK

February 2004

Greenbook Process Evaluation Report: Phase I

17



February 2004

Existing laws/legislation, statutes; community/political climate around DV and child maltreatment; organizational cultures of partner agencies, community resources, readiness, other initiatives/funding

**EXHIBIT II-2
PROCESS EVALUATION DATA SOURCES**

Data Sources	Collection Timeframe	Purpose
NET Site Visits (3)	Spring 2001 Fall 2001 Spring 2002	A mechanism to conduct in-depth interviews on various topics (e.g., community context, history of collaboration, individuals' roles and responsibilities in the initiative, facilitators and barriers) with key stakeholders, including project directors, local research partners, collaborative members, and service providers.
Concept Mapping	October – November 2001	A protocol to elicit across- and within-site goals and priorities for the Greenbook Initiative and to understand sites' expectations in terms of a timeframe for seeing Greenbook-related changes in the communities.
Network Analysis Survey	August 2001 – January 2002	A protocol to provide an assessment of the collaborative dynamics at each site. Technically an impact evaluation piece, data from these surveys were utilized in the process evaluation to help understand participation and power sharing dynamics.
End-of-Planning-Phase Interviews	Spring 2002	In-depth interviews with project directors, local research partners, and Federal monitors to understand their reflections on and insights into the planning process.
Process Evaluation Data Collection Guide/Package	Continuous	A guide/template for sites to use for submitting various process evaluation pieces to NET, including meeting minutes, membership rosters, community descriptions, and technical assistance reviews.
Administrative Documents	Continuous	Documents submitted by sites such as proposals, information on State statutes, and logic models that help NET track activities and goals across sites.
Site Visit Reports from TA Providers	Continuous	Documents reviewed by NET to understand sites' technical assistance needs and the types of technical assistance provided to the sites.

Administrative documents such as the Meetings, Actions, and Activities form were used to answer specific questions about collaboration and turnover. Specifically, the Meetings, Actions, and Activities forms were used to identify at each site whether membership in the initiative was consistent over time, whether additional members came on throughout the course of the initiative, and if a greater variety of agencies were represented as the initiative progressed.

3.2 Site Visits and Interviews

Since a main goal of process evaluation is to understand the participant perspective, written documentation from the sites was supplemented by individual and group interview data. NET liaisons conducted three site visits to each site over the first 18 months to conduct interviews with Greenbook collaborative members and other key stakeholders and to collect additional in-depth process data. Interviews were conducted using semi-structured interview guides. The design facilitated the collection of comparable data across sites while also allowing the flexibility to explore issues of importance to individual interview participants. Key stakeholders representing each of the primary systems were interviewed during the second site visit so that the NET could collect information about how each system deals with cases of co-occurrence and to get a baseline on procedures at that time. In addition, each project director and local research partner participated in an end-of-planning-phase process interview with her respective NET site liaison.

Interview topics for the first round of site visits included the Greenbook collaborative process (e.g., site liaisons asked about the respondent's role in the initiative and perspective on the history of collaboration); the community context (e.g., political, economic, social, and geographic characteristics); and expectations for Greenbook. The purpose of the second round of site visits was to gain insight into how well each community was negotiating the activities of the planning phase. Interview topics included the respondent's role in assessment and planning activities, and factors that were contributing to or impeding successful completion of the planning process. Topics discussed during the end-of-planning phase process interviews included the respondent's perspective on the planning process; factors that contributed to her or his ability to collaborate and engage key stakeholders in the Greenbook process; key planning phase challenges; factors that facilitated or hindered the overall planning process; and her or his overall experience during the planning phase of the initiative.

4. ANALYSIS

Process evaluation data were coded according to the topical themes discussed below. Once coded, the data were further thematically analyzed. Content analysis of the data mentioned above was used to identify themes within the documents that emerged from the readings. A latent content analysis, in which the symbolism and meaning of the content are analyzed rather than counting elements as in manifest content analytic techniques, was then conducted to refine themes and sub-themes. The utility of this approach is that it allows one to identify general themes, as well as to refine themes around key research questions. The data were coded by one person so that inter-rater reliability was not an issue. Coding was done by hand, without the assistance of qualitative data analysis software.

Data were coded and page numbers and locations were noted so that they might be referenced later. Initially, any information that addressed one of the themes was coded under that theme. Later, a second coding was done that identified different issues raised under each coding theme. Data from all sites were merged under the thematic categories. When themes appeared across multiple sites, they were clustered and further analyzed. Clusters were identified by their relationship to the research questions and theoretical project.

FOUR TOPIC THEMES

- 1. Agency mobilization – includes perceptions and activities related to establishing and maintaining a Greenbook collaborative board.**
- 2. Assessment – includes conducting community assessments and integrating the results into strategic, implementation, and evaluation plans.**
- 3. Planning – includes logic model development and activities**
- 4. Capacity Building – includes the impact of technical assistance, Federal monitors, and the national evaluation.**

In the chapters that follow, the sites and their activities during the first 18 months of the Greenbook Initiative are described. Throughout this report, specific examples are used to illustrate the themes and constructs that emerged out of data that were coded across sites. That a specific site was used to illustrate a point does not signify that the concept being discussed was more or less relevant for that site than for others. Rather, site-specific information was used to provide concrete examples so that the reader will have a context for the information presented.

III. THE GREENBOOK SITES

III. THE GREENBOOK SITES

While the Greenbook Initiative recommends guidelines for policy and practice, demonstration communities across the country may implement these guidelines differently depending on their unique characteristics and prioritized needs. Based on data from grant applications, process data collection forms, and interviews with key stakeholders and primary systems representatives, this chapter presents a baseline picture of system structure, capacity, and identified needs and challenges as sites began planning their local Greenbook initiatives. The sections contained in this chapter describe the key community features of each site, including demographics and history of collaboration; the primary systems and system activities related to co-occurrence; and the needs and challenges of system collaboration in response to co-occurrence as identified prior to implementation of Greenbook activities.

CHAPTER III OUTLINE

1. Key Community Features
 - 1.1 Demographics
 - 1.2 History of Collaboration
2. The Primary Systems
 - 2.1 Organization of the Systems
 - 2.2 A Look at Collaborative Relationships: System Challenges and Needs Prior to Greenbook
3. Chapter Summary

RELEVANT RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What site-specific characteristics, including background, history, and philosophy of the three primary systems, contributed to the sites' readiness for the Greenbook Initiative?

DATA SOURCES

- Process evaluation data collection guide
- Interviews with key stakeholders and primary systems representatives
- Network Analysis
- Grant applications

1. KEY COMMUNITY FEATURES

1.1 Demographics

As mentioned above, the six Greenbook demonstration sites are a diverse group of communities. They range from sparsely populated areas to heavily populated cities. The population in some sites is racially homogeneous, while other sites are ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse. Demographic information about each Greenbook site is summarized below; more specific information about each of the six sites is included in the site-specific reports (see Appendices A-F).

El Paso and Lane Counties are characterized by open spaces and national parks punctuated by urban centers where the large majority of the population lives. El Paso County covers more than 2,126 square miles, yet 70% of the residents live in the city of Colorado Springs, situated in the western part of the county. The majority of the population is white (81 percent), followed by Hispanic (11 percent), African-American (7 percent), and Asian (3 percent) residents. Hispanics represent a growing portion of the

population. The county's economy is heavily influenced by the military, which is the largest employer. Likewise, Lane County is mostly covered by forestland but also includes the State's second largest urban area. The majority of the population is white (91 percent), but the county also has a growing Hispanic population (5 percent). Only a fraction of Lane's residents describes themselves as people of color. Recent declines in the logging industry and other factors have affected the State's economy and led to a significant loss of jobs.

St. Louis and Santa Clara Counties each have large populations that spread throughout the counties. St. Louis County, geographically and politically distinct from the city of St. Louis, is the largest county in Missouri. The proportion of the population that is white has been declining over the past few decades, while representation from other racial groups has continued to grow. Asians and Pacific Islanders are still a small proportion of the population but are currently growing faster than any other ethnic group. St. Louis County benefits from a diversified economy, and as a result enjoys consistently low unemployment rates. Like St. Louis County, the large population in Santa Clara County spreads over a wide area. Its population continues to grow. As the population has increased, it also has become more diverse. As of 2000, less than one-half of the population was white, while roughly one-fourth identified as Hispanic, and one-fourth were of Asian or Pacific Islander descent. The economy has recently been driven by Silicon Valley, which brought an explosion of jobs in the 1990s but has subsequently suffered an economic decline with the collapse of the dot-com industry.

San Francisco and Grafton Counties are the demographic extremes of the Greenbook sites, representing opposite ends of the spectrum. Grafton is a large, rural county comprising roughly 20 percent of New Hampshire's land. Grafton County has a relatively small population of 82,000. Its residents are overwhelmingly white; just three percent identify as persons of color. San Francisco, on the other hand, is the smallest county in California in terms of square miles. Though this urban area has a large population (roughly six million people in the metropolitan area; 780,000 people in the county), it is one of the few counties in California that is expected to lose residents over the next 20 years. The residents are among the most diverse populations in the world. In 2000, the population was composed of whites (44 percent), followed by Asians (31 percent), Hispanics (14 percent), African-Americans (8 percent), and other races (3 percent). The residents benefit from being better educated and having higher incomes than most other Californians, but the county has the highest rates of AIDS, homelessness, and drug overdose deaths in the country. The key community features are summarized in Exhibit III-1.

**EXHIBIT III-1
KEY COMMUNITY FEATURES**

EL PASO COUNTY	
Population Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 516,929 people ▪ Over 2,126 square miles (incl. 14,000 acres of national parks and open space), yet 70% of residents live in the city of Colorado Springs
Demographics	81 % White; 11 % Hispanic; 7% African American; 3% Asian
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Median household income: \$53,000 ▪ Heavily influenced by the military—the region’s largest employer
LANE COUNTY	
Population Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 324,000 people ▪ 90% forestland, but also includes State’s second largest urban area
Demographics	91 % White; 5% Hispanic; 2% Asian; 1% African-American; 1% Native American
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Median household income: \$37,000 ▪ Recent declines in logging industry have affected the State’s economy ▪ 14% of population lives below the poverty level
ST. LOUIS COUNTY	
Population Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1,016,315 people ▪ Largest county in the State
DEMOGRAPHICS	White population declining; other racial groups’ population growing
ECONOMY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Benefits from diversified economy and has consistently low unemployment rates ▪ 11% of children live below the poverty level
SANTA CLARA COUNTY	
Population Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1,719,600 people ▪ 1,312 square miles (largest of all Bay Area counties)
Demographics	50% White; 25% Hispanic; 25% Asian or Pacific Islander descent
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Driven by Silicon Valley; recently suffered an economic decline with the dot-com industry ▪ 10% of families live below the poverty level
GRAFTON COUNTY	
Population Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 82,000 people ▪ Rural county comprising 20% of the land in New Hampshire
Demographics	97 % White; 3% Persons of Color
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The largest sector of employment is educational services ▪ 9% of population live below the poverty level
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY	
Population Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 776,733 people ▪ Less than 47 square miles
Demographics	44% White; 31% Asian; 14% Hispanic; 8% African-America; 3% Other
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Successful port and significant hub for commerce and manufacturing ▪ Residents have higher income levels than most other Californians ▪ 12% of families live below the poverty line

1.2 History of Collaboration

The demonstration sites have long recognized the need to address child maltreatment, domestic violence, and other social issues in a collaborative manner as evidenced by extensive histories of community collaboration. Grant applications and interviews with key stakeholders revealed three types of collaboratives that might be expected to influence and shape Greenbook projects at the local sites most directly: 1) community collaboration activities that are nationally recognized or Federally funded; 2) community collaboratives that include each of the three primary systems; and 3) collaborative partnerships that expressly focus on addressing co-occurring domestic violence and child maltreatment.

Nationally Recognized or Federally Funded Collaboration Activities

Each Greenbook demonstration site has experience with a nationally recognized or federally funded initiative. The Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team (DVERT) in **El Paso County** is a nationally recognized collaboration run by the Colorado Springs Police Department consisting of representatives from domestic violence service providers, child welfare agencies, the courts, law enforcement, and many other organizations. DVERT identifies the most dangerous domestic violence cases and then works with victims and perpetrators to connect them with services, assure their safety, and prevent recidivism. In 1996, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention awarded a grant to Womenspace, Inc. in **Lane County**. That project, Coordinated Community Response to Prevent Intimate Partner Violence, seeks to improve services and service coordination, and to increase community awareness of domestic violence. **San Francisco** is currently receiving Federal funds to implement the Safe Start demonstration project from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Safe Start is intended to coordinate and integrate multiple systems and service delivery networks that serve young children who have been exposed to violence.

In **Grafton County**, child protection offices and crisis centers were among the first in New Hampshire to implement a Domestic Violence Program Specialist (DVPS) position under a Federal Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) grant called the Domestic Violence Rural Enhancement Project (DVREP). DVPS workers were placed in local child protection offices to provide training and consultation to child welfare workers in the screening, planning, and management of cases involving domestic violence. **St. Louis County** also has experience with Federally funded initiatives. At that site, the Violence Against Women Grants Office (now the Office for Violence Against Women) funded the development of a court advocacy project for victims of domestic violence with cases in municipal courts. **Santa Clara County** has served as a national model for court-based mediation in juvenile dependency cases.

Community Collaborations that Include the Three Primary Systems

The second type of collaborative history that may enhance local Greenbook initiatives is a partnership between the three primary Greenbook systems: dependency courts, child welfare agencies, and domestic violence service providers. All of the six sites chosen as Greenbook demonstration sites have prior experience with collaboratives of this type. In **El Paso County** the three primary systems, among others, previously collaborated on the Domestic Violence Protocol Committee to address the county systems' response to domestic violence. This committee was responsible for initiating mandatory arrests in the local area prior to State legislation. In **Lane County**, the three systems have a history of collaboration through the Domestic Violence Council, which was founded in 1993. This Council is credited as the driving force behind the successful Greenbook bid in Lane County. **San Francisco's** Safe Start Initiative brings together members from each of the three primary systems, among others, to address children's exposure to violence. **Santa Clara** has been addressing domestic violence for over 10 years through their cohesive Domestic Violence Council. That council, along with at least four other collaborative initiatives in that county, is supported by members from each of the three primary systems. In **Grafton County** the primary partners, among others, have a history of collaborating through participation on the NH Governor's Commission on Domestic and Sexual Violence, the Attorney General's Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect, and the New Hampshire Kids Cabinet. Lastly, in **St. Louis County** the Domestic and Family Violence Council was created in 1996 to increase the ability of member organizations to collaborate with each other and to more effectively assist victims of domestic violence and their children.

Collaborations Specifically Focused on Co-occurrence

Finally, a majority of Greenbook sites have prior or existing collaborative partnerships that specifically have focused on co-occurrence. In **Grafton County**, the Domestic Violence Rural Enhancement Project (DVREP) was formed in 1998 to improve outcomes for battered mothers and their children by enhancing collaboration between the domestic violence and child welfare systems. Child welfare and domestic violence organizations in **San Francisco** took steps to address co-occurrence by sponsoring a conference and training on the issue in 2000. In **Santa Clara County**, the child welfare agency collaborated with the sheriff's department to provide a coordinated response to families in which co-occurrence is an issue. Finally, the nationally recognized DVERT team in **El Paso County** has been a successful collaborative venture that addresses co-occurrence.

Summary of Collaborative Experience and Activity

Examination of activity across sites reveals a strong history of collaboration in each instance, and this is expected to be beneficial to the Greenbook Initiative in many ways. All six

sites have demonstrated the capacity to undertake nationally recognized or Federally funded projects, and four of the six sites have some history and experience addressing co-occurrence in their communities. All of the sites selected for the Greenbook Initiative are communities in which the three primary systems have already worked together in a collaborative manner and may therefore have some advantage or may more quickly be able to mobilize and begin planning. Four of the sites have experience with all three types of collaborations. At the time of funding, sites recognized the need to move beyond past collaborative activities, to become more inclusive, and to strive to make more lasting system changes.

In general, collaborative activity across sites has most often involved child welfare and/or domestic violence agencies, and less often dependency courts. Furthermore, domestic violence appears to be the focus of the majority of prior collaborations. That is, most prior initiatives either directly address domestic violence or are led by domestic violence organizations. The leadership experience of other Greenbook systems, and less extensive collaborative relationships between the dependency courts and other Greenbook systems, may therefore affect the Greenbook Initiative. For instance, more time might be needed to build trust and institutional empathy between collaborative partners who have less experience working with one another.

2. THE PRIMARY SYSTEMS

The goal of the Federal Greenbook Initiative is for the three primary systems to work collaboratively with one another to confront co-occurring child maltreatment and domestic violence within communities. Therefore, each site's collaborative body must include, at a minimum, representatives from dependency courts, child welfare agencies, and domestic violence agencies.

As mentioned earlier, these three "systems" are organized differently as a function of their distinct histories, philosophies, and mandates. Also, child welfare agencies and dependency courts are public entities, while domestic violence agencies are non-profit organizations. These factors have repercussions and are important in order to understand how the systems ultimately progress and succeed in working together in a context such as Greenbook. The size of the systems and the populations they serve also might be expected to influence the dynamics of Greenbook collaboration at each site. Coupled with the unique demographic characteristics at each site and their differing collaborative experiences and histories, relationships among the three primary systems do – and are expected to continue to – manifest somewhat differently. Below is a snapshot of the organization and capacity of the three primary systems at each Greenbook site at baseline (i.e., prior to Federal Greenbook funding). Data from the following sections were collected through interviews with key collaborative stakeholders and representatives from the three primary systems at each site. Again, more detailed, site-specific information is included in Appendices A-F.

2.1 Organization and Capacity of the Systems

Child Welfare

All communities in the United States are served by public child welfare agencies. These agencies perform several functions organized to address specific child welfare issues (e.g., child protection, family reunification, and foster care). The child welfare mandate always has been “in the best interest of the child,” but at the same time, child welfare agencies have recognized gaps in their own system and many have taken steps to change the way they work with families. In fact, child welfare systems in several Greenbook sites have undergone major reorganization efforts in recent years. Descriptions of the child welfare systems at each site prior to Greenbook are described below, followed by a cross-site comparison and summary.

Grafton County. New Hampshire’s child welfare agency is run by the State. Residents of Grafton County are served by three of the state’s 12 Division for Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) district offices. Statewide, DCYF employs approximately 155 staff members. On average, 6,400 cases of child maltreatment are opened for investigation in the state every year. In 2000, nearly nine percent of investigated cases were substantiated as cases of child maltreatment.

In terms of policy and practice concerning how to respond to co-occurrence, New Hampshire DCYF child protective service (CPS) workers receive one day of mandatory training on domestic violence. CPS workers may attend additional trainings as part of their professional development. Formal procedures to screen child welfare cases for domestic violence exist. Recent implementation of a structured decision-making model means that all investigations and service provision plans must consider childhood exposure to domestic violence. Under a state statute DCYF can request, pursuant to a court’s finding in support of an abuse/neglect petition, a court order removing and prohibiting a batterer from the home. Moreover, Domestic Violence Program Specialists (DVPS) are located in each of the three district offices that serve Grafton County. DVPSs are co-located within DCYF and local crisis centers, and it is their mission to provide consultation services to battered women and their children.

San Francisco County. The child welfare agency in San Francisco is the Children and Family Services (CFS) division of the County Department of Human Services. It employs 524 staff members. CFS has four locations throughout San Francisco that serve specific clients according to geography, age, or need. Approximately 1920 substantiated cases of child maltreatment are handled by CFS per year.

A local closed case review study found that 30 percent of randomly selected child welfare cases in San Francisco had documentation of domestic violence. However, there are no formal

procedures in place to screen for co-occurrence, so that number must be interpreted accordingly. Domestic violence services are included in case plans when there is a clear indication that domestic violence exists. Information training on domestic violence is provided to all CFS staff, but it occurs only on a voluntary basis. There is no co-location of local DV advocates within CFS.

Lane County. The Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS) has four local offices in Lane County that are responsible for child welfare services and other human services. There are 82 child welfare caseworker positions at these sites, and approximately 1920 investigations of child maltreatment occur every year. Recognizing that families have multiple problems and needs, the Oregon DHS began a major reorganization in 2001 with the goal of providing coordinated, integrated service delivery plans to all clients.

All state DHS child welfare caseworkers receive intensive mandatory training on child abuse and neglect that includes a section on domestic violence. This training is augmented by annual training sessions conducted locally by Womenspace, although currently that training is voluntary. At baseline, there are no formal procedures to screen child welfare cases for domestic violence. However, a full-time domestic violence advocate is located at the child welfare office. This advocate primarily works with battered mothers to overcome barriers that may prevent her from leaving an abusive situation in which her children are unsafe. Specialized services are provided by DHS to children exposed to domestic violence, and Oregon state statutes allow domestic assault to be elevated from a misdemeanor to a felony if a child witnesses the crime. The Community Safety Net (CSN) serves families in which reports of child abuse and neglect are unsubstantiated by DHS Child Welfare, but who may still be at risk for family violence. Representatives of DHS, Womenspace, parole and probation, and others have instituted a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to triage and share information regarding these families.

Santa Clara County. The Santa Clara County Department of Family and Children's Services (DFCS) administers the child welfare programs. It has four family resource centers – one to serve predominantly Latino populations, one to serve a predominantly Asian population, one to serve predominantly African American clients, and one in the geographically distinct South County. DFCS employs 900 people in Santa Clara County, including 400 social workers. In 2001, approximately 22,000 allegations of child abuse were reported to the DFCS hotline, 70 percent of which were investigated.

All new social workers in Santa Clara County attend mandatory training on domestic violence, and ongoing workers are welcome to sit in on this annual training. All child welfare cases are screened for domestic violence. Although, at baseline, local domestic violence advocates are not co-located within DFCS, there is a special DV Unit within DFCS, and all cases with domestic violence are staffed by workers in this unit. In 1998, DFCS implemented “best

practices” to guide child welfare staff to address the needs of families with an open child welfare case due to abuse or neglect who also suffer domestic violence. The practice employs child risk and protection assessments and includes safety planning. The intent is to assist the non-offending parent in developing a child/family safety plan and to hold the offender accountable. Victim witness funds are accessed whenever possible to support both adult and child victims of domestic violence within families entering the child welfare system. In instances where domestic violence is identified and abuse/neglect allegations are not substantiated, social work staff provides families with local contact information for domestic violence resources.

El Paso County. In El Paso County, Colorado the child welfare program is administered by the County Department of Human Services (DHS). DHS has 350 employees who provide a range of services, including child protective services (CPS). El Paso county handles about 8,000 reports of child maltreatment each year. Less than half (46%) are assigned further investigation, and approximately 500 cases are substantiated as child maltreatment.

Child welfare workers in El Paso County receive minimal mandatory training on domestic violence during core services training, and voluntary training is offered on a regular basis by the local domestic violence service provider. Although cases are not specifically screened for the presence of domestic violence, DHS has a very specific, three-tiered approach to helping families that present with co-occurring domestic violence and child maltreatment. The most severe and potentially lethal cases receive a multidisciplinary team approach by DVERT. Two caseworkers within child welfare are assigned to DVERT and handle all of the cases from initial referral through services provision and case closure. Less severe cases in which domestic violence exists along with a specific allegation of child maltreatment receive a second approach. They are assigned to child welfare caseworkers who have been specially trained in domestic violence. Lastly, domestic violence referrals to child protection with no specific child maltreatment allegations are not opened for investigation in CPS. This includes all referrals where the primary involvement of the children is exposure to violence. Instead, these cases are referred to a domestic violence advocate employed by the local domestic violence provider (T.E.S.S.A) and co-located in the TANF office. This advocate determines whether a contact can be made without compromising safety. If so, the program provides services to keep the children in the home and to prevent the family from further involvement in the child welfare system.

St. Louis County. St. Louis County, Missouri is served by the State Division of Family Services (DFS) with four area offices in the County and approximately 160 social workers. In 2001, DFS received 5,290 allegations of child maltreatment statewide, and there were 3,522 additional family assessments that year. (Reports of child abuse or neglect that do not constitute a violation under the State’s criminal abuse and neglect statute may be responded to by conducting a family assessment designed to determine the child’s safety and the family’s need for services.)

Recent initiatives within DFS have included reforms and improvements in agency case processing, some of which include family-centered services such as “dual response.” As with most other sites, however, DFS cases involving domestic violence are not captured formally through screening procedures used by St. Louis County’s DFS. There are no special policies addressing intake of children exposed to domestic violence other than treating this exposure as one of several risk factors. Child welfare workers in St. Louis County do not receive consistent training on domestic violence, although state-wide training on domestic violence is routinely offered. Prior to Greenbook, there were no domestic violence staff co-located in any DFS office. Policies and practices do exist within DFS to address the sharing of information about child welfare cases with domestic violence programs.

Child welfare system summary. An analysis of baseline activities within child welfare systems reveals gaps that Greenbook implementation activities reasonably could be expected to fill and changes to systems that could be realized as a result of this project. According to these data, consistent training, co-located staff, and improved screening and assessment are all areas that could be enhanced by Greenbook efforts. For instance, child welfare workers across the six demonstration projects were not consistently trained on domestic violence at baseline. Five sites offered at least some training on domestic violence to child welfare workers. Training opportunities at the sites ranged from one-day mandatory trainings on domestic violence to trainings that were completely voluntary. At the remaining site, training had not been offered to child welfare workers since 1998. In addition, only half of the sites had domestic violence advocates co-located within their child welfare agencies at baseline. One site had a specialized domestic violence unit within its child welfare agency. Lastly, only two sites formally and consistently screened all child welfare cases for domestic violence at prior to receiving Greenbook funding. These indicate areas on which sites could focus their Greenbook implementation efforts to effect system improvements.

There are other intrinsic factors at each site that Greenbook implementation cannot alter but that might influence how successful Greenbook implementation may be at creating system change. Specifically, child welfare agencies at three sites are operated by the state, while three sites have county administered child welfare systems. It will be interesting to note whether it will be more difficult to implement changes in agency policies and procedures within state-operated systems. As well, the size of each county corresponds with the number of staff employed in child welfare agencies at each site. While Santa Clara County, for example, employs 400 social workers, the child welfare agency in Lane County has 82 caseworker positions. It remains to be seen if Greenbook strategies will be more successful “trickling down” to workers in smaller welfare systems versus employees who work within bigger agencies.

EXHIBIT III-2 A CROSS-SITE LOOK AT CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM CAPACITIES AT BASELINE						
Site	Grafton	San Francisco	Santa Clara	El Paso	St. Louis	Lane
State- or County-Run System	State	County	County	County	State	State
Training	One day of mandatory training on DV; additional optional training for professional development.	Training on DV is provided to all staff on a voluntary basis.	All new social workers attend mandatory DV training. Other staff may voluntarily sit in on this training, which is provided annually.	Child welfare workers receive minimal mandatory training on DV during core services training. Local DV training is provided regularly on a voluntary basis.	No consistent training. (In 1998, a one-time, state-wide training on DV was provided to child welfare workers.)	Mandatory training of child welfare workers includes a section on DV. In addition, local DV training is provided annually.
DV Screening	Formal screening procedures exist.	No formal screening procedures exist.	Formal screening procedures exist, and cases with DV are referred to a special DV unit within DFCS.	No formal screening procedures exist.	DFS intake screening forms have check boxes for DV, but DFS workers are not consistently trained to complete the item.	No formal screening procedures exist.
Co-location	DV program specialists (DVPS) are located in each district office.	No co-location of DV advocates within CFS.	No co-location of DV advocates within DFCS, but social workers considered to be DV specialists work in the DV Unit of DFCS.	Two specialized CPS workers are housed in DVERT; 2.5 FTE DV advocates are housed at TANF.	No co-location of DV advocates within DFS.	One full-time DV advocate is housed in the child welfare office.

Domestic Violence

Historically, domestic violence agencies grew out of the grassroots women's movement to promote the rights and the welfare of women when no other state agencies or institutions seemed to do so. Hence, their prime mission always has been the well-being of women, which advocates argue is inextricably linked to the welfare of children. Local domestic violence service providers are not public agencies. They are non-profit entities typically supported by networks and coalitions of domestic violence service providers across the state or region. This section describes the different domestic violence agencies and the services they provide at each of the Greenbook sites at baseline.

Santa Clara County. Five different agencies in Santa Clara County provide domestic violence services, including emergency services, crisis lines, counseling, legal help, shelters, and wraparound services. Four of the agencies serve geographically distinct areas of the county, while one focuses on Asian American women and children. These agencies are coordinated by a Domestic Violence Council. In 2001, four of the five agencies with shelter services reported that they provided a total of 16,980 bed nights to 386 women and 401 children that year. At baseline, there were no domestic violence advocates co-located within DFCS in Santa Clara County.

All domestic violence service provider staff in Santa Clara County are mandated reporters of child maltreatment, and domestic violence agencies generally become involved with child welfare if their client already has an open case or if mandatory reporting becomes an issue. At baseline, two domestic violence service providers in Santa Clara County offer counseling for children, and one trains its staff on an ongoing basis on issues surrounding child abuse and on working with children who have been exposed to domestic violence. No domestic violence advocates from these agencies are co-located within DFCS or the courts at baseline.

St. Louis County. In the St. Louis County area, 26 nonprofit agencies provide shelter, support, and advocacy for victims of domestic violence and batterer intervention programs. These agencies are located in different areas of the county but provide service to everyone. The primary shelter serving battered women and their children in St. Louis County is the Kathy J. Weinman Shelter. In 2001, this shelter reported serving 243 women and 310 children and turning away an additional 84 women and 170 children due to lack of space.

Staff at the Kathy J. Weinman Shelter estimate that 35 percent of children entering their shelter witness their mother's abuse. Although staff at domestic violence service provider agencies typically does not receive training on child maltreatment, at least six domestic violence providers in the St. Louis County area have specialized staff devoted to working with children of battered women, regardless of whether these children were abused themselves. For instance, the Weinman shelter offers support groups for children, individual and family counseling, weekly

parenting classes, and individual health care advocacy. While domestic violence service providers are not mandated reporters of child abuse, the Weinman shelter has written protocols for reporting the abuse and neglect of children whose mothers find shelter there, and staff report that they make hotline calls on both the women at the shelters and on the perpetrator or her abuser based on what the women have told staff once they are at the shelter. In St. Louis County, domestic violence advocates are neither located in the child welfare system nor in the courts at baseline.

Grafton County. Four domestic violence agencies (crisis centers) serve location-specific populations in Grafton County with guidance from the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (NHCADSV). Under NHCADSV program standards, these crisis centers must provide a 24-hour crisis line, access to shelters or safe homes, advocacy and support services, support groups and peer support, education and outreach, and community relations. In 2000, NHCADSV reported that Grafton County crisis centers served 503 domestic violence victims, including victims of adult and teen dating violence. Services at one crisis center in Grafton County include an in-shelter children's group.

All persons in the state of New Hampshire who suspect child abuse and/or neglect are mandatory reporters. Domestic violence advocates receive training on child abuse and neglect and the effects of witnessing on children, including an optional training at the annual statewide child abuse and neglect conference, but Grafton County crisis centers offer no specialized programming for children. At baseline, no domestic violence advocates are located within the court system in Grafton County, but the four crisis centers have advocates who accompany victims to various court hearings and have Domestic Violence Program Specialists (DVPS) who are out-stationed at DCYF district offices. By state statute, crisis center advocates are able to have confidential communication with victims, with the exception of mandatory reporting of child abuse and neglect. Victims can choose to waive confidentiality fully or partially. When reporting child abuse, advocates will first request that the mother report the abuse to DCYF with a domestic violence advocate present. If the mother refuses, however, the staff will report the abuse to DCYF.

San Francisco County. Domestic violence service providers in San Francisco County are many and varied, including shelters and specialized organizations that target specific populations or specific issues facing domestic violence victims. Five shelters and organizations provide services and support specifically to domestic violence victims and their children. San Francisco County has a total of 70 shelter beds for women and children and serves up to 600 women and children annually; however, roughly 85 percent of women seeking shelter are turned away due to lack of space.

In general, the domestic violence shelters allow clients with children. At baseline, most of these shelters have children's programs and child-dedicated staff members. Some also report having an intensive orientation training with new staff regarding the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment. Domestic violence advocates working in shelters in San Francisco County are mandated reporters of child abuse. Domestic violence advocates are not co-located within either the courts or DFS at baseline.

El Paso County. T.E.S.S.A is the lead domestic violence victim service provider in El Paso County, providing advocacy, safehousing, children's programming, psycho-educational support groups, and counseling for victims for the greater part of El Paso County. Other domestic violence services in the county are provided to specific populations or groups through multiple-service community agencies. T.E.S.S.A receives approximately 55,000 client calls for service and provides more than 6,000 bed nights of shelter every year. At baseline, domestic violence advocates from T.E.S.S.A are co-located in the TANF office but not in the court system. One victim advocate is co-located at probation and another at community corrections. DV advocates have requested and received training regarding child abuse and reporting issues in the past, but there is no ongoing or mandatory training on co-occurrence or child abuse.

The staff at T.E.S.S.A includes therapists who specialize in children, a children's program manager, and a children's program coordinator who serve many children through a variety of programs and services. The Children's Program includes an individual assessment for each child in the safehouse; individual therapy, when appropriate; children's recreation and educational group activities; developmentally appropriate psycho-educational groups; and referrals to community agencies to meet other needs. If a T.E.S.S.A staff member suspects imminent danger, or if there has been an alleged physical or sexual assault involving a child, then she or he must report the incident to child welfare. In other cases, the staff at T.E.S.S.A may discuss with clients the benefits of signing a DHS release so that they can advocate on the client's behalf. Staff will always let a client know about a DHS call and what her or his options are for responding to that call.

Lane County. Lane County has one primary domestic violence provider, Womenspace, that offers an array of services, including a 24-hour crisis line, three rural programs, a drop-in advocacy center, a shelter with space for 18 to 24 individuals, and a transitional case management program. At baseline, four domestic violence advocates are stationed at Lane County Legal Aid, and they are the only such advocates who enjoy client privilege. Another advocate is co-located at the child protection agency and one at DHS Self-Sufficiency, which provides welfare services.

While there is no formal training on child protective services or child maltreatment at Womenspace, two to three hours of domestic violence staff training is devoted to child

maltreatment issues. A children's coordinator, who is well trained in child development and maltreatment, conducts a separate assessment with all children who enter the shelter, and children living in the shelter attend a children's group. The shelter also requires all clients to work on parenting issues. Although Womenspace has no formal policy for reporting child maltreatment in the shelter to DHS Child Welfare, domestic violence advocates are considered "ethically mandated reporters," and staff and volunteers who are licensed social workers are mandated reporters.

Domestic violence summary. A cross-site comparison and analysis of domestic violence service providers suggests ways that Greenbook activities may be able to fill gaps and change the ways that systems interact with one another and respond to co-occurrence. Gaps in training, children's programming, and co-location of domestic violence advocates in courts and child welfare agencies were noted at baseline. For example, only one of the six demonstration sites reported that domestic violence advocates receive on-going training specifically on child abuse and neglect. At three other sites, domestic violence agencies offer a couple hours of training devoted to child maltreatment or co-occurrence during staff training/orientation. In the remaining two sites, domestic violence service providers report receiving no mandated or organized training on child maltreatment.

In a majority of sites, certain domestic violence agencies provide special programs for children. Five of the sites have at least one agency with specialized staff devoted to working with children, but not every shelter or agency within each site necessarily offers children's programming. Moreover, the programs vary in the comprehensiveness of individual child assessments and the activities that are offered. Children's activities can include group and individual counseling, education and educational recreation, and support groups.

Finally, there is a greater need for the co-location of domestic violence agency staff in the child welfare and court systems. Domestic violence advocates were co-located in child welfare agencies in just half of the sites. In Lane County, four domestic violence advocates are co-located within Legal Aid and St. Louis County has DV advocates in the Adult Abuse Division of the Family Court but not in the dependency court. Two sites reported having co-located domestic violence advocates in other agencies, such as welfare and parole.

In sum, there are opportunities for Greenbook to effect systems change related to the provision of domestic violence services in all of these areas. Implementation of Greenbook activities has the potential to improve how domestic violence service providers attend to the children of battered women who seek shelter and to create opportunities for domestic violence service providers to advocate for women at more points across systems.

EXHIBIT III-3						
A CROSS-SITE LOOK AT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SYSTEM CAPACITIES AT BASELINE						
Site	Grafton	San Francisco	Santa Clara	El Paso	St. Louis	Lane
Mandated Reporting	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Training	All advocates receive training on child maltreatment, plus optional attendance at an annual statewide conference on child abuse	Some DV providers have intensive staff orientations with training on co-occurrence	1 local agency trains staff on child abuse issues on an on-going basis	Advocates have requested and received training on child abuse and reporting issues, but nothing mandatory or organized.	No	2-3 hours of DV staff training is devoted to child maltreatment
Specialized Staff and/or Programming for Children	No	Most of the shelters have children's programs and child-dedicated staff	2 of the agencies offer counseling for children	Staff includes therapists who specialize in children, a children's program manager, and a children's program coordinator. The children's program includes assessments, therapy, recreation and educational group activities, psycho-educational groups, and referrals.	At least 6 agencies have staff devoted to working with children	A well-trained children's coordinator conducts individual assessments and a children's group
Co-location of domestic violence advocates in child welfare and court systems	CW: yes Court: no Other: no	CW: no Court: no Other: no	CW: no Court: no Other: no	CW: yes Court: no Other: yes	CW: no Court: yes Other: no	CW: yes Court: yes Other: yes

Courts

The initial focus of the national Greenbook initiative has been on “dependency courts,” or those courts handling cases of abuse and neglect. Other domestic relation concerns, such as divorce and custody, have not been addressed directly.¹⁹ The purpose of this section is to describe the range of these dependency courts in the six Greenbook project sites at baseline (again, prior to Federal Greenbook funding), as well as to describe other types of courts that may be involved in the processing of cases with co-occurring child maltreatment and domestic violence. This section concludes with some themes and issues for further exploration of the function of courts and court personnel in the six Greenbook sites.

Courts in child maltreatment and domestic violence. Dependency courts operate as part of the child protection system. The public and private child welfare agencies report to the courts by carrying out the court’s orders under the court’s active monitoring.²⁰ The variation of courts that handle child maltreatment cases among the six Greenbook demonstration sites illustrates the range of types of courts that hear these cases across the country.

Other courts. Within all six project implementation sites, issues in families with co-occurring domestic violence may lead to different types of cases being opened. These different case types may in turn be processed in different court locations. Typically, domestic violence and child maltreatment matters are handled on separate dockets by separate judicial officers in separate courts. Domestic violence cases in which an adult petitioner is seeking civil or criminal relief are heard in criminal (felony or misdemeanor) court proceedings, may be part of civil divorce and/or custody proceedings, or may be part of another separate civil proceeding addressing the temporary or permanent protection order. In at least two sites, this separation between the courtrooms in which child maltreatment and domestic violence cases are heard is not only an organizational issue, but also includes physically separated offices in different buildings and varied locations for domestic violence matters to be heard. This further exacerbates the problem of communication and information sharing between courts.

In the paragraphs below, information about the court structures in each of the six demonstration sites is presented, including the variety of courts that may see families with co-

¹⁹ The *Greenbook* directed its recommendations toward “juvenile or other trial courts which have jurisdiction over child maltreatment cases.” *Greenbook*, p. 12.

²⁰ Federal legislation focused on improving outcomes for children in foster care (e.g. Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 and the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997) outline a more active judicial role in the nation’s state courts with dependency jurisdiction than existed before. These laws outline the need for periodic judicial assessments of agency compliance with the plan for the child and regular permanency reviews to evaluate the plan to return home, continue in foster care, or seek alternative permanent family arrangements – all with strict guidelines to which the courts and agencies must adhere.

occurrence. Finally, some themes and issues are highlighted that arise from this examination of court structures and processes.

San Francisco County. San Francisco County has a unified family courts system that handles civil domestic violence cases as well as divorce, custody, and dependency cases. Domestic violence protection orders may be issued by several different courts: criminal, family, or dependency court. Any felony or misdemeanor charge of domestic violence is heard in the criminal court. Decision-makers in the dependency court include a presiding judge and two commissioners. About 20 court staff, including judges, mediators, and attorneys, are trained annually on domestic violence and/or court procedures for handling domestic violence.

Prior to Greenbook implementation in San Francisco, the unified family court initiated several new practices to better serve families dealing with co-occurrence. In late 2001 the family court established a court task force to develop an information flow protocol between itself and the criminal court. The criminal court now notifies family court when there is a criminal stay away order that involves children. This enables the family court to better coordinate services and to issue consistent visitation orders that do not conflict with other court orders. Although the flow of information between the family and criminal courts is increasing, similar changes have not been initiated to link the dependency court to the family and criminal courts. Despite recent changes, stakeholders complain that there is a lack of focus on child maltreatment in the family court and little focus on domestic violence in the dependency court.

El Paso County. The Fourth Judicial District encompasses all of El Paso and Teller Counties in Colorado. It handles a large caseload, which is shared by district court judges, county court judges, and magistrates. Sixteen district court judges handle a mixed caseload of domestic relations, felony criminal matters, juvenile matters (including dependency and neglect, delinquency, truancy, paternity, adoption, and relinquishment matters), and civil matters that exceed the county court jurisdictional dollar amounts. Eight county court judges are responsible for criminal domestic violence cases, in addition to traffic, misdemeanor, and civil matters that do not reach the jurisdictional dollar amount of the district court. Nine full-time and two part-time magistrates handle a variety of caseloads, including restraining orders, drug court, temporary domestic relations orders, juvenile small claims, and probate. Families with child maltreatment and domestic violence most often enter the court system through the dependency and neglect court or through the protective orders court. El Paso County is one of the busiest judicial districts in Colorado, so dependency judges and magistrates may see 30-45 cases a week. Petitions of child abuse and neglect enter the dependency court system through the public child welfare agency.

The courts in El Paso County work with one another and with DHS to provide the necessary services for children and families dealing with co-occurring domestic violence and

child maltreatment. More resources and statutory authority to order victims of domestic violence and their children to enter therapeutic, drug/alcohol, and other services exist in the dependency court than in other courts in the jurisdiction. When the issue of domestic violence is brought to the dependency court, it typically requires domestic violence assessments, the perpetrator to leave the home, and classes for everyone in the family. If findings suggest that domestic violence occurs at home, services for the victim may be a required part of the family's treatment plan.

Lane County. All cases dealing with domestic violence and/or child maltreatment are heard in the Lane County Circuit Court. The circuit court hears petitions for domestic violence protection orders and cases of defendants accused of domestic violence-related offenses. The specialized juvenile court that hears child maltreatment cases is a component of the circuit court but is physically separate from the rest of the circuit court. This division of the circuit court consists of a presiding judge and a judicial law clerk, judicial assistant, and court clerk, among others, and it hears between 15 and 40 dependency cases per week. About three-fourths of founded dependency cases involve domestic violence and/or drug and alcohol issues.

The juvenile court in Lane County has no special policies or procedures for handling dependency cases where domestic violence is present. The Domestic Violence Council conducts training sessions on domestic violence for court judges and staff on an annual basis; however, there is a lack of training on co-occurrence issues. A main advantage in Lane County's small court system is that one judge currently handles all of the cases, translating into consistent responses and rulings. But the physical separation of the juvenile court and the main circuit court can still create some obstacles. For example, it takes considerable time for juvenile court staff to determine whether a restraining order has been issued in the main circuit court. This can compromise the effectiveness of orders issued in both courts.

St. Louis County. The Family Court of St. Louis County is a Division of the Circuit Court and has two judges and three commissioners to hear dependency cases. They hear a wide range of cases including guardianship, adoption, termination of parental rights, abuse and neglect, and delinquency. The "one family one judge" rule operates in the Family Court; the judge first assigned to a case will follow up with all the related cases for that family.

One challenge to implementing the "one family one judge" goal is the lack of a common database among all the courts working with families. Child abuse and neglect cases brought by DFS are heard by Family Court judges at the Family Court Center. A child order of protection (restraining order protecting a child) is heard by Family Court judges at a different location a few blocks away from the Family Court Center, commonly referred to as "the Hill." The child order of protection case is bundled under the "one family one judge" rule with a child abuse and neglect case on the same child when a prior existing case is identified at the time of the new case

filing despite the lack of a common database. A case can also begin as an adult order of protection heard by Family Court judges out of the Adult Abuse Office. Divorce and custody cases are handled by Family Court and also are heard at the second Family Court “Hill” location. Criminal domestic violence cases with children who are abused, neglected, or at risk are heard by Associate and Circuit Court judges. If a case comes to the attention of the legal staff that represents the Deputy Juvenile Officers in the Family Court, a child maltreatment case can be initiated in the Family Court. These multiple points of entry for both child maltreatment and for domestic violence cases in St. Louis County provide many opportunities and challenges for identifying and serving cases of co-occurrence.

St. Louis County Family Court has its own unit of specialized professionals who provide case management services called the Child Protective Services unit (CPS). Referrals to domestic violence service providers from the Family Court of St. Louis County may be made through Family Court CPS or through the county public child welfare agency, DFS. DFS is involved as the direct service provider, and it is that agency’s responsibility to ensure that a family receives needed services and to report these activities to the Family Court. CPS and the Family Court generally do not track cases that have been referred for domestic violence services. However, court ordered services are tracked and follow-up contact between CPS and domestic violence providers occurs by telephone, in writing, and/or through case consultation.

Grafton County. There are four court locations within Grafton County, each housing a family division and a district court, with six district court judges in the County. The Grafton County court locations have judges who sit part time, but there is 24-hour access to judges for emergency protective orders. Between 1996 and 2000, Grafton County’s court system received about 60 child maltreatment petitions per year.

A Family Division Pilot Program was created by state statute in 1995 and operates in six district and two probate courts.²¹ The Family Division in Grafton County consolidates family-related matters from the probate, district, and superior courts, and it has judges who may preside in more than one court. Its subject matter jurisdiction includes divorce, child custody and visitation, child support, juvenile delinquency and status offense matters, child abuse and neglect, paternity, domestic violence, guardianship of minors, termination of parental rights, and adoptions. Nine family division staff, including court assistants, court clerks, and a court monitor and coordinator, receive training in domestic violence at an annual conference, and ongoing training is accessible as needed. In cases that involve co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence, the family division judge typically will provide referral information to the family for domestic violence services or mandate DCYF to provide services.

²¹ Rottman, David B. et al., *State Court Organization 1998*, (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, June 2000 NCJ 178932), p. 347.

Santa Clara County. A case involving child maltreatment and domestic violence in Santa Clara County may be involved with multiple courts organized within the Superior Court of Santa Clara County: probate court, juvenile dependency court, family court, criminal court, and/or juvenile delinquency court. The probate court has one judge, the family court has six judges, and the juvenile delinquency court has three. The juvenile dependency court includes one judge and two commissioners. Criminal court has a separate domestic violence court, in which three judges hear all of the domestic violence cases filed in central Santa Clara County. Each dependency court typically hears 15 cases a day and approximately 3,000 children are under its jurisdiction at any given time.

There is no formalized system to coordinate cases in which the same family or family members appear simultaneously in different divisions of the court system. However, the Superior Court of Santa Clara County has been working on a project that will coordinate those cases. While all judges in the court system have received training on domestic violence, judges in the juvenile, family, and domestic violence courts have received more than others. Monthly trainings provide valuable information to all participants in the dependency court, including attorneys.

Court system summary. As stated above, child abuse and neglect cases can be heard by one type of judge and court in one location, and orders of protection for an adult victim of domestic violence are often heard by different judges in different courts in a separate location. Divorce cases, custody cases, and criminal domestic violence cases can be heard by yet different types of judges and courts. Communication among court systems and between courts and other systems is often inadequate. From the court perspective, the challenge for each of the Greenbook sites is to determine a strategy for identifying and tracking all of these cases of co-occurrence.

Prior to the implementation of any Greenbook strategies or activities, the court systems in half of the sites had taken steps to share information and consolidate cases. St. Louis endeavored to consolidate cases by employing the “one family one judge” system; and in Grafton, the Family Division consolidated family-related court matters. San Francisco created an information-flow protocol whereby the criminal court notifies the family court when there is a stay-away order involving children. In the remaining sites, no formal policies or procedures to coordinate cases had been implemented. However, because of its small size, Lane County benefited from the fact that one judge handled all cases. Judicial staff in five of the sites received training on domestic violence, but judges were not obligated at any of the six sites to attend this training. At baseline, a lack of training on co-occurrence was reported.

There is certainly awareness of the need for changes within the court system at each site, but gaps are evident that highlight the potential for Greenbook to effect change. All sites could

EXHIBIT III-4						
A CROSS-SITE LOOK AT COURT SYSTEM CAPACITIES AT BASELINE						
Site	Grafton	San Francisco	Santa Clara	El Paso	St. Louis	Lane
Family Court?	Family Court	Unified Family Court System	Family Court	Domestic Relations Court	Family Court	No family court
Dependency Judges	6 District Court Judges hear dependency cases	1 judge and 2 commissioners	1 judge and 2 commissioners	16 District Court judges handle dependency cases	2 judges and 3 commissioners	1 judge
Training	9 Family Division staff receive training on DV annually; Some judges receive training on DV annually, but it is not mandatory	Judicial staff, including judges, receive annual DV training	All judges in court system receive training on DV. Judges in juvenile, family, and DV courts receive more.	The Bench and domestic salon have received some sporadic training on co-occurrence from local service providers	No consistent or mandatory training on DV or co-occurrence	Training on DV is provided annually, but there is a lack of training on co-occurrence.
Special Features	The Family Division consolidates family-related matters	Court task force created information-flow protocol. Now, Criminal Court notifies Family Court when there's a stay-away order involving children	No formal system to coordinate cases in which the same family members appear simultaneously in different divisions of the court system	ICON Database contained case information for all courts, but the information was not being updated frequently, and judges were not regularly using it.	St. Louis County has implemented the "one family one judge" system	No special policies or procedures for cases w/ co-occurrence, but one judge handles all cases, so there are consistent responses and rulings

benefit from increased and consistent court training on domestic violence, batterers, co-occurrence, and lethality assessment (helping judges to assess the risks in cases of co-occurrence). Increased awareness through training may in turn spur greater levels of information-sharing and case consolidation. Additionally, not all sites have focused on all of the connections among types of courts and multiple points of entry for cases of co-occurring child maltreatment and domestic violence. As sites implement system changes to address these gaps, confidentiality of court records in case files that are tracked will be important for jurisdictions to clarify. For example, address information for a battered woman residing in a shelter needs to be omitted from citations and other records if they are to be part of the public process and accessible to the batterer. The role of the court clerk, who handles court documents that are officially filed with the courts and who responds to requests for court case file information by parties and by the general public, is crucial in implementing confidentiality procedures.

2.2 A Look at Collaborative Relationships: Systems Challenges and Needs Prior to Greenbook Implementation

Collaborations through inter-system relationships serve as the foundation for Greenbook recommendations. The organization and capacity of the primary systems, as described above, may prove to be facilitating factors or barriers as the initiative unfolds in each site. As suggested by the recognition of co-occurrence as a key community concern in the Greenbook sites and the history of collaboration, these systems are already working together in many ways to address co-occurrence. This section describes the challenges and needs that have characterized relationships among systems prior to Greenbook implementation. Data from this section were taken primarily from primary systems interview respondents during the first NET site visit and from the Network Analysis survey. Interviews with key individuals in primary systems included questions such as, “What is your experience working with other agencies or organizations collaboratively to meet the needs of children and families with co-occurring child maltreatment and domestic violence?” A section of the network analysis survey asked respondents to describe any barriers to interaction with other organizations during the past six months.

Despite the activities systems had already undertaken to establish better relationships and effectively respond to co-occurrence, respondents across sites identified challenges and needs to which they felt their local Greenbook efforts should respond. The needs and challenges identified below were reported prior to the completion of the needs assessment activities that sites conducted. Inter and intra-system challenges are discussed by system or systems. Analysis of these data reveals that similar challenges and needs were identified across sites. (Further detail concerning the challenges and needs identified within a particular site are discussed in the site-specific appendices.)

Intra-system challenges and needs

The following sections describe the needs of each system that were identified by stakeholders who responded to the network analysis survey and the primary systems interview.

Child Welfare.

- **Increased consistency of identification and responses for co-occurrence.** Although nearly every child welfare agency screened for a variety of risk factors including domestic violence, substance abuse, mental health, and developmental problems, screening for co-occurring domestic violence and child maltreatment in the child welfare agencies was inconsistent and was less of a priority than other risk factors.
- **Increased training.** Most child welfare agencies reported conducting training that addressed co-occurrence, however, the scope of training varied widely. Some agencies only offered training for those staff considered domestic violence specialists, or training was made available to all staff only on a voluntary basis. Although domestic violence training occurs on a regular basis at some child welfare agencies, respondents reported other agencies only conducted trainings every few years. In addition to training specifically about co-occurrence, respondents mentioned other topics that needed more training, such as TANF and failure-to-protect policies.
- **Reduced staff turnover.** Several respondents specifically identified the continuously high turnover rates among direct service staff as a challenge in child welfare agencies. An inexperienced, transitory workforce requires a high degree of training just to maintain the current skill and knowledge level among staff.
- **Expanded services.** Respondents from child welfare agencies cited the need to expand services to include more voluntary services and more services for families with non-substantiated cases.
- **Increased budget.** Several respondents expressed concern over budgetary constraints in their child welfare agency.

Domestic Violence.

- **Increased Training.** Domestic violence service providers across sites reported the need for more consistent, formalized training regarding child maltreatment. Respondents reported that while some child welfare agencies were using domestic violence staff to

conduct trainings on domestic violence, very few domestic violence service providers were using child welfare staff to conduct similar cross-trainings.

(Most of the needs and challenges identified for domestic violence service providers are discussed in the following section about inter-system needs.)

Dependency Courts.

- **Increased Training.** While regular training for court staff was reported to occur in most sites, several respondents reported that the training relating to co-occurrence may not always reach all the relevant players. It is generally directed at court clerks, court coordinators, and attorneys. While judges are often invited to cross-training and profession-specific training, primary systems interview respondents reported that such training is not always well attended, or that the individuals most needing to hear certain kinds of information are absent. In addition to judges, one respondent mentioned that Guardian Ad Litem were also in need of more training about the co-occurrence of child abuse and domestic violence.
- **Increase consistency of responding.** Several sites have reported that dependency courts have no formal policy for addressing domestic violence when it arises in dependency cases. This need for consistency of responding is discussed in more detail in the next section that addresses inter-system needs.

Inter-system needs

In addition to system-specific needs and challenges, respondents identified similar cross-system issues. These needs address barriers that affect the relationships among systems.

- **Collaboration between child welfare agencies and domestic violence service providers in policy formulation.** Respondents at two sites expressed the desire for child welfare agencies to include domestic violence agencies in their process of formulating policy regarding co-occurring child maltreatment and domestic violence.
- **Cross-training between child welfare agencies and domestic violence service providers .** As mentioned in the intra-system needs section, both child welfare agencies and domestic violence service providers report the need for more cross-training between agencies.

- **Co-locating domestic violence advocates.** While domestic violence advocates have a presence in many criminal courts and some family courts, respondents reported a need for advocates to help non-offending victims negotiate both the dependency court and the child welfare agency.
- **Confidentiality and information sharing between child welfare agencies and domestic service providers.** Domestic violence advocates are sensitive to the safety and confidentiality needs of their clients. For example, most shelters do not confirm or deny the presence of a person in response to an inquiry by the child welfare agency. Some agencies will encourage their clients to sign confidentiality waivers, while others will not even suggest it. Likewise, many domestic violence service providers only communicate with child welfare agencies when mandated reporting becomes an issue. The definition of a mandated reporter of child maltreatment varies across sites and agencies. In some agencies, reporting suspected maltreatment is seen as jeopardizing the effort made to protect a woman's safety and confidentiality as she seeks help.
- **Improving responses to children witnessing domestic violence.** An issue that challenges each system is how best to respond to the needs of children who witness domestic violence assaults against their parents and/or other related abusive behavior. In most sites, exposing a child to domestic violence is not considered maltreatment by federal and state statutes. Most domestic violence service providers do not have an established protocol for dealing with a child exposed to domestic violence, nor are they typically required to report it unless the child is or is suspected to be at risk or in imminent danger.
- **Increased consistency in cross-court responses to families with co-occurring domestic violence and child maltreatment.** Respondents in almost every site reported that there were no formal policies to address child abuse in family or criminal court, and likewise, no consistent policies to address domestic violence in dependency courts.
- **Increased information sharing between court systems.** In addition to having no consistent policy regarding co-occurrence across court systems, respondents also reported that there was a need for more information shared among the courts. While some sites had specialized staff or information systems that helped identify and share information about families involved in multiple courts, many respondents reported barriers to information sharing such as the physical distance between courts and problems sharing electronic files.

The needs identified above highlight some of the challenges to collaboration, and subsequently to effectively responding to co-occurrence, that sites face as they plan and implement Greenbook recommendations. Some needs, such as increased information sharing, may be fairly easy to address once stakeholders agree such needs are a site priority. Other needs, such as the need for increased training, increased number of specialized staff or increased services, may require additional funding or other resources. There are many needs, however, such as the need for consistency to responding to families experiencing co-occurrence and improved information sharing between domestic violence and child welfare agencies that represent systemic barriers due to different priorities. Overcoming these systemic barriers to collaboration will take creativity, vision, and a deep investment from key systems.

3. CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter, key community features of each Greenbook site were described, including demographics and history of collaboration. A baseline picture of the primary systems and system activities related to co-occurrence at each site also was presented. This chapter contains information answering the first research question:

What site-specific characteristics, including background, history, and philosophy of the three primary systems, contributed to the sites' readiness for the Greenbook Initiative?

Every Greenbook site has distinct characteristics and contexts. They vary in terms of population, culture, and geography. Primary systems in each site consequently are organized differently, and the local systems represented by the six Greenbook sites have had varying levels of experience collaborating to address co-occurring domestic violence and child maltreatment. But sites have things in common as well. For example, every site has demonstrated the need, willingness, and dedication to improve their capacity to address co-occurrence – and sites face similar challenges in their efforts to do so.

History of and Experience with Community Collaboration

Grant applications and interviews with key collaborative stakeholders at each site revealed that Greenbook sites have experience with three types of collaboratives that contributed to their readiness to participate in the Greenbook Initiative. This history also may influence local project work.

- All six sites have experience with community collaboratives that are nationally recognized or Federally funded

- All six of the Greenbook sites have experience with community collaboratives that include members of the three primary systems
- Four of the local sites have experience with community collaboratives that focus specifically on co-occurring domestic violence and child maltreatment
- Four of the Greenbook sites have had experience with all three of these types of collaboratives in their communities.

Organization and Capacity of the Three Primary Systems

The goal of the Federal Greenbook Initiative is for child welfare, domestic violence service providers, and dependency courts – the three primary systems – to work collaboratively with one another to confront co-occurrence. Analysis of the three systems across sites at baseline reveals that Greenbook resources and activities have the potential to fill gaps and create real system change. The following summarize system resources and gaps at baseline:

Child Welfare System:

- Many of the child welfare systems within Greenbook communities had recognized the need for a more family-centered, holistic approach to their work and had begun or completed major reorganization efforts
- Training for caseworkers on domestic violence and co-occurrence is inconsistent and insufficient
- Only 2-3 sites had domestic violence staff co-located within the child welfare system
- Only half of Greenbook sites have child welfare systems that formally screen for domestic violence.

Domestic Violence Service Providers:

- Training for advocates on child maltreatment and the effects on children of exposure to domestic violence is inconsistent and insufficient
- Not all domestic violence service providers offer children’s programming. The programming that is offered varies in its comprehensiveness
- None of the sites had domestic violence advocates co-located in dependency courts
- Only 2-3 sites had domestic violence advocates co-located within the child welfare system.

Dependency Courts:

- The multiple points of entry for both child maltreatment and domestic violence cases provide opportunities for identifying and serving cases of maltreatment but also present locations where these cases can be missed

- Court systems in half of the Greenbook sites had taken steps to share information and consolidate cases with co-occurrence
- Training for court personnel, including judges, on domestic violence and co-occurrence is inconsistent and insufficient
- None of the dependency courts within the six demonstration sites had co-located domestic violence advocates.

Intra- and Inter-system Challenges and Needs

As primary systems representatives come together to collaboratively address co-occurrence, they must deal head-on with the challenges and needs that historically have characterized the relationships among their systems. Representatives from the three primary systems talked about the challenges and needs to which they felt their local Greenbook initiatives should respond. Similar issues were identified across all six Greenbook sites and are summarized below.

- Improved **identification and assessment** of co-occurrence in all three systems
- Improved **training** (within- and cross-system training)
- Increased **co-location** of domestic violence advocates
- Improved **information sharing** and **confidentiality** among service providers and courts
- Increased **information sharing** within courts
- Improved **services** to families experiencing co-occurrence.

IV. MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION

IV. MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION

Collaboration has been associated with a number of benefits at the community level, including more effective coordination and less duplication of services, more comprehensive services, and a stronger foundation for leveraging public and private funds for services. The mobilization of community agencies (i.e., bringing people to the table, engaging key players, building rapport and trust, negotiating power and decision-making responsibilities) is necessary for collaboration to occur.

As highlighted in the previous chapter and the site-specific appendices, Greenbook sites are unique—from their geography and culture to their history with community-based collaboration. The uniqueness of each site demands a distinct approach to addressing the problem of co-occurrence through agency and community collaboration.

RELEVANT RESEARCH QUESTIONS

2. How were key agencies and individuals mobilized? How did the sites structure their local initiatives? What factors affected the ability of the sites to mobilize, collaborate, and sustain involvement throughout the course of the initiative?

DATA SOURCES

- NET Site Visits/Interview with key stakeholders
- End-of-planning-phase interviews
- Process Evaluation Data Collection Guide
- Network Analysis Survey

CHAPTER IV OUTLINE

1. **Mobilization (Bringing People to the Table)**
 - 1.1 The Draw to Greenbook
 - 1.2 Mobilization Strategies and Activities
2. **Key Players: Community Sector Representation**
3. **Participation and Power Sharing**
 - 3.1 Governance Structure
 - 3.2 Network Analysis
4. **Perceived Barriers and Facilitators to Greenbook Mobilization and Collaboration**
 - 4.1 Ideological Differences and Trust Among Members
 - 4.2 Belief in Change Through Collaboration
 - 4.3 Inclusiveness
 - 4.4 Resources
 - 4.5 Coordination and Leadership of Collaboration Activities
5. **Chapter Summary**

This chapter examines mobilization and collaboration activities of the primary partners in the Greenbook Initiative, including battered women's shelters and domestic violence advocacy centers, child welfare agencies, and dependency courts. The process evaluation results presented here describe the ways in which Greenbook partners engaged in the process of structuring a collaborative framework during the planning phase. Included is a look at participation and power sharing within each site's collaborative framework.

The first section of this chapter examines the types of experiences sites had during the planning phase and the strategies they used to mobilize people and agencies around the initiative. Next, key players and agencies across the sites are presented followed by a discussion of participation and power sharing in the Greenbook Initiative. Lastly, the obstacles and facilitators associated with

engaging key stakeholders in collaborative activities and maintaining the collaborative spirit are presented.

1. MOBILIZATION (BRINGING PEOPLE TO THE TABLE)

1.1 The Draw to Greenbook

Collaborations can be formed for specific reasons, or in response to more general issues that impact different individuals or groups. Greenbook sites have created collaborations for a variety of reasons, including the opportunity to receive targeted funding for needed reform, an increase in community awareness of the issues surrounding the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment; and as a response to a community crisis that crystallized the need to reform the ways systems respond to co-occurrence. The **St. Louis County** Greenbook collaborative, for example, was created specifically to apply for Federal Greenbook funding in order to extend and institutionalize the existing collaborative efforts the County had created in previous years. Greenbook efforts at that site are not reported to be in response to a local crisis or particular case. This is also true for **San Francisco County**, whose Greenbook stakeholders galvanized around the issue of co-occurrence through previous and existing coalitions. In **El Paso County**, the heavy military presence brings a disproportionately young and mobile population to the area that is at higher risk for domestic violence. This may be one reason El Paso County has such strong dedication and interest in addressing co-occurrence that has led to their extensive collaborative history and specific responses such as DVERT. Prior to the Greenbook initiative, key partners and agencies were already working together through various collaboratives; but the community also recognized the need for stronger partnerships with systems such as the courts and an all-inclusive approach to co-occurrence. El Paso County sought Greenbook funding to address these identified concerns.


Grafton County, too, has a significant history of collaborations to address domestic violence and/or child maltreatment. With the existing structure and success of the Domestic Violence Program Specialists (DVPS), Grafton County viewed the Greenbook Initiative as an opportunity to expand and develop a systems-focused vision for responding to the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence.

While **Lane County** stakeholders have a history of community collaboration in support of human services to meet the needs of children and families, this site faced the same issues as the rest of the country: two distinct and separate systems to address domestic violence and child maltreatment. The toll that the fragmentation of these systems and services took on the lives of women and children came sharply into focus in 1992 following the death of two infants in homes where there was intimate partner violence. The community's shock and anger at the failure of the systems to prevent these deaths galvanized the county and many of its public and private

human service agencies into reviewing policies and practices to identify what went wrong. A subsequent trip to the International Conference on the Impact of Domestic Violence on Children in Vancouver, British Columbia in 1998 further inspired Lane County stakeholders to seek funding to begin institutionalizing systems change regarding their community response to co-occurrence.

In **Santa Clara County**, other unique site characteristics served as catalysts for seeking Greenbook funding. A combination of economic factors as well as the increased awareness of and concern for children exposed to domestic violence on the part of law enforcement helped motivate the community to apply for Greenbook funding. Santa Clara County is one of only a few counties in the nation where law enforcement has the authority to remove children from homes without social worker input. Consequently, children have been removed from homes frequently and placed in the child welfare system when, in fact, a social work assessment may have found no need for removal. The lack of affordable housing in the county has compounded the problem, affecting the number of foster care homes that are available. The result has been a child welfare system overwhelmed by high demand and low supply. Moreover, Santa Clara County has benefited from the hard work and dedication of a local judge who chaired the development of the Greenbook document and is well recognized for his work with each of the three primary systems in protecting domestic violence victims. These factors helped Santa Clara County obtain a grant from the Packard Foundation in the year prior to Greenbook funding. Thus, before the Greenbook demonstration grant was even in place, the site enjoyed a year of community-focused attention and collaborative activity on co-occurrence.

In key stakeholder interviews, respondents were asked to reflect on the events and activities of the planning phase. During those interviews, collaborative members reported being drawn to the initiative – and staying involved – because they hoped for meaningful change in systemic responses to co-occurring forms of child maltreatment and domestic violence. In fact, the most frequently reported reason for being engaged in the Greenbook Initiative was the prospect of seeing change. Some explained that this meant seeing change happen in the way organizations work; others said it was about having the opportunity to be involved in something that might lead to broader social change. These sentiments were echoed across sites.



“Some people have said to me, ‘You really think this is about change, don’t you?’ Yeah! I do! I honestly think that we are going to make significant change happen here.”
— Respondent from key stakeholder interview

1.2 Mobilization Strategies and Activities

Despite a common draw to the Greenbook Initiative across communities in terms of a recognized need for change, the process of bringing key players to the table was a different experience for each site. Some sites had a long history of successful collaboration, and some had

key players already focusing on the issue of co-occurrence. Other sites had a good sense of who needed to be involved in an endeavor such as Greenbook, and were able to mobilize and bring people to the table quickly. This section describes different strategies sites used to gain the attention and commitment of community agencies and summarizes factors that facilitated the collaborative process.

Some sites reported that mobilization began in earnest at the time of grant writing and that they never lost the commitment of those people. Others credited existing partnerships and history of collaboration in their community as key facilitators to mobilization. Regardless of the groundwork laid to bring people to the table and secure their commitment, communities still felt the need to invest in and think creatively about mobilizing and maintaining key stakeholder involvement and interest throughout the planning phase.

In **Lane County**, mobilization began during the grant writing process – several people who conceptualized and wrote Lane County’s grant application now serve on Greenbook committees. The number of interdisciplinary councils and committees in Lane County has resulted in considerable community awareness of the problem of domestic violence and a heightened level of buy-in from agency and organization employees. Still, unique strategies to increase the involvement of community organizations in the Greenbook Initiative were developed. Specifically, the Lane County Greenbook project invited other stakeholders, such as representatives from Parole and Probation, to participate as partners in the initiative and restructured its original policy committee accordingly. Additionally, the site boasts a monthly newsletter and web site detailing Greenbook activities and credits these with keeping people informed and motivated.

For **St. Louis County**, extending collaborative membership beyond the handful of representatives that wrote the grant proposal was a challenge of the first project year. This site used a community retreat and discipline-specific technical assistance events such as the toolbox in Boston (April 2002) to garner commitment to their project. Convening an Implementation Committee in February 2002 and conducting their Self Study (part of the needs assessment) energized and mobilized key stakeholders. Like other sites, St. Louis County continually focuses on expanding community and professional involvement.

A solid and formalized partnership at the beginning of grant writing has facilitated mobilization and collaboration throughout **El Paso County’s** Greenbook initiative. Fourteen agencies signed Memorandums of Understanding and worked together to apply for Greenbook funding; all of these agencies remain official Greenbook collaborative partners. Actively engaging key representatives from these agencies has not been effortless, however. Early on, there was special concern over lack of court participation. El Paso County found that key leadership (both from the primary systems and from project staff, including the Project Director

and Local Research Partner) has been essential to progress. Cross-system education and the use of hypothetical case studies around which to discuss Greenbook issues also have been successful strategies to facilitate mobilization and collaboration in El Paso County.

Stakeholders in **Santa Clara County** were relatively well mobilized around co-occurrence prior to the Federal Greenbook Initiative. Their rich collaborative history in this area had already resulted in the receipt of the Packard planning grant. The work conducted under the Packard grant essentially provided Santa Clara County with a year of collaboration prior to the Federal Demonstration project in which stakeholders came to the table to address co-occurrence in a planning mode. During this period, stakeholders from the three systems had time to learn about differing perspectives and philosophies on the subject of co-occurrence and to build trust as they received formal and informal cross-systems training. Although the work of the Packard Grant allowed Santa Clara County to progress almost immediately into planning mode once they received Federal Greenbook funds, stakeholders found out that sustained interest and effective collaboration need careful tending. Specific strategies at this site include continual assessment of missing players, community outreach such as press conferences and marketing packages, and effective local evaluation feedback.

As mentioned, **Grafton County** is large and rural. The geography presents unique challenges to mobilization and Greenbook collaboration. For example, it can take one to three hours for stakeholders to travel to meetings and events; therefore, the local Greenbook initiative must maintain a high level of support and enthusiasm so that people continue to be involved. Grafton County found an innovative way to mobilize key stakeholders both initially and in the longer term. Upon receiving notification of their Greenbook award, Grafton's original executive committee hired Greenbook staff. This Grafton County team then identified and recruited their advisory council and utilized a logic model to develop goals and indicators that would reflect changes recommended by the Greenbook. This process of including the advisory council in constructing a shared vision was important to ensuring broad support and common goals for the Grafton County Greenbook initiative. A comprehensive "I Want" list was developed early on with considerable stakeholder input. The list continues to guide and sustain a relationship between stakeholder, agency, and Greenbook goals. Other mobilization and collaboration strategies used by Grafton County included coordinating Greenbook efforts with other statewide initiatives, distributing a newsletter, and giving education presentations to various local and state groups.

In **San Francisco County**, mobilization began early in the grant writing stage when a group of stakeholders from DHS, Unified Family Court, domestic violence, batterer treatment, and survivors came together to plan the concept paper and proposal. There was such a high level of enthusiasm and buy-in among members of this group that they were committed to continuing to work together regardless of whether they received Greenbook funds. Collaboration

momentum slowed considerably after initial receipt of the grant, because champion of the initiative and key stakeholder from DHS left his position. Decision-making stalled during this time, but Greenbook members took advantage of the time to focus on information sharing and relationship building across systems. San Francisco County utilized a consensus-driven approach, which allowed for greater buy-in and mobilization across systems but some stakeholders were frustrated that decisions were constantly dragged out. This site also increased its stakeholder base by mobilizing the community as its “fourth primary system.” San Francisco reports that inclusion of community members and survivors has been “procedurally complex.”

The site-specific mobilization strategies and activities described above generally fall into one of three categories: 1) addressing structural issues within the collaborative; 2) communication and education within the collaborative; and 3) community integration and visibility outside of the collaborative. Essentially, sites found it necessary to recruit members and to get buy-in from those not invested in the initiative, while simultaneously maintaining the interest of those already at the table. For instance, some sites found it useful and necessary to change the structure of their committees or expand membership to encourage greater participation by those already attending meetings. Communication and education issues impeded mobilization and participation at some sites, so strategies to facilitate the flow of information were devised. Sites also looked for ways to increase their visibility within their communities in order to increase interest and membership in the initiative. The strategies that communities reported as being helpful are presented in Exhibit IV-1.

EXHIBIT IV-1 MOBILIZATION STRATEGIES
<p>I. Changing the Structure of the Collaborative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expanding governing committees, advisory councils, etc.; ▪ Restructuring original committees, workgroups, and councils; ▪ Clarifying decision-making processes and norms; ▪ Providing opportunities for both formal and informal representation on Greenbook committees and subcommittees; ▪ Viewing community as “fourth system” or “fourth primary partner” and make a concerted effort to get them involved and treated equally.
<p>II. Communication and Education within the Collaborative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facilitating brainstorming sessions focusing on outcomes at the initial Greenbook collaborative meetings (which allowed members to begin from a place of equality), and continuously referring to agreed-upon outcomes throughout planning process; ▪ Coordinating communication among stakeholders (e.g., creating a monthly newsletter);

EXHIBIT IV-1 (CONT.)
MOBILIZATION STRATEGIES

- Taking an active role to ensure communication across participants (e.g., project directors/local research partners attended every meeting and subcommittee meeting to facilitate communication between subcommittees and the larger committee);
- Providing outside facilitation/technical assistance to energize “stalled” committee/subcommittee work;
- Providing cross-training for key stakeholders at collaborative meetings (e.g., hypothetical case studies presented by individual partners/members);
- Eliciting a formal pledge to filter/disseminate Greenbook philosophies, policies, and procedures to direct service workers in the agencies.

III. Visibility and Community Integration

- Coordinating Greenbook efforts with other regional initiatives (e.g., cross-collaboration with existing coordinating bodies and projects with similar mandates);
- Providing educational presentations to the public (both local community and statewide) on the Greenbook Initiative (e.g., obtaining a pledge from each member to make a Greenbook presentation to at least three community groups);
- Having Greenbook members serve on other councils and projects in the community, which provided a high level of visibility for the Greenbook project.

2. KEY PLAYERS: COMMUNITY SECTOR REPRESENTATION

The *Greenbook* recommendations encourage communities to develop collaboratives that are comprehensive and representative. Local Greenbook collaborative membership is typically comprised of a comprehensive cross-section of community sectors. As shown in Exhibit IV-2, the courts, domestic violence agencies, and child welfare agencies are the community sectors with the greatest representation across the sites. This is expected given the mission of the Greenbook Initiative and its emphasis on collaboration between these three systems. Importantly, participation by representatives of these three systems remained the same or increased in every instance in the period from January 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002.

As the sites mobilized, collaborating organizations and individuals began to notice that key players were missing. Every site reported that law enforcement was a missing key player. Since law enforcement is often the first point of contact for both domestic violence and child maltreatment cases, it seemed clear to stakeholders at every site that they needed to be involved with the local Greenbook efforts. Three of the sites identified parole and probation as necessary additions to the collaboration. A majority of sites made great progress in the first year of the initiative in getting either the police department, sheriff’s department, or parole and probation

more involved in their initiatives. Additionally, the mental health system was noted as an important recruit by many sites. Consequently, law enforcement and mental health services have relatively high participation rates in local Greenbook projects, indicating the mobilization efforts were successful on these fronts. Two sites reported having no law enforcement members in their local initiatives.

Generally, the composition of the collaborations (in terms of the types of agencies that participated) remained the same after 18 months of tracking membership. There appeared to be a decrease in community volunteers, which may be related to the difficulties of combining community-based partners with bureaucratic organizations. An increase in participation from law enforcement and a larger increase in participation from domestic violence agencies again suggests sites were successful in mobilizing important players during the first phase of the initiative. Similarly, an increase in participation from child welfare agencies indicates that the core agencies are increasing staff representation. An increase in members from cultural/ethnic groups also is evident, perhaps pointing to the success that many sites have experienced with a focus on cultural competency.

A cross-section of participants and a basic count of Greenbook membership across sites from the Process Evaluation Data Collection Guides submitted in January 1, 2001 and June 30, 2002 are presented in Exhibit IV-2. Sites have their own definitions of “collaborative representation” which are listed at the bottom of the table. These definitions range from being broad-- including anyone who attends a Greenbook meeting in the community, to narrow-- only including oversight committee members and designees. The numbers in Exhibit IV-2 should be considered in conjunction with the site-specific definitions of collaborative representation.

Successful collaboration hinges on strong individual commitment to the group and group cohesiveness. One measure of both of these factors is the degree of turnover among committee members. To examine committee member turnover, Greenbook representatives were asked to submit member rosters at the beginning and end of the planning phase, and to indicate which members were still active at the end of the planning phase (Refer to Exhibit IV-2).

EXHIBIT IV-2: GREENBOOK COLLABORATIVE REPRESENTATION

	El Paso		Grafton		Lane		San Francisco		Santa Clara		St. Louis		TOTALS	
	Jan 2001	June 2002	Jan 2001	June 2002	Jan 2001	June 2002	Jan 2001	June 2002	Jan 2001	June 2002	Jan 2001	June 2002	Jan 2001	June 2002
Survivors/Former Clients	3	4		1	1	2	2	2			1	1	7	10
Community Volunteers				0	2		1	1			2		5	1
Justice System/Courts	8	9	12	12	10	11	4	4	21	32	19	29	74	97
Law Enforcement			5	5	4	5			9	15	2	4	20	29
Domestic Violence	2	2	9	9	12	21	9	10	13	42	9	9	54	93
Education/Early Childhood Development			1	2					5	7	1		7	9
Child/Youth Serving Organizations	2	2	2	4	2	1			1	3	5	6	12	16
Child Welfare Agencies	2	3	7	8	6	8	5	5	36	58	11	15	67	97
Health Services				3	1	1			3	3			4	7
Mental Health Services	2	2	1	4	7	7	1	1	14	11			25	25
Substance Abuse Services	*	*	1						2	4			3	4
Civic/Volunteer Organizations	2	2								1			2	3
Business/Private Sector	2				2	1							4	1
Local Foundations							1	1	4	4			5	5
Local Government			2	4	6	8			6	9			14	19
Cultural/Ethnic Groups	6	6			1	1				4			7	11
Existing Collaboratives	3	2	2	3		1	1	1	1	5	1	1	8	13
Public Health	2	2	3	2	1	1			3	5			9	10
TOTALS:	34	34	45	57	55	68	24	25	118	203	51	65		

Each site defined "collaborative representation" differently. Each site's description of who was counted as a collaborative representative is listed below.

El Paso County: Oversight Committee members and designees.

Grafton County: Individuals who agreed to be on at least one of the Project's committees, although many people are on several committees.

Lane County: Individuals who participate in a substantial way, such as advisory committee members or key partners involved/invested in Greenbook.

San Francisco County: Individuals who attended Greenbook steering committees, retreat, and other small workgroup meeting.

St. Louis County: Individuals who attended a Greenbook meeting in the community

Santa Clara County: Any person that has at a minimum attended an Implementation Team meeting in order to learn about the project. These individuals are not necessarily members of one of the four main sectors involved in Greenbook but represent an agency or organization within the County that has an interest in seeing Greenbook succeed.

* For El Paso County, the public health representatives also represent substance abuse services

Membership generally increased over the course of the planning phase (through June 30, 2002), indicating a sustained interest in Greenbook and that activities met with at least short-term success. Numbers grew with the recruitment of more people to do subcommittee and workgroup tasks. Real membership change may need to be measured over a longer period of time to determine if sites are involving more people as the initiative goes on, or at least maintaining current levels of membership. Sites consistently reported the importance of including law enforcement and probation and parole in the initiative. It will be important to assess the degree to which these sectors become or remain involved in the initiative during the implementation phase. Data from the next round of Network Analysis surveys will help to demonstrate the changes in collaboration and sustained involvement at all of the sites.

3. PARTICIPATION AND POWER SHARING

Finding ways to achieve balanced participation and equitable means of sharing power among collaborative members were important tasks for each site. To be sure, striking a balance of power and shared voice among the various partners and agencies impacts how well (or not) the collaborative body functions, what it is capable of achieving, and how long it can be sustained. During the first 18 months of the Initiative, site participants developed governance structures for their collaboratives, formulated and formalized plans that incorporated the best way(s) to structure committee systems, and selected decision-making processes. This section provides a brief description of the governance structures at each site and how they evolved prior to June 30, 2002. Exhibit IV-3 summarizes the similarities and differences among the sites. Finally, a discussion of data collected from the Network Analysis survey provides an important baseline summary of participation and power sharing at the sites during the first phase of the Greenbook Initiative.

3.1 Governance Structure

El Paso County

The El Paso County Greenbook Initiative consists of four main entities. Trust, Education, Safety, Support, Action (T.E.S.S.A) serves as the grantee. The three other main partners include: the El Paso County Department of Human Services (DHS), the Fourth Judicial District Courts, and the Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team (DVERT).

The Domestic Violence/Child Maltreatment Oversight Committee functions as the governing body of the El Paso County Greenbook Initiative. This committee ensures that the demonstration initiative is designed, implemented, and evaluated according to plans. The El Paso collaborative determined that the Oversight Committee should include, at a minimum, a single representative from each of the partnering agencies plus four “family experts” (former

clients or consumers of the three primary systems). The Oversight Committee is co-chaired by the Executive Director of T.E.S.S.A and a family expert.

In addition to the four primary partners, the Oversight Committee includes 10 agencies that are considered official initiative partners. As such, the El Paso's Greenbook collaborative includes representatives from: the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA), Colorado Legal Services, District Attorney's Office, Pikes Peak Mental Health Center, Children's Advocacy Center, El Paso County Department of Health and Environment, Urban League of the Pikes Peak Region, Asian Pacific Family Center, Colorado Department of Human Services' Child Welfare Services Division, and Joint Initiatives for Youth and Families. The Oversight Committee can also invite additional organizations by invitation.

A smaller committee, the Executive Committee, serves to focus the work of the Oversight Committee. Originally, the Executive Committee was made up of an equal balance between family experts and agency personnel: the four family experts and one representative from each of the four primary partner agencies. As subcommittees were defined and became an integral part of the project however, the group decided in May 2001 to ask all subcommittee chairs and co-chairs to join the Executive Committee. The two co-chairs of the Oversight Committee also co-chair the monthly Executive Committee meetings.

During the later stages of the planning phase of the Greenbook Initiative, the decision-making and voting process of the Oversight Committee changed. Originally, only one member from each agency had voting power. A delegate from an agency could be sent, but would not have voting privilege on the Oversight Committee. This policy was intended to encourage regular monthly attendance by the leaders of the agencies represented on the committee. However, in August 2001 the Oversight Committee decided that each agency could have, in addition to one voting member, one designated delegate with voting privilege. If family experts could not be present at a meeting, they could vote by proxy via another family expert. That decision, like all committee decisions, was determined by a vote. The Oversight Committee uses the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order to govern the meetings.

The Executive Committee is charged with providing the needs assessment, pilot investigation and supervision of El Paso's project-oriented subcommittees. Five main subcommittees have been created to continue to develop and implement Oversight Committee plans: 1) the Service Access and Resource Development (SARD) subcommittee, 2) the Judicial Integration subcommittee, 3) the Judicial Education subcommittee, 4) the cultural competency subcommittee. The fifth subcommittee has been created, ad hoc, as the family experts have continually met as a subcommittee throughout the planning phase of the initiative.

Grafton County

The Grafton County Greenbook Initiative consists of four main entities. The Administrative Office of the Courts for the State of New Hampshire serves as the grantee. The primary partners include: the Grafton County District Courts and Family Division; the Division for Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) of the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS); the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence; and the four crisis centers serving Grafton County, including The Support Center at Burch House, Voices Against Violence, Women's Information Service, and Women's Supportive Services.

The Executive Committee functions as the governing body of the Grafton County Greenbook project. The Executive Committee consists of the following representatives: Administrative Judge for the New Hampshire District Courts; Supervisory Judge of the Grafton County Family Division; Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts; Director of the Division for Children, Youth and Families (DCYF), the Executive Director of the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence and the Executive Director of the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) of New Hampshire.

A significant restructuring of the Executive Committee occurred when the Committee was reduced from ten to five representatives of the primary partners. The Executive Director of CASA of New Hampshire was added at the same time, creating a six-member governing committee. The inclusion of CASA ensured that the perspectives and needs of children were fully incorporated. The Administrative Judge for the New Hampshire District Courts chairs the monthly committee meetings, and is assisted by the Project Director, who plans the meetings and creates the meeting agendas. Decision-making follows a modified consensus model. Failing agreement, there are provisions for going to a vote.

Grafton County made crucial changes to their governance structure over the course of the first 18 months of the Initiative, to which they credit much of their success. In the winter of 2001, a mid-level workgroup, the "Cross-Systems Work Group," was created to assist in implementation of Greenbook initiatives. This 16-member Cross-Systems Work Group was developed for several purposes. The Cross-Systems Work Group is charged with identifying, exploring and recommending interdisciplinary practices and policies for consideration by the Executive Committee. The creation of this group, which focuses on 7 to 10 interdisciplinary goals, allowed the Executive Committee to focus on key overarching programmatic and policy decisions. Additionally, this new structure made it easier for implementation to proceed by focusing on what and how initiatives would be accomplished. Finally, the introduction of the Cross-Systems Work Group supported the Advisory Council enabling it to remain a broad-based, participatory body.

Situated below the Executive Committee and below the Cross-Systems Workgroup in Grafton's organizational structure is a larger, more community participatory Advisory Council. Advisory Council has 58 members, which includes Executive Committee members, workgroup members, and individuals from various area service providers working with families experiencing co-occurring domestic violence and child maltreatment. Advisory Council members attend quarterly meetings, give input, act as liaisons to their agencies, and, if interested, serve on subcommittees to work on specific issues.

There are two subcommittees of the Advisory Council: a Cross-training and Education Subcommittee and a Batterer Accountability Subcommittee. There may be additional subcommittees in the future including a "Safety Review" subcommittee.

Lane County

The Lane County Greenbook Initiative consists of five main entities. The Lane County Commission on Children and Families' Department of Children and Families serves as the grantee. The four other main partners include: Lane County Circuit Court's Juvenile Court; Lane county offices of the Oregon Department of Human Services Child Welfare (DHS-CW); Womenspace, Inc.; and Lane County Community Corrections Parole and Probation, which joined as a formal partner in the second year of the grant.

The Lane County Greenbook Initiative was originally guided by a six-member policy board consisting of five voting members—representatives from the four original partners plus a parent advocate from the Family Advisory Council. The original Policy Group also included a non-voting member from Lane County's Domestic Violence Council. In order to create wider community buy-in as well as to support the move toward the implementation phase of the initiative, several changes to the original governance structure were implemented. The policy board was split into two committees: a smaller Executive Committee comprised of management representatives from the partnering agencies; and a larger Advisory Committee. The Executive Committee is responsible for developing and overseeing the implementation of the Lane County Greenbook Initiative work plan as well as prioritizing and authorizing the expenditure of grant funds. The Lane County Circuit Court's Juvenile Court Judge chairs both the Executive and Advisory Committees, which meet on a monthly, and bimonthly basis, respectively. Decision-making within the Executive Committee is nonhierarchical. All Executive Committee members vote on all decisions, which are finalized through consensus.

The Advisory Committee includes Executive Committee members as well as an additional 25 members from local service agencies, organizations, councils, and committees. Specific agencies were identified and recruited by project staff into the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee is further structured into five workgroups: 1) Cross-training; 2) REAL

Heroes/Striving for Change; 3) Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team (DVERT); 4) Neighbor to Neighbor, and 5) Case File Review. All workgroups report to the Executive Committee.

San Francisco County

The San Francisco County Greenbook Initiative consists of three main entities. The Family and Children's Services Division of the San Francisco Department of Human Services serves as the grantee. The two other main partners are the Unified Family Court and domestic violence service providers. Executive directors of domestic violence organizations and batterers intervention programs represent the domestic violence system.

The Greenbook Steering Committee functions as the governing body of San Francisco's Initiative. In order to address identified gaps in membership, restructuring of the Steering Committee took place in February and May 2002. The restructured committee includes the Deputy Director of the Department of Human Services, a Family Court Commissioner of the Unified Family Court, and the Executive Director of the Asian Woman's Center as chairs. Additional partners include two Executive Directors of domestic violence organizations; three Executive Directors of batterer intervention programs; a representative from the Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic; and survivors of domestic violence.

Decision-making within the Steering Committee has been nonhierarchical. Members of the committee report that the level of participation among the collaborative partners is fairly balanced; all participants have the opportunity to have their voices heard and valued. However, some participants are more vocal than others, and hierarchy within collaborating structures may exert an influence (e.g., the power of the judiciary over the work of domestic violence advocates). Therefore, rather than vote on decisions, the Steering Committee has adopted a consensus-driven approach where discussion continues until all are in agreement. While this approach ensures some distribution of power among partners, it reportedly also slows down the decision-making process.

The Steering Committee convened two subcommittees: the Community Advisory Council and the Systems Advisory Council. The Community Advisory Council is composed primarily of interested community residents, including family members who have experience with one or more of the three primary systems. The committee would serve to mobilize and organize residents to help change attitudes, policies, and procedures related to domestic violence and child maltreatment. While members of the Steering Committee describe the community as the "fourth partner" of the collaborative, it has been challenging to recruit diverse members. As of June 2002, activities of this council had been suspended as members felt further clarification of the goals and objectives for the committee should be established prior to outreach. The

Systems Advisory Council was created to convene organizations and agencies whose interests overlap with those of the Initiative's primary partners in order to share information about Greenbook activities. These entities would include law enforcement, school districts, parole and probation, and religious institutions.

Santa Clara County

The Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative consists of five main entities. The Department of Family and Children's Services (DFCS) is the grantee. Kids In Common administers the grant under contract with DFCS. The other main partners include three domestic violence organizations (the Support Network for Battered Women, Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence, and Community Solutions) and the Juvenile Dependency Court.

The original organizational structure of the Santa Clara Greenbook Initiative consisted of an executive committee, an Implementation Team, and six project committees. The 12-member Executive Committee was led by three co-chairs, one representing each of the three primary systems. The Implementation Team consists of approximately 40 members representing 32 local organizations who are interested in – and whose work may be affected by – Greenbook activities. The Implementation Team meets quarterly to listen to project committee updates and to give feedback. The six original project committees were formed in November 2000 (prior to Greenbook funding) as a result of the Packard planning grant. Project committees are responsible for planning and implementing local Greenbook activities.

In May and June of 2002, Santa Clara Greenbook project staff made recommendations for a committee structure change. These recommendations were developed to address the fact that the Executive Committee was frequently overwhelmed with financial and administrative tasks, leaving little time for oversight of project-specific work. To remedy this, a new committee structure was introduced. The Executive Committee was broken down into two entities – the Executive Committee and the Project Oversight Committee. The Executive Committee now consists only of three executive chairs – one from each primary system – and deals with financial and administrative issues. The Project Oversight Committee has approximately 12 members (most of whom were on the original Executive Committee) and focuses on overseeing project activities. The Implementation Team continues to function as it did initially.

Lastly, a few changes were made to the original six project committees, which are focused on planning and implementing Greenbook strategies and activities. Santa Clara's six project committees are: 1) Development and Training of Domestic Violence Advocates; 2) Cross-Training and Building Internal Capacity; 3) Batterers Accountability and Services; 4) Multidisciplinary Response; 5) Changing Agency Policy and Worker Practice in DFCS; and 6) The Courts. In addition to these six project committees, the Respect Culture and Community

Initiative (RCCI) was created as an overarching, initiative-wide committee to emphasize the importance of cultural competency and community involvement in all of the project work of the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative.

St. Louis County

The St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative consists of three main entities. St. Louis County's Unified Family Court serves as the grantee. The two other main partners are the Department of Social Services Division of Family Services (DSS-DFS) and domestic violence service providers.

The St. Louis County Collaboration to Address Domestic Violence and Child Maltreatment is governed by a four-member Steering Committee, which includes two representatives from the Family Court, one representative from the Department of Social Services Division of Family Services (DSS-DFS), and one representative from the domestic violence service provider community. The Family Court's two representatives on the Greenbook Steering Committee include the Administrative Judge and the Director of the Court Protective Services Department. The county office of the State-run Division of Family Services that investigates reports of child abuse and neglect is a key member of the collaboration. Finally, the Steering Committee includes one member representing the St. Louis County area's 26 non-profit domestic violence service providers and batterer intervention programs.

The Steering Committee provides guidance to a 20-member Implementation Committee that has been operating since February 2002. All four members of the Steering Committee and the Greenbook director also participate on the Implementation Committee. Additional members of the Implementation Committee include representatives from the Missouri Coalition Against Domestic Violence; DFS St. Louis County office; community based organizations; elected domestic violence service provider representatives; judicial officers; Family Court non-judicial representatives; and domestic violence survivors.

Governance Structure Summary

The six Greenbook demonstration sites include from three to five partnering agencies in their Initiatives. While two sites chose to include one agency representing each of the main three systems (St Louis and San Francisco), three sites have included four partners (El Paso, Grafton, and Santa Clara) and one site has five in their partnership (Lane).

With the exception of Lane County, the grantee at all of the sites is one of the main three Greenbook entities: the dependency courts, the state's child protection system, or domestic violence service providers. Two sites have courts as the grantee (Grafton and St. Louis), two have county CPS agencies as administrators (San Francisco and Santa Clara), and one is

administered by an umbrella domestic violence organization (El Paso). Lane County's grant administrator is a "neutral" party, the County's Commission on Children and Families.

Whether initially organized as such or restructured in order to better meet the needs of implementation, all of the Greenbook communities have created two-tier governing structures. Generally, the primary governing entity is a smaller committee charged with fiscal and policy decisions, with a larger, community-inclusive committee reporting to the primary committee. The secondary committee/s are charged with intermediary oversight of project workgroups or subcommittees. The primary governing entity (called an "Executive," "Steering" or "Oversight" Committee), is typically comprised of at least one representative from each of the formal partnering systems, although Lane County is the only site which does not include additional voting members. St. Louis includes representatives from two courts and El Paso and San Francisco have included "family expert" survivors and/or former batterers on their primary governing boards.

The second-tier committees are primarily charged with staffing and implementing the various workgroups or projects determined by the primary governing entity. Among the sites, San Francisco has the least hierarchical organizational structure, with two second-tier subcommittees reporting their steering committee, and one of these subcommittees was suspended in June for lack of clear purpose and direction. Most sites have created a range of two to six subcommittees or workgroups.

The decision making processes employed by the governing entities of the local Greenbook Initiatives range from structured to informal. In El Paso, all agencies have one voting representative, and the committee meetings follow the procedures of Robert's Rules of Order. Grafton County and Lane County both use a combination of group consensus and voting to make decisions: In Grafton County, if consensus is not met, a vote is taken; while in Lane County, all members vote, and then decisions are finalized through consensus. San Francisco, St. Louis, and Santa Clara Counties have the least formal decision making processes which rely solely on consensus. In San Francisco, decisions are discussed until all are in agreement. Santa Clara never specified a decision-making process. It has subsequently been characterized as "consensus" although, unlike in San Francisco, no minimum level of agreement must be reached among members for a decision to be made. Stakeholders at these two sites have seen the ambiguity of the process as creating delay, confusion, and a lack of accountability.

A summary of each site's governance structure is presented in Exhibit IV-3, which identifies the partners, grantees, primary and secondary governing entities, chairs, and the decision making process of each site.

**EXHIBIT IV-3: SUMMARY OF GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES OF GREENBOOK DEMONSTRATION SITE INITIATIVES
(AS OF JUNE 30, 2002)**

Site	Partners	Grantee	Primary Governing Entity	Secondary Governing and/or Planning Entity/ies	Chair/s	Decision Making
El Paso	4 total <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3 primary systems, (<i>DV represented by TESSA</i>) ▪ DVERT 	TESSA: (Trust, Education, Safety, Support, Action)	Oversight Committee (OC): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3 primary systems ▪ 4 “family experts” ▪ 10 other invited agencies 	Executive Committee (EC), with 5 subcommittees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Service Access & Resource Development (SARD) ▪ Judicial Integration ▪ Judicial Education ▪ Cultural competency ▪ Family experts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OC: TESSA executive director and a family expert ▪ EC: TESSA executive director and a family expert 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By vote ▪ Robert’s Rules of Order
Grafton	3 total <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3 primary systems 	AOC SNH: (Administrative Office of the Courts for the State of NH)	Executive Committee (EC): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3 court personnel (2 judges) ▪ Division Director, DCYF ▪ Director, DV/SA Coalition ▪ Executive Director, CASA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cross-Systems Work Group (16 members), created winter 2001 ▪ Advisory Council (AC) (58 members, includes EC members), with 2 subcommittees: Cross-training & Education; Batterer Accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ AC: Administrative Judge for the NH District Courts ▪ EC: Administrative Judge for the NH District Courts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modified consensus model ▪ Vote is taken failing agreement
Lane	5 total <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 3 primary systems ▪ LC CCF/ DCF ▪ LC Community Corrections Parole and Probation 	Lane CCF/ DCF: (Commission on Children and Families’ Department of Children & Families)	Executive Committee (EC): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1 executive director level representative from 5 partners 	Advisory Committee (AC) (25 members, includes EC members), with 5 subcommittees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cross-training ▪ REAL Heroes/Striving for Change ▪ Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team (DVERT) Readiness Assessment Workgroup ▪ Neighbor to Neighbor ▪ Judicial Case File Review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EC: LC Circuit Court, Juvenile Court Judge ▪ AC: LC Circuit Court, Juvenile Court Judge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Non-hierarchical ▪ All members vote on all decision ▪ Finalized through consensus

**EXHIBIT IV-3: SUMMARY OF GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES OF GREENBOOK DEMONSTRATION SITE INITIATIVES (CONT.)
(AS OF JUNE 30, 2002)**

Site	Partners	Grantee	Primary Governing Entity	Secondary Governing and/or Planning Entity/ies	Chair/s	Decision Making
San Francisco	3 total ▪ 3 primary systems	Family & Children's Services Division of SF Department of Human Services	Steering Committee (SC): ▪ DHS Deputy Director ▪ Judge/commissioner from Unified Family Court ▪ 2 Domestic violence agency executive directors ▪ 3 Batterer Intervention program executive directors ▪ Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic ▪ 4 DV survivors/former perpetrators.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community Advisory Council: interested residents including survivors with systems experience (<i>group suspended as of 6/02</i>) ▪ Systems Advisory Council: convenes organizations and agencies whose interests overlap with Greenbook activities, such as law enforcement, school districts, parole and probation, and religious institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DHS Deputy Director ▪ Unified Family Court Judge ▪ Director of DV agency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nonhierarchical ▪ Consensus model (decisions discussed until all are in agreement)
Santa Clara	5 total ▪ 3 primary systems (<i>including 3 DV organizations</i>)	DFCS (Department of Family and Children's Services)	Executive Committee: ▪ 3 primary systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Oversight Committee, with 6 projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Development and Training of Domestic Violence Advocates -- Cross-training and Building Internal Capacity -- Batterers Overcoming Violence -- Multidisciplinary Response -- Changing Agency Policy & Worker Practice in DFCS -- The Courts ▪ Respect Culture & Community Initiative (RCCI) ▪ Implementation Team 	Co-chaired by 1 representative from each system	During first 18 months, did not have formal decision-making structure, instead decisions were made informally by "consensus"
St. Louis	3 total ▪ 3 primary systems	St. Louis County's Unified Family Court	Steering Committee (SC): ▪ 3 primary systems ▪ 2 Family Court (Admin Judge, Director of Court Protective Services Department)	Implementation Committee (IC) ▪ 20 members ▪ Conducted the self-study of partner agencies	SC Chair: Family Court Judge IC Co-Chairs: Director of DV Agency and Director of Child Protective Service Unit within Family Court	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consensus model

3.2 Network Analysis

Network Analysis was used to collect a baseline measure of collaboration in each community during the planning phase with the intention of tracking changes in collaborative networks over time. While Network Analysis was conducted primarily to inform the outcome component of the Greenbook evaluation, the data about participation and power sharing information are relevant to the process evaluation.

The Network Analysis survey uses both quantitative and qualitative techniques to gather data about the interactions among key Greenbook agencies. The baseline data collected in August- December 2001 reveal the communication processes of agencies during the planning stage of the initiative. The technique compares data from multiple interview sources to understand how interview participants and their agencies are participating within the collaborative. To gather the Network Analysis sample, each site was asked to identify individuals who were “important” to the initiative, with the aim of including two individuals from each of the initiative’s key partner agencies. The sample was restricted to include key organizations involved (i.e., those most appropriate to participate in the Greenbook Initiative, as identified by project directors and local research partners). These sample members were surveyed to gather the quantitative portion of the Network Analysis data (a summary of the quantitative information from survey respondents is represented in Exhibit IV-4). Appendix G gives more information about the Network Analysis survey questions and the meaning of terms used in the text and table below.

According to data gathered during the quantitative component of the Network Analysis, agencies at each site already were functioning at a relatively high level of collaboration in this first stage of the Initiative in terms of density and decentralization. In fact, in most of the sites, nearly three-fourths of the possible linkages between organizations in the Greenbook network were occurring at the baseline planning stage. Bi-directional communication among agencies at each site and balanced collaboration appear to exist for a majority of organizations involved in the Greenbook Initiative. Furthermore, most sites reported a decentralized or fairly decentralized collaborative process, meaning that “power” is shared among collaborative members rather than centralized with a couple of organizations.

Other indicators of collaboration showed some sites functioning at a lower level of collaboration. For example, agency representatives did not always report frequent communication with fellow collaborative partners. At two sites, survey respondents indicated that communication with other agencies in the collaborative occurred, on average, somewhere between weekly and monthly. One site reported communicating with other collaborative members only once per month, and at the three remaining sites, communication between member agencies was occurring less than once per month at the time of data collection.

Moreover, agency respondents at each site did not appear to place great importance in the relationships they had with other agencies in terms of serving the needs of families affected by the co-occurrence of child abuse and domestic violence. On a scale of 0 to 4, with 0 meaning “not important at all” and 4 meaning “very important,” respondents across sites ranked the importance of these relationships as 2.48, or only “somewhat important.” The lower level of importance attributed to these relationships may explain, at least in part, the relatively infrequent interaction. This also could influence their incentive to participate in Greenbook activities.

Not surprisingly, there appeared to be a correlation between how members ranked the importance of relationships, how frequently they communicated with member agencies, their network density,²² and the centralization of power²³ among collaborative members. Sites that valued the importance of collaborative relationships tended to have higher network densities, reported communicating more frequently with other agencies, and worked in relatively decentralized power structures. The reverse also appeared to be true. Santa Clara and Grafton County are useful examples of this relationship. Respondents from Santa Clara County ranked the importance of relationships with other collaborative agencies higher than other sites. Presumably related, Santa Clara respondents reported a high frequency of contacts with member agencies. At this site, the network density showed that 86 percent of possible interactions were taking place. Conversely, Grafton County respondents rated the importance of relationships among agencies as slightly less than “somewhat important.” As might be expected, Grafton respondents reported having communication with other agencies, on average, only slightly more than 1 or 2 times total. It is not surprising that Grafton emerged with a lower network density (56 percent of possible interactions taking place) and a somewhat centralized power structure, with only 12 of the 22 participating organizations in the core network. See Exhibit IV-4 for more results from the Network Analysis.

The qualitative component of the Network Analysis survey uses the quantitative survey results as a base for discussion with the sites. These discussions are designed to identify possible explanations for the quantitative results and highlight areas for exploration in the follow-up Network Analysis surveys. The discussions with the sites included several caveats inherent in the Network Analysis methodology, and considerations that warrant within-site comparisons over time, rather than cross-site comparisons at baseline. First, the results are a function of the survey

²² **Network Density:** The density of a network is a measure of the proportion of the actual linkages to the total possible linkages between the organizations in the network. Numbers can range from 0 to 100 with zero percent indicating that none of the organizations are interacting with one another, and 100 percent meaning that every possible pair of organizations is interacting. Therefore, the closer the percentage is to 100, the higher the levels of collaboration between the organizations/ agencies that participated in the survey.

²³ **Centralization of Power:** Numbers can range from 0 to 100. A number closer to 0 indicates a very decentralized process, while a number closer to 100 indicates a centralized process.

respondents themselves. As mentioned above, each site defined its own sample and may have had varying definitions of individuals who were “important” to the initiative at baseline. In other words, the survey results are contingent on how the network was specified in each site. Second, these measures were taken at a single point in time, and therefore are not indicative of all the communication that took place at baseline. Many demonstration sites experience a flurry of activity at the start of an initiative, after which communication between partner agencies may slow down somewhat. Some of the sites may still have been in the early and very active stages of the initiative at the time of the surveys, while others had moved onto a stage where a smaller number of their participants were more active. Additionally, the quantitative results of the Network Analysis are most useful when the survey respondents are the “right” respondents (i.e., those who are integral and active members of the network). It is difficult to know which respondents are “right” until they have been surveyed and their responses have been analyzed, however. This is another reason why the Network Analysis requires both a quantitative and a qualitative approach. Network analysis is a useful tool in examining the relationships between agencies, but the results should be examined along with other qualitative and quantitative community data in order to create the most complete picture of agency interactions. For more information about each Greenbook community, refer to the site-specific appendices at the end of this report.

The discussions with the sites after the quantitative portion of the analyses also highlighted many possible explanations for the results found in Exhibit IV-4. First, all quantitative results are dependent upon the response rate (as indicated in the Sample/Response) column. Non-responders are not withdrawn from the analysis, but are considered to have no communication with the other responders. Therefore, sites with lower response rates will appear to have fewer interactions between identified sample members. The varying definition of “important” initiative members is also apparent by looking at the number of individuals identified in each site. It is interesting to note that the more populous sites (e.g., San Francisco County) identified fewer sample members, while the least populous sites (e.g., Grafton and Lane Counties) identified the most sample members.

The network density statistics not only reflect the response rate discussed above, but also the variability of sample members surveyed. Densities lower than those reported in Exhibit IV-4 can be found in highly integrated networks when there is a great deal of variability among the individuals surveyed. The centralization results may be a function of distinct site characteristics in addition to the frequency and direction of communications between sample members. For example, sites appearing to have a more centralized network may have some sample members who are confronted by geographic obstacles and are therefore unable to have regular communication with the other sample members. Such a situation might lead to a centralized structure among the sample members who are not geographically isolated, rather than a decentralized structure among all sample members. It is therefore important to assess change in

EXHIBIT IV-4: NETWORK ANALYSIS SUMMARY							
Site	Sample/ Response	Network Density	Direction and Balance	Centralization	Core/Periphery	Frequency of Communication (Scale 1-4)	Importance of Relationship (Scale 1-4)
El Paso	16/17 individuals 13/13 organizations	.89	Bi-directional communication and balanced collaboration for all organizations	Indegree: 11.8% Outdegree: 11.8% (decentralized)	10/13 organizations in core network (.98 network density)	2.16 (average between weekly and monthly)	2.62
Grafton County	23/35 individuals 22/29 organizations	.56	Bi-directional communication and balanced collaboration for 18/22 organizations	Indegree: 41.4% Outdegree: 41.4% (somewhat centralized)	12/22 organizations in core network (.86 core network density)	1.22 (average less than monthly)	1.92
Lane County	26/30 individuals 24/27 organizations	.76	Bi-directional communication and balanced collaboration for 20/24 organizations	Indegree: 20.8% Outdegree: 24.7% (fairly decentralized)	18/24 organizations in core network (.88 core network density)	2.01 (average monthly)	2.60
San Francisco	11/12 individuals 10/11 organizations	.74	Bi-directional communication and balanced collaboration for all organizations	Indegree: 29.0% Outdegree: 29.0% (somewhat decentralized)	8/11 organizations in core network (.86 core network density)	1.92 (average less than monthly)	2.55
Santa Clara	15/15 individuals 14/14 organizations	.86	Bi-directional communication and balanced collaboration for all organizations	Indegree: 15.4% Outdegree: 15.4% (decentralized)	11/14 organizations in core network (.94 core network density)	2.33 (average between weekly and monthly)	2.72
St. Louis	18/19 individuals 15/16 organizations	.78	Bi-directional communication and balanced collaboration for all organizations	Indegree: 15.8% Outdegree: 23.47% (fairly decentralized)	11/15 organizations in core network (.96 core network density)	1.66 (average less than monthly)	2.49

all the quantitative measures reported in Exhibit IV-4 both with unique site characteristics in mind, and within sites across time rather than across sites at baseline. These baseline Network Analysis measures and methodological considerations will be utilized in assessing change in network characteristics and communications over time.

4. PERCEIVED BARRIERS AND FACILITATORS TO GREENBOOK MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION

Stakeholder Interview participants and Network Analysis survey respondents were asked to identify barriers to interaction with fellow agencies over the past six months. Although respondents did mention some difficulties, they did not refer to them as being insurmountable or even as particularly important. In fact, when responding to the question about barriers, Network Analysis survey participants at each site included qualifiers with their answers, saying that such things were, “relatively insignificant,” “not a big problem,” “improvement from past,” “nothing major,” and “routinely overcome.” Perhaps in some sites, high levels of existing communication and histories of collaboration may mean such obstacles have been surmounted in the past, or they are always present but players have confidence in their ability to deal with them as they arise. On the other hand, respondents who do not place a high value in relationships with other agencies—and therefore have had less interaction and communication—may not yet have had to struggle seriously with these issues. Thus, they may downplay the significance of such barriers.

Several factors were identified as either perceived barriers or facilitating factors to Greenbook mobilization and collaboration, including ideological differences and trust among members; belief in change through collaboration; inclusiveness; resources; and coordination of collaboration activities.

4.1 Ideological Differences and Trust Among Members

The level of trust was reported to play a crucial role in determining whether individuals from different agencies, organizations, and perspectives were able to work together. Although the level of trust is hard to measure quantitatively, respondents in all sites mentioned trust as a key factor that presented obstacles when it was missing, but created opportunities when it was present. For sites where collaboration was reported as relatively high, respondents identified one of the main reasons as a high level of trust among collaborative members. This trust was reported to come from many sources, including having prior relationships and working together successfully on another collaborative. As mentioned earlier, in some cases the respondents indicated that the early stages of the planning process involved steps in which representatives from different agencies had to learn how to talk openly about what their agency did and how it functioned, as well as address their ideas about how other agencies and organizations functioned.

Some sites increased the level of trust by engaging in a formal process of training members about other organizations, and having executive committee meetings to walk through the process for working with co-occurrence cases as they enter different systems.

Since representatives from different Greenbook systems tend to have different priorities, this process of cross-training and addressing different perspectives and agency mandates gave stakeholders an opportunity to explore and understand philosophical differences among systems, thereby increasing the trust among participants during the first phase of the Greenbook Initiative.

At two sites, interview participants indicated that key agencies were working together, but ideological conflicts and past community history made it difficult for them to make a full commitment to the Initiative. One of these sites reported that this caused a delay in moving from mobilization to full engagement in the planning process. Ideological differences include differences in agendas, goals, objectives and perspectives and lack of understanding, particularly regarding the dynamics of domestic violence. Mobilization and collaboration were inhibited by issues that arose due to a lack of trust. For both of these sites there was tension between key members of the Greenbook Initiative that stemmed from issues related to trust among some of the sectors. Even as many of the sites built trust during the early stages of the initiative, those without a strong foundation may be able to find ways to strengthen the collaboration at later stages of the process.

4.2 Belief in Change Through Collaboration

A factor that is related to trust among members is the belief that the Greenbook Initiative can effect change in community systems. Different ideological perspectives among members of a collaboration may be overcome or minimized when the collaborative focuses its energy on a common vision for system change. This belief in change is especially critical for sustained commitment required to affect lasting system change. Interview respondents reported that the belief that change would take place as a result of their work on the Greenbook Initiative was a key factor in maintaining stakeholder engagement after mobilization.

4.3 Inclusiveness

According to stakeholder interviews, an additional factor that affected the success of local collaborations was the presence of a member of the court as a key player in the initiative. Including a judge in the collaborative had a positive impact in five of the six demonstration sites, with one site reporting that not having a judge as an active member of the collaborative slowed down progress. Stakeholders felt that having an invested member of the court in the collaborative increased the initiative's visibility among other members of the legal community.

As one respondent stated, “We have the support from the judge and he is the type of person that can motivate folks...we have that charismatic leader in place.”

While including a judge as an active member of the initiative was reported to increase the progress of the collaborative, interview respondents in two sites reported that soliciting participation from domestic violence survivors and community members presented challenges. In both cases, the survivors were somewhat disruptive and were not able to “gel” with the collaborative. A third site (there were only three sites that mentioned domestic violence survivors as members of the collaborative) indicated that the role of survivors was confusing. It is too early to say whether this is a sign of a broader problem, but it will be worth noting if and how survivors and community members are able to collaborate with agency representatives and other participants from larger, bureaucratic and mostly government structures. Historically, survivors have been left out of community-based initiatives, and some participants reported feeling uncertain as to how to appropriately approach and engage them in the Greenbook Initiative.

4.4 Resources

Interview respondents from all six sites identified inadequate resources as a barrier to collaboration. Some agencies reflected that reduced budgets and understaffing created obstacles for cross-training. Stakeholders also reported that lack of resources could directly affect the amount of time, staff, or other resources an agency could directly contribute to the collaboration. While initiatives may seek out additional funding sources to help supplement Greenbook activities, some resources, such as staff time, are dependent on factors external to the initiative.

4.5 Coordination and Leadership of Collaboration Activities

Being able to coordinate the initiative was another key piece that positively affected collaboration, and later, the planning activities. Respondents from four sites indicated that ensuring that the meetings, phone calls, and e-mails were well coordinated amidst members’ scheduling conflicts and time limitations helped maintain engagement among collaborative members. One respondent specifically noted the inability of the site to coordinate the many meetings and e-mails that are required of the Greenbook Initiative, and cited this as a reason members had trouble staying engaged.

5. CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter answers the second research question, which contains the following sub-questions:

- **How were key agencies and individuals mobilized?**
- **How did the sites structure their initiatives?**
- **What factors affected the ability of the sites to mobilize, collaborate, and sustain involvement throughout the course of the initiative?**

Mobilization of key agencies and individuals

During the planning phase, sites used a variety of mobilization strategies to help people stay involved and invested, including:

- Ensuring the structure of the collaborative is flexible to change as needed
- Facilitating cross-system communication and education among the collaborative members
- Encouraging community integration and visibility through public outreach and active work with other regional initiatives.

These strategies were successful in keeping stakeholders invested. Generally, the composition of the collaborations remained relatively constant between January 2001 and June 2002, although sites reported a decrease in community volunteers and an increase in participation from law enforcement, child welfare, and domestic violence representatives. The increased representation from law enforcement reflects the fact that most sites felt law enforcement, parole and probation, and mental health representatives were important additions to the collaborative.

Local initiative structure

As local initiatives formed and recruited members, governance structures crystallized. Each local initiative searched for a way to structure their governing process in which active and meaningful participation among members was balanced with the practicality of effective power sharing. While all six sites used committees and subcommittees or workgroups to structure their collaborative, they varied in decision making, from formal voting to informal consensus models.

Barriers and facilitating factors for collaboration

As site representatives reflected upon their experiences, they identified factors that helped or hindered mobilization during the planning phase:

- **Ideological differences and trust among members.** Sites reported a lack of trust hindered their ability to overcome ideological differences, and the presence of trust facilitated the level of collaboration among members of local initiatives.
- **Belief in change through collaboration.** One factor that increased the investment of members with different priorities or ideological standpoints was the belief that the collaborative could affect real and meaningful system change.
- **Inclusiveness.** Involving individuals and groups with diverse roles and experiences in systems can increase the visibility and resources of the collaborative, but it also can be challenging for sites to fully integrate divergent perspectives. Sites reported that including judges as active members of local initiatives increased the progress of the collaborative. Some sites that tried to involve domestic violence survivors and community members as participating members in the collaborative found it was difficult for these individuals to easily integrate with the rest of the collaborative.
- **Resources.** Inadequate resources, including reduced budgets and understaffing, were cited as barriers to collaboration at every site. Lack of resources significantly affected the ability of agencies to participate in Greenbook activities such as cross training.
- **Coordination and leadership of collaboration activities.** Keeping members informed and involved through regular correspondence by a designated leader or coordinator was reported to facilitate collaborative functioning.

V. THE PLANNING PROCESS

V. The Planning Process

As described in the previous two chapters, the six Greenbook Initiative sites represented diverse communities and populations, varied histories of collaboration, and differing practices within and among their three primary systems. The sites drew on their strengths and identified obstacles at the start of their initiative to mobilize key participants and to facilitate collaboration among them. As the planning process began, therefore, each site was in a unique position and conducted differing types of resource and needs assessment to determine their priorities over the course of the initiative. The sites then identified expected outcomes, goals, and/or activities as a result of the needs and strengths they identified. For most sites, these planning activities were fluid throughout the first year and a half of the Initiative. Needs were continually reassessed, new resources were identified,

CHAPTER V OUTLINE

1. **Planning Activities that Shaped Local Greenbook Initiatives**
 - 1.1 Resource and Needs Assessments
 - 1.2 Concept Mapping
 - 1.3 Logic Models
 - 1.4 Identified Goals, Outcomes and Strategies
 - 1.5 Additional Examples of the Work Sites Undertook During the Planning Phase
2. **Challenges and Facilitating Factors**
3. **The Role of Technical Assistance, Federal Monitoring, and Evaluation**
 - 3.1 Technical Assistance
 - 3.2 Federal Monitoring
 - 3.3 Local Evaluation
 - 3.4 National Evaluation
4. **Chapter Summary**

RELEVANT RESEARCH QUESTIONS

3. How did the sites determine what their initiatives would address? How did they determine and prioritize their needs? What specific planning activities occurred at the sites?
4. What strategies did sites choose to fill identified needs? What are the expected outcomes as a result of implementing those strategies?
5. How did the sites utilize capacity-building opportunities (e.g., technical assistance, Federal monitoring, and the national evaluation)? What effect did these capacity-building activities have on planning local initiatives?

DATA SOURCES

- Interviews with key stakeholders (including key local collaborative members, members of the Technical Assistance Team, and Federal Monitors)
- Site Visit Reports from TA Team

goals were refined, and plans constantly changed as a result. **It is important to note that there was not an official Greenbook Initiative planning phase – that is, the Federal team did not specify a planning process or timeline, although planning was encouraged.** By the end of the first 18 months of the Initiative, some sites had worked through many assessment activities and formulated a plan for implementation. Other sites were still continuing their planning process along with implementation activities.

This chapter describes the planning processes in the six Greenbook sites, including needs assessment activities and logic model development. The goals identified by each site as a result of local planning activities are summarized, and the sites' reflections on those things that challenged and facilitated the planning process are presented. Lastly, the roles that technical assistance (TA), Federal monitoring, and evaluation played in the planning process are discussed.

Though the sites undertook some similar strategies, planning activities were often different and rarely unfolded in a similar sequence across sites. Many sites began by evaluating their resources and needs, defining relevant goals, and developing a logic model to link those goals to appropriate activities. As mentioned above, this process was not close-ended, and plans may continue to be refined throughout the Initiative. Each site also had the opportunity to build their capacity during the planning process through technical assistance and Federal monitoring. Each local initiative also includes a local research partner (LRP) who was involved to varying degrees in the planning process. In many instances, LRPs were key players, invaluable to the needs assessment and planning processes that unfolded. More detailed discussions of the planning processes the sites went through are included in the site-specific reports. (See Appendices A–F).

1. PLANNING ACTIVITIES THAT SHAPED LOCAL GREENBOOK INITIATIVES

1.1 Resource and Needs Assessments

Each site conducted some form of resource and needs assessment during the mobilization and planning phase. Based on their familiarity with the three primary systems and their systems' histories of working with one another to address domestic violence and/or child maltreatment, the local initiatives came up with distinct and innovative ways to assess community needs concerning co-occurrence that reflected their unique site characteristics.

San Francisco County. Like many sites, San Francisco County did not undertake a formal needs assessment, but several collaborative activities provided a basis for assessing community needs and gaps in service system integration. First, the LRP generated system “maps” for each of the three systems. These maps documented the pattern of family response from the point of entry into each system and the number of people affected at different decision points. Second, the LRP conducted closed file review of substantiated child abuse cases from DHS to help identify the inherent systemic problems and issues facing families involved in the three systems. Currently, the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative is planning a third type of needs assessment that includes focus groups with survivors and perpetrators.

Lane County. Lane County began their initiative by conducting an informal needs assessment using preliminary research. Five multidisciplinary workgroups comprised of Greenbook staff and advisory committee members and paid consultants were created for this purpose. The Collaborative Review Workgroup assessed the community's status on each of the Greenbook recommendations, identified key players, and suggested next steps to the executive committee, including conducting intra-agency needs assessments. The DVERT workgroup was formed to assess the readiness, feasibility, and resources Lane County needed to pilot a multidisciplinary case management response team for domestic violence cases involving children. The Case File Coordination workgroup convened to design a pilot project to determine how many families are engaged in multiple court hearings; the information sharing needs of the various courts; instances where conflicting orders are handed down; and strategies to increase appropriate interaction between the various court proceedings involving families. A consultant was hired to conduct a cross-training needs assessment. Finally, the Neighbor to Neighbor workgroup was formed to seek people to "look beyond awareness of domestic violence and child maltreatment toward actions to be executed in their neighborhoods." This group began by assessing community readiness (i.e., meeting with key leaders, locating resources, and discussing shared objectives) to select a specific neighborhood with which to work.

El Paso County. Because of their longstanding history of working together, stakeholders in El Paso County believed they had a good grasp on needs and areas for improvement in the three systems prior to writing their Greenbook grant proposal. Based on these identified areas for improvement, the grant proposal defined five components of the initiative's vision. With this vision as a starting point, and with many previously-identified challenges in mind (e.g., defining a balance between risk and safety issues and establishing a consumer orientation), the oversight committee continued the needs assessment process. It began by posing several questions about outcomes the initiative hoped to see in 5 years. These outcomes related to changes in the community, the three key systems, and how families experience the systems and other organizations in the partnership. The needs assessment process led to several outcomes that have been revised and refined throughout the course of the initiative and have formed the basis for the planning and implementation phases of the project.

Grafton County. Similar to other sites, the Grafton County team devised several strategies for assessing community needs and resources. The LRP conducted an informal assessment of services available and also distributed an Interagency Understanding and Collaboration Survey in order to obtain baseline data on several of the project goals, such as increasing knowledge of and training on the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment. The survey, which asked about previous training on issues of child maltreatment and domestic violence, also provided information that the cross-training and education subcommittee used to plan future trainings. The Interagency Survey was given to all members of

the advisory council. In addition to ascertaining Greenbook members' previous, recent, and existing training, the survey also assessed perceived barriers to collaboration between Greenbook agencies. Additionally, Grafton County conducted a Life Experiences Survey with the Greenbook advisory council. The purpose of this survey was to ascertain if the project included the voice of survivors/victims.

St. Louis County. St. Louis County conducted an informal needs assessment as well. Their two-tiered approach included a "Tour of the World" and a Self Study. Specifically, the project director of the St. Louis County Initiative conducted interviews of area service providers and system stakeholders. This "tour" was designed to understand system capacity and the level of interest in the Greenbook initiative at the site. The Self Study was designed to gauge current functioning of partner agencies with regard to policies, procedures, practices, and viewpoints on issues related to the initiative: First, representatives from each of the systems examined their compliance with Greenbook recommendations. The implementation committee provided data on cross system issues. Finally, each of the primary systems identified a different set of challenges, unmet needs, and priorities for system change.

Santa Clara County. Once again, Santa Clara County benefited from their previous planning efforts afforded by the Packard Grant funding. Upon receipt of Federal Greenbook funds, stakeholders already had a reasonable idea of community strengths and weaknesses regarding co-occurrence. In lieu of an in-depth assessment of community needs, therefore, the LRP designed a Stakeholder Readiness Survey in order to gain a better understanding of stakeholder preparedness to address those community needs. The purpose of the survey was to provide baseline information related to system specific and cross system recommendations that were identified by the implementation team as important for the first phases of implementation. Stakeholders identified four broad issue areas to address in later phases of the project, and these findings were used to help both the executive committee and implementation team identify priority Greenbook recommendations that would be addressed in the implementation phase of the initiative.

Resource and Needs Assessment Summary. Most often, the needs assessment process was informal, iterative and played a large role in determining initiative goals and related activities. The needs assessments themselves consisted of a variety of activities ranging from informal discussions to formal surveys. Though needs were continually revisited during the planning period, a majority of sites largely completed this initial process during the first months of the initiative. Sites utilized project leaders, workgroups, and paid consultants during community assessment activities, but it is important to note the extent to which most sites relied on the guidance and expertise of their LRPs during these crucial activities.

The resources identified in most sites were apparent before the planning process began. For instance, as described earlier, many sites benefited from a history of collaboration, strong leadership, and primary systems that were already addressing co-occurrence and were willing to undergo systems change. Identified needs fell into several categories both within and across sites. Needs were identified for the collaborative itself, for the primary systems, across systems, and for families suffering co-occurring forms of child maltreatment and domestic violence. Results of assessment activities across sites were heavily utilized to define project goals, including the prioritization of *Greenbook* recommendations and Federal Expectations and defining expected outcomes.

1.2 Concept Mapping

Concept mapping was a national evaluation activity meant to provide another means by which sites could potentially identify and prioritize their Greenbook goals. The primary purpose of the concept mapping exercise was to generate information related to Greenbook-expected outcomes that would assist sites in planning and evaluating their local initiatives. These data would help both in tracking site progress and in developing a comprehensive theory of change. The Greenbook concept map was developed through a four-step process that started with each site examining the original Greenbook report and logic model, then brainstorming to come up with 102 expected Greenbook outcomes. Local stakeholders were then asked to sort those outcomes based on their relevance and earliest impact. The sorting and rating processes at each site were then analyzed at the national level by the NET. The results were then used by the sites to plan specific actions to achieve their goals and to take corrective actions, if necessary.

Concept mapping analysis at the aggregate level revealed seven clusters:

- Increasing batterer accountability
- Enhancing service system
- Improving practice in the courts/broader community changes
- Identifying and pursuing cross-system outcomes
- Decreasing the harmful effects of children's exposure to violence
- Decreasing incidence of domestic violence/child maltreatment
- Decreasing recidivism.

There was less agreement among respondents on the relevance of individual-level items and greater agreement on the cross-system outcomes. Respondents expected most of the anticipated changes to occur between Years 3 and 4 of the initiative.

1.3 Logic Models

All sites worked on developing a logic model during the first 18 months of the Greenbook Initiative. A majority of sites reported finalizing their logic models by June 30, 2002, and using logic models to link identified needs with objectives and expected outcomes at the end of the Greenbook grant period. Generally, these needs, objectives, and outcomes are linked through identified resources and specific planning activities. LRPs played an important role in each site, helping to communicate the usefulness of logic models and to develop them in concert with local initiative stakeholders.

San Francisco County. The LRP in San Francisco County developed a logic model for the overall local initiative using a “theory of change” approach. Separate logic model trainings for the Greenbook steering committee and the community advisory committee were held. In addition, the LRP led a multi-system workgroup to develop project goals and objectives. Through a series of subsequent meetings, draft goals and objectives were developed and submitted to the steering committee for approval. The logic model in San Francisco County has been completed.

Santa Clara County. The LRP in Santa Clara County identified that local Greenbook objectives at that site were not clearly aligned with any overarching outcomes that had been agreed upon by project stakeholders. Therefore, the LRP began to develop a logic model with the support and participation of both the executive committee and larger implementation team. The logic model was meant to identify what would be different in Santa Clara County as a result of local Greenbook efforts in terms of families that experience co-occurrence and the systems the serve those families. The logic model also was used to ensure that the initial six project committees were the appropriate means by which to reach local Greenbook activities toward stated goals and objectives. The logic model in Santa Clara County has been completed.

El Paso County. In El Paso County, the LRP also provided leadership in developing the site’s logic model. The goal of the model was to encourage the group to think about what they would like to change by the end of the project, thereby becoming an integral and interdependent part of the needs assessment process at that site. Further, the logic model was intended to outline how outcomes would be measured, to identify a conceptual map to perform various activities, and to link the project’s current status with where it should be in 3-5 years. The site specifically used recommendations from the *Greenbook* to help determine priority outcomes. Ultimately, the logic model linked identified needs to periodic implementation milestones, subcommittee

outcomes, and overall Greenbook outcomes. The logic model has been completed, but periodic review and revision of the logic model are expected.

Lane County. The LRP proved crucial to the development of a logic model in Lane County as well. This site used the logic model development process as a “focusing tool” to determine project outcomes and the goals and objectives necessary to achieve them. The LRP provided strong leadership in creating measurable short-term and intermediary outcomes for Lane County’s Greenbook initiative. Lane County considers theirs to be an evolving logic model, and as of June 30, 2002 it is currently in its final stage of revision.

Grafton County. In Grafton County, a subcommittee of the Greenbook executive committee was created to craft and refine the goals, activities, outcomes, and indicators of the local initiative. After extensive consultation with multiple stakeholders, it was determined that some Greenbook objectives were most relevant for a certain primary partner, while others pertained to cross-system collaboration. Consequently, four separate logic models were developed: one for each of the three primary systems and another macro-level model that focuses on community goals. All logic models have been completed, and Grafton continues to utilize them in all programmatic and evaluation efforts.

St. Louis County. As of June 30, 2002, St. Louis County reports using results from an early community retreat, results of their Self Study (described earlier), and logic models developed by other Greenbook sites to assist them in the active process of developing their own logic model.

The Value of Logic Models. During on-site interviews, Greenbook stakeholders talked about the value of logic model development activities. In general, these activities helped to facilitate a common understanding of the problem of co-occurrence among local collaborative members. Further, they helped to ensure agreement among stakeholders about initiative goals, objectives, and outcomes and, in some cases, specific activities that would lead to these identified outcomes.

The logic model development process was deemed as one of the most useful activities during the planning process by respondents at most of the sites. For some sites, the logic model process served as a “guiding light” and was a tool for planning, operationalizing outcomes, and ensuring connections were present between project activities and outcomes. Some sites developed a logic model early on and used it consistently throughout the first 18 months, making modifications to the planning process through the logic model and referring to it as they went along. Some sites developed logic models but had to revise them in order to ensure that they represented goals that could be reached within the 3-year time period.

Logic models typically were developed under the leadership and expertise of the LRPs, and many LRPs reported that they used their respective logic models as guides throughout the process to help keep planning committees on track and aware of the goals and objectives they had set for themselves. For a minority of the sites, however, the logic model appeared to be something that was not referred to throughout the process because it was not helpful as a reference tool when things got confusing. These sites did not benefit from the logic model process as much as those that used their logic models consistently. For copies of the logic models that have been completed to date, refer to the site-specific reports in Appendices A-F.

1.4 Identified Goals, Outcomes, and Strategies

Needs assessment and logic model development activities helped sites understand and then translate their system change needs related to co-occurrence into goals, strategies, and expected outcomes. Sites envisioned and articulated these things differently, as evidenced in their logic models. This section presents the results of site planning activities in terms of the goals and outcomes of each of the six local initiatives.

Lane County. As a result of their planning process, Lane County identified five objectives for their local Greenbook initiative prior to June 30, 2002. Several specific strategies to meet those objectives were also identified. Lane's objectives are:

- Develop and implement internal and cross-system protocols
- Support and enhance the provision of collaborative case work
- Improve the community's capacity to hold offenders accountable
- Increase competency about domestic violence and child maltreatment and increase knowledge of practice and mandates of the Greenbook Initiative's primary partners
- Increase grassroots and systems engagement in strategies that improve the community's response to domestic violence and child maltreatment.

The six strategies Lane identified to achieve these objectives are:

- Identify, review, and adapt the internal policies and procedures of: DHS-Child Welfare; Womenspace; Parole & Probation; and the Lane County Circuit Court's Dependency Court.
- Expand and enhance prioritized joint service models

- Implement applicable activities identified by the Domestic Violence Council’s Batterer Intervention Committee
- Develop and implement cross-training, emphasizing activities that build cross-disciplinary relationships
- Participate in the Neighbor-to-Neighbor partnership
- Integrate Greenbook principles and approaches into local, state, and national planning efforts.

In Lane County, the goals grew from specific activities the collaborative wished to implement. The site also established goals related to other identified needs such as increased case coordination in the court system, cross-training, and community engagement. Planning workgroups were organized around these activities. Lane has a mix of objectives that focus on supporting local collaboration, providing both within- and cross-system training on co-occurrence, revising both internal and cross-system protocols, improving batterer accountability, and sustaining Greenbook principles and approaches.

Grafton County. During its planning phase, Grafton County identified a total of 67 goals for the four sectors of its Greenbook partnership (community, courts, DV, CPS). Each sector has a series of intermediate and long-term goals and its own logic model. The overarching (across all four sectors) intermediate goal is: “Ensure immediate safety of women and children.” The overarching long-term goal is: “Engage in systems change to increase safety of women and children experiencing domestic violence and child abuse/neglect.” Program activities expected to lead to these intermediate and long-term goals are specified in the logic models. Examples of intermediate goals from each of Grafton’s four sectors are below:

- Community Goals
 - Increase community awareness of the three systems (services and issues)
 - Increase interagency collaboration
 - Develop strategies to reduce service gaps for families experiencing both child abuse and neglect and domestic violence
 - Develop procedure for stand alone child support
- Domestic Violence Goals
 - Increase consistent and effective use of DVPSs

- Enhance victim- and child-centered safety planning
- Increase knowledge and awareness of child welfare and judicial systems, including roles, services, issues, and procedures
- Increase domestic violence staff's understanding of the impact of domestic violence exposure on children
- DCYF Goals
 - Improve Assessment of DV
 - Enhance family-centered safety planning
 - Increase knowledge and awareness of domestic violence and judicial system, including roles, services, issues, and procedures
 - Monitor effectiveness of DCYF-funded agencies serving families experiencing co-occurrence of domestic violence and child abuse/neglect
- Court Goals
 - Increase information sharing among civil, criminal, and juvenile courts
 - Improve communication with victims regarding case status (in both civil and criminal cases)
 - Increase knowledge and awareness of domestic violence and child welfare system, including roles, services, and issues, and other community services (e.g., substance abuse, children's services, housing, etc.)
 - Improve monitoring of batterers across systems.

Grafton County identified goals that they expected to realize both within and across the primary systems. The site expects each system to be able to accurately identify co-occurrence and to work with the other systems to serve these families. One goal for Grafton County within the child welfare system is to consistently utilize the expertise of co-located staff from the domestic violence system. All systems also are expected to increase their knowledge of the other two primary systems, including their mandates, philosophies, and operating procedures. All of Grafton County's 67 goals can be found in the logic models in Appendix B (pp. B-21-25).

Santa Clara County. In their logic model, Santa Clara County prioritized system outcomes as well as both short- and long-term client outcomes. These outcomes are linked with

six project work groups that are responsible for implementing activities meant to achieve the desired results. Santa Clara's 10 system outcomes include:

- Each social worker, domestic violence worker, court worker, and law enforcement personnel will have a better understanding of: 1) the dynamics of child abuse and domestic violence; 2) how to screen/assess for domestic violence, and 3) available services
- Differential response according to situation: the ability of responders to be able to call social workers and domestic violence personnel to scene, or to confer with them (within 45 minutes, or as appropriate)
- Every child has an advocate
- Coordinated individual service plans are created that respond to client needs and are manageable
- Staff will be able to follow up on client service plans
- Every child, victim, and perpetrator receives intervention and/or counseling services
- Better batterer accountability through closer collaboration with the courts and other service providers and through the use of former abusers as mentors, etc.
- Courts, social workers, and other service providers will ensure batterer will be safely reintegrated according to family's circumstances, culture, etc.
- Better coordinated system between juvenile, family, and criminal courts
- Domestic violence dependency court consistently provides supervised visitation to facilitate normalized relationships.

Santa Clara outcomes focus on cross- and within-system training; improved advocacy; better identification through screening and assessment; batterer accountability; coordinated courts; and an immediate, multidisciplinary response to co-occurrence. Santa Clara County's logic model is presented in Appendix E (p. E-22).

El Paso County. The planning process in El Paso County led to the identification of several outcomes that have been revised and refined throughout the course of the initiative. El Paso's logic model includes four overall Greenbook outcomes, which are expected to occur within the grant period. These overall outcomes are linked to periodic implementation milestones and additional outcomes (including initial, intermediate, and long-term outcomes)

specific to El Paso's four subcommittees (Service Access/Resource Development, Judicial, Cultural Competence, and Family Experts). El Paso County's overall Greenbook outcomes are:

- Systems are philosophically aligned with regard to response to co-occurrence of domestic violence/child maltreatment
- Decrease in revictimization of individuals by any system
- Systems can provide increased safety for abused adults and children
- Increased trust in the system on the part of consumers.

The intermediate subcommittee outcomes include:

- Service Access/Resource Development Subcommittee
 - Systems can identify co-occurrence of domestic violence/child maltreatment efficiently and effectively
 - A collaboratively defined, multidisciplinary, and culturally sensitive differential response to co-occurrence is in place
 - There is increased education among Greenbook partners regarding best practice services for families impacted by domestic violence/child maltreatment
- Judicial Subcommittee
 - Increased awareness about domestic violence/child maltreatment and the dynamics of their interaction by judicial system members
 - Increased court integration
 - Increased awareness of and access to community resources among parties to domestic violence/child maltreatment cases
 - Increased levels of accountability for domestic violence offenders
- Cultural Competence
 - Increased understanding among systems about how culture impacts client experiences

- Increased knowledge, skills, and abilities among Greenbook partner staff in the area of cultural competence
- Family Experts (provide the perspective of former clients of the three systems)
 - A fully representative family expert subcommittee is in place and working as a partner in the Greenbook Initiative.

Cross-system, community-level, and individual-level outcomes were identified and prioritized in El Paso County, as in other Greenbook sites. Unique to El Paso County is the focus on Family Experts. Involvement of the Family Experts is a key component to keep the input of consumers prominent in all collaborative activities and goals. El Paso County's logic model is included in Appendix A (pp. A-19-20).

San Francisco County. San Francisco County's logic model depicts their theory of system change and represents a four-tiered series of immediate, intermediate, and long-term outcomes indicating how the site will measure the success of their local Greenbook initiative. San Francisco County's outcomes, which focus on defining the roles of collaborative members as well as cross-system changes, are not linked to specific activities in their logic model. The immediate and intermediate outcomes are presented categorically below:

- Immediate Outcomes
 - Increased level of collaboration between representatives of 4 systems,²⁴ shared leadership, shared decision-making, shared vision
 - Increased contact between representatives from 4 systems
 - Increase in shared resources between 4 systems
 - Increased understanding of what each other's systems are trying to do
 - Increased participation by representatives from the 4 systems
- Intermediate (1) Outcomes
 - Increased cross-agency communication
 - Improved screening and assessment of the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and DV

²⁴ San Francisco County includes the community as a fourth system within their Greenbook collaborative.

- Increase mandated DV training for court and DHS staff
- Increased joint problem solving between the four systems to develop solutions
- Intermediate (2) Outcomes
 - Implementation of Greenbook best practices regarding co-occurrence of child maltreatment and DV
 - Improved tracking and monitoring of child maltreatment and DV cases
 - Implementation of protocols that have been jointly developed by representatives from 4 systems
 - Increased community dialogue regarding DV
 - Increased access to data affecting these families across systems
 - Improve parenting skills to better protect children exposed to DV
 - Increase perceptions of court and CPS staff that batterers should be held accountable for children's exposure to domestic violence.

San Francisco County has a significant focus on outcomes related to collaboration, which are expected to occur most immediately as a result of Greenbook activities. They also have identified improved parenting skills as an important intermediate outcome, an articulated individual-level outcome unique to this site. Additionally, San Francisco County has prioritized both within- and across-system changes focusing on screening and assessment, jointly-developed protocols, training, and batterer accountability.

St. Louis County. St. Louis had not completed their logic model prior to June 30, 2002. At that time, they were completing their needs assessment process and actively identifying their initial project priorities and goals based on their Self Study.

Summary of Goals, Outcomes, and Strategies. The goals in each site drew largely from the needs assessment and, to a lesser degree, from identified community strengths. The goals most often were based on system gaps, needs, and priorities for the initiative.

Overall, Greenbook sites identified a range of goals and outcomes in their logic models. Some aligned specific strategies and/or workgroups with their identified outcomes and objectives, while others did not. Sites typically categorized goals and outcomes as to whether they were expected to occur in the immediate-, intermediate-, or long-term. Every site included

within-system and cross-system goals as outcomes. Some sites also included collaborative goals, such as maintaining key representation in planning activities and increasing participation from representatives from each system. Several sites included individual level outcomes, most often related to batterer accountability and increased safety for victims of domestic violence and child maltreatment.

Future process evaluation reports will study how closely actual implementation activities align with the strategies, objectives, and goals the six Greenbook sites have identified. Furthermore, these implementation plans and activities will be analyzed in terms of how they align with both Federal Expectation and recommendations from the Greenbook.

1.5 Additional Examples of the Work Sites Undertook During the Planning Phase

It is important to remain mindful of the fluidity that can characterize goal setting, planning, and implementation. While the sites have engaged in similar (yet site-specific) mobilization and planning activities during this first phase of the initiative, they have done so at their own pace. Thus, they are at various stages in their work. In the preceding sections of this chapter, the sites' needs assessment and logic model development processes have been discussed, along with the goals and outcomes that emerged as a result of these planning activities. The following paragraphs include more examples of the local work that took place across sites at various stages throughout the first 18 months (through June 30, 2002) of the Greenbook Initiative.

Screening, Assessments, and Protocols. All the demonstration sites included a system mapping or system description in their resource and needs assessments process. As a result of this process, a couple of sites identified the need to have more consistent and effective screening, assessments, and protocols in the three primary systems. For example, the Multidisciplinary Protocol Development Group in Lane County was charged with conducting a review of collaborative casework around the issue of co-occurrence and making recommendations to its policy board in order to enhance casework for families with co-occurrence. A subcommittee in El Paso County identified and prioritized what standardized tools were needed at the site, what tools were already in place, and what action was needed. This group also researched best practices and resources nationally.

Batterer Accountability. Many sites identified batterer accountability as a key concern at the beginning of the grant period, but many also decided instead to focus on other systems-level changes once community assessments were completed. Grafton County, however, created a subcommittee to specifically address batterer accountability. With the support of the local Greenbook staff, the subcommittee held a batterer accountability conference. This conference had 80 attendees representing various disciplines, agencies, and geographic sections of the

county. The conference focused on three areas: national trends and issues in batterer intervention, the recent introduction of statewide New Hampshire guidelines for batterer intervention programs, and needs and strategies for Grafton County.

Planning activities regarding batterer accountability in Santa Clara County are led by their Batterer Accountability and Services project. This project plans to: 1) work with existing standards to increase batterer accountability through increased communication with the courts and court personnel; 2) develop and offer after care supports to individuals who successfully complete a certified batterers intervention program; and 3) develop an education protocol for service providers that reflects appropriate services and interventions for families that wish to reunify with the batterer.

Cultural Competency. Cultural competency was a need identified in most of the Greenbook demonstration sites, including San Francisco, El Paso, Santa Clara, St. Louis, and Grafton Counties. El Paso County created a subcommittee workgroup specifically to address the issue at both the system and the individual level. After defining the concept, the subcommittee decided that each primary system should conduct an organizational self-assessment centered on cultural competency. The subcommittee also planned to provide training to Greenbook systems and agencies, integrate strategies with the other subcommittees, and provide guidance for other community groups and agencies. Santa Clara County created their “respect culture and community initiative” (RCCI) not as a subcommittee but as an initiative-wide, overarching committee to emphasize the importance of cultural competency in all of the primary systems of the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative.

Information Sharing Within Systems. Examination of the primary systems at the start of the Greenbook Initiative revealed that nearly every court system could benefit from better communication between the courts that handle dependency cases and those that address domestic violence. Lane County created a case file coordination group to pilot a project to address this concern. The project will coordinate various court case files related to a single family, and create a multi-disciplinary case management response team for domestic violence cases. The judicial integration subcommittee in El Paso County also is tackling the problem of communication within the court system. The subcommittee’s work plan includes a cross-court integration strategy and ways to better provide information about domestic violence and child maltreatment cases across courts.

Cross-system Training. Information sharing within systems is a priority at some sites, but nearly all sites hope to facilitate information sharing across systems, and this necessitates training. Several sites already have begun to identify specific training needs through the creation of subcommittees. The cross training and education subcommittee in Grafton County addressed the need for Greenbook partners to have a greater familiarity and understanding of other

Greenbook systems through several “open houses.” The purpose of the “open house” is for Greenbook participants to improve their familiarity and understanding of different Greenbook agencies’ work environments, services provided, and internal capacity to address co-occurrence. The subcommittee also planned a similar event called “job shadowing.” The intent again was to increase Greenbook participants’ knowledge, empathy, and understanding of each other’s work. Lane County also created a cross-training workgroup. Initially, the workgroup was charged with conducting a needs assessment related to training, after which it would disband. An outside consultant helped to facilitate that assessment process. The workgroup made such an impact on the initiative, however, that it decided to continue its activities throughout the course of the initiative.

Community Engagement. Finally, a couple of sites have taken specific steps to get the community more actively involved in the Greenbook Initiative. Lane County chose to collaborate with another current initiative, Neighbor to Neighbor, because neighborhoods are a greater part of family life, and friends and neighbors are frequent first responders. The project seeks to get people to “look beyond awareness of domestic violence and child maltreatment toward actions to be executed in their neighborhoods.” The project assessed community readiness (e.g., key leaders, resources, shared objectives) that helped the collaborative to make decisions regarding a community with which to work. Eventually, the project hopes to engage the arts community and to gain media coverage for this project. In San Francisco, active involvement and representation of the community is seen as essential. As such, the community is considered a “fourth system,” on equal footing with dependency courts, child welfare, and domestic violence organizations.

2. CHALLENGES AND FACILITATING FACTORS

To fully understand the range of factors that helped or hindered sites’ progress throughout the planning phase, qualitative data were gathered from key stakeholders (e.g., project directors, LRPs, and key collaborative members) at three different time points. Interview respondents were asked to reflect on their experiences during the planning phase, to talk about specific accomplishments and struggles throughout the process, and to share what they learned from these experiences. In combination, these multiple interviews and interview respondents helped provide a picture of the planning experience overall.

“Now I think, hopefully, by putting the time in on this front, there will be a lot less time in mopping up afterwards. I think that we tend to run into projects wanting activity and implementation very quickly without all the trust building, without the systems really working together towards something with a vision.”

— Key Stakeholder

2.1 Factors Influencing Participation in the Greenbook Initiative

There were three common factors that emerged across sites as issues that sites had to confront regarding the overall Greenbook Initiative: time required/allotted; conflicting organizational cultures; and reaching multiple levels of the organizations.

Time Required/Allotted

The amount of time required/allotted for local Greenbook initiatives to take shape was the most commonly reported challenge to the overall process of participating in Greenbook. Specifically, time required describes the length of time it took to bring people to the collaborative, educate them on the issues at hand, and conduct the assessment activities required before planning could begin. Respondents reported a sense that “the clock is ticking.”

Several sites described a dilemma whereby the grant money was allocated, and work needed to start immediately, but it took time to get the initiative up and running. By the time all the pieces were in place and a planning process were underway, the sites worried about how far along they were in the process and how far away they were from their outcomes. One site suggested that a first year where very little money was allocated might be helpful, just to provide them with the time to plan, then fully fund the initiative once they had a work plan. Respondents reported that the time needed for planning and needs assessment was essential.

Conflicting Organizational Cultures

The next challenge the sites reported was that of conflicting organizational cultures. Conflicting organizational cultures is a term used here to describe the varying views and priorities that participants bring to the table. For domestic violence advocates this might mean a frustration with the systems-oriented approach to the Greenbook Initiative. As one respondent indicated, “Systems are much more process oriented and are satisfied when a process has been developed not necessarily whether or not the process is successful, and they tend to stay in the process mode.” One stakeholder discussed how each member of their local collaborative had a similarly intense passion about their particular subject matter (e.g., as passionate as domestic violence advocates were about women, child protective services members were just as passionate about children). Understandably, this created some difficulties around the priorities and approach to the Greenbook Initiative. The educational process that most sites engaged in seemed to be a good way to deal with this, and many sites reported that as members learned more about other systems and about the issue at hand, organizational priorities became less of an issue.

Reaching Multiple Levels of the Participating Organizations

Finally, one-half of the sites reported some concern with achieving buy-in from reaching all levels of the participating organizations. Two sites reported that they were concerned that while agency heads were on board, direct service workers were not changing how they operate. This is an understandable obstacle for any initiative and it remains to be seen if that “trickle-down” method will work. One site actually had the opposite concern, reporting that direct service workers understood the issues, but policy planners and agency heads still needed to be brought on board to the Greenbook way of thinking.

2.2 Challenges Specific to Planning Activities

Two themes emerged that addressed challenges specific to planning activities: participants were concerned about resources and confidentiality.

Resources

The majority of key stakeholder respondents, including representatives from every site, said they were concerned about the amount of resources available to the project (e.g., did they have enough?) and how to manage existing resources efficiently and obtain additional resources to sustain project activities beyond the Greenbook funding terms. Participants feared that they would not have adequate resources to implement fully their existing plans or would have difficulty finding appropriate staff to conduct planned services. The lack of resources specific to the project was manifested in three ways. The first concern that some sites addressed was the inability of domestic violence service providers to be fully engaged in the initiative as a result of their lack of resources. Because many of the agencies depend so heavily on volunteer staff, it was hard for them to spare the personnel to attend meetings and otherwise participate in the initiative in some sites. Secondly, budget cuts at the state level, which resulted from a downturn in state revenues, compounded by the events of September 11th, left many participants concerned with service provision, especially for child welfare agencies. The last thing about resources – and perhaps most interesting to consider in terms of replication of the initiative – was a issue about expectations. Many respondents raised the issue that if the goal of the Greenbook Initiative was to provide more, better, and more accessible services to women and children, the initiative potentially raises expectations for services as well as demand. Finding funding for those needed services will be problematic, because as one respondent stated, such services tend to be discretionary.

Confidentiality

Similarly, most of the key stakeholder interview respondents, including representatives from every site shared concerns about confidentiality. Issues of confidentiality centered on information sharing. Even when agencies were willing to share information, dealing with confidentiality issues was still a hurdle in terms of putting the proper protocols in place. Although confidentiality might be an issue that revolves around trust, it seemed more of a case of working together to figure out how agencies can collaborate and protect individual privacy.

“So then there is the formalization of how do you interact with those agencies so that you’re not violating confidentiality but you’re being able to coordinate services. We’re developing protocols and guidelines in that area...The concept of collaboration is fantastic, but then how do you develop these partnerships with everybody’s guidelines and [with] parameters between the DV agency, law enforcement, the social services, and then present something to a family that’s respectful of their privacy and to what they need? These are really – it’s difficult, and you have to work on it, and it’s not going to happen without a lot of hard work.”
— Key stakeholder

2.3 Facilitating Factors

Interview respondents also shared their perspectives about how specific planning activities facilitated their initiative’s success. Four facilitating factors emerged across sites, including: 1) project directors; 2) Logic Model development; 3) Structure; and 4) Meetings.

Project Directors

One of the most commonly reported facilitating factors was the role of the project director as a facilitator. Two sites indicated that they had suffered when project directors either were not in place or were having trouble with the collaborative. One site has two full-time project directors and credits the strength and focus of the initiative with this organizational decision.

Logic Models

Secondly, respondents mentioned specific needs assessment and planning activities as facilitating factors. Specifically, as discussed earlier, logic models were seen as tools that helped to generate a common understanding and vision of the initiative among collaborative members. Logic models were deemed incredibly useful to the planning process by most sites. A respondent at one

“As frustrating as it was sometimes to put it into a framework that was new to all of us – this logic model concept...So there was a learning curve for us, but understanding then what [a logic model] was really helped us to formulate our goals and to come up with some really specific program activities that we wanted to accomplish. I think it took longer than we envisioned because of the nature of doing the work – you really have to think through what exactly you want to accomplish...and how are you going to frame and set some priorities for it. So, I don’t think that any of us envisioned it, and I don’t think we would change any of that because it was a really good, meaningful process to come through that..”

—Key Stakeholder

site described the logic model as initially daunting but ultimately useful.

Structure

Another predominant theme was having or using structure to guide the initiative. In this context, “structure” was defined in four different, yet related, ways: 1) using existing structures (i.e., committees already convened to address similar issues) instead of creating new ones; 2) using the actual Greenbook document to guide the process; 3) using existing grant guidelines as a roadmap; and 4) developing small groups to which you can delegate tasks. All of the sites reported that structure was important, and two of the sites reported that a lack of structure had been an obstacle to the planning process. The most commonly cited form of structure that respondents found helpful was breaking down their initiative into small groups. Most sites had a larger oversight committee that included everyone in the initiative, and a smaller executive committee to oversee the specific administrative work of the project. In addition, having very small tasks and topic-specific work groups was extremely helpful in maintaining accountability, using participants’ time effectively, and maintaining momentum in terms of getting the actual work accomplished.

Meetings

Finally, sites spoke about the use of meeting time. This involved generally two issues. The first was the number of meetings and their length. Sites reported that many meetings were needed, and when they tried to have fewer meetings to reduce the burden on stakeholders, members got out of touch, became less invested, and the process slowed. Some sites needed lengthier meetings and found they could not do without them, but other sites discovered that if they met more frequently they could do so for less time and still keep everyone engaged.

3. THE ROLE OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, FEDERAL MONITORING, AND EVALUATION

3.1 Technical Assistance

The Structure of TA

The Federal Greenbook Initiative funded a team of three national organizations, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, the Family Violence Prevention Fund , and the American Public Human Services Association, to provide technical support and assistance to the six demonstration sites. These organizations represent the policy and practice perspectives of the three systems central to the Greenbook Initiative. The Technical Assistance

team for the Greenbook Initiative is charged with conducting technical assistance needs assessments, developing a plan for the delivery of technical assistance, providing on-site services and material resources, and hiring and coordinating consultants as needed.

During the first year of the Initiative, each demonstration site was assigned a TA site liaison. The liaisons concentrated on building and fostering relationships with the sites so that site staff felt comfortable requesting assistance to address organizational and structural issues. They worked closely with sites to determine specific needs, provide support to project coordinators, and coordinate the provision of technical assistance. The TA team also planned and organized technical assistance meetings and conferences and held monthly conference calls with project coordinators to facilitate peer to peer learning, to build relationships across sites, and to provide a consistent method of communication between the site's project coordinators and technical assistance partners.

Based on insights gathered during the first year of providing technical assistance, the TA team decided to restructure the mechanism for delivering TA. Several factors led to this decision, including:

- The need for enhanced communication among national partners
- The need to clarify the respective roles of the federal partners and the technical assistance providers in relation to the sites
- Insights into the complexities of the Initiative after the national partners had been working together for a year
- The desire of the TA team to build on the strengths of the various partner organizations, not underutilize any partner agency, and build a structure that would more closely meet the team's own definition of high quality technical assistance
- A request by the federal partners for a change in structure to take place.

In October 2001, the Project began a three-month transition period, moving away from the site liaison model. Under the new structure, a program manager position was created in order to streamline the TA process. The program manager is responsible for the tracking and documentation of requests for and delivery of technical assistance, development and maintenance of the Initiative communication forums (i.e., website, listserv, toll-free number), recruitment and brokering of consultants, and grant reporting and budget monitoring. In addition, the program manager coordinates communication among the TA partnership, and works to improve communication with other national initiative partners.

While the program manager provides overall leadership and management, technical assistance is provided through a team approach. Technical assistance requests are processed for the most part by the entire team with different team members taking the lead on different requests depending on the timeframe, available resources, and needed expertise. This process draws upon the collective thinking and experience of the members of the TA partnership and matches the site with the resources they need to address the specific request.

The new TA structure has had a number of positive impacts, including: more clearly defined roles and responsibilities; creative use of limited resources to address site-specific and cross-site issues; an increase in the amount and timeliness of technical assistance delivered; and more collective thinking of the entire TA team in addressing the needs of the initiative. However, the absence of site specific liaisons has led to a decrease in the amount of contact the TA team has with each site and limited the amount of in-depth knowledge the TA providers have of the ins and outs of a particular community, including the personality of the players and project leadership ongoing activities. As a result, the process of understanding the unique TA needs of the demonstration sites takes longer.

Technical Assistance Provided

In addition to addressing specific needs as they arise at the local level, the TA team plans and provides for the following:

- Topic-specific gatherings for site teams (e.g., community organizing, safety audits)
- System-specific resource meetings for representatives of each primary system (i.e., courts, domestic violence, child welfare)
- An all-sites conference
- On-site consultants
- Compilations of resources, research, and protocols
- A listserv
- A national Greenbook Web-site
- National support through regional forums and the Greenbook Policy Advisory Committee.

In addition to the services above, several features were added to the new TA structure, including: a toll-free telephone number to reach the TA team; forms to track the requests and receive feedback; and weekly TA team calls to keep all TA team members informed of national and local activities. TA providers also respond to site-specific requests. Monthly TA reports list the requests made, who the requestors are, and what has been done to fill each request.

During the early planning phase for the initiative, on-site facilitation, on-site assessments, and telephone consultations were provided about once per month. Almost all of the site specific TA provided was initiated by requests from the sites. A majority (70%) of the requests were made by Project directors, which may reflect the preferred flow of information on the site level (i.e., Project Directors facilitate and coordinate contact with TA). The remainder of the requests were made by judges, steering committee members, and Federal partners. A listing of the major group events planned, provided, and hosted by the TA team to date is included in Appendix H.

The Impact of TA

While it is still early to assess the impact of technical assistance on each site's local initiative, TA appears to have had a significant influence in at least two key areas:

- Providing a national framework for operationalizing the Greenbook work
- Assisting sites with developing and organizing the structure of their initiative (e.g., developing steering committees and creating new positions)

As mentioned previously, TA team members work for national organizations that represent each of the primary systems in the Greenbook. This affiliation presents opportunities for the TA team members to keep abreast of and relay to sites emerging system specific and cross-system policy and practice trends. Most of the sites reported benefiting from receiving information on relevant activities, programs, and best practices taking place nationwide. As one stakeholder stated, "there's a benefit to being told what's happening and then deciding what to bring in." The TA team also hosted topic-specific gatherings, toolbox meetings, and other events that introduced demonstration site representatives to national experts, cutting edge issues, and allowed for cross-site and peer-to-peer learning. In addition, with private, non-Federal funding, the National Council for Juvenile and Family Court Judges organizes the Greenbook Policy Advisory Committee. This committee aims to support communities that are engaged in the implementation of the Greenbook recommendations by providing critical thinking and policy strategies. Representatives from each of the Greenbook demonstration sites serve on this advisory committee.

This exposure to national policy and practice expertise around the issue of co-occurrence provided sites with a "national Greenbook perspective" with which to frame their local activities.

For some of the sites, TA has also influenced the foundation-laying and structuring of their local initiatives. TA was instrumental in supporting site project leadership by: 1) shaping and clarifying their roles and responsibilities; 2) assisting them with thinking about their governing bodies and how to approach reorganizing to best meet the needs of the initiative; and 3) building trust among collaborative members. For example, TA was brought in for a retreat in

San Francisco that resulted in the development of an implementation committee. In Grafton, TA helped facilitate initial conversations among the Executive Committee and Advisory Council. In El Paso County, TA has assisted in the development of new positions to enhance the systems' response to co-occurrence, such as the case coordinator position in the courts.

The Community Organizing conference in particular helped structure local collaboratives. After the Community Organizing conference, all of the sites were working in some way to incorporate a community awareness and engagement component within their initiatives. The Oversight committee in El Paso County voted to require each member to make three fifteen minute presentations on co-occurrence to community groups. Grafton County is conducting focus groups with battered women and discussing what the informal community can do for these women. Lane County is working on neighborhood organizing by identifying a community/neighborhood to target for neighborhood empowerment. St. Louis has added two community-based organizations to their initiative. Though San Francisco was already working to include community within their initiative, they are currently working with an agency to conduct focus groups with individuals in the community, and to include grassroots organizations in their initiative. Santa Clara began defining community and what Greenbook messages they would like their community to receive. While it is difficult to assess the degree of impact the Community Organizing conference had on local activities, it is apparent that sites have worked to incorporate this piece, some to larger degrees than others.

A couple of sites also spoke of the impact that the Safety Audit conference had on their initiatives. While El Paso was already conducting pieces of safety audits, they are now working on systems mapping for their primary systems. Lane County is working to formalize what they're already doing, such as a batterer accountability mapping project funded by another source. In general, information from this particular conference has been difficult to incorporate due to the cost of performing safety audits. Feedback from the sites indicates that it would have been more useful to receive this information earlier, when safety audits could have been integrated into budgets and long-range plans.

Sites have also received information tailored to local Greenbook projects, such as intake forms and risk assessment protocols and articles on cultural competency and supervised visitation. These materials have assisted the development of local projects and according to one site, enhanced community capacity.

In summary, during the early planning phase of the initiative most site participants found the technical assistance providers to be responsive and helpful. TA seems to have helped build the structure of local initiatives and to have provided a national perspective that assisted in the development of local activities.

Challenges and Lessons Learned

The most significant challenge identified by the TA Team in the early phase of the initiative concerned guiding sites through the process of system change collaboration while balancing the planning and implementation demands presented by the initiative timeline. Specifically, the TA team has grappled with being responsive to site requests for resources while being cognizant of the unintended consequences of moving too fast and implementing tools or new services before a community has adequately addressed the process of system change.

The TA Team has identified several key lessons that have emerged during the early planning stage of the initiative:

- Different kinds of technical assistance are needed along the life of the initiative. For example, upfront there is a lot of one-on-one relationship building and assistance with planning and organization. As sites begin to implement, subsequent technical assistance requires more financial resources (e.g., brokering consultants and subcontracts, organizing meetings, etc).
- Providing technical assistance in a new topic area is extremely difficult when there is no direction yet in the field (i.e., advisory groups, consultants, etc., must be given enough time to adequately address issues in collaboration with sites).
- The planning and start-up phases of the initiative take longer than one year.
- Meetings have been effective ways to build community among the sites and introduce them to new subject matters, but they are costly.
- It is imperative that the national components of the initiative are on the same page and support one another.

This report reflects the first six months of the new TA structure. Technical assistance continues to provide support and guidance to the Greenbook demonstration sites. Subsequent reports will more fully describe the impact of this new structure on the activities of the six sites.

3.2 Federal Monitoring

Each site has a Federal monitor who maintains regular contact with local representatives. Federal monitors conduct site visits and often host monthly conference calls with project directors, LRPs, and NET liaisons. The Federal partners frequently provide guidance and feedback to sites during these interactions. One goal of the national evaluation has been to assess the impact of national partners' interaction with the demonstration sites.

Feedback on Federal monitoring was gathered from the sites during interviews with stakeholders and conference calls. In addition, the Federal perspective was obtained during phone interviews with each site's Federal monitor. In general, project directors and other key stakeholders note having limited contact with the Federal partners. Federal monitors tend to interact with sites, particularly the project directors, about once per month. Most site-level participants felt that their current level of interaction was sufficient and appropriate.

Interactions mostly consisted of receiving guidance on budgetary or administrative issues from Federal monitors. They covered areas such as managing the grant application process, handling carry-over funding from the first year, and funding new positions. At times, conversations with Federal monitors provided a forum for discussing organizational or programmatic issues (e.g. selecting LRPs and project directors, working through "hot button issues, getting key partners to the table, developing protocols, and applying for additional grants). Federal monitors also played key roles as facilitators: they facilitated the relationships between LRPs and project directors, between transitioning project directors, and between the NET and the sites. They also match sites with TA when needs were identified. In addition, Federal monitors were a source of information on expectations for the initiative and activities that are occurring across sites. One project director noted that she checked in with her Federal monitor to see how her site was doing and to make sure they were on track with Federal expectations. During site visits, she asked her monitor about her concerns and what she thought the site needed to focus on. She said she would not ask TA for this type of assessment, as it is the Federal expectations that have a greater influence on their initiative. This respondent also remarked that her monitor was a good source of information on other projects taking place in her region.

From the federal perspective, the demonstration is seen as a balance between having a national standard, represented by the Greenbook recommendations, and the need for local buy-in and local goal setting. The Federal monitors saw the planning and implementation of Greenbook as a dynamic and evolving process with Greenbook recommendations adapted by each community to meet local needs and reflect local demands. They expected to learn and provide assistance to sites as the process unfolded and needs were identified.

While Federal monitors have expressed the desire that the majority of decisions be site-driven, their guidance and support have exerted some influence on local processes and activities. One respondent stated that feedback and direction from the Federal partners had a "tremendous impact" on their local initiative. Aside from providing more general support and facilitation, examples of concrete impact include an application for a new grant in St. Louis County at the suggestion of its Federal monitor, and a presentation on judicial ethics in San Francisco arranged through the Federal team.

Local respondents also commented on their perception of their interaction with the Federal monitors and how it could be improved. While one respondent appreciated the amount of Federal investment in the Greenbook Initiative, others would have liked more direction. Regarding the overall leadership at the national level, one respondent said, “We’re looking to you guys to say ‘okay,’ to show us what to do, and you guys are saying ‘well, we’re figuring out what we’re doing.’” Some commented on their confusion as to the roles of the Federal partners. As one stakeholder explained, this may be due to the need to adjust to having a partnership with the grantors, as this relationship is different than with other grants she has administered in the past.

Other feedback on the relationship with the Federal partners focused on the desire for clearer goals and objectives at an earlier point in time. One participant explicitly stated that the lack of clear Federal expectations up front may have delayed the site’s progress. In general, site-level representatives have indicated that they would have appreciated receiving the most recent list of Federal expectations towards the beginning of the initiative. One LRP suggested having the overarching outcomes in place up front in the future, with a 6-month window to plan on how to make them operational. She stated, “That would have really helped our group to quell the desire to get out right away and change the world. That wouldn’t be directive, because it would still be up to the sites to think about what part of the system they need to fix, and how they want to make those outcomes take place.” The Federal partners acknowledge that while they wanted the Greenbook process to be site-driven based on local needs, it became clear after the first year of the initiative that there was a need for more explicit federal expectations to guide both site work and the national evaluation.

3.3 Local Evaluation

Once again, participation from the LRPs was crucial to the needs assessment and logic model processes described earlier. During the planning stage, nearly every LRP played a leadership role in developing the logic model. Local researchers also were involved in several other activities that directly contributed to the resource and needs assessments process. As discussed, in nearly every site, the LRP was responsible for describing the primary systems, including system maps, case flow processes, and current policies and practices. In sites where individual needs were included as goals of local initiatives, the LRP played a significant role in collecting that information. As the sites move from the planning to the implementation phase, they will continue to rely on the LRP to provide updates on their progress and to evaluate the system changes they implement. Individual-level outcomes also will be collected by all of the LRPs in conjunction with several national evaluation activities, including focus groups and case abstraction.

Similar to the NET, many LRPs also plan to conduct a process evaluation that will inform the collaborative process and to evaluate the changes that are implemented locally. The teams at the El Paso, Grafton, and San Francisco sites evaluated the collaborative relationships among key participants, including an internal functioning survey, a collaboration survey, and a collaborative process interview tool. Process evaluations also will focus on new positions and enhanced services that are planned and executed through the local initiative.

3.4 National Evaluation

During the course of conducting site visits and regular phone conversations, feedback was obtained regarding the national evaluation. Much of the feedback was similar to the comments made about Federal monitors. Specifically, site-level participants would like to have received clearer goals and objectives for the evaluation at the beginning of the initiative. There also was some confusion about the roles of the local research partners and NET. As with the Federal partners, sites were often waiting to receive approval or direction from NET before proceeding with local activities, whereas the NET was looking to build more of a partnership. Respondents also commented that they would like to remain better informed of the national evaluation and to receive detailed information on surveys before they are distributed. Other comments reflected a desire to have collected more baseline data and a concern over duplication of national and local evaluation activities. In general, communication has improved and site leaders appreciated events that enhanced this communication (particularly the local research partner and project director meetings at Caliber). Specifically, the local research partners became more involved in determining the outcome measures and future direction of the evaluation at the most recent local research partner meeting at Caliber. As a result, they have taken a greater ownership in the national evaluation, as well as insuring that national evaluation was integrated with their local evaluation plans. Coordination with and ownership of design and protocol development issues also has been enhanced through local research partner workgroups that tackle many issues confronting the national evaluation, such as recruitment for focus groups, methods of case abstraction, and ways to incorporate batterer accountability.

4. CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter presents information to answer the third, fourth, and fifth research questions and sub-questions:

3. How did the sites determine what their initiatives would address? How did they determine and prioritize their needs? What specific planning activities occurred at the sites?

4. What strategies did sites choose to fill identified needs? What are the expected outcomes as a result of implementing those strategies?

5. How did the sites utilize capacity-building opportunities (e.g., technical assistance, Federal monitoring, and the national evaluation)? What effect did these capacity-building activities have on planning local initiatives?

In addition to answering the above research questions, this chapter also discussed the factors that influenced Greenbook participation.

Needs Assessment and Planning Activities

All sites conducted needs assessment and planning activities but did so in distinct ways that reflected their unique site characteristics and contexts. Formal and informal needs assessment activities included:

- Preliminary research on primary systems and/or the generation of systems maps that identify systems gaps and capacities
- Informal discussions and interviews with key community leaders and service providers
- Formal surveys of collaborative members, system representatives, and the broader community.

Sites relied heavily upon the expertise and leadership of the LRPs to conduct local needs assessments. Some sites formed workgroups to help conduct research on the needs of their community, and at least one site hired a paid consultant do conduct needs assessment work. Needs were identified for the collaborative itself, for the primary systems (both within- and across-system needs), and for individual family members suffering from co-occurrence.

Logic models were used as a tool to link identified needs with the strategies, objectives, and goals of the local Greenbook initiatives.

- LRPs typically led the logic model development process at each site
- A majority of sites said logic models were invaluable tools that generated a common understanding and vision among collaborative members
- Four of the six sites completed their logic models within the first 18 months of the Initiative.

Goals, Outcomes, and Strategies

By June 30, 2002, most sites had a well-developed and shared vision of their goals and outcomes, and many had devised strategies to meet these ends. While sites differed in their focus on collaborative, individual, and community-wide goals, there were certain elements common to the goals of each site (as depicted in site logic models):

- Within- and across-system goals were articulated at every site
- Goals and objectives were categorized as immediate-, intermediate-, or long-term
- Sites focused on a core of the same goals and objectives, including:
 - Within- and across-system training
 - Improved screening and assessment
 - Advocacy
 - Integrated courts
 - Batterer accountability
 - Cultural competency.

Capacity Building: TA, Federal Monitors, LRPs, and the NET

Within the Greenbook Initiative, there are several structures in place that may help the six sites increase their local capacity to plan and implement their projects:

- The Technical Assistance (TA) team
- Federal Monitors

- Local Research Partners (LRPs)

During interviews, key stakeholders were asked to reflect upon the roles that these groups played throughout the planning process. Interview respondents said that technical assistance was most influential in:

- Providing a national framework for operationalizing Greenbook work
- Assisting sites with developing and organization the structures of their initiatives
 - Shaping and clarifying collaborative members' roles and responsibilities
 - Structuring the sites' governing bodies
 - Reorganizing governance structures as the groups matured to best meet the needs of local initiatives
 - Building trust among collaborative members.

Stakeholder feedback on the role of Federal monitors included:

- Monthly interaction with Federal monitors has been appropriate and sufficient
- Federal monitors have provided helpful guidance on budget and administrative issues
- Federal monitors have provided the best source of information on expectations for the initiative and also offer helpful information pertaining to activities at other Greenbook sites
- The sites would have appreciated and benefited from more direction and clearly articulated expectations at the beginning of the Initiative.

As discussed, the LRPs have contributed a significant amount to the progress of Greenbook planning at each site:

- LRPs played an important role in conducting community needs assessments
- LRPs led the instrumental process of logic model development and ensuring that their sites articulate clear, achievable, and measurable outcomes for their Greenbook work.

Factors Influencing Participation in Greenbook

Three factors emerged across sites as strong influences on successful participation within the Greenbook Initiative:

- **Time.** Sites identified time as the most significant challenge they faced as members of the Greenbook Initiative. Stakeholders suggest that more time should be allotted for planning such a collaborative venture as Greenbook.
- **Conflicting organizational cultures.** The distinct histories, philosophies, and mandates of the three primary partners involved in the Greenbook work at each site presented barriers to collaboration, especially in terms of prioritizing the goals and visions of local initiatives. Cross-system education was seen as a successful strategy in alleviating some of these tensions.
- **Reaching multiple levels of the participating organizations.** Key stakeholders at half of the sites reported concern that they did not have sufficient buy-in from all levels of participating organizations.

Greenbook stakeholders also reported benefiting from:

- The hard work and good facilitation skills of project directors
- Logic Models
- Building and utilizing structure (e.g., project workgroups and committees, Greenbook grant guidelines and The *Greenbook* recommendations)
- Manageable and consistent meeting times.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

This chapter presents a summary discussion of the six Greenbook sites and their experiences as they mobilized systems and communities to address co-occurrence. The following sections reflect research questions and major findings described in the five previous chapters. This chapter highlights lessons learned and potential topics that may be explored in later phases of the National Evaluation.

CHAPTER VI OUTLINE

1. Overview of Historical System Challenges
2. Greenbook Process Evaluation
3. The Greenbook Sites
4. Mobilization and Collaboration
5. The Planning Process
6. Lessons Learned

1. OVERVIEW OF HISTORICAL SYSTEM CHALLENGES

The first chapter of this report describes how the child welfare system, dependency courts, and domestic violence service providers historically have responded to child maltreatment and domestic violence in different ways. The differences can be seen in how systems prioritize the needs of those affected by the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment. For instance, the child welfare system historically has put a child's safety, permanency, and well being before addressing the needs of an adult victim. Conversely, domestic violence advocates historically have served the needs of the adult victim before those of her children. On an individual or family level, these differing system priorities can lead to gaps in or inappropriate service provisions and, on a system level, such gaps can lead to distrust and barriers to communication among systems.

In response to these issues, an Advisory Committee created by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges published a set of recommendations in a report entitled *Effective Intervention in Domestic Violence and Child Maltreatment Cases: Guidelines for Policy and Practice*, which became known as *The Greenbook*. While many of these recommendations pertain to a specific system, they are set against a background of active community collaboration. The focus of this national evaluation is to describe how six demonstration sites have interpreted the guidelines and recommendations set forth in *The Greenbook* and applied them to their local initiatives to address co-occurrence. The national evaluation uses a multi-level, multi-site comparative research design to study across- and within-system change in the demonstration sites through process and outcome measures.

2. GREENBOOK PROCESS EVALUATION

Chapter Two presents an overview of the national evaluation design and describes the goals of this first phase of the process evaluation: the planning phase. The process evaluation of the Greenbook planning phase sought to determine *how* and *why* sites mobilize and collaborate to address the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment; *who* is involved during the first phase of the initiative; *what* strategies and activities collaborative members undertake as they address the multifaceted needs of domestic violence victims and children; and *what* obstacles and facilitating factors impact sites' progress toward their desired goals. Specifically, this component of the process evaluation has sought to answer the following key research questions:

1. What site-specific characteristics, including background, history, and philosophy of the three primary systems, contributed to the sites' readiness for the Greenbook Initiative? (*This question was addressed in Chapter Three.*)
2. How were key agencies and individuals mobilized? How did the sites structure their local initiatives? What factors affected the ability of the sites to mobilize, collaborate, and sustain involvement throughout the course of the initiative? (*This question was addressed in Chapter Four.*)
3. How did the sites determine what their initiatives would address? How did they determine and prioritize their needs? What specific planning activities occurred at the sites? (*This question was addressed in Chapter Five.*)
4. What strategies did sites choose to fill identified needs? What are the expected outcomes as a result of implementing those strategies? (*This question was addressed in Chapter Five.*)
5. How did the sites utilize capacity-building opportunities (e.g., technical assistance, Federal monitoring, and the national evaluation)? What impact did these capacity-building activities have on planning local initiatives? (*This question was addressed in Chapter Five.*)
6. What lessons were learned during the planning phase of the Greenbook Initiative? (*This question was discussed in Chapter 4 and 5 as topics arose, and is summarized in Chapter Six.*)

3. THE GREENBOOK SITES

Each Greenbook demonstration site is distinct. The six Greenbook sites vary widely in terms of geography, population diversity, and culture. The three primary systems in each site also are organized differently, primarily as a result of these contextual factors. Yet the sites are similar in many respects as well. All sites have recognized a need to work together, combining community concern, dedication, and expertise to serve families experiencing co-occurrence. Furthermore, all sites – regardless of size or location – face similar challenges in addressing co-occurrence through community and system collaboration.

The six communities that were chosen as demonstration sites were selected at least in part because they demonstrated readiness or capacity for collaboration. Varying levels of relationship building among the three primary systems had occurred across sites prior to Greenbook, but in every instance, sites had demonstrated at least some capacity in this regard. Three types of pre-existing collaborations were identified among sites:

- *Collaborations that are nationally recognized.* Every site has had experience with nationally recognized and/or Federally funded initiatives.
- *Collaborations that focused on co-occurrence.* Four of the six sites have had experience addressing co-occurrence through a collaborative forum.
- *Collaborations that represent all three primary systems.* Every site has had community collaboratives with representative members from all three of the primary Greenbook systems.

Four sites have had experience with all of these collaborative types, which may have made for smoother, more efficient progress through the first phase of Greenbook planning activity. Less experienced sites seemed to require a bit more time for community mobilization and collaboration.

Based on relationships built through previous community collaboration, various strategies were underway across sites to improve within- and across-system capacities prior to Greenbook. In some instances, sites had already begun to discern their gaps and needs regarding service provision to address co-occurrence. Education and cross-training efforts had begun; specialized staff was being utilized; and screening for co-occurrence was a familiar concept, if not practice, in both domestic violence and child welfare agencies. This foundation of experiences and capacities positively influenced the mobilization and planning experiences of Greenbook sites.

An analysis of baseline activities within the three primary systems also revealed gaps that could be filled and improvements to system functioning that could be realized across sites as a result of Greenbook implementation activities. In the child welfare system, for example, data showed that consistent training, co-located staff, and improved screening and assessment were needed at most sites. Among domestic violence service providers at the sites, gaps in training, more comprehensive children's programming, and co-located staff also are needed. Finally, according to these baseline data, Greenbook has the potential to effect change within the courts system. This is especially so concerning increased and consistent training on co-occurrence and domestic violence and information sharing across different courts.

4. MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION

Sites reported being drawn to Greenbook for several different reasons. Most sites were interested in institutionalizing some of their existing collaborative efforts, and many wanted to expand their successful efforts at responding specifically to co-occurrence. In addition to these reasons, two sites reported that they were responding to and motivated by a specific event or crisis within their community. Finally, respondents from all sites said that they were drawn to the Greenbook project because of their belief that important change can and will result from their efforts.

Mobilizing agencies and individuals to become a part of Greenbook was a different experience for every site. For some, membership was firmly entrenched from the time of grant writing or before. At other sites, a few passionate people came together to write the grant but required more time to garner broader support. Regardless of the starting point, mobilization and collaboration needed constant nurturing and tending. Several strategies emerged as being helpful to keep momentum and membership constant. Broadly, a flexible collaborative structure; "in-house" communication and cross-system education; visibility in the broader community; and community integration were common approaches to mobilization and collaboration across sites.

With these successful strategies, local Greenbook initiatives came to include a reasonably wide array of stakeholders in addition to the required participation of the three primary partners. Membership across sites ranged from community volunteers and domestic violence survivors to business community and law enforcement representatives. There were certain key players sites thought of as important recruits: every site expressed an interest in increasing the participation from law enforcement. Sites also desired increased participation from parole and probation and mental health agencies. Generally, most sites experienced an increase in collaborative membership during the first 18 months. It will be important to assess the degree to which sites are able to sustain participation in the collaborative (particularly in sectors such as law

enforcement, mental health, and parole and probation) and to understand the contributions of these collaborative partners.

With so many players coming from various positions of interest and influence, each local initiative required rules and structures for participation and power sharing. Striking a balance in this regard became very important, as it impacted collaborative membership, functioning, and capacity. There is not a wide variety in terms of how each site has structured their Greenbook collaborative. All sites have a committee system with subcommittees and/or workgroups. Generally, a small decision making committee includes representatives from the primary partner systems. This committee typically is informed by a larger advisory body that is more inclusive of other collaborative members. Interestingly, decision making within the collaboratives has been more variable. In two sites, executive committee members make decisions by voting. Two sites are driven by non-hierarchical, consensus model approaches; one of these sites has provisions for voting procedures failing consensus. The remaining two sites did not report having a formal decision-making process during the first formative months of the project.

As mentioned, all sites have found it helpful to be flexible about changing their governing structures when warranted. Power-sharing and the structure of governing bodies are continually evolving as sites learn how to ensure meaningful participation within large and diverse bodies while maintaining forward progress.

Mobilization and collaboration activities at the six Greenbook sites were affected by a variety of factors. Trust presents obstacles when it is gone and facilitates opportunity when it is present. Ideological differences and lack of trust were blamed by at least two sites for causing friction and delays in moving the process forward at their sites. In sites where mobilization and collaboration is a relatively trouble-free process, respondents cite a foundation of trust as the main reason. Greenbook sites obviously began their initiatives with differing levels of trust among the primary partners. Importantly, sites that did not enjoy that foundation of trust from the start learned that trust-building exercises such as cross-education, group retreats, or other means could be effective ways to keep momentum and progress flowing.

Other factors such as inclusiveness, communication, leadership, and resources also impacted the experiences of sites during this phase. Including community members and survivors of domestic violence as collaborative members was a priority in several sites and is important since these stakeholders are often left out of community-based initiatives. Their inclusion, however, presented special challenges that have yet to be resolved in some sites. In five of the six sites, the participation and leadership of judges was seen as critical to success; one site reported that the lack of active participation from their local judge had been problematic. A majority of sites regarded the coordination and communication facilitated by site project

directors as an important facilitating factor. Lack of resources was reported as a barrier to collaboration by interview respondents from all six sites.

5. THE PLANNING PROCESS

All sites conducted some form of resource and needs assessment during the first 18 months of the initiative. Needs assessment and goal-setting activities were distinct and innovative, reflecting the diversity of contexts at each site. The needs assessments consisted of a variety of activities ranging from informal discussions to formal surveys. Needs were identified for the collaboratives themselves, the primary systems, across systems, and for families.

Sites also worked on developing a logic model to help plan their local Greenbook initiatives. Logic models emerged as extremely beneficial tools at most sites. They are credited with bringing collaborative members to a common ground concerning expectations and goals for local Greenbook initiatives. They also assisted the sites in planning the activities to reach those shared goals. Local Research Partners were critical to both the community needs assessment and logic model development processes.

As evident in their logic models, sites envisioned and articulated goals, strategies, and outcomes differently. Goals were based on both needs assessment and identified community strengths in each site. Sites typically distinguished immediate, intermediate, and long-term goals. Every site included inter and intra-system outcomes. Some sites included individual level outcomes, such as increased safety for victims of domestic violence and child maltreatment, and batterer accountability. Further evaluation will be conducted to see how closely actual implementation activities align with the goals and objectives identified in the initial planning phases of the local initiatives, and to assess how these activities align with the Federal Expectations and the recommendations in The Greenbook.

While assessment, planning, and implementation phases are recognized as fluid, some sites had progressed farther into implementation activities than others by the end of the first 18 months of the initiative. By the end of the first phase, activities to improve screening, batterer accountability, information sharing, cross-system training, community engagement, and cultural competency had begun to varying degrees.

Importantly, Greenbook stakeholders have identified facilitating factors and have learned from the obstacles encountered as they planned their local projects. Stakeholders reported benefiting from the good facilitation skills and hard work of project directors. As mentioned, the leadership and expertise of local research partners also was crucial to sites' positive experiences and successes during the first phase of Greenbook. Logic model development, identifying and agreeing on attainable goals, and building and utilizing structure were all cited as important facilitating factors.

Common challenges emerged across sites as well. A majority of sites did not feel they had enough time for planning. To varying degrees, they also were challenged by the need to address and work through conflicting cultures of the three systems. Sites also struggled to come up with ways to make sure they reach multiple levels of the three primary Greenbook systems. Planning activities also were affected by the concerns about resource availability and management and confidentiality.

6. LESSONS LEARNED

Throughout the data collection process, specifically during on-site interviews and in semi-annual progress reports, stakeholders had opportunities to talk about lessons learned. The following paragraphs detail six “lessons learned” that emerged across sites.

- **The important role of project coordinators and local research partners (LRPs).** The respective roles of the project coordinators and LRPs emerged as critical during the planning phase of the Greenbook Initiative. In many sites, LRPs were essential for helping the sites understand and utilize the logic models that have been credited for making local initiatives more focused and manageable. Likewise, collaborative members likely would not have sustained interest in, nor committed their time to, the Greenbook Initiative were it not for the project coordinator’s strong facilitation and organizational skills, which kept everything moving. Future Greenbook sites should think carefully about how to structure the roles and responsibilities of the project coordinators and LRPs and what would work best at their sites (e.g., some sites found it helpful to have co-coordinators and co-LRPs).
- **The importance of logic models.** Most of the sites found logic models to be very helpful. In the face of the sometimes overwhelming task of defining the goals and objectives of such a large initiative, participants found the logic model to be a great conceptualization tool to structure attainable goals. Many respondents said that the structure of the logic model made the initiative feel more “doable” and, further, appreciated its usefulness in linking project goals and objectives to how they would ultimately be measured or evaluated. Use of the logic model also served to keep many groups focused and on track during the planning phase, and sites were able to sustain more productive involvement from members. Importantly, it was learned that for the logic model to be truly useful, sites needed to refer to it often and update it as needed.
- **The need to engage more players in local initiatives, especially law enforcement.** For good reason, Greenbook originators identified the dependency courts, domestic

violence providers, and child protective services as the three primary partners to be included in the initiative. Still, it became clear to several of the sites that it was essential to have law enforcement at the table as well. Every site reported that law enforcement was a key missing player, and four of the six sites were able to draw law enforcement into the initiative. Given that law enforcement agencies are often the first point of contact for both child maltreatment and domestic violence, a majority of sites felt more comfortable including law enforcement and felt that it should be recommended directly that law enforcement be recruited to participate in the Greenbook Initiative. Several sites also tagged mental health and substance abuse treatment providers as important missing links within local initiatives.

- **The importance of maintaining flexibility in and constantly attending to the collaborative process.** Historical tensions among and the sometimes differing agendas of the three primary systems results in a somewhat tenuous foundation upon which to build local Greenbook initiatives. Whatever progress was being made, stakeholders found that collaboration requires mindful and continuous nurturing to shore up the foundation that so carefully is being built. Because of the diversity in and the size of collaborative membership, it was typically a deliberate balancing act 1) to negotiate the competing interest, concerns, and power levels of members, and 2) to build that necessary foundation of trust while making tangible forward progress in terms of planning and implementation so that busy stakeholders did not feel that they were spinning their wheels. Successful mobilization and collaboration strategies employed by the six sites fell into three categories:
 - *Flexibility/Willingness to change the structure of the collaborative.* This included such things as expanding or restructuring committees and subcommittees and clarifying decision-making processes and norms.
 - *Communication and education within the Collaborative itself.* This included such things as cross-system education (e.g., job shadowing), monthly newsletters, and outside facilitation.
 - *Visibility and community integration.* This included such things as coordinating Greenbook efforts with other regional initiatives and having Greenbook members serve on other councils and projects within the community.
- **The need for more planning time.** Greenbook planning included activities ranging from mobilization and community assessment activities to planning specific local strategies to address co-occurrence. Sites found that mobilizing key stakeholders and

garnering the trust that is so important for successful collaboration could take a considerable amount of time. Furthermore, conducting resource and needs assessments and identifying expected outcomes were time-consuming tasks. When (or if) these things were successfully completed in the first 18 months of the initiative, adequate time did not necessarily remain for formal planning. Sites generally agreed that more time for planning was necessary. Perhaps the Greenbook timeline could be more formally broken up into separate mobilization, community assessment, and planning phases. This would be especially true for communities that did not have a solid relationship base among the primary partners at the outset.

Several participants, most often project directors, coordinators, and core group board members, talked about having had to learn to “let the process unfold” during the first 18 months of the initiative, learning to be patient with the process, letting relationships develop among members, and taking things “one step at a time.” Most reported that at some time during the planning process, time restrictions began to drive the process rather than project activities and goals. It was at these times that they came to understand that it would take time and require patience to successfully engage a community in something as important and complicated as the Greenbook Initiative and to negotiate planning phase activities in a meaningful way. While they were not sure if their attempts to “let the process unfold” actually facilitated their progress, in the end they reported feeling that it had contributed to the commitment and cohesiveness of the collaborative.

- **The need for more guidance and structure from the Federal and national evaluation teams.** There was some indication from the sites that having a more structured approach to the initiative from the funders initially would have been helpful with meeting deadlines, submitting plans with measurable outcomes, and communicating with the Federal team about expectations. Obviously, there is a careful balance to be achieved between directing site activities and respecting each site’s individual contexts and needs. However, collaborative members felt that the desire to let the sites plan activities that reflected the needs of their communities should not override the need for the funders to provide specific guidelines and expectations.

Valuable lessons were learned as well regarding the Greenbook Initiative national evaluation process. In sum, sites desired to be kept more informed about national evaluation activities. Several sites were unhappy with what they perceived as a lack of (or untimely) communication between project coordinators and the National Evaluation Team (NET). Some sites did not feel they had a complete understanding of the structure of the national evaluation, which they felt should have been made more clear initially.

Based on existing information, it is difficult to assess whether and how more structure and guidance would have helped the sites negotiate the planning process. While participants talked about wanting and needing more structure and guidance, they were not able to talk substantively about the nature of the structure and guidance they desired and how it would have changed their experience had it been available to them. They did articulate the need for specific and measurable outcomes at the beginning of the process.

Next Steps

The first phase of process evaluation data collection was completed at the end of June 2002. As discussed earlier, however, sites will continue to address mobilization and collaboration of key stakeholders, assess resources and needs, and refine outcomes and goals. Many sites have begun specific activities related to identified outcomes, such as cross-training, new screening and assessment procedures, and community engagement and awareness. Sites will continue these planning activities and begin to implement changes within their systems and their communities as the Greenbook demonstration project enters the second half of the 5-year grant period. During this time, the national evaluation will continue to collect data on the processes of implementation and collaboration in each site.

APPENDIX A:
El Paso County, Colorado

APPENDIX A: EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO

1. COMMUNITY CONTEXT

1.1 Demographics

El Paso County is located on Colorado's Front Range, approximately 65 miles south of Denver. The county comprises 2,126 square miles, including 14,000 acres of parks, trails, and open space. Colorado Springs, located in the western third of the county is an isolated urban area encompassing 183 square miles and 70 percent of the county's population. The four smaller cities of Manitou Springs, Security, Widefield, and Fountain comprise 20 percent of the population, while the remaining population resides in rural communities.

El Paso County is the third largest county in the State in terms of population (516,929 as of the 2000 Census) and is forecast to have the largest population by 2005. The county's population has increased by 30 percent since 1987. The increase in population is concentrated in the suburban and rural areas of the county and is largely due to in-migration (45%). The median age is 33.0, and nearly 30 percent of the county's residents are under the age of 20. El Paso County's racial makeup is overwhelmingly white (81.2%), followed by African-American (6.5%), Asian (2.8%), and Native American (1%). Hispanics or Latinos of any race make up 11.3 percent of the population. According to the 2000 Census, El Paso County had 202,428 households, an average household size of 2.61, and an average family size of 3.11. The median household income is \$53,000, while the median sales price of a single-family home in El Paso County is \$159,000.

1.2 Unique Site Characteristics

El Paso County has several characteristics that both distinguish the community and will affect the Greenbook Initiative. First, the county's geographic location and make-up necessitates a unique approach to implementing a countywide initiative. As mentioned above, most of the landmass in the county is rural, with the vast majority of residents concentrated in Colorado Springs. Geographical barriers may therefore pose a challenge to reaching families in the more rural and isolated parts of the county. Furthermore, the residents have a traditionally western libertarian culture that brings with it a general distrust of institutions. The location on Colorado's front range also promotes a large tourism industry, so the service economy is an important characteristic of El Paso County. The military, however, is El Paso County's largest employer with the Air Force Academy, Fort Carson, Peterson Air Force Base, Schriever Air Force Base, and the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) all located within the county. This military presence brings a population to the area that is not only transient, but also young (El Paso County has a disproportionately large group of 18- to 33-year-olds) and

therefore at a greater risk for domestic violence. Finally, El Paso County's residents are largely Republican, a fact that will impact any initiative that will bring together elected officials and/or political appointees.

1.3 History of Collaboration

Child maltreatment and domestic violence were both key community concerns in El Paso County prior to the Greenbook grant—concerns that were addressed by several different agencies. According to the Colorado Springs Police Department (CSPD), there were 2,414 reported family disturbances (6.76 per 1,000 inhabitants) in 1998, an increase of 100 cases from the previous year. In 2001, the El Paso County Department of Human Services (DHS) received 9,333 referrals to its child abuse hotline, 48 percent of which were assigned for investigation. In that same year, the Children's Advocacy Center for the Pikes Peak Region worked with 729 cases of children whose families faced child abuse, assault, and domestic violence allegations/charges. Of those, 644 involved children and teens that were interviewed at the Center regarding allegations of child sexual abuse or assault. In 2000, The Youth and Victims' Services Unit of the Colorado Springs Police Department conducted 535 interviews with children and teens involving allegations of third party sexual abuse.

El Paso County had a number of collaborative initiatives underway when it began work on the Greenbook Initiative, many of which already included the three main Greenbook systems: domestic violence service providers, child welfare, and the courts. These existing initiatives created partnerships between key organizations to address issues of family violence, and helped to form the foundation for the Greenbook collaborative.

El Paso County agencies began to collaboratively address family violence in the community more than a decade ago. For example, the Pikes Peak Domestic Violence Coalition's Domestic Violence Protocol Committee was created in 1988 to address law enforcement's response to domestic violence. The Committee included representatives from domestic violence, child welfare, the courts, and law enforcement, and was responsible for initiating mandatory arrests in the local area prior to State legislation.

The Domestic Violence Emergency Response Team (DVERT) was founded in 1996 by the Center for Prevention of Domestic Violence (now called Trust·Education·Safety·Support·Action or T·E·S·S·A), the Colorado Springs Police Department (CSPD), and the District Attorney's Office (DA's Office). DVERT identifies the most dangerous domestic violence cases, and then works with the victims and perpetrators to connect them with services, assure their safety, and prevent recidivism. Led by the CSPD, DVERT has grown to 35 partners in 2002, including domestic violence advocates, child welfare case workers, and representatives from Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA), the Pikes Peak Area

Humane Society, Probation, the DA's Office, and the El Paso County Sheriff's Department. The program is nationally recognized and in a recent study demonstrated a 12.4 percent recidivism (reoffense) rate among its caseload.

In 1998, DHS and the Center for Prevention of Domestic Violence (now T·E·S·S·A) joined together to create a new domestic violence advocate position. The position is funded through Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and is located in DHS offices to provide both domestic violence-related advocacy and public assistance to clients who identify family violence as a barrier to self-sufficiency. This partnership provides a new approach to dealing with family violence by combining the efforts of child welfare and domestic violence service providers with economic supports into one integrated system. The partnership further recognizes the multiple problems that many TANF-involved families face, and demonstrates how untapped TANF funds can be mobilized to address those issues. The program has expanded to now include 2.5 full-time equivalency (FTE) domestic violence advocates.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE INITIATIVE

2.1 Introduction

The Committee for Children Witnessing Domestic Violence was founded in the summer of 1999 by the Children's Advocacy Center, CASA, the Center for Prevention of Domestic Violence, Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team (DVERT), the courts, and the DA's Office. It focused on developing protocols for law enforcement and the DA's Office to use while interviewing children who witness domestic violence. This committee, along with the collaborative initiatives described above and others, laid the foundation for the El Paso County Greenbook Initiative. They provided the groundwork for the Greenbook collaborative by recognizing the need for a multidisciplinary approach to family violence, establishing relationships among key organizations, and beginning to address gaps in the current systems that address family violence. In addition to the three primary systems identified in the Greenbook, the El Paso County Greenbook Initiative added DVERT as its fourth primary partner.

2.2 Primary Systems

The Child Welfare System

The El Paso County Department of Human Services (DHS) is part of a statewide network of county departments of human services. DHS has 350 employees who provide a range of services to families, including Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), family preservation, and child protective services (CPS). The Child Welfare Division of the El Paso County Department of Human Services handles about 8,000 reports of child maltreatment each year. Based on the initial report and review of relevant resources, a little less than half (46%) of

the referrals are assigned for further investigation. Upon further investigation, including a home visit, interviews with the victim and other children (away from the parents), and use of safety and risk assessment tools, about 512 cases each year are substantiated as child maltreatment. In 2001, CPS filed 212 new dependency and neglect petitions with the juvenile court. This reflects a legal filing in only 6 percent of the total cases investigated. An additional 183 cases (or 5% of total investigations) are offered voluntary ongoing services.

When child welfare is presented with a family that is experiencing the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment, they collaborate with community partners to secure the safety and well-being of the child and family. Specifically, the agency looks at the immediate safety of the child in the context of the current domestic violence incident and the severity. Child welfare currently has a three-tiered approach to such cases based on the severity of the domestic violence and/or child maltreatment. The most serious and potentially lethal cases receive a multidisciplinary team response by the DVERT. This collaborative effort brings child protection, victim's advocacy, and law enforcement directly to the family in an effort to maximize safety for child and adult victims while simultaneously addressing accountability and containment of the offender. These cases may be referred to child protection directly from DVERT, or present as severe domestic violence through the child abuse reporting hotline. Two dedicated caseworkers within child welfare are assigned to DVERT and handle all of the cases from initial referral through ongoing services provision and subsequent case closure.

The second level of intervention is provided to cases in which domestic violence exists along with a specific allegation of child maltreatment. These referrals must be assigned in child protection as they meet Colorado's statutory definition of child maltreatment and are assigned to child protection caseworkers that have been specially trained in domestic violence. CPS works with local domestic violence service providers to train these caseworkers in areas of orders of protection, perpetrators, child witnessing, and services available to victims of domestic violence. In addition, they have received advanced training from their agency partners in family independence programs to conduct initial evaluations for eligibility determinations for TANF and a host of other economic support and family preservation service programs. Finally, domestic violence referrals that present to child protection with no specific child maltreatment allegations are not opened for investigation in CPS. This includes all referrals where the primary involvement of the children is exposure to violence through child witnessing. They are coded out in CPS and referred to a domestic violence advocate who is employed by T·E·S·S·A and co-located in TANF. This advocate reviews the referral and makes a determination whether or not a contact can be made without compromising the safety of the adult victim or children. The program provides services to keep the children in the home and prevent the family from becoming further involved in the child welfare system. All assessments are closed in CPS only

after a supervisor has completed an audit and review of the case and determined that child safety concerns are resolved.

CPS currently works with several Greenbook partners to address the multiple needs of maltreated children and their families. The relationship of CPS and the court system has traditionally been a formal one. As mentioned above, CPS files about 212 petitions each year in the juvenile court. Once the petition is filed on behalf of a child, formal notice is given to the family and a preliminary protective proceeding (PPP) is set within 72 hours. The Guardian ad Litem and respondent counsel are appointed at the PPP and all parties, including child welfare, update the court at a number of regularly set review hearings. Cases are closed within child welfare once the family has satisfactorily completed all court-ordered activities, the parental rights are terminated, or other permanency arrangements are made.

In accordance with Greenbook principles, CPS staff have noted an increased awareness of and a need to support domestic violence victims. This need is most readily apparent in the current relationship between child welfare agencies and the court systems, where families could better be served by a more balanced approach between the two systems. Currently, child welfare has minimal flexibility once a case moves into the legal system. Court appearances consume a great deal of caseworkers' time. The timelines imposed by the courts in dependency and neglect cases often require the development of a service plan very early in the legal process. Many child welfare cases could benefit from a slightly slower process that would allow the worker time to focus on engaging the family in the development of an individualized plan that more clearly addresses their goals and needs.

Domestic Violence Service Providers

T·E·S·S·A is the lead domestic violence victim service provider in El Paso County and the fiscal agent for the Greenbook grant. The agency provides advocacy, safehousing, children's programming, psycho-educational support groups, and counseling for victims for the greater part of El Paso County. Its staff includes therapists who specialize in children, a children's program manager, and a children's program coordinator. Other domestic violence services in El Paso County are provided to specific population groups through multiple-service community agencies. The Fort Carson Family Advocacy Services provides advocacy to military families living on Fort Carson. Centro de la Familia and the Asian Pacific Development Center address a variety of family needs in a culturally specific manner, including domestic violence victim and offender services and referrals.

T·E·S·S·A receives approximately 55,000 client calls for service each year. Other referrals come from the Colorado Springs Police Department, DVERT, DHS, and other community agencies. Clients benefit from agency-specific services as well as referrals that

utilize the relationships T·E·S·S·A has formed with a number of Greenbook partners. Individual treatment and/or service plans can therefore include a number of options, such as safehousing, DHS involvement, CASA support, supervised court visits, DVERT involvement, and safety planning. The Safehouse offers 29 beds (including 6 cribs) and is usually at maximum capacity, providing more than 6,000 nights of shelter per year to women and children. The program provides temporary emergency shelter, food, and case management generally over an 8-week period with follow-up programs that can last up to 2 years. Children under the age of 18, regardless of gender, are allowed to live with their mother at the shelter.

Individual service plans can also include T·E·S·S·A advocacy for clients as they negotiate the court system. This support includes assistance with the temporary restraining order process, education on the court system and how it handles domestic violence, and referrals to relevant community resources. T·E·S·S·A also serves many children through a variety of programs and services. In particular, the Children's Program includes an individual assessment for each child in the safehouse; individual therapy, if appropriate; children's recreation and educational group activities; developmentally appropriate psycho-educational groups; and referrals to community agencies to meet other needs. A case is considered closed when the agency and the client mutually agree that the individually established goals have been met or when the client wishes to discontinue services for any reason at all. Follow-up contacts are made at 3 days, 3 months, and 6 months post-service, however, it is often difficult to reach victims due to their relative transience as well as safety concerns.

Domestic violence victim service providers in El Paso County frequently partner with the court system to keep victims of domestic violence safe. The goals of T·E·S·S·A and the child welfare agency are not always as harmonious, however. If a T·E·S·S·A staff member suspects imminent danger, or if there has been an alleged physical or sexual assault involving a child, then she or he must report the incident to child welfare. Information sharing is an issue when families are involved with both T·E·S·S·A and DHS. If children are in the house when domestic violence occurs, T·E·S·S·A staff may discuss with the clients the benefits of signing a DHS release so that T·E·S·S·A staff can advocate on the client's behalf. Otherwise, T·E·S·S·A does not typically encourage a client to sign the release, but does let the client know her or his rights. In that case, T·E·S·S·A cannot confirm or deny that they are working with a particular client (due to Colorado revised statutes), but will let the client know about the DHS call and what her/his options are for responding to that call. If the family does not initiate the service on its own, T·E·S·S·A may make contact with child welfare in the cases of child maltreatment, suspicion of child maltreatment, threats to children (imminent danger), and credible threats of fleeing with the children and offender, per the mandatory reporting laws.

The Courts

The court system in Colorado is divided into geographic-based districts. The Fourth Judicial District encompasses all of El Paso and Teller Counties. It handles a large caseload, which is shared by district court judges, county court judges, and magistrates. Sixteen district court judges handle a mixed caseload of domestic relations, felony criminal matters, juvenile matters (including dependency and neglect, delinquency, truancy, paternity, adoption and relinquishment matters), and civil matters that exceed the county court jurisdictional dollar amounts. Eight county court judges are responsible for criminal domestic violence cases, in addition to traffic and misdemeanor matters and civil matters that do not reach the jurisdictional dollar amount of the district court. Nine full-time and two part-time magistrates handle a variety of caseloads, including restraining orders, drug court, temporary domestic relations orders, juvenile, small claims, and probate.

Families with child maltreatment and domestic violence most often enter the court system through the dependency and neglect court or through the protective orders court. El Paso County is one of the busiest judicial districts in Colorado, so dependency judges and magistrates may see 30-45 cases a week. Dependency and neglect cases are part of the juvenile caseload and generally enter the court system through child welfare. If child welfare substantiates maltreatment and requests that the child be removed from the home, the court will grant a verbal order placing the child in foster care or with an appropriate family member. The juvenile court then holds a preliminary hearing within 72 hours to reach an agreement as to whether the child should remain in out-of-home care (where DHS must prove that the child is in imminent danger). Appropriate services for the family are also determined, which may include therapy for the children/parents and other treatment options, such as domestic violence evaluations, drug and alcohol evaluations and parenting classes. Visitation for the parents also may be included in the plan if the child is removed from the home. Alternatives to removing the child from the home include protective supervision, usually with home-based services in place and kinship care.

If a child is removed from the home, the family will have another opportunity to settle the case during a pretrial conference. Once the parents either enter an admission, accept an informal adjustment, or the children are found to be dependent and neglected by either a jury or a court, the matter is set for a dispositional hearing. Before the dispositional hearing, the parties are expected to meet to identify any treatment needs the family has that will promote reunification of the family. At the dispositional hearing, the Court adopts a treatment plan which includes expectations for the parents and the children, sets expectations for the caseworker for appropriate case management, and sets deadlines by which the parties are expected to successfully complete the treatment plan in order to ensure timely resolution of the case for the children. Once the treatment plan is ordered, the court will review it periodically. If the parents do not comply with the treatment plan or if the treatment plan has been complied with and is unsuccessful, a motion

for termination of parental rights can be filed. For all children in families with at least one child under the age of 6 at the time of the filing of the petition, the courts have 1 year from the date of out of home placement to find a permanent placement for the children.

Civil cases involving domestic violence (restraining orders) are most often handled by the magistrates in the protective orders court when children are involved. If not, then the domestic violence victim can request that the temporary restraining order provide for temporary care and control of children, or the victim can file a restraining order on behalf of the minor child. Temporary restraining orders are then valid for 14 days. Plaintiffs must appear at their scheduled permanent restraining order hearing, or the order will automatically expire. If the defendant does not appear at this hearing, or if both parties appear and the defendant does not contest, then the permanent restraining order is issued. If the defendant contests, however, then a full evidentiary hearing before the magistrate for the protective orders court is held. Permanent restraining orders usually include provisions for temporary care and control of the minor children. The provisions regarding the children expire within 120 days, during which time the parents can file for divorce and custody arrangements.

The courts work both together and with DHS to provide the necessary services for children and families dealing with co-occurrence. The protective orders court will address the best interests of the children unless there is already an open dependency and neglect case (as described above). If not, and there is evidence of child maltreatment (generally beyond mere witnessing of the domestic violence act) in the restraining order case, the Court can order DHS to conduct a welfare check/assessment for services. There are more resources and there is more statutory authority to order victims and children to enter therapeutic, drug/alcohol, or dove classes in dependency and neglect (juvenile) court. When the issue of domestic violence is brought to the juvenile court, it typically requires domestic violence assessments for the husband and wife, the perpetrator to leave the home, and classes for everyone in the family as recommended. The juvenile court also can place children in foster care due to parental noncompliance with court orders for protection of children. If domestic violence is found to be present in the home, treatment for the victim (T·E·S·S·A dove classes) may be a required part of the family's treatment plan.

Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team (DVERT)

DVERT is a unit of the Colorado Springs Police Department working in collaboration with 36 community agencies. Created in 1996, DVERT is a multidisciplinary organization that is staffed by employees of several partner agencies, including T·E·S·S·A, DHS, the DA's Office, the El Paso County Sheriff's Office, the Humane Society, and CASA. DVERT takes on the most serious domestic violence cases to ensure the safety of the victims and the accountability of

their perpetrators. DVERT is a nationally recognized program and has been credited for reducing repeat incidents of domestic violence in the community.

DVERT handled approximately 800 cases in both 2000 and 2001. Cases can be referred to DVERT from any community source, but are most often referred from T·E·S·S·A or the CSPD. DVERT attempts to contact all referrals through a home visit by the DVERT team, which consists of a police officer, an advocate, and a caseworker. Initial DVERT contact is also intended to make the victim aware of the community resources and options that are available to the victim. DVERT also uses the information gathered during the home visit with other background information to assess the safety of the victim. Any case that requires additional follow-up at intake, such as those with criminal charges, victim relocation, or child protection issues, is then transferred to the DVERT assessment unit.

The assessment unit provides ongoing investigation and advocacy for victims of family violence. The case will remain with the assessment team for two to eight weeks for follow-up and further assessment. Assessment cases generally include intensive, ongoing investigations (i.e., stalking cases). Advocacy can consist of home visits, court support, phone contact, and safety planning. Safety assessments are conducted with the domestic violence victim and the victim's children, including communication with schools, parenting programs, and other relevant resources. DVERT also provides referrals where appropriate to agencies such as TANF; the CASA Supervised Exchange and Parenting Time Program; T·E·S·S·A's counseling and psycho-educational group classes; culturally specific community programs; and a variety of other community, economic, and faith-based supports.

If the case is judged to be very serious and dangerous for the victim and/or the victim's family, it will be continued with DVERT's ongoing case unit. Here, the case is assigned both an advocate and a law enforcement officer who will remain with the case until the danger of domestic violence has subsided. In addition, a 24-hour response team will be activated if there are any subsequent violations by the perpetrator of these ongoing DVERT cases. Cases that are part of DVERT's ongoing unit receive the same advocacy and support services described above. Meanwhile, DVERT also tracks the domestic violence perpetrator through increased law enforcement contact, coordination with probation, enhanced investigation, and enhanced prosecution. DVERT team members meet monthly to track and support ongoing cases, and will continue to work with each case until the danger of repeat domestic violence has subsided.

DVERT is a collaborative effort between law enforcement, child welfare, domestic violence service providers, and a number of other community agencies. Though the court system is not an official partner of DVERT, many court actors are an integral part of the DVERT process, including CASA, the DA's Office, probation, and law enforcement. In some respects, DVERT bridges the gap between the sometimes competing interests of child welfare, where the

safety of the child is foremost, and domestic violence service providers, whose initial concern is for the safety of the domestic violence victim. DVERT provides a starting point for the Greenbook collaborative through a partnership that works to provide safety for the entire family. The Greenbook Initiative can build on this strength by increasing and formalizing the role of the courts, and ensuring the safety of victims and the accountability of perpetrators who are not continued into DVERT's ongoing caseload.

2.3 Governance Structure

The Greenbook oversight committee functions as the governing body of the El Paso County Greenbook Initiative. The committee ensures that the demonstration project is designed, implemented, and evaluated according to plans. The El Paso County collaborative determined that the oversight committee should include, at a minimum, a single representative from each of the partnering agencies plus at least four family experts. Family experts are members of the community who offer the perspective of individuals who have experienced the domestic violence, child welfare, or court systems either through the eyes of a battered woman or a domestic violence offender. The oversight committee is co-chaired by the executive director of T·E·S·S·A, the primary domestic violence service provider in El Paso County, and a family expert. The oversight committee includes 10 agencies that are considered official partners of the initiative, in addition to the 4 primary partners of the initiative—T·E·S·S·A, the El Paso County Department of Human Services, the Fourth Judicial District Court, and the Colorado Springs Police Department, as represented by DVERT. These other partner agencies include: Asian Pacific Development Center, Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) of Colorado Springs, Children's Advocacy Center, Colorado Legal Services, District Attorney's Office, El Centro de la Familia, El Paso County Department of Health and Environment, Fort Carson Family Advocacy Program, Pikes Peak Mental Health Center, and the Urban League of the Pikes Peak Region. Additional organizations may join the committee by invitation of the oversight committee. All 14 official Greenbook partners have signed a memorandum of understanding regarding the goals, roles, and responsibilities of the Greenbook Initiative. The local research partner (LRP) is also an integral part of the collaborative, and, like the project manager, participates in all oversight committee, subcommittee, and executive committee efforts.

The decision-making and voting process of the oversight committee has evolved over the course of the initiative. Originally, only one member from each agency had voting power. An additional delegate could be sent in the absence of the primary agency delegate, but would not have voting privilege if the primary partner was not able to attend the oversight committee meeting. This policy was intended to encourage regular monthly attendance by the leaders of the agencies represented on the committee. However, in August 2001 the oversight committee decided that each agency could have, in addition to one voting member, one designated delegate with voting privilege. If a family expert could not be present at a meeting, he/she could vote by

proxy via another family expert. That decision, like all committee decisions, was determined by a vote. The oversight committee uses the current edition of *Robert's Rules of Order* to govern the meetings.

The oversight committee initially tackled the Greenbook Initiative by discussing expected outcomes, defining system gaps, and assessing their needs. To focus and prioritize the collaborative's activities, the Local Research Partner facilitated the creation of a logic model, and through this process, subcommittees were created around specific topic areas. Four subcommittees were tasked with developing work plans that addressed the specific outcomes outlined in the logic model: the service access and resource development (SARD) subcommittee; the judicial subcommittee, which later split into the judicial integration subcommittee and judicial education subcommittee; the cultural competency subcommittee; and the family expert subcommittee.

The SARD subcommittee focuses on how to better identify the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment so services and supports can be better tailored to meet the needs of families and improve safety, while also minimizing or eliminating any revictimization of the nonoffending adult and children. The judicial integration subcommittee is focused on ways to decrease the number of victims being inadvertently revictimized by the judicial systems and helping the courts to make the best decisions possible on holistic issues facing the family by investigating new ways for the exchange of information to take place. The judicial education subcommittee identifies areas where the bench and other judicial actors could benefit from education related to co-occurrence in the families they serve. The cultural competency subcommittee began a national search for best practices, defined cultural competency on a system and individual level, and has adapted and created tools for Greenbook partner agencies to use in assessing their levels of cultural competence. Throughout the planning phase of the El Paso County Greenbook Initiative, the family experts have continually met as a subcommittee. This group also works on project planning and implementation, especially in areas where the collaborative would benefit from the client perspective of the system. Further discussion of specific subcommittee work and how it has evolved over the course of the project will be discussed in more detail in the planning section.

A smaller group, the executive committee, serves to focus the work of the oversight committee. It plans the agenda for oversight committee meetings, provides high-level oversight of the planning and implementation of the project, and makes recommendations to the oversight committee on key issues. The co-chairs of the oversight committee also co-chair the monthly executive committee meetings. Originally, the executive committee was made up of an equal balance between family experts and agency personnel: the four family experts and one representative from each of the four primary partner agencies. As subcommittees were defined

and became an integral part of the project however, the group decided in May 2001 to ask all subcommittee chairs and co-chairs to join the executive committee.

2.4 Staffing

The El Paso County Greenbook Initiative is staffed by a full-time project manager and an administrative assistant. The project manager was formerly employed by the El Paso County Department of Health and Environment, and joined the Greenbook Initiative in March 2001. All Greenbook staff are housed at T·E·S·S·A, the fiscal agent for the Greenbook grant. The project manager and the executive director of T·E·S·S·A work closely together and head the oversight and executive committee meetings. They also provide monthly updates and ongoing communication with the Federal partners, the technical assistance team, and the national evaluation team. The local research partner also joined the El Paso County initiative early in the planning process (March 2001). Her experience includes evaluations of human service organizations, interagency collaborations, a teen abstinence program, and an early childhood intervention program; and multiple projects involving focus group, interview, and/or survey research. The local research partner spends half her time on the Greenbook initiative and is supported by a research associate. Both the local research partner and the project manager also attend all subcommittee meetings in addition to their other responsibilities.

3. AGENCY MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION

3.1 Getting People to the Table (Mobilization)

The groundwork for the El Paso County Greenbook collaborative was laid through many of the existing partnerships described earlier. The key Greenbook systems, including the courts, child welfare, domestic violence service providers, and law enforcement, were already working together through initiatives such as DVERT, the High-Risk Child Abuse/Neglect Case Management Team, and the Committee for Children Witnessing Domestic Violence. Yet, participants in these initiatives recognized that there were still gaps in the systems where families could be better served. For example, victims of domestic violence may be revictimized by the court system if they choose to drop a restraining order, and subsequently have their children removed because of dangerous situation in the home. Both child welfare and DVERT also have identified the need for a stronger partnership with the court system. Under the initial leadership and coordination of Joint Initiatives for Youth & Families, a local collaboration dedicated to helping children and families, many key organizations joined together to apply for the Greenbook grant. Fourteen agencies signed a memorandum of understanding to address domestic violence and child maltreatment. Each of the agencies that were onboard at the grant writing stage of the initiative is still an official partner in the collaborative process. Therefore, a

solid and formalized partnership at the beginning of the initiative has facilitated mobilization and collaboration at the agency level throughout the project.

Actively engaging key representatives *from* these agencies turned out to require some effort and organization, however. Getting the courts on board was listed as a concern at one of the first oversight committee meetings, especially since the major proponent of Greenbook in the court system was planning on retiring. The project leaders, including the executive director of T·E·S·S·A, the family experts, and the project manager began meeting with other judicial leaders to outline the project's goals and how it could impact the courts. Similar presentations also were made to the broader bench, the board of county commissioners, and the city council.

3.2 Collaboration and Sustaining Involvement

Once the initiative formed subcommittees and began to tackle specific tasks, keeping members actively engaged continued to be a challenge. The service access and resource development subcommittee was formed from a pre-existing committee that had specifically focused on the issue of child witnessing. The shift in the focus to mapping all three Greenbook systems caused some members of the original group to lose interest. The shift in focus also created a slowdown in the work progress as the committee identified new goals and new tasks to achieve those goals. Similarly, the other subcommittees spent some time and effort defining their goals and the means of achieving them. In each case, however, the work progress of the subcommittees and the overall initiative was re-energized by key leadership. After the retirement of an important judicial proponent of Greenbook was announced, the new presiding juvenile court judge came on board in fall 2001, which helped refocus the entire group, especially the judicial subcommittees. About this time, the overall collaborative leadership decided to take a more active role in each of the subcommittees. Either the project manager or the local evaluation partner began to attend each subcommittee meeting and facilitated communication between the subcommittees and the larger oversight committee. Despite these changes, the progress of the cultural competency subcommittee continued to stall. The collaborative therefore brought in an outside facilitator in early 2002 to lead the group and to keep its work focused and on track.

Early in the initiative, the local research partner (LRP) measured the collaboration between the members of the oversight committee and the community by administering a collaborative process interview tool. The results of that process were presented to the oversight committee, and included several successes: inclusion of the family experts, strong leadership, commitment, progress made so far, and the court's participation. Several challenges also were indicated: meeting times, lack of a formal decision-making process and agreed upon norms, lack of full judicial system support, undefined roles of the executive committee, too many members, and irregular attendance. The qualitative evaluation led to several actions by the oversight

committee to define partner roles and decision-making processes in the collaborative. To educate each partner about other partner agencies (identified as a barrier to collaboration in the network analysis), the collaborative decided to include a cross-training piece at the beginning of each monthly oversight committee meeting. Beginning in September 2001, time was set aside for one partner agency each month to give a presentation to the group that focused on the unique roles, mandates, and obstacles within the agency. Through these presentations, collaborative members began to get a better sense of the justification behind other agencies' practices, guiding principles, and expectations. This greater understanding between collaborative members has facilitated compromise and collaboration both within and without the Greenbook process.

Oversight committee work was also energized by hypothetical case studies, which were again presented by individual Greenbook partners. DVERT initiated the process by presenting a case study, which in turn highlighted issues that needed to be discussed by the collaborative, such as confidentiality between the disciplines, the role of substance abuse in family violence, organization/agency roles and mandates, and many others. The other primary partners followed DVERT's lead in the next few oversight committee meetings.

Although the collaborative has taken several steps to engage and energize key participants, it has noted that it could still benefit from more input from the DA's Office, the Public Defender's Office, the Sheriff's Department, and the Colorado Springs Police Department. The collaborative hopes that the visible progress it has made throughout the planning stage will demonstrate the initiative's worth and potential impact to these agencies. The collaborative's strong leadership also continues to reach out to partner agencies on a regular basis to invite representatives to attend subcommittee meetings and to keep them apprised of the group's progress.

3.3 Network Analysis

Network analysis provides a baseline measure of collaborative networks between organizations involved in the El Paso County Greenbook Initiative. It examines both the type and amount of interaction among Greenbook-involved agencies as well as the importance of these interactions and any barriers to these relationships. The national evaluation team (NET) will use this information to assess changes in collaborative networks relevant to the El Paso County Greenbook Initiative over the course of the project.

The NET worked with the collaborative's project manager to identify 17 key individuals from 13 agencies that were heavily involved and/or affected by the Greenbook Initiative. Interviews were completed with 16 of these 17 individuals, who represented the primary agencies from each of the four primary systems: T·E·S·S·A , El Paso County DHS, the Fourth Judicial District Courts, and DVERT. Other representatives of the court system included the

DA's Office, Colorado Legal Services, and Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA). Additional domestic violence service providers were represented by El Centro de la Familia and the Asian Pacific Family Center. Children and family interests were represented by the Children's Advocacy Center, Pikes Peak Mental Health Center, the El Paso County Department of Health and Environment, and the Urban League of Pikes Peak Region.

The network analysis found that key organizations working in the areas of domestic violence and child maltreatment interacted with each other on a fairly regular basis, and recognized (to some extent) the importance of their collaboration. Close to 90 percent of the interactions between organizations (of the total possible interactions) were present during the baseline planning stages. The collaboration also was decentralized with multiple organizations playing key roles in the collaborative process, implying a balanced distribution of power among stakeholders. In addition, many organizations interacted with each other outside of the areas of domestic violence and child maltreatment. The analysis also identified several barriers to collaboration that were common to many of the Greenbook sites, such as communication and staff turnover. El Paso County also identified the need for more interaction and linkages between agencies, and a desire for greater education of the services provided by the organizations. The bureaucratic red tape inherent in many government agencies was also a barrier to collaboration, as well as fundamental philosophical differences between organizations.

4. PLANNING AND GOAL SETTING

4.1 Resource and Needs Assessment

El Paso County began its needs assessment process during the grant writing stage of the initiative. As discussed above, the history of collaboration in the community brought many strengths to the initiative, but also identified areas for improvement in the Greenbook-involved systems. Based on these areas for improvement, the grant proposal defined five components of the initiative's vision:

- Domestic violence/child maltreatment survivor needs are met without unnecessarily involving the juvenile courts
- A holistic approach to domestic violence/child maltreatment is part of the community and organizational culture
- Domestic violence/child maltreatment rates have fallen precipitously
- El Paso County is recognized as having a national "best practice" model for handling domestic violence/child maltreatment

- El Paso County is showing other communities how to address domestic violence/child maltreatment.

With this vision as a starting point, and with many already identified challenges in mind (e.g., defining a balance between risk and safety issues and establishing a consumer orientation), the oversight committee continued the needs assessment process. It began by posing several questions about which outcomes the initiative hoped to see in 5 years. These outcomes related to changes in the community, the three key systems, and how families experience the systems and other organizations in the partnership. The needs assessment process led to several outcomes that have been revised and refined throughout the course of the initiative and have formed the basis for the planning and implementation phases of the project. At the end of the Greenbook Initiative, the collaborative expects:

- Systems to be philosophically aligned in how to respond to the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment
- Decreases in revictimization rates of individuals by any system
- Increased safety of abused adults and children
- Increased trust in the system on the part of consumers.

4.2 Concept Mapping

The concept mapping exercise generated information to help each of the communities to plan and evaluate their initiative. The concept map was developed through a four-step process that started with each site examining the original Greenbook report and logic model and brainstorming to come up with 102 Greenbook outcomes. Local collaborative members were then asked to sort those outcomes into groups based on their perceived similarity. The respondents also rated each of the outcomes on their relevance and earliest impact. The sorting and rating processes at each site were then analyzed at the national level.

Analysis at the national level revealed seven clusters: batterer accountability, service system enhancements, improved practice in the courts/broader community changes, cross-system outcomes, decrease the harmful effects of children's exposure to violence, decreased incidence of domestic violence/child maltreatment, and decrease in recidivism/repeat offenses. There was less agreement among respondents on the relevance of individual-level items, and greater agreement on the cross-system outcomes. Respondents expected most of the anticipated changes to occur between Years 3 and 4 of the initiative. El Paso County respondents rated the relevance of several outcomes higher than any of the other six demonstration sites. These outcomes included: clients following through on their service plans; courts communicating with each other

on domestic violence and child maltreatment cases; and making Greenbook members aware of informational gaps, the needs of the bench and the bar, and alternatives for creating more integrated courts. El Paso County rated better access to legal services lower in terms of relevance than any other Greenbook site.

The concepts that rated highest in terms of relevance in El Paso County were cross-systems outcomes, improved practice in the courts/broader community changes, and service system enhancements. These three concepts are also those that the site expects to achieve earliest in their initiative. Cross-systems outcomes are expected to be realized 3 years into the grant period, with service systems enhancements and improved practice in the courts/broader community changes to follow a few months later. Changes related to all seven of the concepts are expected to be realized in El Paso County by end of the fourth year of the grant period.

Exhibit 1 is a comparison between the El Paso County concept mapping results and the national results. The majority of the top 20 El Paso County concepts matched the national list (17 out of 20). This may be in part due to the high response rate of El Paso County compared to some of the other sites (El Paso County had 22 surveys returned, while some sites had 5). Most of those outcomes that are not found in both the national and El Paso County rankings are individual-level outcomes. Individual-level outcomes are expected to occur later in the Greenbook Initiative or even after the initiative has officially ended, often as a result of system-level changes. The outcomes that are expected earlier in the process and the immediate focus of the initiative, therefore, are priorities in both the El Paso County Greenbook and the wider national initiatives.

EXHIBIT 1	
Outcomes in El Paso County’s Top 20 that were not listed in the national ranking	Outcomes in the national ranking of Top 20 indicators that were not listed by El Paso County
Increased number of families receiving prevention/early intervention services.	Decreased incidence of repeated domestic abuse.
Lower incidence of child abuse	More kids and survivors say they are safe.
Providing more effective and culturally appropriate services to special populations (e.g., racial/ethnic groups, gay and lesbian community, deaf community).	Women and children are protected by the legal restraints that are requested and delivered.

4.3 Logic Model and Its Development Process

The logic model was developed and refined under the leadership of the local evaluation partner. The goal of the model was to force the group to think about what they would like to change by the end of the project, thereby becoming an integral and interdependent part of the needs assessment described above. Furthermore, the logic model was intended to outline how those outcomes would be measured, to identify a conceptual map to perform various activities, and to link where the project is currently and where it should be in 3-5 years. To create the logic model, the local research partner facilitated a meeting of the oversight committee in which the Greenbook recommendations and vision for El Paso County were discussed to determine which outcomes were a priority in El Paso County, and which could be realistically accomplished within the grant period. This subset of Greenbook recommendations became the focus in El Paso County and was linked to specific gaps identified by the collaborative.

Once each of these identified needs in the system was defined, the logic model linked the needs to periodic implementation milestones, subcommittee outcomes, and overall Greenbook outcomes. (See Exhibits 2A and 2B.) In general, the Greenbook outcomes include a system that is philosophically aligned with respect to its response to co-occurrence. The El Paso County project also seeks to decrease revictimization of individuals by the system, and to provide increased safety for abused adults and children. Finally, these changes should result in an increased trust of the system on the part of the consumers. The collaborative intends for these project outcomes to then translate into several long-term outcomes to occur after the grant period had ended, such as a decrease in the incidence of child maltreatment and domestic violence. In January and February of 2002, each subcommittee revisited its respective outcomes to identify progress made and any needed revisions based upon what had been learned/accomplished to date. The overall logic model was revised at this time to accommodate the recommended changes.

4.4 Planning Activities

The planning process in El Paso County took shape around the outcomes identified through the needs assessment and logic model processes. The planning process itself can best be described through the evolution and activities of the subcommittees. The subcommittees were created during the initial stages of the needs assessment process in May 2001.

The oversight committee, initiated and focused the needs assessment process by discussing the project's common vision and potential outcomes of the Greenbook Initiative. The work of the oversight committee resulted in three areas of focus for the collaborative: (1) service access and resource development, (2) the judicial system, and (3) cultural competency. The service access and resource development (SARD) subcommittee began by examining the safety

**EXHIBIT 2A
EL PASO COUNTY LOGIC MODEL**

SITUATION	INITIAL PLANNING PERIOD JANUARY – JUNE, 2001	IMPLEMENTATION – MILESTONES	OVERALL GREENBOOK OUTCOMES*	LONG-TERM (BEYOND GRANT PERIOD) IMPACTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems strength = strong history of collaboration • No methodical way to measure co-occurrence • Developing systems for adult domestic violence survivors, but inadequate in addressing needs of her children • Law enforcement not using full complement of tools to hold offenders accountable • Systems judgmental of women returning to batterer • Victims often placed under juvenile court supervision without assessing if other resources would address safety and other needs • Need for finding an appropriate means of generating more involvement from the bench in domestic violence/child maltreatment community planning • Overall lack of integrated and comprehensive response to domestic violence/child maltreatment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding oversight committee membership • Hiring staff and contractors • Greenbook orientations for partners and community • Identification of issues • Identification of philosophical commonalities and differences • Visioning – how will the community be different at the end of this grant? • Bringing the vision to an actionable level • Establishing focus of work efforts and committees to accomplish these • Development of preliminary outcomes and logic model • Development of Year One milestones. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practice models researched and discussed: 7/01 – 9/01 • 1st draft designs developed and completed: 9/01 – 2/02 • Draft designs tested with key users and stakeholders: 2/02 – 3/02 • Draft designs redesigned based upon feedback: 3/02 – 4/02 • New design piloted: 5/02 – 12/03 • Evaluation/Analysis: 5/02 – 12/03 • Final analysis and report: 12/03. <p>(These milestones are subject to revision based upon potential extended grant timelines.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems are philosophically aligned with regard to response to co-occurrence of domestic violence/child maltreatment • Decrease in revictimization of individuals by any system • Systems can provide increased safety for abused adults and children • Increased trust of the system on the part of consumers. <p>*Subcommittee outcomes are described in Exhibit 2B.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community is aware of domestic violence/child maltreatment as a co-occurring issue, is knowledgeable about solutions, and is empowered to act • Victims can achieve self-sufficiency and empowerment • Decreased incidence of domestic violence/child maltreatment • Decrease in over-representation of people of color in involuntary systems • Decrease in under-representation of people of color in voluntary systems • Decrease in offender recidivism • Availability of increased cultural competency resources.

EXHIBIT 2B
EL PASO COUNTY LOGIC MODEL, SUBCOMMITTEE OUTCOMES

SERVICE ACCESS/RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT	JUDICIAL	CULTURAL COMPETENCE	FAMILY EXPERTS*
<p><i>Long Term:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Families will have enhanced ability to determine, access, and receive services and supports appropriate to their needs • Safe and supportive resources (both voluntary and involuntary) are available for adults (both victims and offenders) and children. <p><i>Intermediate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems can identify co-occurrence of domestic violence/child maltreatment efficiently and effectively • A collaboratively defined, multidisciplinary, and culturally sensitive differential response to co-occurrence is in place • There is increased education among Greenbook partners regarding best practice services for families impacted by domestic violence/child maltreatment. <p><i>Initial:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary systems have intake and risk assessment tools in place that are effective determinants of co-occurrence and provide needed information for safe decision-making. 	<p><i>Long Term:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Fourth Judicial District has completed the necessary groundwork and is prepared – practically and philosophically – to design and implement a one family/one judge pilot project • The judicial system accounts for domestic violence/child maltreatment issues when making decisions • There are increased perceptions by all parties in a case in which their court experiences have been fair and respectful • Courts communicate to enhance appropriate, consistent, and safe decision-making. <p><i>Intermediate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased awareness about domestic violence/child maltreatment and the dynamics of their interaction by judicial system members • Increased court integration • Increased awareness of and access to community resources among parties to domestic violence/child maltreatment cases • Increased levels of accountability for domestic violence offenders. <p><i>Initial:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased awareness of the informational needs of the bench and bar with regard to co-occurrence • Increased awareness of alternatives for creating more integrated courts. 	<p><i>Long Term:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased opportunities for diverse populations to access and use voluntary services and supports that meet their needs • Increased collaborative relationships among Greenbook agencies and agencies serving specific populations • Increased cultural competency among Greenbook agencies. <p><i>Intermediate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased understanding among systems about how culture impacts client experiences • Increased knowledge, skills, and abilities among Greenbook partner staff in the area of cultural competence. <p><i>Initial:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenbook partners have a collaboratively determined, shared definition of cultural competence. 	<p><i>Long Term:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased awareness of the importance of comprehensive family expert partnerships in systems change efforts.** <p><i>Intermediate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A fully representative family expert subcommittee is in place and working as a partner in the Greenbook Initiative. <p><i>Initial:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An initial family expert subcommittee has been established and has initiated work.** <p>**Family experts are part of every Greenbook subcommittee and are integral to achievement of all outcomes.</p> <p>**Comprehensive = representative of all pertinent constituencies</p>

and risk continua for adults and children and the adult victim/perpetrator continuum. Through the identification of this sophisticated continuum tree, families would then be referred to the appropriate and tailored service and support options. SARD subcommittee members researched best practices and resources both nationally and locally. Its basic premise was that if a better job could be done in understanding the nature of the risk and the dynamic among adults and children affected by domestic violence and child maltreatment, then families could be helped in accessing appropriate services and supports. The subcommittee's focus shifted in late 2001 to screening and intake tools, and differential response for families.

The judicial system subcommittee was charged with integration, education, and capacity building within the court system. It sought to accomplish this through several methods, including the development of an integrated approach to the court system, and defining and communicating the “myths and truths” of domestic violence and child maltreatment to enable the courts to make better decisions. Early on, the subcommittee decided that the focus of its work would not be on the integration of the courts, but on the integration of *information* from key court actors in addition to the bench, including probation, the Guardian ad Litem's Office, the District Attorney's Office, the Public Defender's Office, Court Appointed Special Advocates, and others.

The judicial system subcommittee was later separated into two separate subcommittees—judicial integration and judicial education. The judicial integration subcommittee seeks to decrease the number of victims being inadvertently revictimized by the judicial systems and to help the courts make the best decisions possible on holistic issues facing the family. As a result, the courts can better hold the offender accountable and refrain from punishing the adult victim for her/his inability to protect the children, where appropriate. The judicial integration subcommittee work plan includes a cross-court integration strategy and ways to better provide information about domestic violence and child maltreatment cases across courts. The judicial education subcommittee acknowledges that all aspects of the judicial system will benefit from increased knowledge of domestic violence and child maltreatment. This knowledge will help support good decision-making throughout the judicial system. The subcommittee's work plan includes identifying training needs in order of priority by audience (e.g., probation, bench, bar, etc.) and determining logistics associated with training.

A fourth subcommittee was formed to address cultural competency at both the system and individual level. Specifically, in order for Greenbook-involved systems to better reach families struggling with domestic violence and child maltreatment, their services and supports (individual and system) must be culturally competent. The subcommittee began its work by first defining cultural competency. The subcommittee then set several goals for the remainder of the Greenbook initiative – conduct organizational self-assessments, provide training to Greenbook systems and agencies, integrate strategies among the other subcommittees, and provide guidance

for other community groups and agencies. The committee then began work on an assessment instrument for cultural competence, and a plan for addressing and increasing cultural competence within Greenbook agencies.

The family expert subcommittee was created at the outset of the El Paso County Greenbook Initiative in April 2001. The four family experts are also part of the executive committee, the oversight committee, and co-chair one of the other four subcommittees described above. They also attend other ad hoc committees as necessary. Initially, the family experts subcommittee focused on writing a synopsis of their involvement within the systems. Through that process, the group realized that the collaborative would benefit from consumers who had experienced *all* aspects of the system. The subcommittee therefore began to look for a “reformed offender” to include in the family experts subcommittee. It also began to draft a common vision and mission of the roles of the family experts subcommittee and the criteria for the offender who will join the subcommittee. The former offender joined the family experts subcommittee and the oversight committee at the start of 2002.

5. CAPACITY BUILDING

The El Paso County Greenbook Initiative has been supported by technical assistance (TA) providers throughout the initiative. The impact of the TA can be seen in the planning and execution of various Greenbook activities in El Paso County throughout the planning phase. In May 2001 the TA team conducted a site visit where it met with Greenbook staff and key members of the community to gain a basic knowledge and understanding of the community in the context of how it addresses the overlap of domestic violence and child maltreatment. As a result of the site visit, the TA team made several recommendations to provide model policies, protocols, articles, training curriculum, and experts to assist in several areas. The TA team would provide assistance in conducting trainings such as cross-training among disciplines; intervention techniques for direct service providers; creating and sustaining inter- and intra-agency collaborations; cultural competency planning; assessment; and implementation. TA activities also addressed areas such as defining key terms; identifying model protocols; screening, assessment, and safety planning; and conducting needs assessments of resources available. The initial TA site visit also identified the need to develop a continuum of services for children in families dealing with co-occurrence and to develop policies and protocols for information sharing.

The El Paso County collaborative proactively utilized technical assistance on a monthly basis at the beginning of the initiative, but has tended to rely less on this outside help towards the end of the planning period. Specific technical assistance provided during the planning period included assessing cultural competency, judicial training on co-occurrence, and the development of a court case coordinator position. The TA team also was able to provide sample intake forms,

literature, and other resources that focused on how other communities were addressing co-occurrence. Much of the TA provided had a direct impact on the site's planning activities. For example, the sample risk and safety assessments were an integral part of a SARD retreat in late 2001, and the statistics related to domestic violence and child maltreatment were incorporated into a community mobilizing presentation. The site visit in February 2002 to assess the needs of the bench formed the basis for a judicial training that is to occur in fall 2002.

The TA team was restructured in the middle of the planning process, and as a result, El Paso County no longer had the benefit of a site-specific TA liaison. The El Paso County initiative felt that this restructuring interrupted the relationship building and resulted in the TA people being unfamiliar with the site and its priorities. Furthermore, El Paso County found the safety audit training very informative, but felt that it occurred too late in the planning process to conduct a safety audit within one of the primary systems. The information contained in the two-day meeting would have been very helpful in shaping the local initiative if it had occurred when the site was conducting its needs assessment – nearly a year prior. The site's capacity to move forward with its initiative could have also been improved through greater coordination with the national evaluation. The national evaluation design was not finalized until a year into the planning process, a point at which El Paso County had already mapped out many of its planning and implementation activities.

6. LOCAL EVALUATION

As described above, the role of El Paso County's local research partner (LRP) has evolved considerably throughout the planning process. She was hired to work on evaluation activities, such as collecting baseline data and developing the logic model, but has since become an integral part of the project's planning and implementation process. Her involvement in the subcommittee work began in fall 2001 as it became clear that many local evaluation activities should be put on hold while the national evaluation design was finalized. At that time, the LRP then began work with the service access and resource development (SARD) subcommittee to assist in the development of its work plan and to help the committee develop an effective and measurable standardized assessment. Her involvement greatly facilitated the progress of the subcommittee, and so both she and the project manager began attending all subcommittee meetings to form a link between all the collaborative activities. The LRP's role has therefore expanded to include process and planning support to the Greenbook executive committee, the oversight committee, the four topic-specific subcommittees, and the family expert subcommittee.

In the initial stages of the grant period, the LRP worked with the oversight committee to develop the project logic model, including overall outcomes and outcomes per subcommittee. Her work throughout Year 1 then turned to helping each subcommittee realize specific project goals. The LRP has played an integral role on the SARD subcommittee, especially aiding in its

systems and resource mapping activities. She also works closely with the family experts subcommittee as they work on methodological and logistic issues related to focus groups that will measure the client experience of Greenbook agencies. She has worked closely with the cultural competency subcommittee and conducted an assessment of current cultural competence/diversity training practices among Greenbook agencies. Once the subcommittee decided to implement a cultural competency self-assessment in all Greenbook partner agencies, it turned to the local researcher for help in selecting the self-assessment instrument. The organizations will use the instrument to assess their overall cultural competence on a variety of dimensions, such as current strengths, training needs, and awareness of training already in place. The LRP also will provide evaluation technical assistance to each of the agencies as they implement the self-assessment tool. Other background research conducted for the committees has included interviews of current intake/assessment workers in the various assessments regarding their perceptions of current tools and a professional development interest survey with judges and magistrates.

In Year 2, the LRP will continue to work closely with the subcommittees, but will also return to more evaluation-focused activities. She plans to conduct a process evaluation that will assess the new positions and the expanded programs created as part of the Greenbook Initiative (e.g., legal services attorney, TANF worker at T·E·S·S·A, court case coordinator, T·E·S·S·A advocate at child welfare office, and expansion of CASA's supervised visitation and exchange program). She also will continue to support the NET with case abstraction, survey implementation, client interviews and focus groups, and other local data collection.

7. WHERE ARE THEY NOW?

El Paso County is steadily progressing from planning to implementation as it continues into Year 2 of the grant period. None of the key partners interviewed at the close of the planning phase identified any specific obstacles to negotiate as the site moved from the planning phase into implementation. Instead, many collaborative members expressed enthusiasm to finally be seeing the results of their efforts. In addition, the initiative will continue its planning activities throughout implementation to constantly reassess its activities as they relate to the site's overall goals. Several specific implementation activities are described below.

One of the first goals identified through the needs assessment process was the need for standardized assessment tools and practices for key Greenbook agencies. In February 2002 the service access and resource development (SARD) subcommittee finished its work on revising intake tools, as new intake instruments were implemented at T·E·S·S·A, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and child welfare offices. A block of questions related to domestic violence were added in February 2002 to the child protective services (CPS) intake form. Whenever domestic violence is identified, the case is assigned to specialized caseworkers who

have received domestic violence training. TANF also has added more questions about children to their intake in an effort to move away from labels and towards identifying behaviors. The T·E·S·S·A intake form was implemented in May 2002 and includes additional questions about the nature and frequency of child maltreatment as well as many other changes directed at improving cultural sensitivity. Changes also have been recommended for law enforcement reporting forms, although implementation may take as long as a year. The SARD subcommittee is now conducting a caseflow analysis to identify gaps in the process by focusing on each of the three main Greenbook agencies as well as law enforcement. One goal of this exercise is to identify potential gaps in the system and to plan more implementation activities to address those gaps.

The judicial education subcommittee implemented a professional interest survey with the bench in late 2001. The survey identified several training topics, including children who witness domestic violence (the most important identified training need for judges), understanding victim/perpetrator behavior, batterer accountability, and judges as decision-makers. Eight training sessions are now planned throughout the coming year in order to train the judiciary on these topics. The first of these is a half-day training for judges in September 2002 and will focus on understanding victim/perpetrator behavior. Additional judicial training sessions will occur locally and engage a wider variety of court actors (e.g., Guardian ad Litem's Office, the DA's Office, county attorneys, public defenders, other court personnel, and local service providers).

A court case coordinator position has recently been filled and is expected to play a crucial role in the judicial integration piece of the project. One of the key problems identified in the courts is that the bench does not have information regarding other cases involving the families that come before them. This communication gap can sometimes lead to conflicting orders, and reduces family accountability. The new position will be based on the existing practice in the juvenile court of doing research on other cases involving the juvenile's family. Initially, restraining order court and dependency and neglect cases will be the trigger point for the court case coordinator to research relevant cases, determine what orders are already in effect, and communicate that information to relevant members of the bench. The court case coordinator also may monitor family compliance with court orders, so that noncompliance can be identified and addressed immediately. The coordinator also will be a resource and referral for families needing to access community services.

As El Paso County moves through Year 2, it will continue to implement activities aimed at changing the way key Greenbook agencies identify and serve families struggling with co-occurrence. For example, the collaborative created a new TANF position to further enhance communication within and among Greenbook-involved systems. The new position will be co-located at T·E·S·S·A's main office to provide a seamless system of support for victims of domestic violence and their children. Greenbook partners also hope to improve the services they

provide to families in need by examining their cultural competence. The local researcher and the cultural competency subcommittee have worked closely to create an organizational self-assessment that will be conducted by the primary Greenbook systems in fall 2002. The oversight committee also has funded the hiring of a Colorado Legal Services attorney to assist with domestic violence/child maltreatment-related issues as well as other civil legal family safety and stability issues. Domestic violence survivors will be better able to obtain timely court orders and protections without inadvertently putting themselves or their children in juvenile court custody. The funding of this attorney will assist our community in developing a program to address the legal demands of these victims and children. These Year 2 activities will pave the way for longer-term outcomes that are hoped to occur after the grant period has ended, such as a decreased incidence of co-occurrence, improved access to and trust of the domestic violence and child welfare systems, and a reduction in reoffenses.

APPENDIX B:
Grafton County, New Hampshire

APPENDIX B: GRAFTON COUNTY, NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. COMMUNITY CONTEXT

1.1 Demographics

Grafton County is a rural county made up of 38 towns and 1 city. It occupies 20 percent of the land of New Hampshire, and over one-half of the county's area is part of the White Mountain National Forest. The county's total population is 82,000, which is 6.6 percent of the population of the State. According to the 2000 Census, 97 percent of county residents are white and 3 percent are persons of color. Seventy-eight percent of the county's population is over the age of 18, while about 5 percent is under the age of 5. A majority of the county's population (57%) has at least a two-year college degree. According to the 2000 Census, the largest sector of employment in Grafton County is classified as educational services. As of 1998, the average annual wage for Grafton County was \$27,461. Approximately 9 percent of the county's population live below the Federal guidelines for poverty.

In 1998, Grafton County accounted for 6 percent of its child abuse referrals, 7 percent of its child protection caseload, and 8 percent of crisis center clients. Between 1997 and 2000, 20 percent of the State's domestic violence fatalities occurred in Grafton County.

1.2. Unique Site Characteristics

Several phenomena should be examined to better understand New Hampshire. The State is one of only of a few States in the Nation without a State income or sales tax. This is a source of great pride and division within New Hampshire. With significant positive and negative impacts, this political and economic choice shapes how human services, including Greenbook agencies, utilize local resources.

Secondly, a landmark court case has influenced State funding for a range of services. Without a State income or sales tax, revenue for school and town services has traditionally been raised primarily through local property taxes. In 1993, the New Hampshire Supreme Court ruled in *Claremont School District vs. Governor* that the State's reliance on local property taxes to fund public education was unconstitutional. This and subsequent *Claremont* decisions have forced the legislature to re-examine its funding structure and priorities. After many proposals and debates, the legislature enacted a statewide property tax.

The *Claremont* case has caused public and legislative concern over the role of the judiciary in public policy-making, with many claiming that the court had overstepped its authority. Since the decision, legislators have introduced numerous bills in an attempt to limit the court's power. The legislature's attention on education funding, legislative cuts of the

judiciary's budget, and the balance of power between the legislative and judicial branches of government have strained the court's working relationship with the legislature.

As previously described, Grafton County is one-fifth of the land mass of New Hampshire. A local public transportation system does not exist within the county. In most of New Hampshire, a working car is a necessity for survival. Many of the State's residents must drive to their destinations, whether to work, medical appointments, childcare, shopping, or meeting a friend. Weather also can be a significant factor in accessing services. New England winters, particularly in mountainous areas like Grafton County, can be quite challenging.

The rural nature of the county presents a challenge for Greenbook partners to fully participate in the project, but also draws upon their strengths. Given the time demands on the key stakeholders, specifically the 1-3 hours it can take to travel to meetings and events, the Greenbook Initiative must maintain a high level of support and enthusiasm. The players must embrace the project and must do so from various geographic parts of the county and State. While there are geographic barriers, the small population of the State allows for familiarity among the stakeholders.

These factors reveal the framework under which the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative operates. As many advocates, professionals, researchers, and survivors have noted, domestic violence and child maltreatment thrive in an atmosphere of secrecy and denial. The "Yankee mentality" with its emphasis on hard work and self-reliance creates a challenge for a project that is focused on collaboration, communication, and structural changes in and outside of government. The physical and social isolation of Grafton County residents also requires a high level of personal commitment and professional productivity.

1.3 History of Collaboration

There is a strong history of collaboration in Grafton County, particularly among current members of the executive committee. These individuals, along with their agencies, have worked on a number of projects together, several of which have involved domestic violence or child maltreatment. The Greenbook Initiative represents an opportunity for these players to work together again with a specific focus on the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence.

In 1998, a Federal Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) grant became available for rural areas of the State. Through the Domestic Violence Rural Enhancement Project (DVREP) the first Domestic Violence Program Specialist (DVPS) positions were created. DVPSs are placed in local child protection offices to provide training and consultation to child welfare workers in the screening, planning, and management of cases involving domestic violence. The DVPSs provide direct services to battered women involved with the Division for Children,

Youth and Families (DCYF) as well as links to local crisis centers. These specialists also have a set of responsibilities at their local crisis centers. Recognizing that other community systems also were working with these families, DVREP implemented outreach programs for education, training, and public awareness campaigns.

Child protection offices serving Grafton County were among the first offices in the State to implement the DVPS position. As illustrated in the following table, baseline statistics from the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence for the year 2001 indicate there is strong collaboration between DCYF and local crisis centers via the DVPS in Grafton County. In 2002, Grafton County had 3 DVPSs out of the 10 in the State (30%) and they reported providing 72 percent of the statewide total number of consultations to DCYF. In addition, 4 percent of new domestic and sexual violence crisis center clients statewide were reportedly referred by DCYF, whereas in Grafton County 13 percent of new crisis center clients were referred by DCYF in 2001. (See Exhibit 1)

EXHIBIT 1			
NEW HAMPSHIRE DVPS BASELINE DATA			
	State of New Hampshire (10 Crisis Centers)	Grafton County (3 Crisis Centers)	Grafton County's Percentage of State Total
Referrals by DCYF Staff to DVPS	413	136	33%
DCYF Consultation Provided by DVPS	1,115	802	72%
Number of Individuals Referred From DCYF that Contact Domestic and Sexual Violence Crisis Center	204	79	39%
Number of Total New Crisis Center Clients	5,698	593	10%
Percent of New Domestic and Sexual Violence Crisis Center Clients Referred from DCYF	4%	13%	

Grafton County Greenbook partners on the executive committee and/or advisory council and Greenbook staff also have collaborated on the following projects related to child maltreatment and domestic violence:

- An executive committee member was instrumental in an initiative about 5 years ago to create a collaborative social service center in the Plymouth area (in Grafton County), the Whole Village Family Resource Center.
- DCYF subcontracts with the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (NHCADSV) to provide support, training, and case consultation to DCYF

workers on cases involving domestic violence and child maltreatment. In child protection cases where domestic violence is suspected or indicated, DCYF workers consult the previously described DVPS.

- Domestic and sexual violence crisis centers with the support of the AmeriCorps Victim Assistance Program have advocates who work with battered women as they move through the court process.
- DCYF has begun using a structured decision-making model of intake and assessment.
- The Grafton County court system employs a part-time attorney to oversee the domestic violence protocols and district court domestic violence coordinating councils.
- The Grafton County court system employs a full-time attorney to oversee the Court Improvement Project (CIP), which addresses the Adoption and Safe Families Act (AFSA). In its third year of operation, CIP has drafted protocols for child abuse and neglect cases and permanency planning that are in use throughout the State.
- Since 1994, there has been a statewide Governor's Commission on Domestic and Sexual Violence as well as local domestic violence coordinating councils. Several Greenbook participants serve on the Commission, the Commission's subcommittees, and the coordinating councils.
- Several key Grafton County Greenbook Initiative participants also serve on statewide intimate partner and child fatality review teams. The presence of these individuals on these teams enhances Greenbook Initiative's knowledge of related projects while also expanding the teams' knowledge of co-occurrence.
- Grafton County Greenbook staff also serve on the steering committee for the Child Advocacy Center as well as a State Department of Corrections committee.

These collaborations have informed Grafton's capacity in implementing Greenbook recommendations. By participating in these and other child maltreatment/domestic violence collaborations, Grafton County Greenbook agencies have developed confidence and a strong familiarity with one another. They also have increased their organizations' knowledge of child maltreatment and domestic violence. This history of collaboration led them to envision a partnership focusing exclusively on the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence, resulting in the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative.

This history of collaboration is at the center of Grafton County's strengths. With key and influential partners serving on statewide committees and task forces, the Grafton County

Greenbook Initiative can be influential and informative in a number of ways. Whether it is related to domestic violence or child fatalities, law enforcement issues in addressing offenders, or understanding the needs of domestic violence victims, Grafton County's Greenbook team continues to raise issues associated with co-occurrence. These concentric collaborations only increase the potential for sustaining the work once Federal funding ends.

In addition to these concurrent and historical collaborations, several of the key Greenbook partners have strong personal relationships with one another. As previously described, given Grafton County's small and rural population, familiarity and trust are crucial to the Greenbook Initiative's success. These personal relationships are enhanced by a strong commitment to the issues and a high level of trust. In the remaining time, it will be important to utilize these assets to identify and negotiate any conflicts that arise.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE INITIATIVE

2.1 Introduction

As previously described, there is a substantial history in Grafton County of domestic violence and/or child maltreatment collaborations. With the existing structure and success of the Domestic Violence Program Specialists (DVPSs), Grafton County viewed the Greenbook Initiative as an opportunity to expand and develop a systems-focused vision for the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence. With this hope and vision, Grafton County applied to be a Federal Greenbook demonstration site.

Grafton County was first notified of its Greenbook Initiative award in late December 2000. At that time, the individuals from the primary partners who had worked together to develop the award application and concept paper formed the original executive committee.

2.2 Primary Systems

National studies have established that a linkage between child maltreatment and domestic violence exists in up to 60 percent of all cases. In September 1999, however, a study by the Division for Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) revealed that domestic violence was a factor in approximately one-third of all New Hampshire cases referred to that agency, which suggests the potential under-identification of co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment and the need for better screening and assessment procedures.

The Child Welfare System

The New Hampshire DCYF has 12 district offices, 3 of which serve various parts of Grafton County. The Littleton DCYF office is located in Grafton County, while the Laconia and

Claremont offices serve parts of Grafton County. DCYF employs approximately 155 staff statewide.

In 2000, DCYF received 13,309 calls to its statewide toll-free telephone number about child maltreatment. Between 1996 and 2000, DCYF opened an average of 530 cases per month/6,400 cases per year for investigations of child maltreatment statewide. In 2000, 608 cases out of 6,987 investigations (8.7%) were found to be substantiated cases of child maltreatment.

As a part of DCYF's new staff orientation and training, child protection service (CPS) workers receive a full day of training on domestic violence from the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (NHCADSV). They also have opportunities to attend regularly scheduled trainings that are part of the DCYF professional development plan. The agency has recently implemented a statewide structured decision-making model to provide a more uniform and consistent approach to risk assessment and safety planning for all referrals investigated by DCYF and for all families receiving services from DCYF. In addition to other risk factors, structured decision-making considers childhood exposure to domestic violence.

As always, the main priority of DCYF is to establish safety for the child. A new State statute in 2000 allows a batterer to be ordered out of the home, resulting in a criminal charge if he or she violates that order, pursuant to the court's finding in support of an abuse/neglect petition by DCYF. The DCYF director also has proposed a strategic planning initiative to identify barriers to service provision.

Cases generally enter the child welfare system through the DCYF Central Intake Unit. There, an intake worker determines what kind of concern exists in the family and whether that concern needs action. If the situation needs action and the case is deemed credible, the family is assigned a level of risk. High-risk situations require an immediate response (within 24 hours). Intake staff also directly screen cases for substance abuse, domestic violence, emotional/developmental impairment, mental health, and lethality issues. However, the ability of intake staff to conduct an adequate assessment of family risk factors often depends on the reporter's familiarity with and knowledge of the family. A referral remains open with DCYF until a safety assessment has been accomplished, typically for a period of 60 days. During this period, DCYF makes a determination of whether the children are observed to be in a safe environment or if there is sufficient evidence to proceed to court with a petition for abuse and/or neglect. Alternatively, on rare occasions, families may receive supportive services on a voluntary basis. Once there is a court finding of abuse/neglect, steps are taken to insure the safety of a child, either through the identification of alternative safe placements for the child and/or services to the family, with expedited permanency planning always in mind.

DVPSs are located in each of the three DCYF district offices that serve Grafton County. DVPSs spend half of their time in the DCYF office and the other half at their local crisis center. The mission of the DVPSs is to provide collaborative services to battered women and their children in order to maximize their safety and well-being.

DCYF has an ongoing relationship with the courts, local domestic violence providers, and NHCADSV. At a site visit, DCYF noted that it would like to improve those relationships by enhancing the role of DVPSs, which would include establishing a clearer structure of their role at DCYF and increasing the consistency of referrals for community services.

Domestic Violence Service Providers

In 2000, the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence reported that Grafton County crisis centers served 503 domestic violence victims, which included victims of adult and teen dating violence. Additionally, 52 victims in Grafton County were seen by the crisis centers for sexual assault.

Domestic violence service providers (crisis centers) in Grafton County are community-based providers who serve location-specific populations. Crisis centers in New Hampshire are required under NHCADSV program standards to provide the following services: 24-hour crisis line, access to shelters or safe homes, advocacy and support services, support groups and peer support, education and outreach, and community relations. All crisis center advocates are required under State law to satisfactorily complete a minimum of 30 hours of training provided by a bona fide crisis center in order to conduct confidential communications with domestic and sexual violence victims. The minimum content to be addressed in the training is outlined in the NHCADSV program standards and includes all relevant laws, such as the domestic violence State statute and child abuse reporting requirements. The four crisis centers serving Grafton County meet these standards.

Voices Against Violence (formerly the Task Force Against Domestic and Sexual Violence) in Plymouth serves domestic and sexual violence victims in southern and central Grafton County. Its services include nine shelter beds, a 24-hour crisis line, an in-shelter children's group, court and hospital advocacy, support groups, educational programs, and referrals. Families generally remain in shelter services for a maximum of 2 months. Female children of any age are allowed to join their parent in the shelter, as are males under the age of 16.

The Support Center at Burch House (formerly The Support Center Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault) in Littleton serves domestic and sexual violence victims in

northern Grafton County. Clients can utilize a 24-hour crisis line; court, police, and hospital advocacy; support groups; community education; and school-based programs.

Women's Information Service (WISE) in Lebanon serves western Grafton County. The agency operates a shelter with room for four or five people, support groups, and school- and community-based education programs. It has no age restrictions on who may utilize the shelter, but restrictions may be imposed on a case-by-case basis.

Women's Supportive Services (WSS) in Claremont serves lower Grafton County and Sullivan County. Services include a 24-hour crisis line; emergency shelter and safe home network; peer support and support groups; court, legal, medical and social service advocacy; information and referrals; educational workshops; and community education.

Voices Against Violence, The Support Center, and Women's Supportive Services each have DVPSs who are out-stationed at DCYF's district offices. By State statute (New Hampshire law RSA 173-C), crisis center advocates are able to have confidential communication with victims, with the exception of mandatory reporting of suspected child abuse and neglect. Victims hold the privilege and can choose to fully or partially waive it. When reporting child abuse, advocates will first request that the mother report the abuse to DCYF with a domestic violence advocate present. If the mother refuses the request, however, the staff will report the abuse to DCYF.

All persons in the state of New Hampshire who suspect child abuse and/or neglect are mandatory reporters. Domestic violence advocates receive training on child abuse and neglect and the effects of domestic violence on children, including training at the annual statewide child abuse and neglect conference. WSS also conducts inservice training with DCYF and mental health professionals, as well as internal trainings on topics such as witnessing domestic violence, mandated reporting, and legal obligations of agency staff. Voices Against Violence holds a 40-hour inservice training and orientation for all employees, volunteers, and hot-line staffers. These trainings are consistent with and guided by the NHCADSV program standards, previously mentioned.

In general, the domestic violence service providers work independently from DCYF. DCYF rarely contacts a domestic violence shelter for substantiation or investigation purposes. If it does, however, the domestic violence service provider can only discuss a client if the client has signed a release of information. During a site visit, it was discussed that the issues surrounding confidentiality have made collaboration with DCYF a challenge at times.

Cases generally enter a domestic violence service provider through phone calls to the hotline, drop-ins, or referrals. The courts also may contact crisis centers in cases where a

domestic violence victim is present and requests the assistance of an advocate. As previously described under the NHCADSV program standards, all crisis centers must offer a range of services including crisis intervention, peer support, and information and referral to services including the courts, medical facilities, and housing assistance. Additionally, individual crisis centers may offer additional or supplemental services, which can vary by center. Crisis centers generally do not have formal service plans for clients.

In various site visits, domestic violence service providers in Grafton County identified a number of areas where they might improve their service to domestic violence victims. Although New Hampshire consists of a predominantly white population, more women of color are moving into southern Grafton County, as are immigrant women from countries of the former Soviet Union. Crisis centers also are seeing some male victims of domestic violence. Therefore, race, ethnicity, language, sexual orientation, and country of origin may be evolving issues that warrant attention. Issues of poverty and physical isolation also provide a challenge to the crisis centers in providing services to victims.

The Courts

There are four court locations within Grafton County, each housing a family division and a district court: Littleton, Plymouth, Haverhill and Lebanon. The Haverhill location also includes the county's superior court and probate court. The four Grafton County court locations are open to the public full-time, with judges sitting part-time. There also is 24-hour access to judges for emergency protective orders.

Between 1996 and 2000, Grafton County's courts received about 60 child maltreatment petitions per year. This varied by court, with the Haverhill family division receiving the fewest (an average of 8 per year) and the Plymouth family division having the greatest share (an average of 27 per year). In cases that involve co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence, the judge will typically provide referral information to the family for domestic violence services or mandate DCYF to provide resources.

The family division is a pilot project in Grafton County that consolidates family-related matters from the probate, district, and superior courts. Its subject matter jurisdiction includes divorce, child custody and visitation, child support, juvenile delinquency and status offense matters, child abuse and neglect, paternity, domestic violence, guardianship of minors, termination of parental rights, and adoptions. The family division has judges who may preside in more than one court. Nine family division staff, including court assistants, court clerks, and a court monitor and coordinator, receive training in domestic violence at an annual conference and ongoing training as needed.

The Grafton County District Court has jurisdiction over misdemeanor criminal offenses and traffic violations. It also hears civil and small claims cases and conducts preliminary hearings in felony cases. Six district court judges preside in the county as well as nine clerks.

Domestic violence protective orders are primarily heard in the Grafton County family division, however, protective orders also can be obtained at the superior court. A domestic violence case is initiated by a victim who comes into the court and files a petition, either alone or with a crisis center advocate. If the petition sets forth facts, which meet the definition of abuse under the statute, and if the court determines there is an immediate and present danger to the safety of the petitioner, a temporary protective order will be issued. A final restraining order hearing is then scheduled, with notice to the respondent, for no more than 30 days from the filing of the petition. If a final protective order is issued, the protective order lasts for 1 year, unless extended for good cause. Domestic violence cases do not have specific case plans, but may involve referrals to outside agencies for the victim and the children. If the action leading to the request for a restraining order is prosecuted as a criminal offense, the district court becomes involved for misdemeanor offenses, while felony offenses are handled in superior court.

Cases involving child welfare usually enter the court system via a petition filed by DCYF. Once the petition is filed, a hearing occurs within 3-10 days (depending on whether the children were removed from the home), an adjudicatory hearing is conducted within 30 days, and a final dispositional hearing within another 30 days. Children involved in child protection cases are appointed a Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) or Guardian ad Litem to set forth for the court what is in the child's best interest. All abuse and neglect cases that are found to be true by the court will result in specific orders and the creation of specific case plans, which may include mandated services to outside agencies. In general, if the children are placed outside the home, the parents have 1 year (under the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997) to correct the conditions that led to the abuse and neglect finding or risk having their parental rights terminated.

Abuse and neglect cases are kept confidential by statute, although parents, family services, and other relevant parties may access the information. In May 2002, however, the State legislature enacted a pilot project in Grafton County that opens child abuse and neglect case to the public. In domestic violence cases, the judge has the power to seal any or all of a case file as she or he sees fit. The victim's address and phone number are kept separate and no one other than the police department can obtain them.

2.3 Governance Structure

The primary partners in the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative are the Grafton County district courts and family division; the Division for Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) of the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS); the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (NHCADSV); and the four domestic and sexual violence crisis centers serving Grafton County. The Administrative Office of the Courts for the State of New Hampshire is the lead agency for the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative, providing fiscal and administrative oversight. The administrative judge for the New Hampshire district courts, who is also the presiding judge of the Plymouth District Court, a district court within Grafton County, serves as executive committee chair of the Greenbook Initiative.

The executive committee functions as the governing and policy review body of the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative. The executive committee, which operates on a modified consensus model, includes five of the original members: the Administrative Judge for the New Hampshire District Courts; the Grafton County Family Division Supervisory Judge; the director of the New Hampshire Administrative Office of the Courts; the director of the New Hampshire DCYF; and the executive director of NHCADSV. The executive committee subsequently added the executive director of CASA of New Hampshire.

A 16-member cross-systems work group is the primary group exploring and recommending cross-systems policies for consideration by the executive committee. Each primary partner also has a discipline-specific team, which focuses on goals related primarily to their individual system. The advisory council, a broad-based committee ensuring geographic, agency, and secondary partner participation, is comprised of all members of the above listed groups, as well as an additional 36 individuals from various area service providers working with families experiencing the co-occurrence of violence. There are two subcommittees of the advisory council: a cross-training and education subcommittee and a batterer accountability subcommittee. Thus, Grafton County has eight committees, groups, and subcommittees working on Greenbook recommendations.

A substantial component of Grafton County's success during the planning phase was its perceptiveness and willingness to reassess, modify, and change its governance structure. These changes were crucial to Grafton's ability to mobilize their community and maintain high levels of interest and engagement. Changes in their governance structure are described in Section 3.2, Collaboration and Sustaining Involvement.

2.4 Staffing

The Grafton County Greenbook Initiative has five staff members. The project director, program coordinator, and administrative/research assistant are full-time Greenbook personnel, and there are two part-time local research partners (LRPs). The project director reports to the Administrative Judge for the New Hampshire District Courts. She is responsible for the overall management of the demonstration project and receives assistance from a program coordinator and an administrative assistant. The onsite LRP works 32 hours per week and is responsible for implementation and analysis of the research design. The consulting LRP devotes 8 hours per week to the Greenbook Initiative and is responsible for the methodological oversight of the evaluation. All Grafton County Greenbook staff are considered employees of the court system since the fiscal agent is the Administrative Office of the Courts. It is important to note, however, that the Greenbook offices are not within any of the court system's locations, and instead are located at a separate office suite accessible to all project participants.

With a staggered hiring process, Grafton was not fully staffed until fall 2001. The project director started in April 2001, the program coordinator and the administrative assistant in May and June, and the LRPs started in August. The Greenbook staff have a variety of backgrounds that enhance the project's viability. In addition to their specific roles within the Greenbook, one staff person is an attorney and another has been a domestic violence advocate.

Site visit interviews with Greenbook partners continually cite the professionalism and expertise of Greenbook staff as a tremendous asset. In addition to being knowledgeable about domestic violence and child maltreatment, interviewees stated that Greenbook staff are excellent at organizing events, communicating with key stakeholders, and ensuring that everyone's time is well spent.

3. AGENCY MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION

3.1 Getting People to the Table (Mobilization)

Upon receiving notification of their award, the original executive committee hired Greenbook staff. The Grafton County team then identified and recruited the advisory council and utilized a logic model to develop goals and indicators that would reflect changes recommended by the Greenbook. (For a greater understanding of the development and use of the logic model, see section 4.3, Logic Model and Its Development Process.)

The inclusion of the advisory council in constructing a shared vision was important in ensuring broad support for the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative. Early in the planning phase and with the assistance of the national technical assistance team, a process was employed that allowed the various agencies to begin working on Greenbook projects from a place of equality.

Although their personal and organizational goals differed (and in some cases may have been in conflict), the goal was to develop a shared vision. This process developed a comprehensive and optimistic “I Want” list. This list was an important starting point for planning. Once developed, these outcome requests were illuminated, refined, reduced, and prioritized within the logic model and planning process. This “I Want” list continues to guide specific program activities and ensures that there continues to be a relationship between individual, agency, and Greenbook goals.

3.2 Collaboration and Sustaining Involvement

Throughout the planning phase and the early stages of implementation, the Grafton team learned that an essential part of their success would be their capacity to be flexible, creative, and responsive. The original governing body had 10 members that included State-level directors as well as local Grafton County office personnel from the DCFY, the courts, and the crisis centers. As Grafton County Greenbook Initiative conducted and emerged from the planning and goal-setting phase at the end of 2001, the executive committee reassessed whether the existing structure was the best to proceed with Greenbook implementation.

The Grafton team was faced with several realities: it had laid out a very complex project with over 40 articulated goals; some goals would require in-depth discussions that would necessitate cross-systems participation, while others were to be pursued primarily within the three individual systems. In response to these ongoing complexities and with assistance from the National Technical Assistance Team, the existing structure of the project (e.g., executive committee and advisory council) was revised in order to begin the implementation phase and maximize agency and individual involvement. As a result, a cross-systems work group, three system-specific teams, a slightly modified advisory council and a new executive committee emerged.

An important development occurred with the creation of the cross-systems work group in winter 2002. The work group focuses on policies and issues affecting the interaction amongst the three primary systems. It consists of 3 members of the executive committee plus 13 other individuals from the primary partners and Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA). The constituency of this work group includes high- and mid-level supervisors as well as individuals who work within each local crisis center, child protection office, and court location. This work group includes the director of each crisis center serving Grafton County. This is noteworthy and essential because the domestic violence network is dissimilar to the other two primary systems in that each crisis center is autonomous. The work group meets every 2 months for 3 hours. Recommendations made by the cross-systems work group will be forwarded on to the executive committee.

Once the cross-systems work group evolved and programmatic activities were underway, it became apparent that the individual systems needed another mechanism to work toward their goals. In the spring 2002 each primary partner formed a small team of five to eight members. The intent of the individual systems' teams is to ensure that system changes occur within the main primary Greenbook partners. The creation of the individual systems teams demonstrated Grafton's desire to be iterative and flexible. Three executive committee members are active on individual teams, again moving toward sustainability of Greenbook efforts.

In its initial form, the advisory council was created to provide input and feedback to the executive committee and to take Greenbook information back to their respective agencies or organizations. The advisory council changed little as the site moved into implementation. From its inception, the advisory council included members of the law enforcement community, corrections, health care, and multiple human service providers. As it has progressed, additional individuals from these disciplines and others have been added as requested or identified as interested. The advisory council continues to ensure that multiple agencies and perspectives are incorporated into the Greenbook Initiative. This approach allows Greenbook to inform systems beyond child protection, the courts, and the domestic violence agencies.

Advisory council members attend quarterly meetings or training events, give input, act as liaisons to their agencies, and, if interested, serve on subcommittees to work on specific issues. Two advisory council subcommittees currently exist: one focuses on batterer accountability and the other on cross-training/education. The subcommittees meet as needed, either in person or by conference calls. There may be additional subcommittees in the future, including a "safety review" subcommittee that will take each recommendation approved by the executive committee and conduct a rigorous safety analysis for battered women and maltreated children. The development of the subcommittees and expansion of the advisory council were important events in maintaining and maximizing participation.

With the bulk of the planning phase completed, the new executive committee opted to meet less frequently, shifting from monthly meetings to meetings every 3 months. With implementation activities underway within newly formed work group and individual systems teams, the executive committee transitioned to a more traditional oversight role—making programmatic and policy decisions with an eye toward sustainability of Greenbook efforts. Likewise, by meeting less frequently, executive committee members were available to be more participatory on programmatic committees. Given their statewide leadership roles and their hands-on involvement in a countywide initiative, this may positively impact the long-term sustainability of Greenbook efforts. The executive director of CASA of New Hampshire was added to the executive committee at this time to strengthen the voice of children within Greenbook. These changes in the executive committee also strove to maintain and maximize key stakeholders' interest and involvement.

As previously described, Grafton has increased and maintained participation and engagement by having a flexible governance structure. The restructuring of the executive committee after the planning phase and the creation of the cross-systems work group and the individual systems teams have allowed stakeholders to engage at various levels, within disciplines and across system, and for various purposes.

Another approach to maintaining support has been the coordination of Greenbook efforts with statewide initiatives that share similar partners or issues concerning co-occurrence. The project has representatives from various statewide initiatives or key agencies on its advisory council. For example, several Greenbook participants serve as members of the New Hampshire Attorney General's Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect and the Governor's Commission Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, as well as members of the statewide fatality review committees (domestic violence and child fatality).

The mountainous geography and rural nature of Grafton County create challenges to maintaining involvement in the initiative from all parts of the county. To address this, the Project has chosen to hold meetings and events not only in the most central location in the county, but also on the region's outer reaches. Similarly, rather than requesting that Greenbook participants always travel to an outside meeting location, meetings are held at the various agencies' offices around the county. In an effort to maximize involvement and to minimize the burden on the participants, meetings are often scheduled at lunchtime or during already existing staff meeting time. A similar strategy employed to combat lengthy travel times is to have conference-call meetings, if particular subject matters allow.

Grafton also has garnered support and attention for its initiative through public relations efforts. Grafton received considerable press coverage within local and statewide publications, as well as within a Boston newspaper, when they were first named one of the six Greenbook demonstration sites. Additionally, the Governor held a press conference announcing this initiative. Thereafter, Grafton began writing its own quarterly newsletter, *The Green Pages*, disseminated across the State as a means of communicating about Greenbook issues and efforts. In addition to news articles, members of the Grafton team continue to conduct educational presentations on the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative to various groups, including the Child Advocacy Center's steering committee, Grafton County Commissioners, the local rotary club, and the Plymouth State College Department of Social Work, and at annual statewide child abuse and neglect and domestic and sexual violence conferences and Grafton County provider meetings.

3.3 Network Analysis

Network analysis provides a baseline measure of collaborative networks between organizations involved in the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative. It examines both the type and amount of interaction among Greenbook-involved agencies as well as the importance of these interactions and any barriers to these relationships. The national evaluation team (NET) will use this information to assess changes in collaborative networks in Grafton over the course of the initiative.

The list of organizations for Grafton was determined by NET's request for names of at least two individuals from every organization involved with Greenbook. Grafton provided a list of names that included individuals from all organizations on the Advisory Council at the time. The final sample represents a very diverse group of organizations, which extends far beyond members of the key partner groups. This was the case for at least half of the participants. The organizations represented are not necessarily those most active in providing services to victims of domestic violence and/or child maltreatment, and some do not provide direct services.

Twenty-three of the 35 individuals originally selected participated in the network analysis interviews. These individuals represented 23 of the original 29 organizations selected for participation and included the following: the New Hampshire District Court, Grafton County family division; the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (NHCADSV); local domestic violence crisis centers; the New Hampshire Division for Children, Youth and Families (DCYF); local school systems; local hospitals; a batterer intervention program; a children's advocacy group; the New Hampshire Department of Corrections; mental health organizations; a local prosecutor's office; a family resource center; local police departments; and CASA.

Although caution must be exercised in interpreting data drawn from such a diverse group (e.g., school systems and hospitals are not key partners in this project), network analysis results found that Greenbook partners have a good knowledge of and working relationships with one another. Results found that these relationships are mutually communicative and presumably beneficial. Additionally, findings suggested that a limited number of organizations might have been involved at the onset of the planning process. Given the level of intimacy and familiarity of Grafton County Greenbook partners with one another, this finding may be indicative of rural, well-knit communities. (For a more detailed description of network analysis, its methodology, intent, strengths, and weakness, see the relevant section in the cross-site report.) Although network analysis found a small number of organizations involved in the initial planning process, it is worthwhile to note that the logic model planning process undertaken by Grafton involved a significant number of stakeholders. This points to a more extensive collaborative process than network analysis data might suggest.

Information gained through a similar survey, *The Interagency Understanding and Collaboration Survey*, developed by the Grafton team and administered to the advisory council in fall 2001, suggests that individuals and organizations who are the primary project partners are in regular and frequent contact. As was the case for the national network survey, each Grafton survey participant was asked about the frequency of contact between his/her organization and several other organizations in the past 6 months. Survey participants were asked to report interagency contact that took place specifically in the course of responding to domestic violence and/or child abuse and neglect. In reporting frequency of contact, respondents could choose response categories ranging from *none at all*, *1-2 times total*, *monthly*, *weekly*, or *daily*. The results indicated that the most frequent contacts occurred between participants and the New Hampshire District Courts, Grafton County family division, Grafton County domestic violence crisis centers, and DCYF. At least 40 percent of all participants reported having either weekly or daily contact with the following organizations: the New Hampshire District Courts, Grafton County family division, Grafton County domestic violence crisis centers, and DCYF. Thus, it would appear that the key partners are in regular and frequent contact with many other organizations. In addition, findings based on other questions in the Grafton County survey indicated that respondents attributed a great deal of importance to relationships with most other organizations in order to best serve the needs of families affected by the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment.

4. PLANNING AND GOAL SETTING

The Grafton team identified very early that the use of a logic model and baseline data would assist both their planning and implementation efforts. The team conducted several baseline surveys and utilized a logic model as both a planning and evaluative tool, but also as a consensus-building instrument. Though lengthy and complex, this process led to a common understanding among the primary partners of what the desired outcomes would be.

4.1 Resource and Needs Assessment

As previously described, the Grafton team developed and distributed an *Interagency Understanding and Collaboration Survey*. The purpose of this survey was to obtain baseline data on several of the project goals, such as increasing knowledge of and training on the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment. The survey, which asked about previous training on issues of child maltreatment and domestic violence, also provided information that the cross-training and education subcommittee used to plan future trainings. The *Interagency Survey* was given to all members of the advisory council in fall 2001. In addition to ascertaining Greenbook members' previous, recent, and existing knowledge and

training, the survey also assessed perceived barriers to collaboration between Greenbook agencies.

The Grafton team also conducted a *Life Experiences Survey* with the Advisory Council. The purpose of this survey was to ascertain if the project had the voice of survivors/victims involved. The survey found that individual members of the advisory council also had personal histories of child maltreatment and/or domestic violence. Additionally, the local research team conducted an informal assessment of services available.

4.2 Concept Mapping

The purpose of concept mapping is to visually understand group processes. It consists of two components, a ratings exercise and a sorting process. In Grafton County, 10 surveys were completed for the ratings exercise, and 3 individuals conducted the sorting exercise. Grafton had concerns about the usefulness of concept mapping for its site since it had already undertaken a logic model process and determined short- and long-term goals. Given the very small sample size, and the site’s concern about the utility, timing, and duplication involved with the concept mapping exercise, *these results should be interpreted with caution and should not be read as an interpretation of fact.*

There were only a few differences between the individual outcomes relevance ranking at the national level and for Grafton County specifically. (See Exhibit 2)

EXHIBIT 2	
Outcomes in Grafton County’s Top 20 that were not listed in the national ranking	Outcomes in the national ranking of Top 20 indicators that were not listed by Grafton County
Increased knowledge about how other systems work.	Better resource sharing among agencies that serve victims of domestic violence and child maltreatment.
Increase in the number of cases in which the nonoffending spouse stays with the child, in cases where the child must be removed from the home.	Decreased incidence of repeated domestic abuse.
Increased knowledge among those who work with children about the impact of violence on children (by age and birth order).	Systems deal with the whole family, not just the victim.

Combining both the outcomes, which were the most relevant, with the “earliest time of expected impact,” within the grant period, Grafton identified that “cross-systems outcomes” were the most achievable within 3 years. Although created independently of concept mapping, it is important to note that Grafton created a cross-systems workgroup to address a number of these types of goals. (Please see below for a further discussion of local programmatic efforts.)

4.3 Logic Model and Its Development Process

Grafton County used a logic model approach during its planning process. A logic model subcommittee of the executive committee was created to work with Greenbook staff to craft and refine the goals, activities, outcomes, and indicators. Through extensive consultation with the subcommittee, executive committee, and individual Greenbook partners, four logic models were developed. It was determined that some Greenbook objectives were most relevant for a certain primary partner (the court system; the Division for Children, Youth and Families; or the domestic violence member programs), while others pertained to cross-system collaboration and, therefore, four separate logic models were drafted: one for each of the primary partners and one for the Greenbook “community,” which focuses on cross-systems goals.

Each of the logic models was developed with extensive input from members of all three primary systems. Project staff also obtained input on the program activities of the cross-systems work group from members of the advisory council. The development of the logic models was a lengthy process, involving numerous meetings over a 3-month period, but the development and use of these four logic models has been crucial for Grafton’s progress. The logic models include the target population, program activities, intermediate and long-term outcomes, as well potential external factors. Grafton County continues to utilize the logic models in all programmatic and evaluation efforts.

Grafton has identified a number of goals for each individual system and across disciplines. An overarching goal for all of the Grafton logic models is “to engage in systems change to increase the safety of women and children.” The following section presents the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative’s logic models, including all project goals and corresponding program activities.

Given that Greenbook is a demonstration project, site-specific goals, outcomes, and program implementation may continue to evolve. Grafton’s process has been an iterative process thus far. It is possible that the goals set forth on the logic models will be modified, refined, and possibly changed as they proceed.

Grafton County Greenbook Initiative Community Logic Model

1-28-02

Goals (Outcomes)

Target Population

Women, children, and men involved with domestic violence, child protective services (CPS), and/or district/family court systems in Grafton County.*

Program Activities

- Community resource description and analysis.
- Community engagement activities.
- Develop and provide training for community groups re: domestic violence, CPS and judicial system.
- Develop and provide training for community groups re: new service delivery model.
- Develop and provide training for primary partners re: new service delivery model.
- Engage in facilitated discussions regarding systems philosophies.
- Develop systems model for case response based on needs of individual families.
- Identify service gaps for families experiencing both child abuse/neglect and domestic violence.
- Develop mechanisms that allow for more effective information sharing.
- Develop mechanisms that allow for more effective case collaboration (among primary partners).
- Facilitate discussions within and across disciplines regarding areas for improvement in providing services to families experiencing domestic violence and child abuse/neglect.
- Coordinate with Office of Child Support Enforcement.
- Collect info regarding child support and domestic violence cases.

Intermediate


- Ensure immediate safety of women and children.
-
- Increase community group knowledge and awareness of domestic violence, CPS, and judicial systems: services and issues.
- Increase interagency collaboration (domestic violence, cps, courts, batterers intervention).
-
- Develop strategies to achieve system capable of individualized case response.
- Develop strategies to reduce service gaps for families experiencing both child abuse and neglect and domestic violence.
-
- Develop procedure for stand alone child support.

Long Term

- Engage in systems change to increase safety of women and children experiencing domestic violence and child abuse/neglect.
-
- Increase community group recognition and understanding of child abuse/neglect and domestic violence.
- Increase community capacity to engage in prevention and supportive intervention activities for families.
- Increase effective information sharing among three primary partners and with other organizations as appropriate.
- Increase effective case collaboration among three primary partners and with other organizations as appropriate.
- Make community groups aware of changes in service delivery.
- Implement individualized case response system.
- Reduce service gaps for families experiencing both child abuse/neglect and domestic violence.
- Implement procedure for stand alone child support orders in domestic violence cases.

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Grafton County Greenbook Initiative Greenbook Community Logic Model (continued)




*The Greenbook Project recognizes that national statistics indicate women represent 95 percent of domestic violence victims. The project addresses all adult victims of domestic violence and their abused and neglected children.

External Factors: Confidentiality, philosophical differences, political climate, existing legislation.

Community Resources: Housing, employment, transportation, childcare, visitation center, mental health services, substance abuse services, DCYF, and domestic violence programs.

Grafton County Greenbook Initiative

Domestic Violence Member Programs Logic Model



*The Greenbook Project recognizes that national statistics indicate women represent 95% of domestic violence victims. The project addresses all adult victims of domestic violence and their abused and neglected children.

External Factors: Philosophical differences, confidentiality, legislation, resources (domestic violence programs: staffing, funding).

Community: Shelters, housing, employment, transportation, child care, visitation center, mental health, substance abuse services, judicial system, DCYF.

Grafton County Greenbook Initiative Division for Children, Youth and Families Logic Model

Target Population	Program Activities	Intermediate Goals (Outcomes)	Long Term Goals (Outcomes)
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>Women, men, and children involved with Grafton County Child Protective Services (CPS).*</p> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop domestic violence screening and assessment tools for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - incoming referrals - open cases with children placed out of home. • Develop domestic violence screening and assessment tools for proposed caretakers. • Develop mechanism to assess service needs of each family member. • Develop separate service plans for victims and batterers. • Assess CPS practices regarding referral and implementation of services for families with domestic violence • Establish agreement on best practices for CPS utilization of DVPS. • Develop procedures for referral to DVPS. • Develop strategies to assess effectiveness of DCYF-funded agencies serving families experiencing co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment. • Train CPS staff in domestic violence and judicial system. • Provide education/guidelines to foster parents regarding domestic violence issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure immediate safety of children. ----- • Increase CPSW’s recognition, understanding and response to domestic violence. • Improve assessment of risk and impact to child. ----- • Improve assessment of domestic violence. • Increase consistency and effective use of DVPS. • Improve assessment of parental protective efforts. • Enhance family-centered safety planning. • Increase services to abused caretaker to allow children to remain safely at home. • Increase knowledge and awareness of domestic violence and judicial system: roles, services, issues, and procedures. • Implement separate service plans for victims and batterers emphasizing batterer accountability for responsible parenting. • Monitor effectiveness of DCYF funded agencies serving families experiencing co-occurrence of domestic violence and child abuse/neglect. • Improve assessment of domestic violence for proposed caretakers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in systems change to increase long-term safety of women and children experiencing domestic violence and child abuse/neglect. ----- • Establish criteria for individualized case response to families with domestic violence (including but not limited to voluntary cases, court ordered cases, and any other cases identified as appropriate for individualized response). ----- • Reduce incidence and duration of out-of-home placements for abused/neglected children of abused women. • Reduce recidivism of child abuse and neglect in cases where there’s a co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment. • Increase effective services for families experiencing co-occurrence of domestic violence and child abuse/neglect for DCYF-funded agencies.

*The Greenbook Project recognizes that national statistics indicate women represent 95 percent of domestic violence victims. The project addresses all adult victims of domestic violence and their abused and neglected children.

External Factors: Caseloads, funding, staffing, confidentiality clashes, philosophical differences.

Community Resources: Housing, employment, transportation, childcare, visitation center, mental health services, substance abuse services, NH District and Family Court, domestic violence programs, legislation.

Grafton County Greenbook Initiative Court Logic Model

(1/29/02)

Target Population

Men, women, and children involved with Grafton County Family and District Courts.*

Program Activities

- Develop and implement screening tools to assess risk to women and children.
- Assess service needs of women and children (includes checklist of needed services for child to remain with nonoffending parent).
- Disseminate information to victims regarding options and resources.
- Develop mechanism for information sharing among civil, criminal, and juvenile courts.
- Develop victim notification procedures (case status, court proceedings, victim rights, batterer intervention compliance).
- Train judges and other court personnel in child welfare and domestic violence.
- Train judges and other court personnel in other community services.
- Develop clear, detailed guidelines/criteria for visitation (including decision-making regarding supervised visitation vs. unsupervised visitation; visitation between offending parent and child; method for assessing appropriateness and frequency).
- Monitor batterer treatment & violations.
- Review court's ability (with existing powers) to ensure the safety of all families experiencing co-occurrence to determine if statutory changes necessary.

Intermediate

- Ensure immediate safety of women and children.

- Improve needs assessment for women and children.
- Improve risk assessment for women and children (as a means to implementation of individualized case planning).
- Increase information sharing among civil, criminal, and juvenile courts.
- Improve communication with victims regarding case status (in both civil and criminal cases).
- Increase court staff knowledge and awareness of domestic violence and child welfare?roles, services and issues; and of other community services (e.g. substance abuse, children's services, housing, etc.).
- Implement clear, detailed visitation guidelines and increase safe visitation & custody arrangements.
- Improve monitoring of batterers across systems.

Goals (Outcomes)

Long Term

- Engage in systems change to increase safety of women and children experiencing domestic violence and child abuse/neglect.

- Increase the perception and reality of courts as problem solving, helpful organizations.
- Increase the ability of courts to identify cases where there is co-occurrence of domestic violence and child abuse. This includes improving recognition, understanding and response to domestic violence and child abuse and neglect.
- Implement individualized case planning based on holistic (comprehensive) family needs approach.
- Increase stability and permanency for children in cases where there's co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment.
- Reduce incidence and duration of out of home placements for abused/neglected children of abused women.
- Increase batterer accountability.

*The Greenbook Project recognizes that national statistics indicate women represent 95 percent of domestic violence victims. The project addresses all adult victims of domestic violence and their abused and neglected children.

External Factors: Court security, facilities, uncertain continuation of Family Division, funding, staffing, confidentiality clashes, political/ legislation.

Community Resources: Housing, employment, transportation, childcare, visitation center, mental health services, substance abuse services, DCYF and domestic violence programs.

4.4 Planning Activities

As described in the previous section, the logic model development process was instrumental to the success of the planning phase for the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative. This process necessitated multidisciplinary discussions about how to take the broad recommendations of the National Greenbook Project and operationalize those selected by Grafton. To date, Grafton has concluded the planning phase and is moving into the early implementation stages.

5. CAPACITY BUILDING

Grafton has conducted a number of capacity building efforts. By attending several technical assistance meetings including the judges' toolbox meeting, a safety and accountability audit training in El Paso County, a community organizing meeting in San Francisco, all-site cross meetings, and a domestic violence advocates meeting in Boston, Grafton continues to use the resources of the Greenbook's national technical assistance team.

Through the support of the national technical assistance team, the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative team has enlisted an experienced consultant to facilitate several important meetings. For example, the consultant facilitated one of the first meetings of the executive committee to clarify positive group dynamics such as effective teamwork, communication, authority, responsibilities, and guiding principles for effective committee interaction. The consultant attended the second advisory council meeting and facilitated the development of the previously described "I Want" list.

As the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative's governance structure evolved to include the work group, the project again utilized the consultant to bring together work group members to agree upon the tenets for effective communication, ground rules for working collaboratively together, and an initial exploration of the philosophical underpinnings of the three systems, both real and perceived, that may pose challenges in their collaborative efforts.

The Grafton County Greenbook Initiative team has and continues to inform the national evaluation team. By attending and participating in the cross-site national evaluation team/local research partner meetings and dialoging with the site liaison, Grafton strives to minimize evaluation efforts that may be duplicative, ensure that its local evaluation efforts are integrated in site assessments, and emphasize the specific needs and strengths of a small, tightly-knit, rural community.

6. LOCAL EVALUATION

As previously mentioned, Grafton County constructed four logic models to define the project's goals, program activities, and the local evaluation design. The local evaluation design was developed by translating goals from each of the logic models into measurable objectives with corresponding indicators. The local research partners worked closely with the Greenbook staff and executive committee members to determine measures that capture the project's achievements given the local focus and available data. The Grafton team has designed an evaluation consisting of multiple methods and multiple indicators.

Methods for gathering the information on the project's impact include:

1) Focus groups with Division for Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) social workers, domestic violence advocates, and domestic violence victims/survivors. The first round of focus groups with DCYF social workers and domestic violence advocates was completed in May 2002. These focus groups explored current practices in working with abused parents and their children, perceptions of knowledge about the other primary systems, views on collaboration/coordination with other systems, and perceived service gaps in the community. The focus groups with domestic violence victims/survivors will be conducted in order to learn their views on current services, areas for improvement, and mechanisms to increase safety for women and children.

2) Individual interviews with judges, court staff, and Domestic Violence Program Specialists (DVPSs). Interviews with judges and DVPSs were completed in June 2002. The general purpose of the interviews with judges was to gather information about the practices of the judicial system in Grafton County in regard to domestic violence and child abuse cases. Interview questions for judges explored the practices and protocols of the family division and district courts. The broad areas covered by the interviews included mechanisms for sharing information among and between the family division and district courts, protocols for communicating case status information to domestic violence victims, determination of visitation procedures in domestic violence cases, and procedures for monitoring batterers. Grafton County has several goals related to the DVPS position (e.g., increasing DCYF's consistent and effective use of DVPSs) and therefore the local evaluation includes both qualitative and quantitative measures of change in the practices of the DVPSs and those who work with them.

3) Exploratory interviews with community members (e.g., town welfare directors, police in rural areas, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families workers) who can help clarify obstacles to rural residents' access to services. A *Rural Women's Needs Survey* also will be developed and distributed with the cooperation of these community members. Because Grafton County is the most rural site participating in the National Greenbook Project, the local project aims to learn about issues that may be unique or intensified for victims living in rural areas. Grafton seeks to

better understand how the rural context affects the experience of survivors. One of these issues may be the lack of access to needed services. The Project also aims to identify the areas where supportive community services are lacking in the county. The *Rural Women's Needs Survey* will gather perceptions of Grafton County community members regarding gaps in services and obstacles to accessing services.

4) File reviews of family division and district court files. The purpose of abstracting data from court files is to ascertain whether implementation of the Grafton County Greenbook Initiative has affected changes in the court's practices in child abuse cases, domestic violence cases, and co-occurrence cases. File reviews will provide information about the project's impact on assessment of service needs, visitation orders, communication with victims, and batterer accountability, for example.

5) File reviews of DCYF files. The purpose of abstracting data from DCYF case files is to ascertain if the project's implementation has affected changes in child protective service (CPS) worker practices in cases of co-occurrence. For example, file reviews will provide information about Greenbook's impact on the screening and assessment of domestic violence in child protection cases and on the assessment of domestic violence victims' parental protective strategies.

In addition to these activities, the local research partners (LRPs) are planning to obtain information from several pre-existing data sources. Local research efforts will use statistical data from the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, DCYF-Bridges, batterer intervention programs (in Grafton County), and the Attorney General's Office. With the exception of batterer intervention programs, data from these sources will be obtained for Grafton County and for the State as a whole. Comparing Grafton County data to the rest of the State will strengthen the Greenbook's ability to attribute changes to the work of the project. LRPs also will document statutes, policies, and protocols that may have been developed or changed because of Greenbook efforts.

Some of the key findings of the focus groups and DVPS interviews include the DCYF workers' perception that the assessment of domestic violence is conducted by both direct and indirect means. Who conducts the assessment, what is assessed, and how it is performed varies. To date, assessment questions are nonstandardized. Focus groups and interviews also revealed that the process of referring CPS cases to DVPSs varies across district offices in terms of the formality or standardization of procedures. All DVPSs in the county reportedly have taken active steps to increase the number of referrals they receive from CPS. One of the key findings from the judicial interviews is that judges perceive decisions about visitation arrangements to be one of the most challenging aspects of domestic violence cases. Information such as this not only provides a measure of current practices (to be compared to data obtained at the end of the

project), but also will inform the project's program activities. For example, information on current practices of DCYF workers and DVPSs may inform the development of policy recommendations for the DVPS position.

7. WHERE ARE THEY NOW?

Grafton County has taken advantage of its strengths in the first phase of the demonstration project and has drawn on high levels of trust and familiarity (particularly among major stakeholders) to conduct a systematic planning process and to begin implementation. The Grafton team has fully incorporated the expertise of the local research partners (LRPs) and various Greenbook partners.

The Grafton site has and continues to be flexible in its committee structure. The recent addition of the individual teams, in combination with the cross-systems work group, the advisory council and its subcommittees, and the governing executive committee, puts Grafton in a strong position to make significant progress on its goals. The next step in its development will be to establish and implement a mechanism that allows the individual teams to inform the work group and vice versa, with input and assistance from the advisory council.

The local research partners have completed numerous focus groups and key informant interviews. The reports that are about to emerge from these evaluation activities should be informative for the programmatic activities of this site.

One goal currently being addressed is the "effective and consistent use of the Domestic Violence Program Specialist." Aware of the State trend toward the use of Domestic Violence Program Specialists (DVPSs), the Grafton Greenbook team is focusing on how to ensure the specialists are used effectively and consistently. Additionally, through Greenbook implementation there is greater understanding of the DVPSs by the courts and Guardians ad Litem, who were less familiar with the specialists prior to Greenbook.

Another goal that has been a primary focus in the early months of implementation is "increasing batterer accountability." Partly based on the "I Wants" list set forth by the advisory council in June 2001, Grafton recognized the concept of increasing batterer accountability was important to its participants and subsequently integrated it into the logic model. In January 2002, a batterer accountability subcommittee of the advisory council was formed. The subcommittee set out to build upon the existing dialogue and planned a batterer accountability conference. This conference was held in June 2002 and had 80 attendees representing various disciplines, agencies, and geographic sections of the county. The conference focused on three areas: national trends and issues in batterer intervention, the recent introduction of statewide New Hampshire guidelines for batterer intervention programs, and the needs of and strategies for Grafton County. The conference was consistent with several batterer intervention program activities outlined in

project logic models. The batterer accountability subcommittee will take recommendations from the conference in considering their future initiatives.

As Grafton County continues to implement the Greenbook strategies, the coming year will focus on policy revisions, batterer accountability, cross-training of personnel, and confidentiality issues.

During the implementation phase, Grafton will face some challenges. One of these is the possible reduction and reprioritization of goals. Another is maintaining broad geographic participation given the realities of the region. Another is the identification and negotiation of possible conflicts. However, with its planning phase completed and through the intense commitment of several key Grafton participants, this site is well-positioned to adequately address these and other challenges as the implementation proceeds.

APPENDIX C:
Lane County, Oregon

APPENDIX C: LANE COUNTY, OREGON

1. COMMUNITY CONTEXT

1.1 Demographics

Lane County, one of 36 counties in Oregon, spans approximately 4,600 square miles that extend from the Pacific coast to the Cascade Mountains. The county's population is approximately 324,000. Although nearly 90 percent of Lane County is forestland and only 9 percent of the State's total population resides in the county, the Eugene/Springfield metropolitan area is Oregon's second largest urban area after Portland, and third largest urban area north of San Francisco, California. According to the 2000 Census, 91 percent of Lane County's residents are white, with a rapidly growing Latino population, currently almost 5 percent. People of color, including African American (1%), American Indian and Alaska Native (1%), and Asian (2%), make up a small fraction of Lane's population.

Lane County's principal industries are agriculture, higher education (e.g., University of Eugene), high technology, forestry, recreation/tourism, and RV manufacturing. Over the past several years, downturns in the logging/wood products industry have significantly impacted Oregon's economy, leading to a significant loss in jobs. The State is currently in a recession necessitating significant budget cuts in state-supported services.

Lane County's median household income of \$37,000 is lower than the State's median household income of \$41,000. Sixty-three percent of the county's households are classified as families and almost 7 percent of the households with children under 18 years of age are female-headed. Fourteen percent of Lane County's total population and 18 percent of the county's children live below the poverty level.

1.2 Unique Site Characteristics

As a whole, Lane County values the balance between process and outcome as well as individual and systems interdependence. The acknowledgement and prioritization of these values as they relate to the Greenbook activities can be seen in several ways.

Lane stakeholders have consistently characterized their county as "process oriented." In fact, one stakeholder proudly joked that Lane was the "process capital of the U.S." This statement sums up the cultural value Lane folk share regarding their understanding of how things are pursued and conducted and how equally important it is to the goals achieved. While those who are highly focused on end product results often minimize process activities or emphasize a fear that end results may be jeopardized or not accomplished if process takes precedence, Lane

aims toward balancing the process with the outcome. This balance enables buy-in from large constituent populations and creates the foundation for long-term sustainability.

An example of how these values are expressed at the institutional level can be found in the very high ratio of human service agencies per capita in Lane County. While these organizations and services are often legislatively mandated (e.g., the Public Safety Coordination Council and the Lane County Commission on Children and Families), the specific prioritization of activities and services takes place at the county level. Having a larger number of human service agencies can be seen as a reflection of the commitment and desires of its citizens who have learned that collaboration and cooperation are the keys to maximizing resources for and services to its residents.

Lane County folks are known to be very community minded. People volunteer and are paid to participate on formal councils and commissions and in informal public involvement activities. This is evidenced (and discussed at length below) through the multiple public safety boards with which Greenbook Initiative members are involved. Through their involvement, individuals actively help define, shape, and prioritize goals, and work to realize them. Through this participation, the balance of process/product is exercised, practiced, and reinforced, and this model, with its implicit values, is brought forth into other formal and informal paid and volunteer activities.

The Lane County Domestic Violence Council, for example, gathers together a broad range of service providers and systems representatives. This transdisciplinary council moves well beyond the “traditional” groups identified as the “domestic violence community.” As such, it incorporates the perspectives, knowledge, practices, and influence of a wide range of disciplines, including civil justice, criminal justice, advocacy, batterer intervention, grass roots feminist activism, child welfare, public health, and education. While burn out can occur if the same people are asked to be on a number of committees, advisory boards, etc., the synergy created from this multidisciplinary work is carried forth into the array of activities each member participates in throughout their citizenship in Lane County. This balancing of process and outcome and the acknowledgement that the independent value of each of these perspectives and their mandates requires an interpersonal and institutional interdependency with the others to achieve their goals.

1.3 History of Collaboration

Lane County has a number of well-established councils, coalitions, and committees operating within the county. The Domestic Violence Council and the Public Safety Coordination Council are of particular importance to Lane County’s Greenbook Initiative. Furthermore, one of the primary partners, Womenspace, is in its sixth and final year of the Coordinated

Community Response to Prevent Intimate Partner Violence (CCR) Project, a cooperative agreement funded by U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

All of the original representatives from the four main systems that comprise the Lane County Greenbook Initiative have worked together on the county's Domestic Violence Council, which was founded in 1993. Rather than being agency-driven, this council and its Child and Family subcommittee provided the impetus and readiness for the Lane County Greenbook Initiative, which is known locally as the Family Violence Response Initiative (FVRI). As a result, the initial stages of the collaboration (i.e., the grant proposal process) were described as "almost grassroots" in that the impetus was generated by those involved with the Domestic Violence Council and "trickled upward."

The Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC), a regional advisory board charged with ensuring the effective use of resources to prevent and reduce crime, to hold offenders accountable, and to increase public safety within communities, is another well-established Lane County council. Per legislative mandate, each county in the State maintains a PSCC. Comprised of representatives from a wide-range of disciplines (i.e., law enforcement, schools, and other policy makers), the Lane County PSCC is "dedicated to enhancing community safety through interagency collaboration and proactive problem solving." Lane's PSCC membership includes several members who later became part of the Lane County Greenbook Initiative executive and advisory committees.

In order to improve services and service coordination as well as to increase community awareness of intimate partner violence, Womenspace, Inc. was awarded funding in 1996 from CDC to implement the CCR Project. Initially funded for 3 years, the cooperative agreement was renewed for 3 additional years in January 2000. The CCR grant administrator serves on the Greenbook Executive Committee and the Greenbook Cross-Training Workgroup. The Portland, Oregon, branch of RMC Research serves as the CCR Project's evaluator and functions as the local research partner for the Lane County Greenbook Initiative.

The working history created by members of the Lane County Greenbook Initiative through their participation on the CCR project, the Domestic Violence Council, and the Public Safety Coordination Council has provided the foundation for a cohesive group as well as a community familiar with domestic violence issues.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE INITIATIVE

2.1 Introduction

While Lane County residents and stakeholders have a history of community collaboration in support of human services to meet the needs of children and families, Lane faced the same issues as the rest of the country: two distinct and separate systems to address domestic violence and child maltreatment. The toll that the fragmentation of these systems and services played in the lives of women and children came sharply into focus in 1992 following the death of two infants in homes where there was intimate partner violence. The community's shock and anger at the failure of the systems to prevent these deaths galvanized the county and many of its public and private human service agencies into reviewing current policies and practices to identify what went wrong.

In 1998, 38 Lane County professionals, many of whom were members of the Children and Family Violence Committee of the Domestic Violence Council, attended and presented work at the International Conference on the Impact of Domestic Violence on Children in Vancouver, British Columbia. This trip further galvanized this group of professionals to seek funding to begin the process of institutionalizing systems change regarding their community response to co-occurring forms of family violence.

2.2 Primary Systems

The Child Welfare System

The Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS), which is responsible for providing child welfare services and other human services throughout the State, began a major reorganization in 2001, which integrated the delivery of three human services functions—child protection, welfare, and vocational rehabilitation services. The goal of DHS's reorganization is to recognize that families have multiple problems and needs that would be better served through a coordinated, integrated service delivery plan. The reorganization will allow clients to come to one location to receive help rather than visiting at multiple agencies and locations. There are currently four DHS sites in Lane County, and each site provides child welfare, welfare, and vocational services. Across the four sites are 82 child welfare caseworker positions; about 160 investigations are handled each month.

A part-time domestic violence advocate is stationed at the child welfare office. The advocate primarily works with victims of domestic violence to overcome barriers (e.g., housing, financial assistance, and alcohol and drug treatment services) that may prevent them from leaving an abusive situation in which their children are unsafe. The advocate also may attend family decision meetings to provide input on the children's needs for safety and parental

attachment, and/or to provide advocacy and service referrals to assist the mother in becoming self-sustaining and to eliminate the need for child welfare involvement.

A parole and probation case management supervisor also is located, at least part-time, in one of the DHS child welfare offices.

Three years ago, DHS instituted a new system of care to meet the individual needs of each child in families involved in the child welfare system. The new system of care included funds to provide specialized services to children, including those living in families where domestic violence had occurred. Furthermore, State statutes allow domestic assault to be elevated from a misdemeanor to a felony if a child witnesses the crime. The perception in Lane County, however, is that many of the child-witnessing cases are not prosecuted as a felony.

During their initial employment training at the State academy, DHS child welfare caseworkers receive intensive training on child abuse and neglect, which includes a section on domestic violence. Although not mandatory, this training is augmented by annual training sessions provided by Womenspace.

Child welfare policies are strict regarding the release of any information without a client's written consent. Under very rare circumstances, however, the agency may release information without the client's written consent if it is in the best interests of the child to do so. For substantiated cases, child welfare staff are prohibited by law from disclosing any portion of a child's record to anyone except law enforcement, with which there is reciprocal reporting. Parents may receive verbal information, but may not have the written record itself. When the juvenile court is involved, the full record may be provided to the parent. The judge may petition to exclude some types of discovery (e.g., mother's psychiatric evaluation) from the other parent, but not the other parent's legal representative.

The Community Safety Net (CSN) serves families in which reports of child abuse and neglect are unsubstantiated by DHS Child Welfare, but who may still be at risk for family violence. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) has been instituted among representatives of DHS child welfare, Womenspace, parole and probation, and others, to triage and share information regarding these families in order to provide services to prevent potential family violence from escalating.

Cases typically enter DHS because of a report made by a mandated reporter, such as a teacher. Child abuse cases also may enter the system through a police report. During intake, child welfare workers assess the "threat of harm," including child exposure to domestic violence. DHS child welfare may petition the juvenile court alleging parental abuse or neglect for substantiated cases. Child welfare staff may require the mother obtain a restraining order or will

instruct her in how to do so, or the family is required to secure one as part of its service plan. Service plans are generally created in tiers for each family, in which a substance abuse problem would be addressed first, for example, followed by other issues such as domestic violence.

DHS Child Welfare in Lane County recognizes co-occurrence of and the correlation between child maltreatment and intimate partner violence. Child welfare workers receive basic training on co-occurrence issues, and may benefit from the availability of domestic violence advocates and parole and probation officers who are housed within the agency.

In Lane County, DHS Child Welfare is struggling with a young workforce, however, as the majority of experienced staff members have retired and newer staff members have been with the agency for 5 years or less. Key stakeholders in the community believe that the inexperienced staff need more training, especially in the area of co-occurring child maltreatment and domestic violence, in order to achieve the goal of overall consistency in handling of these cases.

Domestic Violence Service Providers

Womenspace, Inc. provides a wide variety of domestic violence services in Lane County and is the primary provider in the metro area. These services include a 24-hour crisis line, three rural programs, a drop-in advocacy center (in Eugene), a shelter with space for 18–24 individuals, and a transitional case management program. In addition, the agency provides services for children who are with their mothers while living in a shelter. Womenspace also hires, trains, and supervises co-located advocates in a variety of Greenbook-involved systems. Four domestic violence advocates are stationed at Lane County Legal Aid; they are the only domestic violence advocates that enjoy client privilege. Another advocate is stationed at the child protection agency. This 40-hour per month position has been funded by the DHS Child Welfare Office since 1998. A second domestic violence advocate is stationed at DHS Self-Sufficiency, which provides welfare services. Womenspace also operates several community outreach and educational programs, such as a dating and domestic violence classes at area middle and high schools.

Womenspace underwent a restructuring in late 2001 and is now headed by one executive director who is supported by an associate director. There are 30 full- and part-time employees, although volunteers provide a substantial portion of the organization's labor. The staff is diverse and includes at least five bicultural/bilingual staff members and a lesbian alliance office. All staff receive 22–24 hours of domestic violence training before they start working with clients. While there is no formal training on child protective services, 2–3 hours of the training is devoted to child maltreatment issues. This portion of the training focuses on the effects of exposure to domestic violence and the experience of abuse on children.

The children's coordinator, who is well trained in child development and maltreatment, conducts a separate assessment with all children entering the shelter. Children living in the shelter attend a children's group while their mothers attend a support group. Although the shelter does not house male children over the age of 12, Womenspace keeps two rooms at the Family Shelter House at Lane ShelterCare for clients with teenage male children. Otherwise, these families are housed at local motels or referred to another shelter in the State. Womenspace requires all clients living at the shelter to work on parenting issues, which are incorporated into each client's weekly and long-term goal planning. Womenspace does not routinely ask a client to complete a release of information form to share information with DHS Child Welfare unless the client requests it. Without this form, Womenspace will not confirm or deny the client's presence at the shelter. Case files are subpoenaed with regularity, so advocates consciously update their records with that possibility in mind. Furthermore, identifying information is not collected during hotline calls or drop-by visits to the Advocacy Center, and files may be opened under pseudonyms.

Womenspace has an informal procedure, but no formal policy, for reporting child maltreatment in the shelter to DHS Child Welfare. Womenspace domestic violence advocates are not mandated reporters, nor are they protected by client privilege. Any decision to report child maltreatment is made collaboratively by several staff; advocates never make such a decision in isolation. Clients are always informed before any report is made to child protection. The shelter has a "no violence" policy that respects cultural differences in disciplinary methods, but also expects mothers to be open to learning new, nonviolent methods. If child maltreatment is suspected, Womenspace advocates first try a "supportive intervention." For example, an advocate expresses her concerns about a mother's behavior toward her children and suggest a goal to modify that behavior. Supportive intervention also may be used with women in the transitional program, many of whom are already involved with DHS Child Welfare. In doing so, an advocate approaches the mother and suggests that she let Womenspace support her in her efforts to keep or regain custody of her children.

Womenspace has had very little interaction with the local child welfare agency in developing policies and practices on co-occurrence issues, although there has been collaboration between Womenspace and DHS at the State level. This collaboration, however, has not trickled down to the local level. Womenspace is encouraged by the DHS reorganization at the local level, which will allow one person to manage all aspects of a family's case plan. This reorganization was also intended to produce workers who will have a greater understanding of the dynamics of domestic violence. Womenspace would like to explore more practical methods that DHS could use to hold abusers accountable and to increase women's safety. For example, Womenspace staff have suggested that DHS could facilitate the court's granting of no-contact orders and restraining orders.

Lane County presently offers five batterer intervention programs. The batterer accountability subcommittee of the Domestic Violence Council voluntarily coordinates these programs. The executive director of Womenspace, a founding partner and member of the executive committee, chairs this subcommittee. Three of the programs are general in scope, one program is faith-based, and another provides intervention services for Latino men. All five batterer intervention programs receive court-mandated referrals (discussed below). Furthermore, while Oregon has not yet issued State program certification guidelines, all five batterer intervention programs have agreed to provide 52-week programs for their clients. Three Greenbook stakeholders currently are involved in the State's taskforce to develop certification criteria for Oregon's batterer intervention programs.

The Courts

All cases dealing with domestic violence and/or child maltreatment are heard in the Lane County Circuit Court. The circuit court hears petitions for domestic violence protection orders and cases of defendants accused of domestic violence-related offenses. The specialized juvenile court is a component of the circuit court, but is physically separate from the rest of the circuit court and housed in the county's juvenile facility. The juvenile court consists of a presiding judge, a judicial law clerk, one judicial assistant, one juvenile court clerk, two assistants, and court clerks that handle clerical responsibilities. It hears two primary types of cases: dependency cases and delinquency cases. Dependency cases, such as child abuse and neglect, termination of parental rights, adoption, and emancipation, make up about one-half of the juvenile court docket.

The juvenile court has no special policies or procedures for handling dependency cases where domestic violence is present. The court, however, can issue restraining orders (which are rarely granted in dependency court hearings) or impose conditions that reflect the need for safety due to risks related to domestic violence. For example, it is DHS policy to place a child with his/her nonoffending parent and the juvenile court may impose conditions on the offending parent or partner. These conditions may include specifying the type and amount of contact allowed with the children or requiring drug testing, attendance at treatment programs, or other relevant restrictions. The existence of domestic violence is occasionally the rationale to provide a Court-Appointed Special Advocate (CASA), although CASAs are not commonly appointed for this reason. The Domestic Violence Council conducts training sessions on domestic violence for court judges and staff on an annual basis. A training in October 2001 focused on the connection between domestic violence and child maltreatment.

The juvenile court hears between 15–40 dependency cases per week. These cases may include a variety of hearing types related to child welfare, depending on the status of the case, including the original hearing, the fact-finding hearing, the disposition hearing, and the permanency hearing. Court files are confidential, but court proceedings are open to the public.

Information from dependency case files is not accessible to other judges unless the file is specifically requested and then physically transported to the main circuit court building. Attorneys, however, are more likely than judges to request a dependency file.

A typical dependency case enters the court system through a DHS petition in which the parties are summoned to court for an original hearing. Depending on the original hearing ruling and stipulations, the child in question may or may not be taken into care based on DHS's assessment. It is DHS practice to keep the child with his/her nonoffending parent or with a relative of the family, if possible. If the child is placed with a nonfamily member, that temporary guardian must be certified by DHS. Oregon law limits the court's ability to order treatment or other conditions unless they specifically pertain to the allegations admitted in court. The juvenile court does not typically follow up on cases, nor does it determine whether a dependency case is closed by DHS Child Welfare. Instead, DHS Child Welfare may bring cases back for periodic review or petition for new hearings. About three-fourths of founded dependency cases involve domestic violence and/or drug and alcohol issues. For most of these cases, alcohol and drug treatment, domestic violence services, and/or batterer intervention services may be stipulated as a condition of child placement at the original hearing.

One of the main advantages of the juvenile court system in Lane County is its small size. One judge currently handles all of the cases, which translates into consistent responses and rulings. The legal community that regularly works in the juvenile court system is another asset. Most of the parents and children in these cases are indigent and represented by 1 of approximately 20 experienced attorneys who are members of a consortium and paid by the State for their services. The consortium attorneys are more interested in acting in the best interest of the children and families involved than promoting the adversarial nature of the legal system. Some key stakeholders in Lane County believe that the juvenile court could benefit from having parent advocates available to assist and support nonoffending parents in understanding and negotiating the court system.

The physical separation of the juvenile court and the main circuit court is an obstacle. For example, it takes considerable time and effort on the part of juvenile court staff to determine whether a restraining order has been issued in the main circuit court. Another obstacle in Lane County's court system is the lack of training on families dealing with the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment. Although training may be available, judges either lack the incentive or the time to take advantage of these valuable opportunities.

2.3 Governance Structure

The Lane County Greenbook Initiative consists of *five* main entities: the courts, represented by the Lane County Circuit Court's Juvenile Court; child welfare services,

represented by Lane County Department of Human Services (DHS) Child Welfare; domestic violence service providers, represented by Womenspace, Inc.; the Lane County Commission on Children and Families' Department of Children and Families, which serves as the grantee; and Lane County Community Corrections Parole and Probation, which joined as a formal partner in the second year of the grant.

The Lane County Commission on Children and Families, an 18-member layperson commission, was created in 1993 with the passage of Oregon House bill 2004. The legislation mandated a county-level commission system through which the State formally recognized the county's authority to conduct a needs assessment and other planning activities, and to allocate funding for services to children, youth, and families. Although it is not a service provider, the Lane County Department of Children and Families provides the staff to operationalize the policy recommendations of the Commission.

The Lane County Greenbook Initiative was originally guided by a six-member policy board. The original policy board consisted of five voting members and one nonvoting member. The original members included representatives from: the Lane County Department on Children and Families; the juvenile court division of the Lane County Circuit Court; the Lane County Department of Human Services-Child Welfare (formerly Lane County Services to Children and Families); Womenspace; the Family Advisory Council (represented by a parent advocate); and a nonvoting member from Lane County's Domestic Violence Council. The policy board began meeting monthly in April 2001. As required by the conditions of the grant, the juvenile court judge chaired the policy board during its inaugural year. In February 2002, a newly reconfigured executive committee (see below) voted to retain the judge as the chair.

In order to create wider community buy-in as well as to support the move toward the implementation phase of the initiative, several changes to the original governance structure were implemented. First, in November 2001 the policy board voted to reorganize the governing structure of the initiative. The policy board was split into two committees: a smaller executive committee comprised of management representatives from the partnering agencies and a larger advisory committee. Second, changes were made to the configuration of the executive committee. A representative from the Lane County Parole and Probation was formally invited to participate on the executive committee since the agency had become a new partner. The parent advocate from the Family Advisory Council and the nonvoting member of the Domestic Violence Council moved from the executive committee and became members of the advisory committee.

The executive committee, which meets monthly, is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Lane County Greenbook Initiative work plan and prioritizes the expenditure of grant funds. The advisory committee, also chaired by the juvenile court judge,

includes the executive committee members as well as an additional 25 members from local service agencies, organizations, councils, and committees. The advisory committee members are further structured into five workgroups: Cross-Training; REAL Heroes/Striving for Change; Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team (DVERT); Neighbor to Neighbor; and Case File Review. Two of the original workgroups, the Collaborative Review Workgroup and Evaluation Advisory Group are now defunct. All of the workgroups report to the executive committee. An executive committee member participates in each of the workgroups and provides “silent leadership.” Each of workgroups is staffed by one of the project co-directors.

2.4 Staffing

The Lane County Greenbook Initiative grant has been used to fund three full-time staff—two co-directors and a project assistant—all of whom are employed by and located at the Lane County Commission on Children and Families’ Department of Children and Families in Eugene. Originally, the initiative had one project director, who departed on maternity leave. The executive committee decided to expand the position to two full-time co-directors and the hiring process began in March 2001. The first project co-director started in April 2001 and the second co-director began in September 2001 after the Department of Children and Families formally created the position. The project was fully staffed in September 2001.

Initiative funding also has been used to contract with a local research partner, RMC Research, located in Portland, Oregon. This contract supports the equivalent of one half-time position.

Staff Title	Status	Hired	Funded by	Reports to
Co-Director	Full time	April 2001	100% Greenbook Initiative	(Interim) Director, Dept. of Children and Families
Co-Director	Full time	September 2001	100% Greenbook Initiative	(Interim) Director, Dept. of Children and Families
Project Assistant	Full time	May 2001	100% Greenbook Initiative	Co-Directors

While the FVRI executive committee is responsible for the overall vision and leadership of the Greenbook Initiative, including developing the strategic plan and authorizing the distribution of grant funds to implement these activities, the Greenbook Initiative directors are responsible for the overall daily management of the Initiative. A sample of activities that the Greenbook staff are responsible for include:

- Fiscal administration of the grant
- Executing and managing grant subcontracts with its partnering agencies

- Serving as the primary liaison between the community and the Federal oversight team
- Writing semi-annual progress reports and annual grant proposals
- Participating in all executive and advisory committee meetings
- Analyzing and making recommendations based upon workgroup findings
- Organizing, attending, and participating in training and cross-training workshops
- Publishing *The Greenbook Gazette* newsletter
- Creating and maintaining the FVRI Internet Web site.

3. AGENCY MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION

3.1 Getting People to the Table (Mobilization)

While the grantee of Lane’s Greenbook Initiative is the Commission on Children and Families, the grant was co-written by a founding member of the Domestic Violence Council (who was also an original member of the executive committee) and the grant’s original project director at the Department of Children and Families. A couple of the grant partners, who are now represented on the executive and/or advisory committees and helped conceptualize and research the grant proposal, first developed their ideas and interests in collaboration on the overlapping forms of family violence during their attendance at the International Conference on the Impact of Domestic Violence on Children in Vancouver.

The number of interdisciplinary councils and committees in Lane County dedicated to public safety, crime reduction, and offender accountability has resulted in considerable community awareness of the problem of domestic violence (as measured by a CCR evaluation activity). Furthermore, the fact that a number of members of Lane’s FVRI actively participate on these community boards created a heightened level of buy-in from agency and organization employees regarding the necessity of institutional change for addressing the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment at the beginning of Lane County’s Greenbook Initiative.

The FVRI project staff have developed strategies to build upon this nascent readiness to increase the involvement of community organizations in the Greenbook Initiative, including formal and informal representation on Greenbook committees as well as coordinated communication among Greenbook stakeholders. For example, although parole and probation has been represented since the initial grant-writing stage of the initiative, it was formally invited to participate as a partner agency in the second year of the grant. Restructuring the original policy board also was a strategy used to engage a wider variety of stakeholder agencies.

In order to update formal and informal members of the Lane County Greenbook Initiative as well as to publicize and educate the community regarding FVRI's work, the project staff launched a monthly newsletter, *The Greenbook Gazette*, in March 2002. The newsletter is distributed via the Lane County Greenbook listserv and is available in hardcopy form. The staff also have created and maintain a Web site dedicated to the project. *The Greenbook Gazette* also may be downloaded from the Web site at: http://www.co.lane.or.us/CCF_FVRI/.

3.2 Collaboration and Sustaining Involvement

In addition to implementing structural changes to the governing structure of the initiative, Lane County's Greenbook Initiative also has made considerable use of existing coordinating bodies, councils, and projects with similar mandates. Along with the five primary entities, two other main coordinating bodies operate with overlapping mandates and function pivotally within the initiative. These councils include: the Public Safety Coordinating Council, a law enforcement and criminal justice council mandated by a State statute to coordinate public safety on issues ranging from fire safety to child maltreatment and woman abuse, and the Domestic Violence Council, a 9-year-old collaborative with a variety of subcommittees, including an active batterer accountability group co-chaired by an executive committee member. The Lane County Greenbook Initiative has benefited considerably from these cross-collaborations.

While Lane County's Greenbook Initiative began with community buy-in, they have increased community representation by expanding their governance structure to include a significant number of community stakeholders. This has created and strengthened a number of alliances with councils sharing similarly mandated purviews (e.g., the Domestic Violence and the Public Safety Coordination Councils). Furthermore, parole and probation's involvement from the start of the grant was formalized in Year 2 of the grant when they became a partnering agency. The addition of parole and probation is expected to have considerable impact on the batterer accountability component and other criminal justice elements of Lane County's Greenbook Initiative.

Although Lane County has done much to "bring folks to the table" to increase the community's involvement with the Greenbook Initiative, its focus on sustainable institutional change combined with a process-oriented philosophy has meant that community engagement is viewed as a two-way street and that the Greenbook Initiative must give back to the community. As such, the project co-directors now serve on several committees on behalf of the Greenbook Initiative. In this capacity, they function in a liaison role, bringing a Greenbook approach on the issues of co-occurrence to wider community efforts and plans. The paradigm shift from community involvement to community integration represents a significant change: its aim is sustained change rather than short-term change.

While Lane County DHS child welfare is currently in the midst of a radical reorganization and the State is in a recession necessitating many human service cutbacks, the FVRI staff has remained stable with remarkably low turnover. Due to the restructuring of DHS Child Welfare and an early medical retirement, two members of the executive committee, the DHS Child Welfare representative and the Commission of Children and Families representative were replaced, by the new manager of DHS Child Welfare and the Acting Interim Director of the Commission on Children and Families, respectively.

3.3 Network Analysis

To understand the connections between organizations and their changes over time, the network survey systematically measures changes regarding who is talking with whom, about what, and the frequency of these conversations. The instrument, administered twice, at baseline and at 12 months, measures both the entire collaborative network as well as individual actors within the network. Overall, during their planning phase of activities, Lane County showed a high level of collaboration among the organizations involved in their Greenbook Initiative.

Lane County project staff originally identified 27 Greenbook-involved organizations, however, 3 were dropped due to an inability to contact the organization after numerous attempts.¹ As such, Lane County's baseline network analysis included 24 organizations and 552 pairs of organizations possible (the relationship between pairs of organizations is the unit of analysis). Analysis of baseline data indicated that most of the key organizations working in the areas of domestic violence and child maltreatment interact with each other on a regular basis (about once per month) and they recognize, to some extent, the importance of their collaboration (2.6 on a scale of 1 to 4).

In terms of the network density, the Lane County results imply a high level of collaboration between the organizations. Specifically, close to 76 percent of all of the possible interactions between organizations are occurring at the baseline planning stage of the initiative. Furthermore, these relationships appear to be bi-directional and balanced (i.e., the organizations are contacting one another at about the same rate). Further survey results suggest a decentralized planning phase process, implying that a number of organizations shared key aspects of their planning phase instead of creating a centralized process in which the locus of power is held among a few organizations. Approximately 32 percent of Lane County organizations interacted in areas outside of domestic violence and child maltreatment. This implies that the collaboration between the organizations is somewhat broader than the domestic violence-child maltreatment connection and builds upon relationships in other areas.

Key barriers to collaboration, identified through an open-ended question, include (in order of importance): issues involving philosophical differences (e.g., differences in agendas,

goals, objectives, and perspectives, particularly regarding assistance to women victimized by intimate partner violence); communication (e.g., “miscommunication,” confidentiality and data sharing, and language/cultural competence); and resource availability (e.g., lack of services in rural areas and staffing limitations). These identified barriers are common in most collaborative initiatives.

4. PLANNING AND GOAL SETTING

In order to identify needs and resources, prioritize goals and outcomes, and begin to develop the strategies to meet these needs, priorities, and outcomes, Lane County began with an informal needs assessment using preliminary research. Recommendations were made to the executive committee by the multidisciplinary workgroups created by Greenbook staff, advisory committee members, and paid consultants.

4.1 Resource and Needs Assessment

Collaborative Review Workgroup (defunct). As Lane County’s first workgroup, it assessed the community’s status for each of the Greenbook recommendations, identified key players, and suggested next steps. The workgroup determined that changes were needed at the statutory and the local levels. Through its assessment, the group reported several significant cross-system practices that were already in place in the county, for example, stationing domestic violence advocates and a parole and probation case supervisor at the DHS Child Welfare office. Based upon the findings of the workgroup, the project co-directors recommended conducting an intra-agency needs assessment before conducting a more extensive cross-system needs assessment and instituting changes.

Domestic Violence Enhanced Response Team (DVERT). The DVERT workgroup includes members from the Public Safety Coordination Council, the Domestic Violence Council’s Criminal Justice subcommittee, and Greenbook personnel. The workgroup began meeting bimonthly in January 2002 to assess the readiness, feasibility, and resources Lane County needed to pilot a multidisciplinary case management response team for domestic violence cases involving children. To support this effort, three members of the Lane County Greenbook Initiative attended the Colorado Springs DVERT technical assistance training and conducted a literature review of different DVERT models.

Case File Coordination. Growing out of an informal conversation among Lane County’s Greenbook staff and key stakeholders in the circuit court, the case file coordination group began meeting in May 2002 to design a pilot project that coordinates the related court case files for each family. The project’s primary goal is to identify and assess the scope of the problem, and, specifically, to determine: (1) how many families are engaged in multiple court

hearing or proceedings, (2) the information sharing needs of the various courts and court personnel, (3) instances where conflicting orders are handed down, and (4) strategies to increase appropriate interaction between the various court proceedings involving families.

Cross-Training. A consultant was hired to conduct a cross-training needs assessment. Information collected for this report consisted of a series of indepth interviews with personnel at Greenbook-affiliated agencies (e.g., CASAs, circuit and juvenile court judges, advocates, caseworkers, senior and line staff); the final report was submitted to the executive committee in January 2002 and is available online at the Lane County Web site.

Neighbor to Neighbor. Lane’s Greenbook Initiative members recognize that community involvement, particularly at the neighborhood level, is integral to responding to and preventing co-occurring forms of family violence. Because friends and neighbors are a part of family life and are most frequently the first responders to domestic violence and child maltreatment, the Neighbor to Neighbor project seeks to get people to “look beyond *awareness* of domestic violence and child maltreatment toward *actions* to be executed in their neighborhoods.” In September 2001, Lane County sent representatives from the Greenbook and CCR initiatives to a specialized “toolbox” conference on community engagement held by the Greenbook technical assistance providers. In January 2002, a community engagement expert conducted a site visit to assist in developing an action plan for this effort. The Neighbor to Neighbor project began by assessing community readiness (i.e., meeting with key leaders, locating resources, and discussing shared objectives) to select a specific neighborhood to work with. The wish of at least one stakeholder is that the arts community and the local media will be engaged to create wider community awareness of the Neighbor to Neighbor project and its aims to reduce and be more responsive to family violence.

4.2 Concept Mapping

The concept mapping exercise produces a pictorial representation of the relationship between the various Greenbook Initiative outcomes at the national and local levels. While the information generated from the concept mapping exercise could have been helpful to the site in planning and evaluating their initiative, Lane had developed their strategic plan before the results of the concept mapping were distributed.

The concept map was developed through a four-step process: brainstorming, sorting, rating, and analyzing. Each site began by examining the original Greenbook report and identifying Greenbook outcomes for their local initiative. This local information was collected by the national evaluation team (NET) and compiled into a list of 102 outcomes. Key stakeholders in the Lane collaborative then sorted these 102 outcomes into concept groups based on their perceived similarity. Respondents were then asked to rate each of the outcomes on their

relevance and earliest impact. The sorting and rating processes at each site were then analyzed at the national level (n=15) and the results were reported. Low response rates for the sorting activity prevented meaningful site-level analysis from being conducted. Rating results were presented by national and site level (national: n=76; Lane County: n=9).

Analysis of the sorting activity at the national level revealed seven clusters: batterer accountability, service system enhancements, improved practice in the courts/broader community changes, cross-system outcomes, a decrease in the harmful effects of children’s exposure to violence, decreased incidences of domestic violence/child maltreatment, and a decrease in recidivism/repeat offenses. These clusters showed a high level of consistency with the outcomes generated at the March 2002 local research partner meeting in Fairfax, Virginia.

Exhibits 1 and 2 compare Lane’s ranking of their most important activities with NET’s analysis of the ranking of all six demonstration sites in composite. Lane County had 47 outcomes with mean relevance scores of 5.0 on a scale that ranged from 1.0 to 5.0, with 5.0 being the most relevant to the site. As a result, it was impossible to determine the top 20 outcomes for this site. Therefore, Exhibit 1 below lists the top 20 outcomes in the national ranking that were not listed among Lane County’s top 47. Only two outcomes in the national ranking of the top 20 were not included in Lane’s top 47 outcomes.

EXHIBIT 1	
Outcomes in Lane County’s Top 20 that were not listed in the national ranking	Outcomes in the national ranking of Top 20 that were not listed by Lane County
Lane rated 47 outcomes as 5.0.	Systems make referrals for involuntary or voluntary services appropriately.
	Better resource sharing among agencies that serve victims of domestic violence and child maltreatment.

In order to compare Lane’s priorities with the national composite of all of the demonstration sites, Exhibit 2 compares the top 49 outcomes from both Lane County and the national ranking. The number 49 rather than 50 was chosen because there were a significant amount of mean relevance scores of 4.0 for Lane County, which would have been the score of the next most relevant outcome.

EXHIBIT 2	
Outcomes in Lane County’s Top 49 that were not listed in the national ranking	Outcomes in the national ranking of Top 49 that were not listed by Lane County
Changes in the family meeting process to integrate safety screening and planning	Better resource sharing among agencies that serve victims of domestic violence and child maltreatment
Education for batterers about how domestic violence affects the child	Systems make referrals for involuntary or voluntary services as appropriate
Greater attendance for a longer period of time for batterers at batterer intervention programs	Better access to legal services
Improved ability of courts to address issues with nonrelated partners	Community has increased general public awareness of domestic violence and child maltreatment issues
Increase in supervision of batterers by parole and probation	Consistency in approach of difference systems
Increase in pre-trial supervision of batterers	Decrease in re-involvement with child welfare and law enforcement
Increase in the number of batterers self-referred to intervention services	Decreased number of families requiring court intervention
More children who have witnessed or experienced family violence are able to speak out	Law enforcement will be more coordinated with child welfare system
More unified domestic violence community	Increase in clients reporting that they feel “people are on my team”
More women and children receive the safe housing they need	Increased client perceptions that their court experiences have been fair and respectful
Quicker response to batterers	Increased coordination of crisis response services for children
Increase in number of services in place addressing identified gaps	Increased number of families receiving prevention/early intervention services

In terms of concepts (clusters of outcomes), systems changes—specifically, improved practice in the courts and broader community changes (4.4), batterer accountability (4.4), service system enhancements and cross-system outcomes (4.2)—were most relevant to the Lane Country Greenbook Initiative. The individual level concept—a decrease in the harm of children’s exposure to violence (4.1)—was ranked fifth in relevance to Lane County’s vision. This concept, like similar individual level concepts, is expected to take the longest to show improvement (4.3 years). Lane County key stakeholders expect to first see changes in cross-systems outcomes (3.2 years), batterer accountability (3.2 years), and improved practice in the courts/broader community changes (3.5 years).

In terms of specific outcomes and their relevance, Lane County respondents rated their top five outcome priorities as: 1) sustainable systems change, 2) secure funding to ensure sustainability of Greenbook changes, 3) judicial system accounts for domestic violence/child maltreatment issues when making decisions, 4) systems can identify co-occurrence, and 5) increase in supervision of batterers by parole and probation.

4.3 Logic Model and Its Development Process

The Lane County Greenbook Initiative has used logic model development as a “focusing tool.” The Lane County Greenbook Initiative policy board (now the executive committee) began working on a logic model in August 2001 and an evaluation advisory workgroup was set up in the fall of 2001 to develop outcomes and the goals and objectives needed to achieve them. The local research partner, RMC Research, was instrumental to the process of developing the logic model. RMC Research facilitated the group and provided leadership in creating measurable short-term and intermediary outcomes. Lane County’s logic model is in its final stage of revision.

4.4 Planning Activities

Lane County initially approached the Greenbook Initiative with a large scope of activities and began to focus its efforts on creating a strategic plan and identifying realistic and measurable outcomes—within the funded grant period. As discussed above, the Lane County Greenbook Initiative has concentrated on a number of tasks that are driven by workgroups. While many of the initiative’s stakeholders have a substantial history of working with each other, time was needed to build relationships while identifying, prioritizing, and planning work on tasks, and to foster trust, particularly at the policy-maker level.

An early workgroup, Collaborative Review Workgroup, was charged with conducting a review of collaborative casework on the issue of co-occurrence and making recommendations to the policy board in order to enhance casework for co-occurrence families. Based on the workgroup’s findings, project co-directors recommended that before the initiative began developing and instituting interagency systems changes, intra-agency examinations should be conducted to identify strengths, weaknesses, and gaps. With the help of the process evaluation being conducted by RMC Research, key agencies are examining their internal protocols, policies, and procedures with “Greenbook business” in mind.

As these intra-agency examinations are conducted, the Lane County Greenbook Initiative has begun to implement other activities. Although there is not a clear-cut distinction between the planning and implementation phase of the Lane County initiative, each main project has had a

needs assessment and a planning phase, and some workgroups began implementing their activities in late spring 2002 (e.g., cross-training session in June 2002).

In January 2002, a Cross-Training Committee was formed to address the recommendations and findings of the Cross Training Workgroup's needs assessment. In June 2002, the group held an interdisciplinary pilot cross-training for Court-Appointed Special Advocates (CASAs), judges, and court, child welfare, domestic violence, and parole and probation personnel. Designed to be an interactive workshop based on a series of case studies that moves beyond "awareness" of co-occurrence issues, the pilot training focused on policies, skills, and "what happens in real-life" when policies change. Recommendations made from the pilot will be incorporated into future training sessions.

By May 2002, the DVERT workgroup completed its efforts and reported its findings to the executive committee. The group identified that the core of a DVERT-like response already existed in the Child Advocacy Center's Domestic Violence Witness Program, but that the multi-disciplinary parts of that program did not operate as a formal team, nor did they coordinate their work as closely as a DVERT team might. The workgroup recommended building on and enhancing the existing team. Second, while three local law enforcement agencies actively participated in the planning workgroup, none of the agencies were in a position assume leadership roles for a DVERT response. As a result, the Lane County Greenbook Initiative shifted its strategy to planning for the expansion and enhancement of the Child Advocacy Center's Domestic Violence Witness Project, focused on criminal domestic violence cases that involve a child witness.

5. CAPACITY BUILDING

The Lane County Greenbook Initiative's co-directors have instituted and/or used a number of management and communication strategies in order to facilitate interaction among the Greenbook collaborative partners and to better manage the project. These strategies have been enhanced by the use of Greenbook technical assistance resources, toolboxes, and gatherings. Finally, the initiative has increased its capacity by networking with other Greenbook staff around the county.

In terms of management strategies, the most successful approach to developing capacity for the project was the executive committee (then the policy board) decision to hire co-directors rather than a single director to coordinate the initiative. Each co-director is responsible for the oversight of particular components within the initiative, and serves as the point person to answer questions from executive and advisory committee members and the general community, including the press. Furthermore, one of the co-directors is represented on each of the six work groups, updating and providing recommendations to the executive committee regarding the

groups activities and findings. Another management strategy the co-directors have implemented is a half-day monthly retreat to allow them to focus on management issues, the general direction and status of the initiative, to brainstorm and do detailed planning work.

While the Lane County Greenbook Initiative has not relied heavily on technical assistance to shape the collaborative goals and activities, the initiative has utilized a variety of technical assistance forms to guide and inform specific, site-defined tasks. In addition to making frequent use of the technical assistance listserv (GBQuest), Lane County has received technical assistance on the following topics:

- Batterer intervention and accountability (requested a national expert for on-site training and consultation);
- Batterer intervention for adolescents (requested research literature on best practices);
- Law enforcement response to children exposed to domestic violence (requested, on behalf of the local chief of police, research literature and best practices);
- Risk assessments and danger/lethality/safety assessment tools (requested research literature and best practices);
- Cross-training (requested “training of trainers” information and case scenarios for training pilot);
- Advocacy for clients in court proceedings (requested critical thinking models and information on training opportunities for attorneys);
- Critical thinking on direction for local project.

Lane County sent representatives from a diverse group of stakeholders to national gatherings and training sessions. While many of these representatives are key stakeholders, a significant number are members of the advisory committee rather than the executive committee, thus broadening the depth of resources and increasing the initiative’s sustainability. These gatherings included:

- National Council of Juvenile Family Court Judges Judicial Institute (1/01; New Mexico; circuit court/juvenile court judge attended)
- Community Engagement Workshop (9/01; San Francisco, CA; co-director, parent advocate, CCR principal investigator attended)

- DVERT Training (2/02; Colorado Springs, CO; co-director, DHS Child Welfare, P&P, Public Safety Coordinating Council representatives attended)
- Safety and Accountability Audit Training (2/02; Colorado Springs, CO; co-director, DHS Child Welfare, the district attorney's office/victim's services program representatives attended)
- Greenbook Policy Advisory Committee Meeting (3/02; Sonoma, CA; DFC representative attended)
- NW Regional Leadership Meeting (4/02; Seattle, WA; co-director attended)
- Domestic Violence Advocate Retreat (4/02; Boston, MA; Womenspace representatives attended)
- Greenbook Project Coordinators' Conference (5/02; Reno, NV; co-directors attended).

Attendance at technical assistance training sessions impacted the Lane County initiative in several ways. In terms of coalition and trust building capacities, these off-site travel opportunities provided time for bonding as well as to informally learn more about their colleagues and their work. On a content level, these intensive training sessions provided sustained, facilitated time to focus on one or more outcomes the site is interested in pursuing. For example, the September 2001 Community Engagement Workshop led to the follow-up request for a community engagement expert to help the Lane County initiative focus on coordinating community-based programming; this idea developed into the Neighbor to Neighbor project. Also, the juvenile court judge's attendance at the Judicial Institute in the winter of 2002 created the impetus to begin planning for a similar training session for Lane County's circuit court judges and other court personnel.

Some of Lane County's "most crucial" capacity-building assistance has come from peers at other Greenbook demonstration sites. Monthly project director and other conference calls; in-person networking opportunities at trainings, including the Project Directors' retreat in Reno, Nevada; and regular emails and telephone calls has added considerable and valuable depth to their capacity building. For example, the Lane County project co-directors have linked their job shadowing component efforts to the Grafton County project director's cross-training activities. The sharing of training committee minutes and plans has allowed for a more concrete focus for Lane County's job shadowing efforts.

6. LOCAL EVALUATION

RMC Research, the local research partner (LRP), is responsible for conducting the local evaluation and acts as liaison to the national evaluation team (NET). RMC Research also provides support for national evaluation activities and provides an empirical perspective to the executive committee. The LRP attends all executive committee and advisory committee meetings.

In addition to the formative evaluation activities (e.g., facilitation of the logic model development), Lane County’s local evaluation design includes process and outcome evaluation components. The process evaluation involves mapping out the current practices of each of the key Greenbook systems and its case flow. The mapping process relies on interviews with key agency personnel, collecting and analyzing policy and procedures documentation, and reviewing a sample of DHS Child Welfare cases. The case review will examine changes due to Lane County Greenbook Initiative activities. Furthermore, in coordination with NET, RMC staff will interview clients of the three systems—domestic violence services, batterer intervention , and child protection—to collect information about their experiences with the systems.

As the Lane County Greenbook Initiative evolved, the local evaluation design evolved to accommodate it. Specifically, it has been determined that the local demonstration project needs to operate on both the local and State level, and that the local evaluation context needs to be “multi-jurisdictional” to document and measure horizontal and vertical change. For example, the impact of the statewide reorganization of DHS must be viewed in both local and statewide contexts.

7. WHERE ARE THEY NOW?

While Lane County has a broad scope of Greenbook activities, many of their projects are being rolled out from the planning stage into the implementation phase on a project-by-project basis. As such, while implementation has begun on some pilot projects (e.g., cross training), other projects have necessarily shifted to a more in-depth planning stage (e.g., DVERT) but currently lack resources to implement. This pattern is expected to continue throughout the funded initiative and is consistent with Lane County’s highly prioritized interest in creating *sustainable* change at the systems level.

Overall, senior-level administrators who comprise the executive committee have a solid sense of trust in each other and their shared agenda, even when their priorities diverge. This foundation has been created by the development, use, and recognition of the value of solid conflict resolution and listening skills. These skills have been developed through the Greenbook collaboration and enhanced by the values and skills developed from prior working relationships.

The executive committee has a strong foundation of respect for one another's skills, knowledge, and commitment. A future challenge will be how this sense of trust and commitment "trickles down" to frontline and less senior staff who may be more territorial and/or insular in their perception of their mandated mission (e.g., to protect children *or* to protect women). Another challenge will be how to address the lack of survivor representation on their advisory and planning boards. Lane County recognizes that there are "lots of survivors working on the project, [but] they're working in their professional capacity" and more input is needed from survivors in their advisory role *as survivors*.

APPENDIX D:
San Francisco, California

APPENDIX D: SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

1. COMMUNITY CONTEXT

1.1 Demographics

The city and county of San Francisco, surrounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west and the San Francisco Bay to the east and north, is the smallest county in California, occupying less than 47 square miles of land. San Francisco is known for its successful port and as a significant hub for commerce and manufacturing. As the financial and cultural center of a metropolitan area that is home to nearly 6 million people, San Francisco's distinctive neighborhoods, districts, and population reflect the rich diversity and high spirit of a thriving and energetic city. San Francisco residents are better educated, have a higher per capita income, and are employed in more professional, managerial, and administrative positions than the average Californian.

However, as is common in most metropolitan areas, San Francisco faces many challenges, including some of the highest rates of AIDS, homelessness, and drug overdose deaths in the country. While poverty data from the 2000 Census will not be available until 2003, data from the 1990 Census indicates that in 1990 12.2 percent of San Franciscans lived below the poverty line, slightly lower than the 12.7 percent average for California. Although children and youth under the age of 18 make up only 14.5 percent of San Francisco residents, this population accounts for fully 60 percent of all residents living in poverty.

San Francisco has been densely developed for some time and its land use patterns are well established. The housing market is very tight, characterized by high rents, low vacancy rates, and high home prices. For example, a mid-priced Bay Area home sold for \$393,000 in February 2001, an 18 percent increase from February 2000, and median new home prices at \$422,500 are the highest in the nation. High housing prices in this major job center have driven low- and moderate-income workers to the outer suburbs in search of affordable housing. In 1990, 46 percent of people working in the City could not afford to live there. Inadequate or unstable housing places families at risk for dissolution, displacement, and increased stress and conflict.

1.2 Unique Site Characteristics

San Francisco is a socio-culturally distinctive community and offers a unique setting for implementing the Greenbook demonstration project. Demographically, San Francisco is one of the most ethnically, racially, culturally, and linguistically diverse populations in the world. In 2000, the population was 31 percent Asian, 14 percent Latino, 8 percent African American, 44 percent white, and 3 percent other (including American Indians, Native Hawaiian, and other

Pacific Islanders). San Francisco ranks fifth among U.S. cities with the highest percentage of foreign-born residents. More than 55 percent of babies born to San Franciscans have foreign-born mothers. While family violence affects all populations, its effects on women of color (people of color make up approximately 60 percent of San Francisco's population) are complicated by race, class and poverty, institutional discrimination, and barriers to accessing social services. For women who are immigrants or refugees, complex changing cultural norms, traditional gender definitions, anti-immigrant sentiment, and language barriers further compound family violence.

San Francisco has a strong domestic violence advocacy community. The domestic violence organizations involved in Greenbook are committed to improving the way systems respond to families with co-occurring domestic violence and child maltreatment and have assumed clear leadership roles in the initiative. In addition, leaders of several batterer intervention programs are equal partners in the Greenbook initiative, adding strong resources to address issues of accountability.

Finally, San Francisco is one of nine Safe Start demonstration sites across the country seeking to coordinate and integrate multiple systems and service delivery networks that come into contact with young children who witness or are victims of violence. Of the six Greenbook demonstration sites, San Francisco is unique in this regard; no other county serves as demonstration site for both the Greenbook and the Safe Start initiatives.

1.3 History of Collaboration

San Francisco has a long history of collaboration, particularly among key stakeholders on the steering committee. At the beginning of the Greenbook project in 2001:

- The Domestic Violence Consortium had established working relationships among 16 member agencies, and linkage between the police, district attorney, adult probation, the criminal court, and batterer intervention programs was improving.
- The unified family court was actively seeking resources to strengthen the response to families experiencing co-occurring domestic violence and child abuse. The unified family court also was working with the criminal court to consider how the two could achieve better communication on behalf of their mutual clients (i.e., batterers going through the criminal justice process and involved in civil actions in family court, for example, custody, visitation, etc.).
- Department of Human Services (DHS) family preservation staff had been meeting informally with domestic violence and batterer treatment programs to learn more about domestic violence and how to intervene with families earlier and more comprehensively. Also, in

spring 2000, DHS sponsored a conference, “Blocking Barriers – Building Bridges,” that convened providers, law enforcement, and the courts to explore links between domestic violence and child maltreatment. Many of the child welfare and domestic violence agencies and groups that continue to be involved in Greenbook activities were involved in planning and implementing the conference.

As mentioned previously, San Francisco also is a Safe Start demonstration site. Many of the key partners in the Greenbook project also are participants in the Safe Start initiative. Both initiatives are presently seeking ways to collaborate in an attempt to maximize resources within the community. For example, the Safe Start project director serves on the Greenbook steering committee while the Greenbook project director attends the Safe Start advisory committee meetings. In addition, Greenbook’s local research partners (LRPs) are working with the Safe Start evaluators in an effort to conduct joint planning related to local evaluation activities. Additional information on the Safe Start Initiative can be found at the National Safe Start Web site at <http://www.ncccev.org/programs/safe-start>.

These collaborative activities have helped to position participants presently involved in this project to respond in a quick and sustained way during the planning process, for both the concept paper and then the formal proposal for Greenbook funding. A core group of about 12-15 representatives from DHS; unified family court; child welfare, domestic violence and batterer intervention programs; and survivors from the community met regularly two to three times a week to plan and write the concept paper and formal application.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE INITIATIVE

2.1 Introduction

San Francisco has committed itself to countywide, cross-system collaboration to address factors precipitating family violence and its impact on children and families. Through previous and existing interagency and community collaborative activities, a coalition of passionate and committed stakeholders have galvanized around the issue of family violence. The Greenbook initiative builds on this commitment through its strong vision, its preliminary planning activities, and the involvement of a wide range of relevant systems and community-based organizations.

2.2 Primary Systems

The Child Welfare System

The Children and Family’s Services (CFS) Division of the Department of Human Services has a total of 524 staff members who collectively work to ensure the welfare of

children. The agency has four different locations throughout the city that serve specific clients based on location (Southeast Offices), age (Teen Services), or need (San Francisco General Hospital Sexual Trauma Unit). CFS handles about 160 cases of substantiated child maltreatment each month, which includes approximately 25 out-of-home placements each month. The agency does not specifically collect information on the number of cases that also involved domestic violence, although staff members estimate that about two-thirds of the cases they see involve co-occurrence. A closed case review of substantiated child welfare cases conducted by the local research partners (LRPs) found approximately 30 percent of the randomly selected cases had documentation of domestic violence. However, this low documented rate, compared to staff estimates, may be because the department does not presently screen for co-occurrence.

The Greenbook Initiative has paved the way for new positions within CFS to address domestic violence, including a domestic violence liaison (an in-kind contribution from CFS) and a domestic violence representative from a community-based organization. Three staff members are currently trained in domestic violence: the liaison, a domestic violence advocate, and a domestic violence certified counselor. Information training on domestic violence also is provided to all CFS staff, but occurs on a voluntary basis. CFS recognizes that its entire staff needs comprehensive training on this issue, however, and plans to make the training mandatory in 2002. There are currently no formal procedures in place to integrate domestic violence and child maltreatment, although a protocol for handling domestic violence cases is currently being developed. Ultimately, CFS would like to develop a comprehensive method of detecting and assessing families with domestic violence through staff training, formal safeguards to protect the non-offending parent, and interface with the courts to ensure batterer accountability.

CFS has recently completed a significant reorganization. The agency previously had six units, each of which performed its three main functions of emergency response, family preservation, and court dependency. The agency now has three units that primarily perform emergency response and family preservation, and three other units dedicated solely to court dependency.

Cases typically enter CFS through a child abuse hotline. The hotline social worker determines, based on the information received during the call, whether there appears to be sufficient evidence of abuse or neglect. If sufficient evidence does not exist, a case is not opened and the family may be referred to voluntary services in the community. If there is sufficient evidence of abuse or neglect, a case is opened and the emergency response (ER) unit completes an investigation (within 2 hours or 10 days, depending on severity and degree of risk). Several outcomes can occur as a result of the investigation:

- The case is closed—The investigation finds no evidence of child maltreatment.

- The child remains at home and his/her parents accept services—The investigation finds no immediate risk or inconclusive evidence to substantiate abuse and ER social worker decides to leave the child at home and offer parents up to 30 days of ER services or up to 6 months of voluntary family maintenance.
- The child is removed from the parents—The investigation determines that the child cannot remain safely at home and immediate steps are taken to remove and place the child in a safe environment, such as a temporary shelter or emergency foster care.

Domestic violence services are included in the case plan when there is a clear indication that domestic violence exists and/or the child is at risk of physical or emotional harm due to domestic violence. CFS caseworkers will then follow up with the referrals to ensure compliance with the case plan. A case is ultimately closed when an investigation reveals that the referral is inconclusive or unsubstantiated, when a dispositional hearing determines that the problems have been resolved, or when all of the case plan goals have been met.

Domestic Violence Service Providers

The domestic violence services providers in San Francisco include shelters and specialized organizations that target specific populations or specific issues facing domestic violence victims. San Francisco has a total of 70 shelter beds for women and children affected by domestic violence and serve up to 600 women and children annually. Approximately 85 percent of women seeking shelter are turned away due to lack of space. The shelters have the capacity to serve women from a wide variety of cultures, ethnicities, and languages. In general, the domestic violence shelters allow clients with children, although some do not allow teenage boys. Most shelters have children's programs and child-dedicated staff members. Some also may have an intensive orientation with new staff regarding the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment.

San Francisco's domestic violence crisis line (WOMAN, Inc.) receives more than 25,000 calls annually. The women who call the hotline are culturally, ethnically, racially, and linguistically diverse including Latina (23%), African American (22%), white (22%), Asian/Pacific Islander (14%), and other/unknown (19%). In fiscal year 2001, services were provided to more than 1,100 women. The following shelters and organizations provide services and support to domestic violence victims:

- Asian Woman's Shelter has a crisis line and provides counseling, advocacy, emergency shelter, and support services for battered women, including specialized services for non-English speaking Asian women and their children. The shelter has 16 beds and can provide services in 24 different languages.

- Asian Perinatal Advocates (APAs) provides a range of services to victims such as support services, home visitation for families, education and outreach programs, and a bilingual counseling program. The group also subcontracts to three other agencies that provide outreach and domestic violence education workshops. APAs are mandated reporters and work very closely with CFS. Although the relationship emphasizes the positive aspects of CFS, APA serves as an intermediary between the family and CFS to obtain appropriate services.
- WOMAN, Inc. provides comprehensive, multilingual services for battered women and their children through a 24-hour crisis line, support groups, employment rights clinic, counseling, and legal assistance. WOMAN Inc. reports having a good working relationship with CFS. All clients who call the crisis line are asked about child maltreatment, and the agency will file child abuse reports on any reported physical abuse. They also will discuss any case with child protective services (CPS) if they have a release from the client.
- Domestic Violence Consortium is a network of 16 domestic violence service agencies, including the Family Violence Prevention Fund, providing emergency shelter, transitional housing, crisis lines, counseling, prevention and education programs, and legal assistance to victims of domestic violence.
- The Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic (CROC) provides restraining orders for the dependency courts. CROC usually works with clients who are referred by other community agencies (e.g., WOMAN, Inc. and Bay Area Legal Aid), police-distributed referral cards, or the court system. Although CROC is not a mandated reporter, it has not had an instance of a mother admitting to abusing her children. The staff does notify its clients of the consequences of including or not including child abuse information on restraining order petitions. If indicated, CROC will provide child-specific referrals to the Child Trauma Project, for example.

There are several additional organizations that provide comprehensive services and support to battered women and their children. Living in a Non-Violence Community (LINC) is an effort in the Western Addition community that seeks to address the needs of children who witness domestic violence by providing awareness and training to medical staff and professionals, instruction to students, clinical interventions, and legal services for children and their families. Both Instituto familiar de la Rasa and Bayview Hunters Point Resource Center provide mental health and supportive services for adults, children, and families. The Child Trauma Research Project, operating at San Francisco General Hospital, provides assessments and has developed interventions and treatment for preschool age children who have witnessed domestic violence. The Child Abuse Council educates the public, policy makers, and legislators

about child abuse; coordinates monthly meetings among child abuse prevention agencies in San Francisco; and works within the public sector to coordinate child abuse response systems in San Francisco. Safe Start Resource Centers provide an integrated system of care for young children in families experiencing domestic violence.

San Francisco also has a number of batterer intervention programs. Approximately 1,200 individuals attend San Francisco's nine certified batterer intervention programs annually. Manalife Violence Prevention Program recruits its program graduates to use an "each-one-teach-one," male role model, peer re-education, and community organizing approach to teach men enrolled in programs offered by the community, in high schools, in the Sheriff's Department, and in the "Resolve to Stop the Violence Project" jail and post-release programs how to stop the cycle of violence. Men Overcoming Violence (MOVE) works to prevent male violence through community organizing and education, school-based programs, early intervention with juvenile perpetrators, and an adult batterer intervention program. POCovi (Programa De Hombres Contra La Violencia Intrafamiliar) offers a Spanish-speaking intervention model for Latino men who have been violent with their partners and want to stop their violence. In addition, there are a number of uncertified, community-based batterer intervention programs such as the Positive Directions Equal Change Program that serve male batterers and women in the Bayview area.

The Courts

San Francisco has a unified family court system, which handles civil domestic violence cases as well as divorce, custody, and dependency cases. Domestic violence protection orders may be handled in the criminal, family, or dependency court, however. Any felony or misdemeanor charge of domestic violence is heard in the criminal court. Decision-makers in the dependency docket include a presiding judge and two commissioners. The court is further staffed by three mediators, a court clerk in each courtroom, a court reporter, and a bailiff. About 20 court staff, including judges, mediators, and attorneys, are trained annually in domestic violence and/or court procedures for handling domestic violence cases.

Child abuse cases typically enter the court system from petitions filed by DHS. The court may make referrals to domestic violence service providers when a parent is at risk. A court-ordered service plan is facilitated by a DHS caseworker who determines the most appropriate referrals and referral method. Cases are closed in the court through either a recommendation of the DHS caseworker, evidentiary hearings, and/or judicial findings. There is currently no follow-up protocol between the court and domestic violence service providers. Follow up with CPS consists of ad hoc meetings for training or procedural problem solving—specific cases are not discussed.

The unified family court has recently initiated on its own several new practices to better serve families dealing with co-occurrence. In late 2001 the family court established a court task force to develop an information flow protocol between itself and the criminal court. The criminal court judge now notifies family court when there is a criminal stay away order that involves children. The family court clerk then checks the names to ensure that litigants appearing in family court do not have a criminal protective order that is in conflict with the orders issued by the family court. Knowing that a parent also is involved with the criminal court enables the family court to better coordinate services and to be more careful when making visitation orders. The new process also encourages the courts to talk to each other about cases and orders they share in common.

Another recent innovation in the family court is the development of a bench card that outlines the procedures and substantive law for family court judges and commissioners pertaining to domestic violence restraining orders. The bench card therefore encourages judicial officers who are handling domestic violence cases to rule in a more consistent manner. Finally, a parent orientation for the restraining order calendar is now required for all parents who appear on the domestic violence docket. The orientation provides information about what judges and commissioners look for when making custody orders in cases involving domestic violence allegations and discusses the effect of conflict and violence on children.

The court also is facing a number of challenges, which it is currently addressing through some of the innovations described above. There is no easy access to information or data between the courts, although the flow of information between the family and criminal court is increasing.

2.3 Governance Structure

The lead entities in the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative are DHS, the unified family court, and domestic violence service providers. Executive directors of domestic violence organizations and batterers intervention programs represent the domestic violence system. The level of participation between key collaborating partners is fairly balanced. The Family and Children's Services Division of the San Francisco Department of Human Services is the administrative lead agency for the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative.

The Greenbook steering committee functions as the governing body of the project. As a result of a Greenbook retreat held in January 2002, the stakeholders reviewed the original composition of the steering committee that was detailed in the grant proposal and identified gaps that needed to be filled. Until then, steering committee meetings had been conducted in an informal manner (led by the co-chairs and a short-term interim project director) and decisions to take action were made by the entire group present at the meetings. At the next meeting in February 2002, the group reaffirmed the original members of the steering committee and added

some new members. The steering committee membership includes: deputy director of DHS (co-chair), unified family court judge/commissioner (co-chair), two executive directors of domestic violence organizations (Domestic Violence Consortium and WOMAN, Inc.), three executive directors of batterer intervention programs (Manalive, POCovi, Positive Directions Equals Change), a representative from the Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic, and four survivors of domestic violence (including both victims and perpetrators). Based on an internal assessment of critical missing players, the steering committee decided to initiate recruiting a juvenile dependency court judge or commissioner, a criminal court judge, and representatives from the police, adult probation, and the city attorney's office, to serve on the committee. In May 2002, at the recommendation of the project director, the steering committee added a domestic violence agency representative to share co-chair responsibilities so that a "leadership" or executive group of the steering committee would represent the three primary Greenbook systems.

Historically, decision-making within the steering committee has been nonhierarchical, however, the lack of defined leadership resulted in a lack of focus and an inability to articulate a common goal. Many committee members expressed frustration with the lack of direction and structure of meetings; meetings tended to be free flowing with an open discussion style that did not always result in specific outcomes or concrete decisions. In addition, while members of the committee reported the level of participation among the collaborative partners to be fairly balanced (i.e., all participants have the opportunity to have their voices heard and valued), some participants are more vocal than others and hierarchy within collaborating structures exerted an influence (e.g., the power of the judiciary over the work of domestic violence advocates). Upon hiring a project director, the decision-making process was re-evaluated to help move the project forward. The project director explored various models of decision-making that would ensure consensus and movement. In addition, a consultant was hired to assist the committee in clearly defining the decision-making body and to identify the next steps.

The steering committee convened two subcommittees: the community advisory council and the systems advisory committee. The community advisory council is composed primarily of interested community residents, including family members who have experience with one or more of the three primary systems. The intent was to mobilize and organize residents to help change attitudes, policies, and procedures related to domestic violence and child maltreatment. The community advisory council began meeting monthly at an off-court site beginning in May 2001. It has been a challenge, however, to recruit diverse members of the public to participate in the community advisory council. Thus far, the community advisory council has primarily provided an opportunity for some survivors with open cases to participate in the Greenbook process and to establish a "fire wall" between people with open cases and the judiciary who can't be on the same committee as an individual with an open or pending case. Meetings of the council were temporarily suspended in late 2001 because members wanted to clarify the goals

and objectives so they were culturally competent and responsive to community needs before beginning outreach activities. A community organizing training was recently held for the Greenbook partners and the steering committee plans to do more public outreach to the community in the near future.

In order to solicit input and obtain buy-in from additional agencies and organizations, the steering committee decided to convene a systems advisory group. This group will bring together organizations and agencies such as the San Francisco Police Department, the school district, the Department of Health, probation, and churches in order to share information about the Greenbook Initiative. Meetings are expected to be held quarterly. Representatives from the steering committee will present updates on the status of the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative, pose questions, encourage dialogue, and request feedback. The formation of the systems advisory group also is expected to encourage further collaboration with agencies and departments that serve overlapping populations.

2.4 Staffing

The Family and Children's Services Division of the San Francisco Department of Human Services provides administrative, fiscal, and contract oversight for the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative. The project is staffed by a project director who is responsible for coordinating and implementing Greenbook activities and a project assistant who handles day-to-day administrative duties. The project director provides support and guidance to the steering committee, assists workgroups with planning, and serves as a liaison to the Federal Greenbook partners and the Department of Human Services (fiscal agent). The initiative is also in the process of hiring a full-time project manager who will work with the project director in supporting all aspects of the Greenbook Initiative.

The San Francisco Greenbook Initiative contracted with a research team from Polaris Research and Development to serve as the local research partner (LRP). The LRP assists the collaborative body with strategic planning and conducting progress assessments and coordinates site-level data collection and analysis for the national evaluation. They also carry out local research activities to help address site-specific issues and answer local evaluation questions.

3. AGENCY MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION

3.1 Getting People to the Table (Mobilization)

Mobilization for the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative began early in the grant writing stage when a core group of key stakeholders from the Department of Human Services (DHS), the unified family court, domestic violence service providers, batterer treatment organizations, and

survivors from the community came together to plan the concept paper and proposal. These stakeholders had a history of collaborating on various issues and had a strong interest in and commitment to addressing the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence. This group was led by the deputy director of DHS who had a strong vision for the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative and a commitment to make the needed changes within his agency. The collaborative work established during the grant writing phase created such a high level of enthusiasm and buy-in that key partners felt committed to continuing their collaborative work regardless of whether the initiative was Federally funded.

3.2 Collaboration and Sustaining Involvement

Collaborative momentum slowed down considerably after the initial planning phase for a number of reasons. The deputy director of DHS left his position soon after the grant proposal was submitted, and his replacement was hired just as the grant was received. While his replacement was engaged in and committed to the Greenbook Initiative, attending to the administrative and political issues inherent in a senior-level agency staff transition did not allow the time to provide the same level of leadership. During this transition, decision-making was somewhat stalled and the members of the Greenbook collaborative primarily focused on information sharing and relationship building.

A lack of key staff to provide project direction and coordination also contributed to delays. Hiring a project director proved to be more difficult than originally anticipated. The first request for qualifications (RFQ) for project director yielded no applications. The hiring process was reopened for a second round with wider distribution of the RFQ (e.g., posted to the entire domestic violence community). The initial lack of response to the RFQ may have been due to DHS hiring protocols, which required completion of a long and difficult application while providing little information about the requirements of the position or the pay scale. In addition, the position was initially advertised as an independent consultant position, and the potential liability issues of this structure may have discouraged potential applicants. An interim project coordinator facilitated the work of the initiative until a project director was hired. During this interim period, the collaborative body was very process oriented. There is no specific system or protocol for decision making, and decisions are made through a consensus-driven process. While this allowed for more community and stakeholder buy-in, it resulted in extensive discussions on specific topics and tended to drag out the decision-making process. In October 2001 a permanent project director was hired. Having served as the project director for Safe Start, the newly hired project director was familiar with many of the key Greenbook partners and had a pool of institutional knowledge about the San Francisco community as well as the dynamics of children's exposure to violence. The project director has actively worked to move the collaborative agenda forward.

San Francisco is known for being very “grass roots” and community-oriented in its approach to social policy and politics. For Greenbook, this means the community is considered a “fourth” system, on equal footing with the courts, child welfare, and domestic violence organizations. From the beginning of the initiative, active involvement and representation from the community was seen as essential to the success of the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative. Inclusion of community members, however, particularly survivors of domestic violence and offenders, has been procedurally complex. Aside from obvious concerns about safety, given the presence of both victims and offenders at the table, there have been concerns about judicial ethics. The California Code of Judicial Ethics requires a judge to disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding if for any reason the judge has personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding or a personal bias or prejudice regarding the party. The collaborative body spent a significant portion of their time together grappling with this issue and the underlying question of inclusion and power. To address this issue, the steering committee formed a community advisory council, which would provide information from the various communities on the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment, and advise and direct the steering committee throughout the policy-making process. Information would be shared between the community advisory council meetings and the steering committee via liaisons. Community members on the community advisory council, however, expressed frustration about feeling cut off from the broader discussion and decision-making process. In addition, the community advisory council meetings had reportedly lacked specific direction and clarity on how to best use the experience and expertise of community members. As a result, the meetings were halted in order to revisit the purpose and function of the council. The project director and the implementation workgroup invited a manager from the Family Violence Prevention Fund to a committee meeting to discuss strategies for conducting successful outreach efforts. It was determined that the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative needed a more focused approach that would be responsive to community needs in addition to meeting project goals. The project director scheduled training on community organizing to help clarify the community’s roles and responsibilities, goals, leadership opportunities, and participation with the project in a culturally competent manner. In addition, town hall meetings will be planned with community members who may or may not have had experiences with the three primary systems. Community members who have had experience with the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment will be invited to attend the meetings. These meetings will identify the communities’ perception of the three primary systems.

Although collaborative partners feel that essential key players across the four systems are engaged in this initiative, they note that a critical missing piece is the absence of a dependency court judge. Difficulty recruiting judges given the degree of time and energy needed for active involvement in a collaborative initiative such as Greenbook was one explanation for the lack of dependency court involvement. Some stakeholders felt there may have been an initial

assumption that the family court judge could adequately represent dependency court. Representatives from mental health organizations, police, probation, the criminal court, health care organizations, faith-based organizations, early childhood educators, prosecutors, district attorneys, schools, and immigration offices also were noted as important missing players. The Greenbook Initiative is presently in the process of soliciting participation of a dependency judge within the unified family court to serve on the steering committee. In addition, there is a plan to get peripheral players to the table as key partners on the steering committee or through participation on the systems advisory committee.

3.3 Network Analysis

Network analysis provides a baseline measure of collaborative networks between organizations involved in the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative. It examines both the type and amount of interaction among Greenbook-involved agencies as well as the importance of these interactions and any barriers to these relationships. The national evaluation team (NET) will use this information to assess changes in collaborative networks relevant to the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative over the course of the project.

The organization list for San Francisco County was determined primarily in coordination with the local research partners (LRPs). The LRPs provided a list of representatives from the organizations *most* active in providing services to victims of domestic violence and/or child maltreatment, particularly organizations that would be targeted by the initiative. LRPs are advised to select individuals based on their level of participation in Greenbook and their ability to provide information on organizational contacts. The resulting list included 12 representatives from 11 organizations. For one of the larger organizations, two individuals were nominated. In this instance, we recognized that one person might not be in a position to answer for the entire organization. Eleven of the 12 individuals selected completed network analysis interviews. These individuals represented 10 of the original 11 organizations selected for participation. These organizations included primary agencies from each of the three systems: Department of Human Services/Children and Family's Services, WOMAN, Inc., and San Francisco Unified Family Court. Additional organizations representing domestic violence issues (Asian Women's Shelter), batterer intervention programs (POCOVI, Manalive), child welfare issues (Asian Perinatal Advocates, Child Abuse Council), and the court system (Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic, San Francisco Criminal Court) were surveyed.

The network analysis found high levels of collaboration between the organizations. Close to 74 percent of the interactions between organizations (of the total possible interactions) occurred during the planning stage. Communication among individual organizations was bi-directional and balanced. In addition, collaboration was fairly decentralized with multiple organizations playing key roles in the collaborative process, implying a balanced distribution of

power among stakeholders. A majority of the interviewed organizations (7 out of 10) were included in the core network, reflecting evidence of interaction among key organizations working in the areas of domestic violence and child maltreatment. However, these organizations tended not to interact with each other outside this content area. In addition, while the level of interaction among the core network was high, the overall frequency of communication was relatively low (on average less than monthly).

The barriers reported by the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative were common to other initiative sites as well as to collaboration in general. The three most common categories were:

- Communication difficulties—No lines of communication between organizations, lack of data sharing, problems accessing information in emergency situations.
- Resource availability—Budget barriers, service cutbacks, lack of bilingual staff and services, lack of training on issues of domestic violence.
- Philosophical—Lack of understanding of the dynamics of domestic violence, organizations not set up to address domestic violence, differing philosophies about how to address co-occurrence issues.

The presence of cultural barriers was a significant issue raised by responding organizations, particularly the lack of bilingual workers/services and the lack of cultural sensitivity in working with families from different ethnic backgrounds.

4. PLANNING AND GOAL SETTING

4.1 Resource and Needs Assessment

While San Francisco did not undertake a formal needs assessment, several collaborative activities provided a basis for assessing community needs and gaps in service system integration and coordination. Through interviews with key staff and a review of administrative data, the local research partners (LRPs) generated service system “maps” for each of the three systems. These maps document the pattern of family responses from the point of entry into each system and the number of people affected at different decision points. In addition, a considerable amount of data on systemic barriers and breakdowns within each system was collected from the Department of Human Services (DHS), the unified family court, domestic violence organizations, and batterer intervention programs.

Closed file review of substantiated child abuse cases from DHS was also conducted to help identify the inherent systemic problems, challenges, and issues facing families involved in the three systems. The intent of the case review was to document the problems faced by families

with co-occurring domestic violence and child abuse and to present these findings to the Greenbook steering committee. The LRPs pulled two samples for review. A random sample of 50 case files closed between January 1, 1999, and February 28, 2002, was pulled in order to get a sense of the prevalence of domestic violence documented in DHS case files. Of the 50 randomly selected cases, a total of 14 (28%) were found to have some reference to domestic violence noted in the case files. A second purposive sample of cases where domestic violence-related services had been paid for by DHS also was reviewed. This sample represented the universe of cases where DHS had paid for domestic violence/batterer intervention-related services in 2001. There were 12 domestic violence-related cases found using this method, but 4 were re-activated during the study period and were removed from the case review.

The San Francisco Greenbook Initiative is currently planning focus groups with survivors and perpetrators. The focus groups will both inform and help make the Greenbook process community sensitive. The participants will be given an opportunity to tell their stories and asked to discuss the needs and concerns of survivors, including resilient factors, barriers to participation, and what they need to feel safe. The focus group also will serve as a baseline measure of client experiences with the three systems and will inform both the local and national evaluation.

4.2 Concept Mapping

The primary goal of the concept mapping exercise was to generate information related to expected outcomes that would assist Greenbook sites in planning and evaluating their initiative. This information should help both in tracking site progress and in developing a comprehensive theory-of-change. Through an initial brainstorming exercise a list of 102 Greenbook outcomes was generated. These outcomes represented prioritized indicators generated by referencing the original Greenbook document, the national evaluation logic model, and input from each of the sites. Collaborative members at each of the sites were then asked to sort these outcomes into clusters based on their perceived similarity. Respondents were also asked to rate each outcome on its relevance to their individual community and earliest expected time to impact. Due to the limited number of respondents from San Francisco (five), findings from this exercise should be interpreted cautiously.

Cross-site analysis of the sorting exercise revealed seven clusters: batterer accountability, service system enhancements, improved practice in the courts/broader community changes, cross-system outcomes, decreased harmful effects of children's exposure to violence, decreased incidence of domestic violence/child maltreatment, and decreased recidivism/repeat offenses. All sites, except for San Francisco, rated system-level outcomes as more relevant than individual-level outcomes. The concepts rated highest in terms of relevance for San Francisco included decreased harm of children's exposure to violence and decreased incident of domestic

violence/child maltreatment. These concepts also were expected to take the longest to achieve. There also were differences between the individual outcomes ranking at the national level and for San Francisco specifically. Exhibit 1 summarized these differences.

It should be noted that the concepts rated as most relevant for San Francisco may be an artifact of the small sample size. In addition, due to delays in getting a project director on board, San Francisco was relatively early in their planning stage compared to the other sites at the time of the concept mapping exercise and were focused on more global Greenbook impacts at the community level. Through ongoing planning, San Francisco has developed a “theory of change” approach (depicted in the logic model) and highlighted expected outcomes at both the system and community level. These outcomes more closely parallel the pattern of relevance of other sites.

4.3 Logic Model and Its Development Process

Based on the original proposal submitted for grant funding and the outcomes identified in their internal functioning survey, the LRPs drafted a logic model for San Francisco using a “theory of change” approach. In this model, increased collaboration among Greenbook partners will lead to increases in knowledge and understanding of domestic violence and child maltreatment and the implementation of screening tools and assessment procedures for addressing issues of co-occurrence. In addition, there should be increased cultural competence around issues of co-occurrence and awareness of over-representation. These combined actions will lead to changes in policies and practices within the three systems as well as to increases in batterer accountability. Ultimately, the three primary systems will better serve families that are experiencing co-occurrence.

The LRPs held separate logic model trainings for the steering committee and the community advisory committee in October and November 2001. In addition, they led a multi-system workgroup to develop project goals and objectives. Three meetings were held in April 2002, and draft goals and objectives were reviewed twice in May and submitted to the steering committee for approval. The San Francisco logic model is shown in Exhibits 2 and 3.

EXHIBIT 1

Outcomes in San Francisco’s Top 20 that were not listed in the national ranking	Outcomes in the national ranking of Top 20 that were not listed by San Francisco
<p>Fewer children exposed to domestic violence.</p> <p>Greater parental understanding of impact of domestic violence on children.</p> <p>Lower incidence of child abuse.</p> <p>Increased level of quality of life for women and children whose partners have been through an appropriate intervention.</p> <p>Decrease the harm children experience as a result of coming in contact with the legal system.</p> <p>Providing more effective and culturally appropriate services to special populations (i.e., racial/ethnic groups, gay and lesbian community, deaf community).</p> <p>More women and children receive the safe housing they need.</p> <p>Increase in number of services in place addressing identified gaps.</p> <p>Decreased number of families requiring court intervention.</p> <p>Decrease in over-representation of people of color in the involuntary systems.</p>	<p>Better information sharing across systems.</p> <p>Judicial system members have increased awareness about domestic violence, child maltreatment, and dynamics of their interaction.</p> <p>Better screening procedures.</p> <p>Better resource sharing among agencies that serve victims of domestic violence/child maltreatment.</p> <p>Courts communicate with each other on domestic violence (DV)/child maltreatment (CM) cases to enhance appropriate, consistent, and safe decision-making in the best interest of every family member.</p> <p>Sustainable system change.</p> <p>Increased education among Greenbook members regarding best practices from families impacted by DV/CM.</p> <p>Enhanced ability of families to determine, access, and receive services (both voluntary and involuntary) and supports appropriate to their needs.</p> <p>Clear protocols applicable to all agencies to serve victims of DV/CM.</p> <p>Increased education among Greenbook members regarding currently available services for families impacted by DV/CM, how to access services, and gaps in services.</p>

EXHIBIT 2

Draft Logic Model San Francisco Greenbook Project





EXHIBIT 3

OUTCOMES (How We Will Define Success)



4.4 Planning Activities

The planning process in San Francisco has evolved slowly due to collaborative partnership issues regarding judicial ethics and the potential impact of the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance Law on their ability to conduct Greenbook business. Staff turnover and a delay in hiring a project director also affected the initiative's ability to plan and decisively move forward. Despite these obstacles, the collaborative has worked hard to improve communication among members, determine initiative goals and objectives, and begin implementation of key system change activities.

The collaborative held a planning retreat in early 2002. The primary purpose of the retreat was to develop strategies for addressing key Greenbook organizational issues such as project goals, roles and responsibilities of partner agencies and organizations, decision-making structure, and communication among key partners. Most of the retreat participants wanted the general committee to move forward towards specific activities rather than continuing to process issues at meetings. Having a permanent project director on board was perceived by some committee members as an ideal time to do this. The retreat was described as a major turning point in the initiative. It helped mobilize collaborative members and build some consensus around the mission of the initiative and broad outcomes for the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative. Out of this retreat, an implementation workgroup was formed to assist the project director in developing an implementation plan. Two trainings held in April 2002 addressed the issues around judicial ethics and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance Law.

5. CAPACITY BUILDING

San Francisco has proactively made use of the training and technical assistance available through the National Technical Assistance team and the Federal partners. Collaborative members have attended numerous Greenbook-related meetings and conferences, including:

- Greenbook National Policy Advisory Committee Meeting (San Francisco, St. Louis)
- International Conference on Children Exposed to Violence (Ontario, Canada)
- All-Sites planning meeting (St. Louis)
- Baltimore Community Organizing Conference
- Judges Toolbox for Greenbook Project
- Domestic Violence Advocate Toolbox Training
- NET/LRP Meeting

- Greenbook All-Sites Conference
- National Judicial Institute
- Colorado Springs Training/DVERT
- Praxis Institutional Safety Audit

As the collaborative process began to stagnate due to the judicial ethics issue, the collaborative actively sought out technical assistance for a judicial ethics training session to assist the site in addressing boundary and liability issues regarding community members with open cases who are participating in the process with judges. While there was some delay in obtaining the technical assistance due to confusion around the nature of the assistance needed, two training sessions were conducted as well as a training session on the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance Law and how it affects collaborative meetings. Partners report these trainings as very useful in helping them address these issues. The collaborative also received assistance with soliciting a facilitator to assist with the retreat and with training in community organizing.

The San Francisco project director has actively sought out information and advice from national experts and project directors from the other Greenbook demonstration sites. This information has provided an opportunity to identify problem areas and to seek the necessary solutions for moving the process forward. For example, by discussing the project management structure among the other Greenbook sites, the San Francisco project director determined it was important to have a project manager to assist with implementing Greenbook work. As a result, the collaborative is presently seeking to hire a full-time project manager.

The project director reports spending a tremendous amount of time responding to the interdisciplinary conflicts that the steering committee members are struggling with. For example, she has facilitated a series of retreats and workshops with the steering committee members to facilitate open communication, increased trust, and a readiness to discuss their professional differences as they relate to the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment.

6. LOCAL EVALUATION

San Francisco was delayed in getting a local research partner (LRP) onboard. The request for qualifications for the LRP was not released until July 2001. In the interim, they contracted with a research team from MK Associates. This interim team primarily served to provide an empirical perspective to collaborative planning and to assist the national evaluation team (NET) in formative data collection at the site. This team was subsequently hired and officially contracted as the LRP for the San Francisco Greenbook in October 2001 through Polaris Research and Development.

Despite the delay in hiring the LRPs, the evaluation activities of this team have been key in moving the initiative forward. The LRPs initially engaged in formative evaluation activities (e.g., logic model development and training) and an informal community needs assessment. The team interviewed key administrative staff within each of the three systems, created a “systems map” documenting the process of service response in each system, and collected available and relevant data. They developed a screening tool and conducted a closed-case review of child welfare cases to gather data on the prevalence and handling of cases where co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence exist. The review also helped identify inter- and intra-systemic barriers and gaps in services.

The LRPs conducted an internal functioning survey to provide collaborative members with interim feedback on the dynamic process of the collaborative and to obtain additional information on mission, vision, goals, and objectives to inform local logic model development. The survey identified key challenges to collaboration experienced by partners, including:

- Frustration with the lack of action and the tendency for the group to revisit the same issues at different meetings.
- Lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities of the project director, steering committee, chairs of steering committee, and subcommittees.
- Some dissatisfaction with the cultural and linguistic competence of Greenbook participants.

The LRPs led the work plan subcommittee in reviewing and updating the original work plan and timeline. This work plan delineated proposed Greenbook activities and expected outcomes and indicators of success. They currently are working in collaboration with the Greenbook partners, community members, and the NET to develop a protocol and methodology for conducting focus groups with survivors and perpetrators.

The LRPs also identified a number of challenges in meeting their role as local evaluators. First, finding a balance between the dual roles of local evaluator and local research partner has been an ongoing challenge for them and members of the steering committee alike. While the traditional view of an evaluator involves a “hands-off,” objective, and neutral position, the role of the LRP in the Greenbook Initiative has been much more engaging and “hands on.” Moving between the two roles and meeting the expectations of each has been difficult. Secondly, the LRPs are expected to assist the NET in data collection for the national evaluation. This also has proved challenging because San Francisco often seems to be an “outlier” when compared to other sites. As a result, what San Francisco is most interested in measuring, other sites are not, and what is being measured using national evaluation tools may not be sensitive enough to assess what is happening in San Francisco. Finally, the LRPs feel their relationship with the NET has

been awkward at times. They report that there have been a number of activities on which the NET and LRPs have attempted to collaborate, but with varying levels of success.

The LRPs will continue to work with collaborative members to ensure that the planning and implementation activities are as empirically sound and measurable as possible. They will also continue to assist the national cross-site evaluation with data collection and site-specific evaluation feedback.

7. WHERE ARE THEY NOW?

Since the collaborative retreats and trainings on the judicial ethics and Sunshine Ordinance issue, collaborative partners feel encouraged to move forward with planning and implementation. The implementation workgroup is currently working with the project director to develop a draft action plan delineating the roles and responsibilities of each committee and workgroup. The Greenbook project director and steering committee also are working to add new members to the committee, including a dependency court judge, a domestic violence criminal court judge, the head of adult probation, a representative from the police department, and the executive director of WOMAN, Inc. In addition, the job announcement for the domestic violence advocate from a community-based organization has been posted and they are reviewing applications as they come in.

Some of the implementation activities planned for the immediate future include finalizing the domestic violence screening protocol by the domestic violence protocol workgroup, identifying trainers to conduct cross-training for the four systems about how each other handles co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment, and conducting focus groups with survivors and batterers. They also are beginning to think through cross-training component and exploring potential training consultants. Finally, additional trainings in community organizing are being scheduled as a precursor to reactivating the community advisory council.

Despite the slow pace and challenges confronted thus far, collaborative members are very dedicated and care deeply about this initiative. Members bring a great deal of experience and expertise in their respective fields, and there is a high level of respect among members. Collaborative partners report a greater understanding of and appreciation for each other's systems and the constraints inherent in each. Continued opportunities for relationship building among partners are necessary. The San Francisco collaborative is at a critical juncture as they begin to seriously confront issues of trust and vulnerability. The degree to which they are able to navigate this difficult terrain and proactively yet respectfully address the fears and anxieties inherent in this type of collaborative work will determine how successful they are in fully implementing their vision for the San Francisco Greenbook Initiative.

APPENDIX E:
Santa Clara County, California

APPENDIX E: SANTA CLARA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

1. COMMUNITY CONTEXT

1.1 Demographics

Santa Clara County is one of the original 27 counties of California. Situated at the southern tip of the San Francisco Bay, it is the largest of the nine Bay Area counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma). It is 1,312 square miles and includes open space, salt marshes, and wetlands near the San Francisco Bay; agricultural lands in the south; and cities and suburbs in the middle and northern parts of the county.

Santa Clara County has the largest population of all Bay Area counties. As of January 2002, Santa Clara County had 1,719,600 residents, including 456,402 children, which places it fifth in population for all California counties. San Jose is by far the largest city in the county with a population of nearly 895,000, followed by the cities of Sunnyvale (population 131,760) and Santa Clara (population 102,361).

Santa Clara County also is one of the most diverse counties in the Nation. Residents of Hispanic descent made up roughly one-fourth of the population in 2000, as did those of Asian/Pacific Islander descent, while Caucasians dropped from 58 percent in 1990 to just under one-half in 2000. Many residents of Santa Clara County (34%) were born in other nations; Santa Clara County has the third largest proportion of immigrants out of all of California's counties, behind only San Francisco and Los Angeles. Nearly one-fourth of Santa Clara County students enter school with English as a second language; Spanish is the most common language (62%) within this group, followed by Vietnamese (14%), Tagalog (3%), and Cantonese (2%).

Santa Clara County is the heart of Silicon Valley, which also encompasses parts of adjoining counties. The companies within this area are the dominant force in the county's economy, with 10 of the 15 major employers in the county being technology developers, manufacturers, suppliers, or services. Labor market conditions in the county historically have been very favorable, with a continuous record of job growth and one of the lowest rates of unemployment in California. Unfortunately, recent declines in the technology sector have impacted Santa Clara County heavily; the unemployment rate reached 7.6 percent in August 2002, the highest point in recent history. The tragic events of September 11, 2001, have only worsened the situation, and much of the economic growth predicted for Santa Clara County by the year 2004 may no longer be applicable.

Economic conditions in Santa Clara County have resulted in unbelievable prosperity for a privileged few with varying degrees of financial success for most residents. One in 20 families and 1 in 10 children lived below the Federal poverty level in 2000. Further, many of the county's working poor do not qualify for public assistance benefits, which are often based on the Federal poverty level of roughly \$17,000 annually for a family of four. One national group, Wider Opportunities for Women, estimates that to meet basic needs without public or private assistance in Santa Clara County, a family of four must earn \$51,788 annually. This estimate is referred to as the Self-Sufficiency Standard. Based on the 2000 Census, at least 1 in 4 families earn less than this amount. At the same time, there has been an enormous increase in the cost of housing associated with the economic boom of the late 1990s. The San Jose metropolitan area is the seventh least affordable place to live in the Nation, with only 21 percent of households able to afford a median-priced home. Rental costs also are high. In 2001, rental costs in San Jose ranged from an average of \$1,052 per month for a studio apartment to \$2,030 per month for a three-bedroom apartment.

Child abuse and domestic violence are problems as well. In 2001, there were 6,625 domestic violence-related calls to police in Santa Clara County. This equates to a rate of 12 per 1,000 women ages 18 to 69 years, compared to 18 per 1,000 for California overall. The cities of Campbell and Gilroy had the highest rates of domestic violence in the county at 662 and 563 calls per 100,000 people, respectively. During fiscal year 2001, there were 22,000 child abuse allegations reported to the Department of Family and Children's Services. Approximately 70 percent of these reports were investigated in-person by a social worker. Despite increases in reports and investigations, cases of abuse referred to juvenile dependency court have declined to 1,730 cases in 2000-2001, representing fewer than 4 cases of abuse per 1,000 children in the population. Further, once a case has been referred for some type of court action, every effort is made to provide voluntary services to prevent a child from being removed from the home. In fact, the number of cases of children remaining in parental custody has increased by approximately 23 percent between 1998/1999 and 2000/2001. However, children of color are over-represented within the juvenile dependency system and are likely to spend more time in the system than white children. In 2000, Santa Clara County had the fifth-highest number of reports of child abuse in California, with a rate of 38 reports per 1,000 children.

1.2 Unique Site Characteristics

Several characteristics of Santa Clara County discussed throughout this report clearly distinguish the community from other Greenbook demonstration sites. These characteristics have served as a catalyst for seeking Greenbook funding and have influenced the ways that Greenbook is able to conduct its business in Santa Clara County.

Santa Clara County is unique because it is one of only a few counties in the entire Nation where law enforcement is empowered to remove children from homes without social worker input. Consequently, children have been removed from homes frequently and placed in the child welfare system when, in fact, a social worker assessment may have found there was no need for removal. The lack of affordable housing has compounded the problem, affecting the number of foster care homes throughout the county. The result has been a child welfare system overwhelmed by high demand and low supply. In addition, Santa Clara County is ethnically diverse and such diversity requires a high level of cultural understanding among service providers. The awareness of cultural differences—especially as they relate to child removal—is a high priority for Santa Clara County and something to which the Greenbook Initiative must carefully attend.

Santa Clara County's unique strengths position it to respond well to these challenges. First, the county has a rich collaborative history, including a 10-year-old domestic violence council that readied the community for Greenbook involvement by establishing critical relationships between community service providers. Moreover, Santa Clara County benefited from the hard work and dedication of a local judge well recognized for his work with each of the three primary systems in protecting domestic violence victims. These factors helped Santa Clara County obtain a grant from the Packard Foundation in the year prior to Greenbook. Thus, before the Greenbook Initiative started, the site enjoyed a year of community-focused attention on the issue of co-occurrence.

1.3 History of Collaboration

The Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative has the support of both the county government as well as the city of San Jose. The court in Santa Clara is organized around a collaborative structure, and collaboration is a general way of life for the county. The domestic violence council, in existence since 1992, has facilitated collaboration among key domestic violence services providers. The Department of Family and Children's Services (DFCS) has worked with the Sheriff's Department on the Collaborative Family Violence Project, a project funded by county and State pilot initiatives that provides a coordinated response to families where co-occurrence is an issue. DFCS has caseworkers onsite at the Sheriff's Office and the Family Violence Center to work on co-occurrence issues. Memorandums of understanding to jointly address child maltreatment and domestic violence were already in place between DFCS, the San Jose Police, and the Santa Clara County Sheriff's Department.

Santa Clara County's cohesive domestic violence council is a tight knit group with a history of working well together. The courts, domestic violence agencies, and the county child welfare agency work closely with one another as active participants on this council. It was

formed over 10 years ago and charged by the County Board of Supervisors with the responsibility of working toward a coordinated community response to domestic violence and developing recommendations regarding administrative and legislative remedies to further that goal. The council has 14 subcommittees dealing with different subject matter and collaborating with different segments of the community. These subcommittees also help coordinate a yearly county-wide domestic violence conference. Additionally, the council has played a large role in Santa Clara County's nationally recognized domestic violence protocols and their Web site, <http://www.growing.com/nonviolent>.

The courts, domestic violence service providers, and DFCS developed other strong collaborative relationships through involvement in the child abuse council, multidisciplinary child abuse team, and violence prevention council. The violence prevention council was formed to help change the culture of violence and increase the community's commitment to violence prevention strategies.

Family group decision making also has played an important role in the history of collaboration in Santa Clara County. The family conference model was instituted in 1996 by the Social Services Agency. It allows child welfare staff and families to work together to ensure the care and safety of children through family plans that focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the families and respond to the child's need for care and protection. Since its inception, the involvement of a broad spectrum of community stakeholders has allowed family conferencing to become more of a community-wide collaborative effort. Participation is growing and involves the courts, mental health and probation departments, the Restorative Justice Project, schools, community organizations, and adult protective services.

Santa Clara County also has been a national model for court-based mediation in juvenile dependency cases. Since 1994, DFCS has had protocols in place for utilizing the family group conference model. Court mediators developed protocols for using mediation when domestic violence was involved. The mediators invited other systems to help create these protocols, most notably the domestic violence advocacy agencies. These protocols were later adapted by California and became the basis of recommendations in the Greenbook.

A domestic violence law enforcement protocol is reviewed and updated each year in Santa Clara County. The protocol is approved by the Police Chief's Association and used by the 15 police jurisdictions within the county. In February 2001, the domestic violence protocol for law enforcement was expanded to include protocols related to the presence of children in the home during a domestic violence incidence. That updated protocol requires responding officers to document the presence and the condition of children in the home at the first response to domestic violence. The revised protocol also includes training of police officers on the effects of domestic violence on children.

The Santa Clara Sheriff's Department responds to approximately 1,000 domestic violence cases annually, while the San Jose Police Department (SJPD), representing the largest jurisdiction in the county, handles approximately 6,000 domestic violence cases per year. Both the Sheriff's office and the SJPD have cooperative relationships with DFCS *and* domestic violence agencies. Both jurisdictions have domestic violence advocates co-located within their offices, and officers report incidences of domestic violence to these advocates directly.

Domestic violence service providers located in southern Santa Clara County have a separate and distinct collaborative working history. For a number of years, members of law enforcement from three jurisdictions, DFCS, and domestic violence agencies have been working together on domestic violence cases. This South County collaborative group was brought into the Greenbook planning efforts early, and they have incorporated strategies into their efforts that address the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment.

In the spring of 1999, an executive committee was formed in Santa Clara with equal membership from the domestic violence advocacy community, DFCS, and the juvenile dependency court. Simultaneously, an implementation team was created with wider representation, including seven or more representatives from each of the three primary systems and one or more representatives from drug and alcohol services, the Department of Mental Health, the Departments of Public Health, the San Jose Police Department, the Santa Clara Sheriff's Department, victim witness services, the County Executive's Office, the family court, the criminal courts, probation, batterer intervention services, the Violence Prevention Initiative, and others. The executive committee then applied for a planning grant from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation. The grant, awarded in fall 1999, enabled the executive committee to hire Kids in Common, a well-known child advocacy organization, to staff the planning grant and to engage Applied Survey Research, a respected evaluation organization, to evaluate the planning process. Funding was used to identify key stakeholders, conduct a stakeholder readiness assessment, and initiate strategic planning.

The Packard grant planning process was energetic and successful. Each of the three primary systems got to know one another through "homework" assignments, which included court watching, drive-alongs, and visits to shelters and batterer groups. Additionally, members from the three systems shared readings and other informational materials to help them better understand each system.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE INITIATIVE

2.1 Introduction

Clearly, Santa Clara County had identified co-occurrence as a priority issue that required a collaborative response, and they were working together specifically on the issue prior to Greenbook funding in a variety of ways. One of the unique features of this site is its familiarity with national trends in working with the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence. Thus, they were perfectly poised to apply for – and receive – Greenbook funding.

It is important to note the reasons why the Santa Clara County service providers were interested in addressing co-occurrence in their community in the first place. Interestingly, a combination of economic factors as well as the increased awareness of and concern for children exposed to domestic violence helped motivate the community to address the issue. As law enforcement received training on how to document the presence of child witnesses in cases of domestic violence and how to respond to their needs, increasing numbers of children were removed from homes. The number of children being referred to the dependency system in the county began to overload the system. Economic factors in the area, specifically the high cost of housing, have compounded the problem in that foster homes are few and far between. Many residents of Santa Clara County cannot afford to house a foster child, even if they wish to do so. Consequently, the three primary systems have an interest in working together to ensure not only that children are safely removed from domestic violence situations, but that they can remain with the non-offending parent whenever possible.

Additionally, Santa Clara's efforts in this arena over the years have been spurred by a local judge, his nationally and internationally recognized expertise in juvenile law, and his innovative work with the three primary systems to protect victims of domestic violence. This judge, in fact, participated in the development of the Greenbook Initiative and maintains a strong connection with the National Greenbook Project through the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

For many reasons, then, responding to the crisis of co-occurrence is a compelling priority for the Santa Clara community. Further, the collaborative infrastructure was in place before the Greenbook Initiative began in Santa Clara County. This was integral to the success of Santa Clara's bid for Greenbook funding, as the grant requires that the three primary systems—DFCS, domestic violence agencies, and the courts—be key players in each site's initiative. The following sections describe the three primary systems as they operated at the time Greenbook was introduced in Santa Clara County.

2.2 Primary Systems

The Child Welfare System

Santa Clara County's DFCS operates within the Social Services Agency and provides child protective services to thousands of children and their families each year. Their comprehensive services include the full range of mandated child welfare services—emergency response, shelter care, dependency investigation, out-of-home placement and supervision, family maintenance, and adoptions. DFCS employs about 900 people, 400 of whom are social workers. They receive approximately 22,000 hotline calls annually and generally supervise about 2,400 children who are in out-of-home placements. The department receives about 2,200 referrals each month.

Several years before the onset of the Greenbook Initiative, DFCS conducted exhaustive planning for its Family Preservation and Support Program. During that time, gaps in services for family violence victims were specifically identified, protocols for dealing with victims were recommended, and the importance of allowing families and communities “to determine for themselves what their needs are and how those needs can best be addressed” was stressed. Because of this planning effort, DFCS established four family resource centers to support children and families who receive child welfare services, including those who have experienced family violence. One center was established to serve primarily Latino populations, one to serve a primarily Asian population, one to serve predominantly African American clients, and one in the geographically distinct South County.

In 1998, DFCS implemented “best practices” to guide child welfare office staff on family violence prevention and intervention. DFCS developed these “best practices” to address the needs of families who have been impacted by domestic violence and have an open child welfare case due to child abuse or neglect. The core of this practice is the child risk assessment as well as a child protection assessment that includes safety planning. The primary approach was to assist the non-offending parent in developing a child/family safety plan and to hold the offender accountable. This guide advocated that caseworkers work closely with battered women's advocates, the criminal justice system, and domestic violence offenders treatment programs in order to protect and ensure the safety of the child and the non-offending parent, ensure the use all available systems, and hold the batterer accountable. The approach toward the non-offending parent can best be demonstrated in the following quote, “Adult victims must understand how the decisions they make may place their child at risk and ultimately affect their possible placement outside the home...Adult victims of family violence should be supported in their efforts to protect themselves and their children. However, the strength of the non-offending parent's ability to protect the child must be demonstrated.”

Child abuse and neglect concerns are presented to DFCS in two ways: 1) an individual initiates a call to the child abuse/neglect call center, or 2) law enforcement places a child into protective custody, pending a child welfare investigation. Whether a child is in protective custody or a child welfare social worker responds to a call alleging child maltreatment, all families are assessed for domestic violence. In instances where domestic violence is identified and abuse/neglect allegations are not substantiated, social work staff provides families with local contact information for domestic violence resources. When a child is in protective custody, DFCS has 48 hours to conduct an initial investigation. If the child remains at risk and cannot safely return home, a petition is filed for court intervention. The initial hearing is held the first judicial day after the petition is filed. After the initial hearing, the jurisdictional/disposition hearing addresses the circumstances that brought the child/family to the attention of DFCS and how best to improve the family's functioning while ensuring child safety. DFCS may file a petition on a child who is not in protective custody. This means that the child is with the parent/legal guardian and while the child safety issues are significant, they are not exigent.

DFCS has confidentiality policies in place when dealing with the court system, but it is still working on facilitating the exchange of information with the domestic violence community. At the agency level, some co-location allows an exchange of information to take place around certain cases. For example, DFCS has a domestic violence unit. The licensed clinical social workers in this unit are identified as domestic violence specialists. These specialists consult on cases involving family violence, make referrals to appropriate DFCS and community agencies for domestic violence services, represent DFCS at domestic violence council meetings, and coordinate the domestic violence response team in collaboration with the Santa Clara County Sheriff's Department. These specialists were in place prior to receipt of Greenbook funding.

Cultural competency has been a priority for DFCS, and the agency supports four resource centers that provide culturally specific services. Therapy groups are offered in several languages. The staff is culturally diverse and speaks about 24 different languages. There also is a social worker devoted to gay and lesbian issues. The National Association of Social Workers recognized DFCS with its Agency Recruitment and Retention Award, noting that the department is able to recruit and retain staff and maintains a culturally diverse professional staff. In 1993, a 5-year strategic plan was published to respond to the cultural needs of the Latino community and to reduce the number of Latino children in out-of-home placement. Later, strategic plans were developed by African American and Asian/Pacific Islander employee organizations to identify ways that DFCS could respond to the needs of those communities.

DFCS's philosophy supports providing more wraparound services in order to help children stay within their homes and communities. DFCS also is moving toward using consultant teams to make decisions for children and families instead of supervisors making all decisions in isolation. Victim witness funds are accessed whenever possible to support victims

of domestic violence within families entering the child welfare system. Victim witness funds are available from Federal and State government funding sources. These funds have traditionally been used to assist victims of domestic violence and victims of other violent and property crimes. DFCS has developed a means to use this funding to assist children who are victims of violence in the home as well.

Domestic Violence Service Providers

There are five different agencies in Santa Clara County that provide domestic violence services, including emergency services, crisis lines, counseling, legal help, shelters, and wraparound services. Having five domestic violence service providers in the county can be both an asset and a challenge. The agencies are able to serve diverse populations throughout the county, but they must work hard to determine how best to implement programs and to share resources. The domestic violence council has helped to coordinate the domestic violence service provider community in Santa Clara County.

The Asian Americans for Community Involvement (AACI) Health Clinic offers a range of linguistically and culturally competent services to battered women and their children, including the Asian Women's Home, which is an emergency shelter for battered women and their children. In 2001, AACI served 30 women and 25 children, for a total of 3,662 bed nights. Community Solutions focuses on women in the South County area and was able to provide 3,774 bed nights to 54 women and 70 children in 2001. Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence primarily serves women in the San Jose area with a full range of services. They offered support to 167 women and 146 children, for a total of 5,081 bed nights in 2001. The Support Network for Battered Women serves women in the North County area, providing counseling, legal services, community education, and emergency-based services such as the crisis line and shelter. In 2001, that agency provided 4,463 total bed nights to 135 women and 160 children. WATCH (Women and Their Children's Housing) provides transitional housing, wraparound services, and basic community services. (See Exhibit 1 for a description of Santa Clara County domestic violence service providers.)

From these statistics, it is clear that domestic violence service providers in Santa Clara County see many children each year. All domestic violence service provider staff are mandated reporters of child maltreatment. Domestic violence agencies generally become involved with child welfare if their client already has an open case or if mandatory reporting becomes an issue. The Support Network for Battered Women does not take mandated clients. Both the Support Network for Battered Women and Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence offer counseling for children. The Support Network for Battered Women trains its staff initially and on an ongoing basis on issues surrounding child abuse and on working with children who have been

exposed to domestic violence. Most domestic violence service providers will only allow male children to join their mother in a shelter if they are 12 years old or younger.

EXHIBIT 1 Santa Clara County Domestic Violence Service Providers		
Service Provider	Target Population	Key Services Provided
Support Network for Battered Women	Battered women and children in the San Jose and North County areas.	Crisis line, shelters, counseling services, legal services, and community education.
Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence	Women and children countywide. Primary geographic coverage in the San Jose and South County areas.	Emergency services, crisis line, shelters. Works closely with hospitals and the San Jose Police Department.
Asian Americans for Community Involvement	Primarily focuses on Asian American women and children. Language competency is high, including Chinese, Cambodian, and Vietnamese.	Shelters and crisis and domestic violence hotlines.
Women and Their Children's Housing (WATCH)	Battered women and their children in Santa Clara Valley.	Housing, transitional housing, and wraparound services.
Community Solutions	South County area and San Benito County.	Emergency services, shelter.

Men who are victims of domestic violence can receive crisis intervention, but are generally referred to community-based organizations for further services. Likewise, most domestic violence service

providers refer gays and lesbians to community-based agencies, except for Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence, which has a counselor who specializes in lesbian battering.

The Courts

A family experiencing domestic violence and child maltreatment may be involved with probate court, juvenile dependency court, family court, criminal court, and/or juvenile delinquency court, all of which fall within the Superior Court of Santa Clara County. The probate court has one judge, the family court has six judges, and the juvenile delinquency court has three. The juvenile dependency court includes one judge and two commissioners. The criminal court has a subdivision, the domestic violence court, in which three judges hear all of the domestic violence cases filed in central Santa Clara County.

The juvenile dependency court handles approximately 3,000 children under its jurisdiction at any given time—1,000 per judicial officer. There are about 900 new filings each year. Each dependency court typically hears 15 cases a day (one case represents one family), and trials are held in the afternoon. Cases are initiated when DFCS files a petition. Law enforcement also is a key player in dependency cases, as they are the agency that receives most of the calls from community members notifying them that a child is in danger. In Santa Clara County, law enforcement makes the great majority of the decisions to remove children from homes. Once involved in the court process, each parent and child is entitled to legal representation. Additionally, there are victim advocates who accompany a few victims to court. More advocates are available in the criminal and family courts, mainly because a victim usually will not have an attorney representing them in those legal matters.

The court system in Santa Clara County does not currently have a formalized system to coordinate cases in which the same family or family members appear simultaneously in different divisions of the court. The highest priority “crossover” cases fall into three categories: 1) cases with criminal domestic violence prosecutions and family court custody matters; 2) cases with criminal domestic violence prosecutions and juvenile dependency proceedings; and 3) custody dispute cases with juvenile delinquency and/or juvenile dependency proceedings. Each of these situations presents unique challenges, including identification of crossover cases, confidentiality, and the logistics of separate court facilities. The superior court has been working on a project that will coordinate cases in which the same family or family members appear in different divisions of the court at the same time. That action plan will be submitted to the California Judicial Council for grant approval in January 2003.

All judges in these courts (and in the entire court system in Santa Clara County) have received training in domestic violence, although the judges in the juvenile, family, and domestic violence court have received more than other judges. Many of the attorneys have received training on the prevalence and dynamics of domestic violence. In fact, monthly trainings provide valuable information to all participants in the dependency court, and the attorneys receive credit for their continuing education requirements. Other monthly meetings on various topics are held to bring together representatives from

all participants in the process—judicial officers, attorneys, social workers, clerks, and service providers. Such meetings facilitate communication and understanding among all of the different actors in the system.

2.3 Governance Structure

DFCS is the fiscal agent for the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative. Other key agencies involved in the Greenbook Initiative include the Support Network for Battered Women, Community Solutions, Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence, and the Juvenile Dependency Court.

The original structure of the initiative consisted of 12 members of the executive committee. Three co-chairs lead the executive committee, one representing each of the three primary systems. Approximately 40 members were involved with the implementation committee with representation from 32 local organizations. The initial Greenbook structure also included the six project committees formed in November 2000 as a result of the Packard planning grant. The project committee names are listed in Exhibit 2

EXHIBIT 2 Santa Clara Greenbook Project Initial Committees	
Project Name	Committee Name
Project One	Development and Training of Domestic Violence Advocates
Project Two	Cross-Training and Building Internal Capacity
Project Three	Cultural Competency
Project Four	Development of Guiding Principles
Project Five	Changing Agency Policy and Worker Practice
Project Six	Parenting Programs Integration

The six initial project committees changed somewhat during the first 18 months as a result of the “Charting the Course” process and due to the changing needs of the Greenbook Initiative. (For further information on the “Charting the Course” process, see Section 4.4, Planning Activities.) In June 2002, the respect culture and community initiative (RCCI) committee was created as an initiative-wide committee to emphasize the importance of cultural competency and community involvement in all of the primary systems of the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative. In addition to RCCI, there remain six project

committees, similar to the original. (See Exhibit 3, Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative Project Committees, for descriptions of the current project committees.)

In May and June of 2002, Santa Clara County Greenbook staff recommended changes to the structure of the oversight committee. The recommendations addressed concerns about the lack of sufficient time during the main oversight committee meeting to address both financial and policy issues, in addition to discussing the work of the six project committees. In June 2002, the structure of the project oversight committee was changed so the committee could focus on project activities while the executive committee focused on financial and process-oriented issues. Decisions made by the executive committee are conveyed at the project oversight meetings, and members of the project oversight committee are welcome to attend executive committee meetings.

2.4 Staffing

The Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative is staffed by members of the same organizations that were hired under the Packard planning grant. Two project staff members from Kids In Common, a child and family focused organization, were hired in April 2001. A full-time project director was hired to oversee the implementation of the project. She works closely with the executive committee and the Federal partners to ensure that project goals are met. Additionally, a full-time project coordinator works closely with the six project committee chairs to ensure that information regarding meetings is shared among committee members and that the committees steadily progress toward their goals. The project director and project coordinator serve as the lynchpin for communications among Greenbook members and report to the executive committee of the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative.

Applied Survey Research (ASR) was hired as the local research partner (LRP) for the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative. Like Kids In Common, ASR worked closely with the community to address co-occurrence during the Packard planning grant, and they have worked consistently with Greenbook during the course of the initiative thus far. The activities of the LRP are discussed in more detail in Section 4, Planning and Goal Setting.

EXHIBIT 3**Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative Project Committees**

Project Committee	Purpose
Project One – Development and Training of Domestic Violence Advocates	The goal of this project is to develop a methodology to create an advocacy system that will include specially trained domestic violence advocates. The project process will include looking at other communities with model programs and identifying what will work in the Santa Clara delivery systems.
Project Two – Cross-Training and Building Internal Capacity	This project is intended to research and develop training for social workers, domestic violence service providers, and court and law enforcement personnel on the dynamic of child abuse and domestic violence; how to screen for both of these; and to understand what resources are available in the community.
Project Three – Batterers Accountability and Services	The goal of this project is to work with existing standards to improve batterer accountability through increased communication with the courts and court personnel; develop and offer after care supports to individuals who have successfully completed a certified 52-week batterers intervention program; and develop an education protocol for service providers that reflects appropriate services and interventions for families that wish to reunify with the batterer.
Project Four – Multidisciplinary Response	This committee is working on a protocol that will guide law enforcement and child protection and domestic violence advocates in working together when domestic violence and child maltreatment are detected. This project also is looking at other multidisciplinary response models throughout the country.
Project Five – Changing Agency Policy and Worker Practice in DFCS	This project is developing policies and procedures to ensure that children and the nonoffending parent are safe throughout all stages of the child welfare and juvenile dependency court system when co-occurrence is present. They are working on policies that will be designed to keep the non-abusive parent and child together whenever possible, to hold the perpetrator accountable, to identify service needs of all family members, and to create clear, detailed visitation guidelines that will focus on safe exchanges and safe environments for visits.
Project Six – The Courts	The Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative and the domestic violence council will collaborate to research an improved coordinated system between juvenile, family, and criminal courts and will research how family court and dependency court can consistently provide supervised visitation to facilitate normalized relationships.

3. AGENCY MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION

3.1 Getting People to the Table (Mobilization)

Key to any successful collaborative venture, of course, is the ability to mobilize key community stakeholders—to bring them together around a common focus. Santa Clara’s mobilization efforts around co-occurring domestic violence and child maltreatment were well under way prior to the receipt of Greenbook funding. From the start, the community enjoyed a strong history of collaboration; service providers were familiar and comfortable with the idea of working together. Many of these service providers have extensive background and expertise in the fields of domestic violence and child maltreatment, share a long-term commitment to both issues, and have developed productive relationships between multiple systems within the Santa Clara community. This speaks to their draw and commitment to the issues, ostensibly motivating community buy-in and mobilization.

Second, this rich collaborative history had already resulted in the receipt of the Packard planning grant. The work that was conducted under the Packard grant essentially provided Santa Clara with a year of collaboration prior to Greenbook in which players came to the table to address the issues of child maltreatment and domestic violence in a planning mode. Members of the future Greenbook executive committee and implementation team used the time and resources provided under this grant to continue to build, enhance, and maintain commitment to efforts to reduce co-occurrence. This allowed the different stakeholders to have the time to learn about their differing perspectives and to build trust as they received formal and informal cross-systems training.

The strength of this collaboration provided Santa Clara County with a foundation of trust that allowed members to come forward and engage in frank discussions of the strengths and weaknesses of the community and its systems. To engage in a discussion of this nature requires that systems have some knowledge of each other, how other systems work, and that the collaborative is solid enough to tolerate both self-criticism and criticism from other members of the collaborative. Santa Clara County had this kind of strong background, which allowed these discussions to take place.

3.2 Collaboration and Sustaining Involvement

With their history of productive collaboration helping to ensure mobilization under the rubric of Greenbook, Santa Clara County was able to engage almost immediately in planning activities such as needs assessment, identifying goals and objectives, and selecting appropriate implementation activities. Sustained interest and effective collaboration, however, necessitate careful tending throughout an initiative such as Greenbook, and require collaborative members to periodically identify missing players, deal with membership turnover, and maintain interest by responding to needs and challenges as they arise.

During the first phase of the initiative, members of the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative identified several missing players who were subsequently invited to join the project. Early on, law enforcement and parole and probation were recruited to join the three primary systems as they worked to address co-occurrence. After nearly a year of Greenbook funding, other groups were also identified as missing, and efforts were made to engage mental health and substance abuse service providers. The Immigration Action Network, a community group that studies the needs of immigrant and ethnic populations, also was mentioned as a desirable partner.

In an effort to reach out to the community and recruit additional groups such as these, members of Greenbook engaged in a great deal of outreach. For example, they held a press conference and sent out select marketing and communication packages. In October 2001, during Domestic Violence Month, members of the collaborative gave many presentations about the Greenbook Initiative to the community. Furthermore, in order to sustain the active involvement of its members, results from process evaluation activities and data from the stakeholder readiness assessment were used effectively to provide feedback to Greenbook project and committee members to help them stay involved and on track.

Like all such initiatives, this one experienced turnover. In mid-2001, the representative from the Sheriff's Department left the initiative after being assigned to a new department. The law enforcement co-chair, a lieutenant of the San Jose Police Department, assumed the vacated role of chair on the executive committee. Early in 2002, there was a change in leadership for the domestic violence component of the initiative. The lead domestic violence service provider was the Support Network for Battered Women. The leader of this agency stepped down and the director of Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence became the new lead representative for the domestic violence community. In January 2002, the chair of project committee one (Development and Training of Domestic Violence Advocates) accepted a new position in another county and resigned her position. Fortunately, the co-chair of this project was poised to accept the position of chair. In February 2002, the new DFCS director was introduced to the committee. The previous director was still in attendance at the meetings when the new director came on board.

3.3 Network Analysis

The first round of network analysis assessed baseline measures of collaboration between key agencies involved in the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative. Network analysis examines both the type and amount of interaction among Greenbook-involved agencies, as well as the importance of these interactions and any barriers to these relationships. The national evaluation team (NET) will use this information to assess changes in the collaborative networks in Santa Clara County over the course of the Greenbook Initiative. The organizations that participated in network analysis in Santa Clara County were selected in coordination with the project director and LRP, who provided a list of partners *most* active in providing services to victims of domestic violence and/or child maltreatment, particularly organizations that would be targeted by the Greenbook Initiative. Individual respondents were ultimately selected based

on their level of participation in Greenbook and their ability to provide information on organizational contacts. Fifteen individuals from 14 selected organizations completed network analysis interviews.¹

Data analysis explored changes in key players and the extent of communication between the Greenbook-involved organizations. In addition to measuring whether there was any contact between agencies, the network analysis interviews gathered data on the frequency of that contact and the importance of the relationship, as well as any barriers to relationships.

As one would expect, the results of the network analysis confirmed that high levels of collaboration existed between the participating organizations in Santa Clara. Close to 86 percent of the interactions between organizations were occurring at the baseline planning stage. The results of the analysis also indicated that the planning process was fairly decentralized in Santa Clara County, and a number of organizations were key to the planning process. In other words, power was not centralized among a few organizations. Overall, there are frequent interactions among participating organizations, and participants highly value collaboration as a means to providing better services to women and children.

Another finding indicates that there is a lot of interaction outside the domestic violence/child maltreatment community. This would be consistent with the fact that Santa Clara has pulled in many different types of organizations to do this work including, for example, law enforcement and probation.

Respondents to the network analysis survey reported that barriers to collaboration were minimal. Additionally, they said that when problems between organizations arose, they were “taken care of ASAP” by diligent organization staff; many issues were either being resolved or were taken care of as they presented themselves. The most frequently mentioned barriers were obstacles common to most collaborative initiatives, such as resource availability, communication difficulties, and philosophical differences.

4. PLANNING AND GOAL SETTING

As a result of the Packard planning grant, the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative often straddled the line between planning and implementation activities. The following sections describe such activities as they occurred during the first 18 months of the initiative.

¹ Agencies and organizations participating in the network analysis survey included: the Sheriff’s Department; Asian Americans for Community Involvement; Child Advocates of San Marin and Santa Clara County; Community Solutions; the District Attorney’s Office; Dependency Legal Services; Department of Family and Children’s Services; Legal Aid Society of Santa Clara County; Santa Clara County Adult Probation Department; Santa Clara County Superior Court; Support Network for Battered Women; Victim Witness Program; Women and Their Children’s Housing (WATCH); and the Mental Health Department.

4.1 Resource and Needs Assessment

Because of their Packard Grant funding and their past work with Applied Survey Research, Santa Clara had a reasonable idea of community strengths and weaknesses in addressing co-occurrence. So like many sites, they did not feel it was necessary to conduct an in-depth assessment of their community needs with respect to co-occurrence. However, it was important to gain a better understanding of stakeholder preparedness to address these community needs. Therefore, ASR designed a stakeholder readiness survey. The purpose of the survey was to provide baseline information related to system specific and cross system recommendations that were identified by the IT as important for the first phases of implementation. The survey was also designed to provide information on the extent to which stakeholders perceived the broader community to be aware of family violence and efforts such as the Greenbook to address it. Surveys were collected from 74 people representing 47 organizations. The response rate was 57 percent. Stakeholders identified four broad issue areas to address in later phases of the project. They are as follows:

- **Participation:** Respondents reported the need for, at minimum, juvenile dependency courts, child welfare, and domestic violence service providers to be involved in the project. However, law enforcement, family court, the District Attorney's Office, health care providers, and substance abuse providers also were cited as necessary participants in the initiative.
- **Education of Participants and Service Providers:** Many respondents indicated that they were not as knowledgeable as they would like to be around issues of the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment. Less than one-half (42%) of respondents were aware of Greenbook, which indicated a need for more education specific to the initiative.
- **System Specific Improvements:** The need to create better tracking systems to monitor batterer intervention was cited by respondents, and many of those surveyed indicated that the juvenile dependency court needed to collaborate more with other family courts.
- **Cross System Improvements:** Only one-half of respondents in each of the three systems believed that the domestic violence service providers and child welfare agencies were able to provide culturally competent services, and fewer (39%) indicated that the courts were able to do so.

Findings from the stakeholder readiness survey were used to help both the executive committee and implementation team identify priority Greenbook recommendations that would be addressed in the implementation phase of the initiative. Six initial projects were then formed that incorporated these priority recommendations.

4.2 Concept Mapping

The concept mapping exercise generated information meant to be helpful to each of the communities for planning and evaluating their initiative. The concept map was developed through a four-step process that started with each site examining the original Greenbook report and logic model and brainstorming to come up with 102 Greenbook outcomes. Local collaborative members were then asked to sort those outcomes into groups based on their perceived similarity. The respondents also rated each of the outcomes on their relevance and earliest impact. The sorting and rating processes at each site were then analyzed at the national level.

Analysis at the national level revealed seven clusters: batterer accountability, service system enhancements, improved practice in the courts/broader community changes, cross-system outcomes, decrease the harmful effects of children's exposure to violence, decreased incidence of domestic violence/child maltreatment, and decrease in recidivism/repeat offenses. There was less agreement among respondents on the relevance of individual-level items, and greater agreement on the cross-system outcomes. Respondents expected most of the anticipated changes to occur between Years 3 and 4 of the initiative.

The clusters identified by Santa Clara as most relevant were very similar to those identified by the six sites overall. Whereas nationally the first four clusters in order of relevance were improved practice in the courts, cross-systems outcomes, service system enhancement, and a decrease in the harm caused by children's exposure to violence, in Santa Clara County improved practices in the courts and broader community change were most relevant, followed by cross-systems outcomes, service system enhancements, and a decrease in the harm caused by children's exposure to violence. The three concepts that were less relevant nationally—a decrease in the incidence of domestic violence and child maltreatment, batterer accountability, and a decrease in repeat offending—also were less relevant in Santa Clara. The earliest time-of-impact cited for the seven concepts were the same in Santa Clara as they were nationally, with the exception of batterer accountability which was ranked third by Santa Clara and only fifth nationally, indicating that the community of Santa Clara felt that achieving changes in batterer accountability would happen in only 3.2 years, versus the 3.35 years estimated nationally.

Thirteen rating surveys were completed by Santa Clara stakeholders (out of 76 total rating surveys submitted by the six sites). There were many differences between the ranking of individual outcomes at the national level and for Santa Clara specifically. (See Exhibit 4)

EXHIBIT 4

Outcomes in Santa Clara’s Top 20 that were not listed in the national ranking	Outcomes in the national ranking of Top 20 indicators that were not listed by Santa Clara
Improved levels of cultural competence among individual staff.	Better information sharing across systems.
Providing more effective and culturally appropriate services to special populations.	Judicial systems members have increased awareness about domestic violence/child maltreatment and dynamics of their interaction.
More children who have witnessed or experienced family violence say they feel supported.	Better resource sharing among agencies that service victims of domestic violence/child maltreatment.
Increase in clients reporting that they feel “people are on my team.”	Courts communicate with each other on domestic violence/child maltreatment cases to enhance appropriate, consistent, and safe decision making in the best interest of every family member.
Increased number of families receiving prevention/early intervention services.	Women and children experience seamless interaction with the three systems.
Increased client perceptions that their court experience have been fair and respectful.	Increased education among Greenbook members regarding best practices for families impacted by domestic violence/child maltreatment.
Law enforcement will be more coordinated with child welfare systems.	Enhanced ability of families to determine, access, and receive services.
Decrease in re-victimization.	More kids and survivors say they are safe.
Increased knowledge about how other systems work.	System deals with whole family, not just victim.

There seems to be slightly more of a focus across the six demonstration sites on improving how the systems work and interact with each other, while Santa Clara focuses more on how women and children experience the systems and whether they feel supported, safe, and respected. This may be because Santa Clara has been working for some time on the coordination and cross training of the different systems, and was ready to focus on the end results (although this is a speculative theory). It would not be surprising if these results had changed somewhat after the completion of the “charting the course” process, which led many stakeholders to reevaluate their goals and focus on more short-term achievable objectives, such as system change and increased education.

4.3 Logic Model and Its Development Process

In April of 2001, Applied Survey Research (ASR) officially became the local research partner (LRP) for Santa Clara County. Prior to that point, ASR had a 4-month reprieve from Greenbook evaluation work after the Packard planning grant funding ended. During this 4-month period, the initial six project committees had been working on many activities. After learning more about these activities, it became clear to ASR that their work, while valuable on many levels, was not aligned with any overarching outcomes agreed upon by project stakeholders. Therefore, ASR decided to develop a logic model with the support and participation of both the executive committee and larger implementation team. Building the logic model would serve two purposes: (1) to identify what would be different in Santa Clara County as a result of the Greenbook in terms of families who are dealing with issues of co-occurrence, and the systems that serve those families; and (2) to ensure that the initial six project committees were the appropriate means to reach those outcomes. The use of the logic model as an effective planning tool was also further validated by the work of the national evaluation team (NET).

The process of working on the logic model in Santa Clara County was dubbed “Charting the Course” and involved three components: identification of outcomes, system mapping, and linking outcomes to projects. These components are described in further detail in the next section of the report. ASR worked intensely with the executive committee and implementation team to help them understand and develop the model over many months, and was pleased that stakeholders supported its use as a consistent planning tool throughout the planning period. (See Exhibit 5, the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative Logic Model.)

4.4 Planning Activities

Identification of System and Client Outcomes

In April 2001, the executive committee and the implementation team were able to identify priority Greenbook recommendations from work done during the Packard planning grant phase. As noted previously, these priorities formed the basis of the initial six project committees. During fall 2001, the challenge was trying to identify the anticipated changes or outcomes that would result from these projects. To address this challenge, ASR, in cooperation with the executive committee and implementation team, began developing the logic model to help identify system- and client-level outcomes that would be important to achieve. After these initial outcomes were identified, they were then reviewed, modified, and prioritized. During the review and prioritization process, the project committee members became more aware of the barriers to achieving some of their identified outcomes and the need to have a more in-depth understanding of the systems themselves.

Exhibit 5: The Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative Logic Model

Resources	Projects	System Outcomes	Client Outcomes – Short Term	Client Outcomes – Long Term
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve fourth system (law enforcement). • Recruit new members to participate in different levels of initiative. • Community organizing. • Cultural competency. • Understand service populations. • Understanding of how systems currently work. • Marketing and communication of Greenbook: Web site, presentations, and collateral. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-Training and Building Internal Capacity • Differential, Multidisciplinary Response • Advocacy • Coordinated Service Planning • Batterer Service-Related • The Courts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each social worker, domestic violence worker, court worker (attorney), and law enforcement personnel will have better understanding of: (1) the dynamics of child abuse and domestic violence, (2) how to screen/assess for domestic violence, and (3) available services. • Differential response according to situation: the ability of responders to be able to call social workers and domestic violence personnel to scene, or confer with them, within 45 minutes, or as appropriate • Every child has an advocate • Coordinated individual service plans are created that respond to clients needs and are manageable • Staff will be able to follow up on client service plans • Every child, victim, and perpetrator receives intervention and/or counseling services • Better batterer accountability through closer collaboration with the courts and other service providers, and use of former abusers as mentors, etc. • Courts, social workers, and other service providers will ensure batterer will be safely reintegrated according to family’s circumstances, culture, etc. • Better coordinated system between juvenile, family and criminal courts. • Domestic violence dependency court consistently provides supervised visitation to facilitate normalized relationships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clients follow through on their service plan. • Batterers follow through on their service plans. • Client experience is not affected by their race, ethnicity, sex, etc. • Clients report satisfaction with how the system worked for them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve family functioning. • Children and families live in violence-free homes.

System Mapping

During the last few months of 2001, ASR conducted key informant interviews with representatives from each of the three systems to determine how cases move through the systems, at which points the systems intersect, and where there were kinks in the systems that could inhibit them from reaching their desired outcomes, particularly where clients were concerned. The results of the system mapping were presented to the members of the executive committee and the project co-chairs to make sure that the systems outcomes were related to the problems identified in the systems. As a final cross check on the outcomes, ASR asked members of the implementation team what they felt the most pressing needs were as far as system changes. Based on feedback from the implementation team, additional outcomes were added to the list, which related to courts, batterers, and victim services. By the end of November a list of outcomes had been finalized, both outcomes appropriate for the systems and those appropriate to clients.

Linking Projects to Outcomes

Once the final list of outcomes were developed, the next stage in the planning process was to look at the linkages between the outcomes and the initial six project committees. During this review process, members of the initiative, working with ASR, discovered that there were outcomes that did not have activities to precipitate them, outcomes that could be tied to multiple projects simultaneously, and outcomes that required the identification and development of new project activities. Ultimately, there were several important modifications that were made to the initial six project committees. The initial project on cross-training was modified to ensure that trainings met the desired outcomes of increasing worker knowledge of co-occurrence, how to screen and assess for co-occurrence, and community resources to whom clients dealing with co-occurrence could be referred. Additionally, the structure of the cultural competency initiative also was modified so its work could influence the work of all other projects and the initiative as a whole. Lastly, because there were several outcomes related to batterers and courts, two new project committees were formed. (See Exhibit 3 for a complete list and descriptions of the modified project committees.)

Despite their history of collaboration and previous planning experiences, Santa Clara found that about a year into their Greenbook planning process, they needed to stop and reassess their previously identified project committee activities. The project realized that there were no overarching goals or outcomes that aligned with project committee activities. The “Charting the Course” process proved to be extremely useful in identifying agreed upon system and client outcomes and then making modifications to the project committees as needed. Because of the trust in the local research partner as well as a strong foundation of collaboration, Santa Clara County viewed these modifications as generally positive. Ultimately, the logic model that

resulted from the “Charting the Course” process provided a tangible map to guide implementation efforts.

5. CAPACITY BUILDING

Santa Clara has made use of the training and technical assistance available through the national technical assistance team and the Federal partners. Greenbook staff and collaborative members have attended many national technical assistance events, such as the community organizing training and the safety audit training. Stakeholders have attended two site visits and plan to incorporate ideas into their initiative that they have learned during those visits. Members also have attended court-based conferences, and the courts in Santa Clara are very involved nationally with the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

Technical assistance has helped Santa Clara be part of a more structured national initiative, and collaborative members indicated that without technical assistance, the initiative would have been more grassroots in its approach. One collaborative member reported, however, that it took approximately 1 year before project committees were cohesive enough to generate specific requests for technical assistance. During that time, she observed that the best technical assistance was provided at the toolbox meetings and during site visits to learn best practices. By the end of the first 18-month period, the needs and capabilities of the initiative had become more clear, and technical assistance became more useful because the site knew what to ask for and experts could come to the site and provide more specific consulting.

One of the unique features of the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative is its familiarity with national trends in working with cases where child maltreatment and domestic violence co-occur, and their needs for technical assistance were advanced. Similarly, their history of working with Applied Survey Research (ASR) meant that they had a solid foundation for their local evaluation activities and a good “interpreter” for national evaluation activities. This put them in a good position to grapple with issues around both the local and national evaluations. The strength of their partnership with ASR also meant that they needed little support in terms of evaluation technical assistance.

6. LOCAL EVALUATION

As mentioned, ASR has worked closely with the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative, continuing the relationship that was established during the Packard planning grant. ASR conducted a stakeholder readiness assessment in the year prior to Greenbook, and later became the official local research partner once the initiative was funded in April 2001. As noted in Section 4.3, Logic Model and Its Development Process, ASR worked diligently with initiative members for over 8 months to develop a logic model and identify system and client outcomes.

In addition to the logic model, ASR also evaluated the effectiveness of one of the trainings provided by the initial cross-training project committee. However, since much of the work of the other five project committees was evolving during the planning period, ASR did not evaluate these activities. Instead, they opted to conduct key informant interviews with the project chairs to elicit their perspectives on their successes, challenges, and lessons learned during the early stages of this work.

Beyond the specific projects, there also was an emphasis on increasing the awareness of the Greenbook Initiative during the planning period. ASR helped to develop select marketing and communication pieces using Greenbook data and project information to recruit new members and reach out to the community.

7. WHERE ARE THEY NOW?

The work of the Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative is an clear example of an overlap in planning and implementation. Although a great deal of cross training has taken place already, the planning process continued through the mid-2002. It is clear that developing outcomes, operationalizing those outcomes, and making sure that the project activities and the outcomes correspond is essential work. It is time consuming, especially given the collaborative nature of the project.

Although it took a long time to get activities in place, most stakeholders felt that the time was needed and was well spent. Cross training, in particular, had developed a lot of momentum by the end of the 18-month period. Training has taken place on various topics, including educating new people on the purpose of Greenbook, training on juvenile court and child welfare services cooperation, and training the courts on cultural issues. A larger, broader training on co-occurrence issues even included agencies and community members from an adjacent county.

System changes have occurred as a result of these cross trainings and other Greenbook activities. For example, the family violence review team is a multidisciplinary team including law enforcement, probation, DFCS social workers, and domestic violence advocates. They conduct a review of the most lethal domestic violence-related cases that occur in San Jose. The team provides follow-up home visits to offer continuing support and services to victims and their children. In addition, domestic violence advocates from Next Door Solutions were hired to provide support on a number of DFCS projects; it is reported that these positions are working out well. A domestic violence addendum was created and included as a part of service plans for DFCS clients involved in dependent intake and continuing units. Finally, DFCS changed its request for quotation process with outside service providers. Now, these providers need to

integrate curricula on domestic violence and its effects on children into their parent education work, and they also must receive basic domestic violence training.

As the work in Santa Clara County Greenbook Initiative continues, the site is paying close attention to several other issues that will be important to follow throughout the remainder of the initiative. Over-representation of families of color in the system has always been an undercurrent in Santa Clara's Greenbook work, but they are only now beginning to address the issue formally. In addition, while there are some concerns about what will happen once Greenbook funding ends, Santa Clara is working to integrate the Greenbook Initiative into the existing structure in the community in order to sustain the changes that take place.

APPENDIX F:
St. Louis County, Missouri

APPENDIX F: ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI

1. COMMUNITY CONTEXT

1.1 Demographics

St. Louis County, with a 2000 population of 1,016,315, is the largest of Missouri's 114 counties. The county is politically and geographically independent from the city of St. Louis, while their cultural histories link them closely. The county includes 92 municipalities, many of which have distinct police, court, and social service operations. Middle- and upper-income neighborhoods are adjacent to poor areas. The African American population is concentrated in the northern section of St. Louis County, directly adjacent to the city of St. Louis, with the largest concentrations in communities, such as Pine Lawn, Hillside, and Wellston. Since 1970, the white population of St. Louis County has declined, while the population of other racial groups (African-Americans, Asians, Pacific Islanders, and American Indians) has continued to grow.

Once a bedroom community for St. Louis City, St. Louis County is now the economic heart of the St. Louis region. The county has a diversified economy, a highly skilled workforce, and a consistently low unemployment rate in recent years (below 2% for most of 2000). The economic diversity of the county has kept the unemployment rate far below the national average. In 2000, approximately 11 percent of the county's children under age 18 lived in poverty, also below the national average.

Geography and demographics, however, tell only a small part of the St. Louis County story. The county abuts the city of St. Louis, and the symbols of the city and the region inform impressions and realities. The 630-foot Gateway Arch on the shores of the Mississippi River, completed in 1965 as a monument to President Jefferson's vision of a continental United States, reminds every visitor of the role St. Louis played in the westward expansion of America. Demographic trends show a region that has offered opportunity to immigrants for hundreds of years. The story of St. Louis County and its region is a story of change and confluence—of rivers, of people, and of ideas.

1.2 Unique Site Characteristics

St. Louis County has shown itself to be an innovative leader in each of the systems involved in the local Greenbook project. St. Louis County's Family Court is among the active national proponents of the "one judge one family" philosophy of dealing with family court cases. The county's domestic violence service providers constitute the broadest consortium of providers

among the sites in the Greenbook Implementation Initiative. The county's public child welfare providers have demonstrated great flexibility in coming to and staying at the project "table" in the face of dramatic funding cuts.

As noted in Section 1.1 above, the county includes 92 municipalities, many of which have distinct police, court, and social service operations. There are 73 police departments within the county, as well as the St. Louis County Police Department that serves unincorporated county areas. The Family Court has a Child Protective Services Department with Deputy Juvenile Officers, who handle child abuse and neglect cases for adjudication and follow-up, so it is possible for a child to have the services of both a public child welfare caseworker and a social worker employed by the Family Court. This complex array of multiple service providers and multiple organizational layers and players is a key attribute of the St. Louis County site.

1.3 History of Collaboration

The partners in this initiative worked together on projects prior to St. Louis County's selection as a Greenbook Initiative site. The following report outlines past collaborations with many of the individuals and organizations involved in the current Greenbook Initiative.

The St. Louis County Domestic and Family Violence Council was created by ordinance in 1996 to increase collaboration among membership organizations so they could more effectively assist victims of domestic violence and their children. Some of the projects it has supported include developing a system that provides 24-hour access for orders of protection for St. Louis County residents and training police and court personnel on the dynamics of domestic violence. Federal funding has supported several initiatives of the council:

- The Violence Against Women Grants Office (now the Office for Violence Against Women) funded the development of a court advocacy project for victims of domestic violence with cases in municipal courts.
- The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention funded an early intervention group therapy program for children exposed to domestic violence that involved the family court, the Victim Service Division, and the Children's Advocacy Center of Greater St. Louis (a nonprofit agency serving victims of sexual abuse).

Projects spearheaded or supported by the Family Court of St. Louis County involving a range of local organizations include a pilot family group conferencing program for dependency cases funded by a local foundation; a Division of Family Services (DFS) and court liaison committee that meets regularly to promote collaboration and best practices; and a mutual

concerns committee involving the court,, DFS, police, prosecutors, schools and mental health professionals.

Domestic violence service providers have a long collaborative history in St. Louis County, and all are members of the St. Louis Metro Region of the Missouri Coalition Against Domestic Violence (MCADV). The statewide MCADV was founded in 1980 as the membership organization for all domestic violence and prevention services in the state and provides leadership for many related projects, including joint training for service providers, the Family Court, and DFS. A statewide 1999 training for all DFS workers, in which the MCADV was an instrumental partner, is frequently cited as a pivotal collaborative event that initiated training, policies, and procedures for DFS to better serve battered women.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE INITIATIVE

2.1 Introduction

The St. Louis County collaborative was created so it could apply for the Greenbook Initiative funds to extend and institutionalize the existing collaborative efforts the county had created (discussed in Section 1.3, above), rather than respond to a local crisis or particular case. Initial goals included:

- Creating an inclusive planning process
- Developing shared and unique protocols that would draw from the strengths and expertise of each participating system and provide guidance to each other
- Developing confidentiality procedures to protect the safety and well-being of victims of both domestic violence and child maltreatment
- Raising community awareness and professional capacity through interdisciplinary skill building and training activities
- Developing information linkages among DFS, Family Court, and domestic violence treatment providers to assess and monitor cases where there is both child maltreatment and domestic violence
- Developing community outreach to broaden the reach of the initiative and collaborating with batterer intervention programs

- Funding a “community liaison advocate” to assist battered women in their struggles toward economic self-sufficiency.

The origins of the grant initiative were pragmatic and strategic, designed to support the interorganizational connections that had been forged in the past and to address issues highlighted in the Greenbook that the community felt would address locally the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence. The goals outlined above are far-reaching. To move forward, the Initiative needed to focus its attention on selected goals.

2.2 Primary Systems

The Child Welfare System

The State of Missouri Department of Social Services Division of Family Services – St. Louis County Children’s Services (DFS) received 5,290 allegations of child abuse/neglect involving 7,662 children in 2001. Each of these allegations met the legal definitions for abuse/neglect and for care, custody, and control through reports made to the statewide hotline. In that same year, there also were 3,522 family assessment incidents involving 5,260 children in St. Louis County. (Reports of child abuse or neglect that do not fall into the category of violation under the State’s criminal abuse and neglect statute may be responded to by conducting a family assessment designed to determine the child’s safety and the family’s need for services.) St. Louis County DFS provided out-of-home placement to 1,461 children and community-based services to 1,943 cases in June 2002.

The St. Louis County Office of DFS contains 150-160 social workers, 7-8 workers per supervisor, and 5 managers. St. Louis County DFS has four area offices that serve an average of 80 hotline investigations each month. The average number of DFS cases involving domestic violence each month was not formally reported as of June 30, 2002, and not captured in the data systems used by DFS. As of June 30, 2002, no domestic violence staff members were placed in any DFS office, but plans were evolving to provide such staff assistance using second year local funding from the Greenbook Initiative.

Major initiatives in the agency in recent years have addressed reforms and improvements in agency case processing. Some of these initiatives include family-centered services: “dual response,” separating the stages of “investigation” and “assessment,” and creating service centers within one building that serve a targeted geographic area. DFS leadership works with area domestic violence providers through participation on the local Greenbook Initiative Steering Committee and Implementation Committee (both described in Section 2.3, Governance Structure, below).

Multiple policies and practices address the sharing of information about child welfare cases with domestic violence programs. To remain consistent with their confidentiality policy, DFS shares information with domestic violence providers according to the same standards and criteria they use with the general public. In general, there are no special policies addressing intake of children exposed to child maltreatment and domestic violence other than treating this exposure as one of several risk factors assessed on an intake checklist. There is an explicit policy statement for statewide DFS (dated December 1998, including a policy memo and several statewide DFS practice manual sections) that addresses the issues of domestic violence in child protection cases and elaborates on the ramifications of exposure to domestic violence in child maltreatment cases, including confidentiality concerns.

Cases involving domestic violence and child maltreatment enter the DFS system as any other case of suspected child maltreatment. The first task for the intake worker is to ascertain whether the case is an “assessment” or an “investigation” case under DFS policy and practice. This determines how intensively the agency will respond to the case. Cases classified as “assessments” constitute 85 percent of these evaluations, are less intrusive than “investigations.” Fifteen percent of cases proceed as “investigation” cases, receiving more intensive agency supervision. These cases can be re-categorized as “assessment” cases at any time.

In cases where both child maltreatment and domestic violence have been identified, follow-up communication between DFS and domestic violence service providers is conducted primarily by phone. DFS honors the privacy of the client receiving domestic violence services. Sometimes DFS workers would prefer more information from the domestic providers, but as of June 30, 2002, few formal opportunities exist for this to occur. Follow-up communication between DFS and the Family Court, on the other hand, is extensive and continual. There is a strong partnership between DFS and the Family Court in tracking and reporting on cases. DFS workers track and report on cases on which the Family Court receives DFS reports and issues case rulings.

Domestic Violence Service Providers

The St. Louis County area domestic violence service providers include 26 nonprofit agencies providing shelter, support, and advocacy for victims of domestic violence and batterer intervention programs. The Kathy J. Weinman Shelter, the primary shelter serving battered women and their children in St. Louis County, served 243 women and 310 children in 2001. During that same time period, the shelter reported that it could not serve an additional 84 women and 170 children due to lack of space. In addition, 421 women and 324 children were not served because they did not meet the shelter’s admission criteria. Interviewed in August 2001, staff

from the Kathy J. Weinman Shelter estimated that 35 percent of children entering their shelter witnessed their mother's abuse.

St. Louis County's six batterer programs belong to the Association of Batterer Intervention Programs, which meets monthly and sets program standards. Representatives of these programs have been informally involved in the local Greenbook Initiative throughout its existence. As of February 2002, batterers intervention programs became official members of the St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative Implementation Committee.

Domestic violence shelters in St. Louis County have staff devoted to working with children of the battered women they serve, regardless of whether these children were abused themselves. As of June 30, 2002, there were a children's services coordinator and two children's advocates at the Kathy J. Weinman Shelter; a children's program coordinator and one children's advocate at St. Martha's Hall; and at least one staff member working with children at Lydia's House, Women's Safe House, Women's Shelter, and Fortress Outreach.

As of June 30, 2002, there was no co-location of DFS and domestic violence shelter or other service provider staff at any St. Louis County area shelters, but efforts to collaborate on cases have been attempted. A past trial program that once operated at the Weinman shelter involved monthly meetings between DFS workers and shelter staff to review cases in which domestic violence was suspected. While this program did not survive, a new partnership began between the county's DFS Seven Hills Office and the Weinman Shelter in spring 2002. County DFS staff developed a hotline call protocol for any Weinman shelter resident who called. Two staff members from the Seven Hills Office have been designated as the county's DFS representatives to conduct interviews with shelter residents. The project illustrates new levels of trust and innovation between the two organizations. The Seven Hills Office usually focuses on assessments rather than investigations (typically conducted by staff from another area office), but representatives of the Seven Hills Office are involved due to the positive relationship between the two organizations. These identified staff members are the only representatives from DFS who know the shelter's location. Shelter staff welcomed an original DFS male staff member to the project and facilitated the transition for a shelter staff member to the initiative by taking her on a visit to the DFS Seven Hills Office.

The majority of St. Louis County area shelters accepting the children of battered women take boys through age 13 and girls through age 18. Decisions to refuse boys age 13 or younger are made depending upon the child's history of violence, mental capacity, and other factors. Decisions to accept boys more than 13 years old have been made in cases when both the mother and son have been subjected to abuse and when the mother feared the abuser would locate the child if placed in a local teen shelter.

The Weinman shelter has written protocols for reporting the abuse and neglect of children whose mothers come for shelter there. Staff reported the shelter makes hotline calls on both the women at the shelters and on the perpetrator or her abuser based on what the women have told the staff once they are at the shelter. During intake on every child, based on what the mother reports and whether shelter. During the intake on every child, based on what the mother reports and whether she has reported abuse or neglect and depending on circumstances and whether they fall within state guidelines, the staff inform the women that they will “hotline” the case, always giving the reasons for the action.

Programming for children at the Weinman Shelter includes twice weekly support groups, divided by age, for children ages 4 and older, covering a range of topics that include support, safety planning, understanding what occurred, and their feelings. Clinical social workers provide individual and family counseling, weekly parenting classes that include women without children, the Parents as Teachers program, and individual educational and health care advocacy. The Weinman Shelter seeks to address the diverse cultural, social, and language needs of the women it serves. It has informational materials on the customs of different cultures and the concerns of lesbians, on different religions and spirituality, and in several languages, including Spanish and Bosnian. It also offers special services for battered deaf women, and keeps a kosher kitchen. Staff is sensitive to the needs of rural women who find their way to the shelter and are alert to residents dividing themselves into groups by race.

There have been rare opportunities for leaders of domestic violence programs to work with DFS management in the development of policy and practice arrangements on mutual issues. One historic example of such collaboration was a 1999 training developed by state MCADV and state DFS workers that attempted to promote policy, procedures, and protocols that were sensitive to the needs of battered women.

St. Louis County shelter providers identified as a local problem the tendency of DFS workers to regard the shelter as a place for safekeeping and that “borderline” cases won’t be acted upon or investigated by DFS. The shelter providers indicated that the only situation in which the shelters do not tell a mother that they are making a hotline call in reference to her is when they believe the mother will leave with her children, putting the children in jeopardy. In such cases, the staff indicated they would make a hotline call and then assist the mother with all procedures and protocols.

If hotline calls originate within the shelter, special efforts are taken by DFS and the Family Court’s Child Protective Services (CPS) caseworkers not to show the perpetrator the case file, which would reveal the source of the hotline call. If a hotline call originates outside the shelter, shelter staff members do not share information on the woman’s whereabouts. In practice, once the DFS or CPS caseworker contacts the shelter and informs shelter staff of an

open child maltreatment case, and the shelter staff can verify the worker calling is from DFS, the shelter staff will talk to the woman about contacting DFS or CPS about the case. Shelter staff will monitor the process of the case, but it is up to the woman to make the call to DFS or to the Family Court .

On rare occasions, the shelter staff will break confidentiality if they believe it is necessary to protect the children. One example is when DFS contacts the shelter and informs staff that the resident mother is the perpetrator of child maltreatment. The staff then verifies the caller's identity, confirms the fact that the woman is a resident, and informs her of the information DFS has relayed. The Weinman Shelter will not share any information without the woman's permission. When they do, staff tells the woman what it intends to release and obtains the resident's explicit permission to release the information using a special release form.

A woman receives services from the Weinman Shelter only after she calls the shelter on its hotline phone number. Shelter staff screens her, ask why she is seeking shelter and what she wants to accomplish while at the shelter, describe the program, and obtain information on the children. The purpose of this screening is to determine whether the shelter is the best place for her. If, during the screening, a woman discloses that her child has been harmed, staff clarify that all information the woman provides is confidential unless there is any information about child abuse or neglect and make a report. If child abuse or neglect is suspected when a woman first contacts the shelter, staff wait until she arrives to act so she is more intimately involved in the process and can receive support before shelter staff make a hotline call. If the battered woman chooses not to come to the shelter and staff suspect that a child has been harmed, staff instruct her that they will make a hotline call and that DFS will contact her.

Referrals to the Family Court and DFS from the shelter are initiated over the phone to inform the mother of the shelter's plans in an attempt to minimize her concerns about any information the shelter staff may have and to encourage her to be an active participant in the process. Once a DFS hotline worker passes a case on to a DFS assessment worker, the hotline worker calls the shelter, the DFS worker talks to the mother, and then the mother must take the action to follow up. Shelter staff will provide supportive services to a mother when she goes to talk with a DFS worker. After that, shelter staff involvement in the case will be limited to communicating with DFS regarding what DFS is requiring of the mother to fulfill her DFS case plan. Shelter staff do not hotline on cases emotional abuse unless extreme, because DFS has told them that they are unable to act on those referrals.

After the intake process at the shelter, a shelter staff member will develop with the mother an individual goal plan (e.g., to obtain housing, to file for financial assistance, etc.) and a family plan with the mother as head of the household. Case plans include services provided by courts or DFS; but shelter staff leave it up to the mother to work with these systems. If shelter

staff know the mother is involved in either system, staff encourage her and explain why working with the system is important, but they won't force her to do so. Staff include working with relevant systems as part of the woman's individual goal plan. Shelter staff make the case to the mother that DFS has lots of services and resources to provide. Follow-up contact and communications between the shelter and the courts do not occur without the mother's consent. If such communication occurs, it is most often by telephone and after the shelter makes a hotline call. A case is "completed" at the Weinman Shelter when a woman reaches the maximum stay, which policy limits to 10 weeks. Once the woman leaves the shelter, the case is considered closed. Weinman staff estimate that 50 percent of their residents want follow-up after they leave. Follow-up occurs only at the woman's request.

The Courts

In 2001, 4,041 full adult orders of protection were sought in St. Louis County, and 1,776 were granted. The family crime unit of the St. Louis County Police Department estimates it made 4,500 domestic violence arrests in the same year.

The initial focus of the St. Louis County and the national Greenbook Project has been on the traditionally-defined "dependency courts," or those courts handling cases of abuse and neglect and other domestic relations concerns such as divorce and custody. Within the Family Court of St. Louis County different issues in families with co-occurring domestic violence and child maltreatment may lead to different types of cases being opened, which may be handled in different court locations. The "one family one judge" rule operates in the Family Court; the judge first assigned to a case will follow up with all the related cases for that family.

One challenge to implementing the "one family one judge" goal is the lack of a common database among all the courts working with families. Child abuse and neglect cases brought by DFS are heard by Family Court judges at the Family Court Center. A child order of protection (restraining order protecting a child) is heard by Family Court judges at a different location a few blocks away from the Family Court Center, commonly referred to as "the Hill." The child order of protection case is bundled under the "one family one judge" rule with a child abuse and neglect case on the same child when a prior existing case is identified at the time of the new case filing despite the lack of a common database.

A case can also begin as an adult order of protection heard by Family Court judges out of the Adult Abuse Office. Divorce and custody cases are handled by Family Court are also heard at the second Family Court "Hill" location. Criminal domestic violence cases with children who are abused, neglected, or at risk are heard by Associate and Circuit Court judges. If a case comes to the attention of the legal staff that represents the Deputy Juvenile Officers in the Family Court, a child maltreatment case can be initiated in the Family Court. All these points of entry for both

child maltreatment and for domestic violence cases in St. Louis County provide many opportunities for identifying and serving cases of maltreatment. There are also a number of places where these cases can be missed. The challenge for St. Louis County is to determine a strategy for identifying and tracking all these cases of co-occurrence from the court perspective.

A victim of domestic violence can file for civil relief in the Adult Abuse Office of the Family Court of St. Louis County if she is the spouse or former spouse of the abuser; being stalked or harassed by any person; has a child in common with the abuser; is/was the current or former live-in girlfriend or boyfriend of the abuser; or related by blood or marriage to the abuser. This adult protection order is either “temporary” (up to 15 days and is available “ex parte,” or without the presence of the alleged abuser) or “full” (lasting 6 months to a year, determined by the judge issuing the order, and requiring the subpoena of the abuser). An adult can also directly file for a civil child protection order in the Adult Abuse Office of the Family Court, regardless of whether a DFS case is open or if child abuse is suspected. These cases can be brought by parents or other interested adults, including official of the court (in this way, providing an avenue for a case to be heard by a family court judge without first being opened as a DFS or public child welfare case). The judge in these cases can order the abuser to stay away, and other things for which there are civil remedies including contempt. A victim of domestic violence can also bring criminal charges in the Circuit Court if criminal laws have been violated. Through June 30, 2002, these different offices and courts have not all been equally involved in the St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative, nor has there been a focus on all the connections among these offices and potential points of entry for cases of co-occurring child maltreatment and domestic violence.

The Family Court of St. Louis County has two judges and three commissioners to hear dependency cases. The Administrative Judge of Family Court has a docket as well as administrative tasks. Family Court judges hear a wide range of cases: guardianship, adoption, termination of parental rights, abuse and neglect (permanency review hearings, protective custody hearings, dispositional hearings adjudication hearings), and delinquency (Family Court judges specializing in juvenile cases). A program initiated in summer 2000 addresses delinquency cases with child protection issues by using specialized Deputy Juvenile Officers (DJOs) who are learning to be experts in both categories. These cases may initially appear as delinquency but upon a closer look demonstrate some evidence that the child was neglected or abused or experienced domestic violence at some point in the past or present. Hearings are led by the Family Court legal staff, who also represent the DJO. Family Court personnel who support the judge include 16 child protective services DJOs, 57 delinquency services DJOs; 10 detention DJOs; 9 community program DJOs; 7 domestic relations DJOs; and 3 volunteer/mentor DJOs. In addition, as of June 30, 2002, there were 9 members of the legal

staff, 75-80 Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) volunteers, 23 Guardians ad Litem, and 9 family and clinical services staff working with the Family Court of St. Louis County.

Victim advocates for victims of domestic violence operate out of the Prosecuting Attorney's office, available only in cases where criminal cases are filed. Domestic violence advocates do not participate in Family Court proceedings and do not appear in most adult abuse cases. St. Louis County has restarted a Municipal Court Domestic Violence Advocate program in which a representative of Victims Services assists the victim in both the civil and criminal domestic violence processes. As of June 30, 2002, these advocates participate only in criminal proceedings. A recently initiated program, run by Legal Advocates for Abused Women, called the Court Order of Protection Assistance program, and funded by the Missouri Office of the State Courts Administrator, provides assistance to women initiating the civil order of protection process.

The Family Court Judge judge has the capacity to request that DFS do an assessment of any case. An ongoing effort by Family Court judges who hear the majority of child order of protection cases is to coordinate with DFS and with the CPS unit of Family Court-based social workers. As noted above, cases of co-occurring child maltreatment and domestic violence may enter the Family Court through the Adult Abuse Office when a woman comes to the Family Court for a child order of protection, and the CPS unit at the family court may not hear of the cases. Child Protective Services at the Family Court now screens cases that come before the court to see if DFS is already involved as the investigating agency in a child protection order or other means.

Juvenile (delinquency) and dependency cases are closed to the general public. Confidentiality issues are additionally complicated in domestic violence cases because one of the parties, the alleged batterer, has legitimate access to court files, which could disclose the location of a woman in shelter from the alleged abuser. Address information for a battered women residing in a shelter needs to be omitted from citations and other records if they are to be part of the public process and accessible to the batterer. If educational neglect and school records are submitted to the judge, all the parties (including the batterer) are entitled to receive this information as evidence. One court employee indicated, "Confidentiality is a real challenge in the courtroom because we're challenged legally with making that information available to the batterer as a party to the case." On the other hand, another St. Louis County participant observed that open hearings illuminate issues, "If there's no light, there's no action." The education of court clerks is essential in implementing any system-wide change. According to one initiative participant, "Everybody who touches the file needs to be aware that their role has an impact" in protecting sensitive information.

There are guidelines for how information is captured in court files and rules about who has access, but there is no certainty that guidelines are being followed. Information about the parties in a dependency case separate from other cases is relatively inaccessible to Family Court judges, but one judge reported that personal relationships could facilitate the flow of this information. According to one judge, Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) requirements for speedier timelines for case permanency in dependency cases dominate in the Family Court and affect the overall timelines in child maltreatment cases where domestic violence is present. Sometimes these timelines can work against working with both adult and child victims.

A typical case in the St. Louis County Family Court enters through the Court's Child Protective Services Department Intake Unit and may or may not be a case in which DFS is involved. Police may also be involved in DFS cases if children are taken into custody. Other cases come to the court through the child order of protection process, in which an interested adult brings the case to the attention of the Family Court directly. In these cases, DFS is typically already involved and the Family Court CPS unit is alerted, even though DFS has not referred the case (e.g., the court may receive a letter from a school or a hospital, and once the case is before the court, the fact that the case is open to DFS is identified). Cases brought by DFS to the Family Court include cases in which shelters encourage a woman to call or cases in which shelters themselves "hotline" when they observe children who have witnessed or have been subjected to abuse or neglect.

Referrals to domestic violence service providers from the Family Court may be made through Family Court CPS in conjunction with DFS to make the referral. DFS is involved as the direct service provider, and it is that agency's responsibility to ensure that a family receives needed services and to report these activities to the Family Court. Sometimes the Family Court will refer a battered woman to a support group or issue a court order mandated that the individual become involved in a support group run by domestic violence service providers. Referrals to DFS from the court are made through the CPS staff. Typically, by the time a case comes to the attention of CPS, a hotline call has already been made to DFS and a case proceeds along parallel tracks. CPS makes a referral to DFS typically when DFS has not been involved in the case and CPS believes that abuse or neglect has occurred.

CPS and the Family Court in general do not track cases that have been referred for domestic violence services. However, if there are court-ordered services to address this issue (e.g., counseling or support group), those court-ordered services are tracked. Follow-up contact between CPS and domestic violence providers occurs on a case-by-case basis, sometimes by telephone, sometimes in writing, and on occasion through case consultations. Follow-up contact between CPS and DFS occurs regularly by telephone, in writing, and through case consultations. Case closure occurs, as in all cases, when adults have met all the requirements of their service

plans, including court-ordered services and it has been assessed that the child can remain safely in his/her home or that the child has a permanent, safe, and stable environment.

2.3 Governance Structure

The St. Louis County Collaboration to Address Domestic Violence and Child Maltreatment is governed by a four-member Steering Committee including two representatives from the Family Court, one representative from the Department of Social Services Division of Family Services, and one representative from the domestic violence service provider community. Since the project's inception, St. Louis County's unified Family Court has been the leading partner in the Initiative. The court has been unified since 1993 with jurisdiction over all domestic relations matters, including divorce, paternity and child support enforcement, adult and child protection orders, all child abuse and neglect matters, and all juvenile delinquency matters including status offenses. The Family Court's two representatives on the Greenbook Steering Committee include the administrative judge and the director of the Court Protective Services Department. The county office of the State-run Division of Family Services that investigates reports of abuse and neglect is a key member of the collaboration. Finally, the Steering Committee includes a representative of the multiple St. Louis County area domestic violence service providers. For the first year of the Initiative, domestic violence service providers were represented by the executive director of the Kathy J. Weinman Center & St. Martha's Hall, two shelters for women in the St. Louis County area. This representative resigned from the Steering Committee in January 2002 and nominated the Executive Director of Legal Advocates for Abused Women (LAAW) to take her place. The Executive Director of LAAW assumed this role on the Steering Committee in February 2002 at the first meeting of the project's Implementation Committee.

The four-member Steering Committee provides guidance to a 20-member Implementation Committee that has been operating since February 2002. All four members of the Steering Committee and the local Initiative Director also participate on the Implementation Committee. Members of the Implementation Committee beyond the Steering Committee members, include representatives from the Missouri Coalition Against Domestic Violence; DFS St. Louis County office; community-based organizations (Family Resource Center and the Children's Advocacy Services of Greater St. Louis); elected domestic violence service provider representatives (Redevelopment Opportunities for Women, Abuse Prevention Program, and the St. Louis County Prosecuting Attorney's Victim Services Division); Judicial Officers (judge and commissioner); Family Court non-judicial representatives (including the Court Administrator, CPS, and DJO); and domestic violence survivors.

2.4 Staffing

St. Louis County had a challenging first 8 months (April 2001 through November 2001) with its local research team and has weathered staffing changes with grace and tenacity. The work of the Initiative is administered and facilitated by project staff and consultants with the input of experience and expertise of the Steering Committee, the Implementation Committee, and the work group members.

The full-time Greenbook project director was hired in April 2001, and the full-time program administrative assistant was hired in July 2001. Both these full-time staff are located at a Family Court satellite office building in Clayton, Missouri (i.e., they are not located at either the Family Court Center or the “Hill” Family Court locations). The project director directs all activities of the project, reports on activities to the Steering and Implementation Committees, and represents the project at local, regional, statewide, and national events. Before becoming the project director, she served as a leader and program director in education, evaluation, and religious services.

The first local research partner (LRP) joined the project informally in early 2001 after assisting in drafting of portions of the original grant proposal. This individual proved not to be a good match with the existing project partners (i.e., the Steering Committee as a whole). She had an extensive background in domestic violence as an academic researcher but little background with the courts or with the public child welfare system. Due to her primary grounding in academic rather than applied programmatic research, she was unfamiliar with the unique skills and approach required by the Initiative. It is possible that her particular background did not prepare her for the challenging and initially amorphous LRP role as both general staff to the local Initiative and translator of the needs of the national evaluation team (NET) and of research in general to the local site. The reporting relationship that this LRP negotiated with the Steering Committee also proved cumbersome and untenable for everyone involved. In addition, it was difficult to execute employment contracts for this position through the County bureaucracy.

The Initiative Steering Committee decided to change the LRP staffing in late November 2001. The consultant facilitator (described in more detail below) met with the Steering Committee during several retreats and at three of its regularly scheduled project meetings from December 2001 through February 2002. While the site worked to re-advertise and interview for the LRP position, the NET site liaison acted as “interim LRP” with the site, traveling twice to St. Louis County to meet with the Steering Committee in January 2002 and with the Implementation Committee in February 2002 (trips were funded by the National Institute of Justice and by the local site). During these visits the liaison collected NET research data related to the “concept mapping” exercise, provided the site with information about the existing NET evaluation design, and worked with the project director to develop event timelines and summary documents about

the evaluation for the project's Steering and Implementation Committees. When the new half-time LRP was hired in March 2002, the reporting relationship was directly to the project director.

As of June 2002, the LRP configuration at the St. Louis County site includes a part-time independent researcher, who serves as lead LRP, and two part-time doctoral student partners. These individuals are employees of the Family Court. The lead LRP reports directly to the project director and the additional LRP staff report to the lead LRP. Since March 2002, this has proved to be a flexible and accommodating arrangement for both the local and NET needs. The current team of LRP researchers is well versed in applied research in the courts, criminal justice agencies, and related organizations and accustomed to translating their findings to an audience of practitioners. In addition, these researchers have shown themselves to be quite flexible in meeting the multiple and competing needs of national and local evaluation activities. The lead LRP has stated that some of the tasks being performed could extend beyond standard definitions of "research" to more project implementation tasks, and this may be an observation that applies to most roles played in this Initiative on the national and local levels. New professional roles are being scripted and played, sometimes for the first time. Perhaps the Greenbook Implementation Initiative can draw from St. Louis County's experience that the role of LRP needs to be adapted to local site needs and team cultures. Sometimes this local research capacity may look like a more traditional "research unit" of an agency, and sometimes local research capacity in another type of site may look more like a staff or team members who happen to have research skills but who are asked also to perform a variety of program tasks.

The project director and the Steering Committee appear in the first project year to appreciate and work well with consultants in assisting with various project tasks. One set of consultants assisted the project director and Steering Committee in planning and holding a July 2001 planning retreat to broaden the Greenbook message beyond the core Greenbook Steering Committee members. Another consultant has played several key roles since November 2001, including meeting facilitation, planning assistance, and assistance with general project strategizing. This consultant assisted the Steering Committee in making the LRP staff change decision in November 2001 and continues to facilitate monthly Implementation Committee meetings and occasional Steering and Implementation Committee retreats. She is welcomed as a familiar partner to members of the Steering and Implementation Committees.

3. AGENCY MOBILIZATION AND COLLABORATION

3.1 Getting People to the Table (Mobilization)

St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative members are collegial and professional, and many have worked together in previous and concurrent collaborative initiatives. The Initiative has provided a key, ongoing, energizing forum for organizations to plan future service provision and

develop new system interventions. Rather than distinct and sometimes distant organizations (e.g., the Family Court or one of the domestic violence shelters) developing its own program and operating alone to serve battered women and their children, the St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative and its various committees now provide a place for these projects to convene and develop together.

The St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative was initiated by the Family Court of St. Louis County as the lead agency with partner agencies listed as the St. Louis County Children Services Division, Missouri Division of Family Services, and “the St. Louis area domestic violence service providers.” At the time of the local grant application, no one had been identified to represent the area domestic violence providers. Soon after, this was accomplished with one designated representative and a designated “backup” representative for some months.

Expanding beyond this initial group of four individuals (or five individuals, if the domestic violence “backup” member is counted) was one challenge of the first project year. Mobilization of broader constituencies to work on the Initiative has proceeded and succeeded through several events, including a community retreat (July 2001) and discipline-specific technical assistance events, such as the toolbox in Boston (April 2002), and the convening of the expanded Implementation Committee (February 2002) and its concrete set of Self-Study tasks (described more fully in Section 4.3 “Resource and Needs Assessment” below). After each of these events, St. Louis County was energized and translated the training experience into action.

3.2 Collaboration and Sustaining Involvement

The Greenbook Steering Committee membership has remained constant throughout the initiative with the exception of one change in the domestic violence community representative in February 2002. Through June 2002, the project focused on expanding community and professional involvement in the Initiative through its Implementation Committee and special purpose workgroups. During that time, no project turnover occurred.

The core players on the Steering and Implementation Committees included representatives of the primary project systems (dependency court, domestic violence service providers and public child welfare agency representatives) and some representation beyond those systems (e.g., staff from other courts and from batterer intervention programs). Buy-in was maintained in the St. Louis County site by regular meetings of both the Steering and Implementation Committees and regular communication from project staff.

3.3 Network Analysis

In fall 2001, during the project's planning phase, the network analysis assessed baseline measures of collaboration between key agencies in St. Louis County. This analysis examined both the type and amount of interaction among the Greenbook-involved agencies, as well as the importance of these interactions and any barriers to these relationships. The NET will use this information to assess changes in collaborative networks relevant to the Greenbook Initiative in St. Louis County.

The list of organizations to interview in St. Louis County was determined in close coordination with the project director and the LRP. Based on information collected during the first site visit in March 2001, the NET compiled a list of 49 individuals from 27 organizations. The NET in conjunction with the project director and the LRP pared the list, resulting in 19 individuals from 16 key organizations. The project director and LRP recommended organizations be contacted based on their relevance to the Greenbook Initiative. When possible, more than one individual from an organization was selected in order to offer varying perspectives from that organization. Individuals were also selected based on their level of participation in Greenbook and their ability to provide information on organizational contacts. Eighteen of the 19 individuals selected completed network analysis interviews¹.

The network analysis found high levels of collaboration among the organizations. Nearly 78 percent of the interactions between organizational pairs surveyed in St. Louis County are occurring at the baseline planning stage. The results of the analysis also indicate that the planning process was fairly decentralized, that certain organizations were key to the planning process, and that power was not centralized among a few organizations. A majority of the interviewed organizations (11 out of 18) were included in the core network, reflecting evidence of interaction among key organizations working in the areas of domestic violence and child maltreatment. During this early planning phase, the overall frequency of communication was moderate (on average monthly).

In general, respondents from St. Louis County reported that barriers to collaboration were "not the norm," and were "routinely overcome." One survey respondent commented that St. Louis County organizations were "too interdependent with other organizations to allow barriers," and that "issues are dealt with," so they "do not become barriers." The most frequently

¹ Completed interviews were obtained from representatives from each of the primary Greenbook systems, including: Missouri Department of Social Services, Division of Family Services (DFS); Family Court of St. Louis County; Kathy J. Weinman Shelter; Legal Advocates for Abused Women; Missouri Coalition Against Domestic Violence; St. Martha's Hall; Women's Support and Community Services; and Fortress Outreach. Additional organizations were surveyed including: AVA, Rape and Violence End Now; CASA of St. Louis County; Legal Services of Eastern Missouri; Washington University School of Law; St. Louis County Prosecuting Attorney's Office; Children's Advocacy Services of Greater St. Louis; and the St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative itself.

mentioned barriers were obstacles common to most initiative sites as well as to collaboration in general: limited staff and program resources; communication difficulties; policy and procedural issues (e.g., confidentiality rules varying among participating agencies); and philosophical differences related to recognizing and intervening in domestic violence cases.

4. AGENCY PLANNING AND GOAL SETTING

4.1 Resource and Needs Assessment

St. Louis County conducted several processes and activities that initiated a needs assessment and identification of priorities during the first project phase including a July 9, 2001 retreat and an informal “tour of the world” assessment conducted by the project director. The primary resource and needs assessment activity, what St. Louis County has called its “self-study,” was a major successful project in the first half of 2002. While not formally completed until July 2002, details of the process are included in this section, as well as in sections 6 and 7 below.

On July 9, 2001, the St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative held a planning retreat to broaden participation in the local Greenbook process beyond the initial core group of individuals involved in the Initiative. The project director described the retreat as “the first time we rolled out the Initiative” to the public. Forty-two attendees representing a broad cross-section of people involved in the courts and domestic violence and child maltreatment arenas were invited to the retreat to learn about the Initiative and to share their ideas on how it could be successfully implemented. The event was planned and conducted by a consortium of consultants, including the individual who became the ongoing project event consultant facilitator.

The St. Louis County Initiative project director conducted interviews of area service providers and system stakeholders during summer and fall 2001 that she labeled her “tour of the world.” The project director observed great strengths in leadership on Steering Committee, strength in the community’s experiences in other collaboratives, an advantage in the excitement (among staff and community participants) that they were on Initiative “ground floor,” and the positive perception that project partners and collaborators were willing to be self-reflective and do mid-course corrections addressing their personal perspectives and their agency policies and procedures. The project director also observed at this early stage that if the St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative could leverage resources, it would help to address the barrier to service coordination and collaboration.

The Greenbook Self-Study was designed to gauge current functioning of partner agencies with regard to policies, procedures, practices, and viewpoints on issues related to the Initiative

change process and to broaden the range of community members involved in the initiative. The focus was on a set of recommendations from *Effective Intervention in Domestic Violence and Child Maltreatment Cases: Guidelines for Policy and Practice* (the “Greenbook”) that directly concerned each of the three systems, and a set of “cross-system” recommendations. The study was conducted from April through June of 2002 and involved three core systems that are participating in the Initiative—the public child welfare agency (DFS), the civil and criminal courts, and the network of community-based domestic violence service providers.

Overall, approximately 90 participants were included in this two-tiered study approach. First, each of the three systems examined the extent to which their organizations’ and agencies’ policies and practices were in compliance with Greenbook recommendations specific to their system. Second, the Implementation Committee, which is comprised of representatives from all systems, provided data in regard to compliance with several “cross-system” issues – those that pertained to one or more of the systems. The three core systems all have a stake in creating policies and practices to more effectively address violence against women and child maltreatment. However, each has a unique mandate in this regard. Each system identified a different set of challenges, unmet needs, and priorities for system change.

Through all these activities between July 2001 and June 2002, the St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative has identified a range of issues, needs, and priorities using several different strategies. The challenge to the site is now to work with all of this information and to refine its program priorities.

4.2 Concept Mapping

The concept mapping exercise generated information that could help each of the communities plan and evaluate its initiative. The concept map was developed through a four-step process that started with each site examining the original Greenbook report and logic model and brainstorming that resulted in 102 Greenbook outcomes.² Local collaborative members were then asked to sort those outcomes into groups based on their perceived similarity (the “sorting” exercise). The respondents also rated each of the outcomes on their relevance and earliest impact (the “rating” exercise). St. Louis County conducted these exercises in January and February 2002 with the assistance of the NET liaison, during “interregnum” between LRPs. The sorting and rating processes were then analyzed at the national level. The analyzed results are intended to provide a conceptual map for the objectives deemed important by each of the sites for the

² It is acknowledged that many of the items sorted and rated in the “concept mapping” exercises that were generated through a range of different brainstorming activities in the six sites also could be described as “measures” or “indicators” rather than “outcomes.” For purposes of the results in this section, all sorted and rated items are referred to as “outcomes.”

NET and to assist the project sites themselves when planning specific actions to achieve their goals and to take corrective actions if necessary.

Analysis of all six project sites' results revealed seven clusters of project outcomes sorted and rated during the concept mapping exercises:

- Batterer accountability
- Service system enhancements
- Improved practice in the courts/broader community changes
- Cross-system outcomes
- Children's decreased exposure to violence
- Decreased incidence of domestic violence/child maltreatment
- Decreased recidivism/repeat offenses.

There was less agreement among respondents on the relevance of individual-level items, and greater agreement on the cross-system outcomes. Respondents across the six sites expected most of the anticipated changes to occur between Years 3 and 4 of the initiative.

There were several differences between the individual outcome rankings at the national level (combing results from all reporting sites) and for St. Louis County specifically. Exhibit 1 compares the concept mapping results of St. Louis County and the cross-site national ranking outcomes.

The concept mapping exercise results summarized in Exhibit 1 suggest that while the national results identified education on the Greenbook goals among the individual initiative members as an important project goal, St. Louis County focused on improved individual-level case outcomes for the victims and for the perpetrators.

EXHIBIT 1	
Outcomes in St. Louis County's Top 20 not listed in the national ranking	Outcomes in the national ranking of Top 20 indicators not listed by St. Louis County
Decreased incidence of repeated domestic abuse.	Increased education among Greenbook members regarding best practices for families impacted by domestic violence/child maltreatment.
Increased number of batterers removed from home.	Enhanced ability of families to determine, access, and receive services (both voluntary and involuntary) and support appropriate to their needs.
Support to battered persons to enable greater independence.	System deals with whole family, not just the victim.
Better access to legal services.	Systems make referrals for involuntary or voluntary services appropriately.
Decreased recidivism by perpetrators.	Increased education among Greenbook members regarding currently available services for families affected by domestic violence/child maltreatment, how to access services, gaps in services.

4.3 Logic Model and Its Development Process

St. Louis County had not developed its own logic model as of June 30, 2002, but the results from the July 2001 planning retreat, the results of the 2002 Self-Study, and models developed from other Greenbook demonstration sites are assisting the St. Louis Greenbook staff in the active process of developing their own.

4.4 Planning Activities

Even though the community retreat in July 2001 functioned as an initial “planning” event, the St. Louis County site discovered it had to focus first on its own mission and personnel issues before long-term goals could be translated into shorter term program development and action. Once the project successfully traversed those stormy waters, with the assistance of the national partners (sometimes only as moral support) and the able and ongoing assistance of the local facilitation consultant (who has been facilitator, cheer leader, and synthesizer), the St. Louis County site was able to transition from program adolescence into early adulthood. And with this new constellation of staff, beginning in late December 2001, the site began in earnest to establish an aggressive and ambitious schedule of assessment and planning tasks.

5. CAPACITY BUILDING

St. Louis County has built ties to technical assistance (TA) providers throughout the course of the local Greenbook Initiative planning phase. During the first phase of TA delivery, the project director had a strong and collegial relationship with the designated St. Louis County TA liaison. The project director actively reached out to all of the national partners (the Federal liaison, the TA liaison, and the NET liaison) at various times during the project's first planning and development phase. And all of these partners made a strong commitment to the site and to each other to assist the project in any way they could. All of these relationships augmented the strong leadership that has developed within the St. Louis County site and built upon a series of productive relationships among salaried staff, consultants, and local participants from all the participating systems.

St. Louis County Greenbook staff and selected key stakeholders attended many national technical assistance events, such as the community organizing training in San Francisco in September 2001 (a key event for St. Louis County in underscoring the need to expand the reach of the local initiative), the domestic violence leadership retreat in Boston in April 2002 (which led directly to a local event using national experts to work with the domestic violence community in St. Louis County), and the safety audit training in Colorado Springs, Colorado, in April 2002, which led to the connections for St. Louis County's fall 2002 Praxis events (described under the final Appendix section, below). In addition, the St. Louis County community representation was strong and diverse at the All Sites Meeting hosted by the St. Louis County Initiative in September 2001 in downtown St. Louis.

6. LOCAL EVALUATION

The LRPs in St. Louis County have been extensively involved in a wide range of activities through June 2002 that have involved event-specific assessments (e.g., participant questionnaires) and conducting needs assessment activities of many types. The LRPs have created evaluation tools for training events (e.g., 2001 and 2002 St. Louis County "Stop Court & Train" events for DFS staff and court personnel that have been held for the past several years). At the 2001 event, a Greenbook workshop was attended by more than 70 individuals and involved local Initiative staff, including the LRP. The theme of the entire 2002 event was "Family Violence—It Touches Us All," at which 12 of 20 workshops discussed domestic violence and child maltreatment. The LRP also attended three child order of protection training sessions held for Family Court staff in April and May 2002, attended by more than 30 individuals, for which the LRP produced survey tools, training reports, and a combined report.

The site's systematic "needs assessment" or "Self-Study" was initiated during the first meeting of the Implementation Committee in February 2002 and involved the current LRP as soon as she was hired in March 2002. Directing and monitoring this task became her primary responsibility for the next several months. The primary LRP and her colleagues collected data through interviews, focus groups, and surveys regarding how the domestic violence, child protection, and dependency systems respond to the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence. Surveyed and interviewed participants assessed project priorities and identified key concerns and challenges for each Initiative system (courts, domestic violence service providers, and DFS).

As a result of an April 2002 training event on accountability audits held by the national TA team in Colorado Springs, Colorado, St. Louis County began planning for a local audit of domestic violence case processing by Praxis in September 2002. In preparation for this event, the LRPs developed "system maps" outlining the manner in which cases flow through the various courts that process cases involving child maltreatment and domestic violence: the dependency court, the adult abuse court, and the criminal court. In June 2002, the site anticipated that the "Praxis Project" for the St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative would focus on the two key issues of accountability of parent abusers: defining accountability and outlining referral and compliance processes.

The St. Louis County local evaluation plan will build upon the findings of the Self-Study, and continue to focus on the issues identified in this process and during the September 2002 Praxis visit.

7. WHERE ARE THEY NOW?

At the end of June 2002, the project had just completed the 2002 Stop Court and Train event that focused on family violence with an important keynote presentation by a national expert and survivor of family violence. This energized and excited community members to address more rigorously the issue of co-occurring child maltreatment and domestic violence. The community Self-Study was in its final stages, and staff drafted reports on the results for an Implementation Committee retreat in late July with extensive involvement with more than 70 community members and professionals. The local domestic violence community looked forward to a National Greenbook Initiative summit meeting in July 2002 addressed primarily to the domestic violence community.

The St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative is moving, strong, and full of tremendous energy. The Initiative is informed by its Self-Study, and strengthened by its core staff, small Steering Committee, and broadly composed Implementation Committee. The Self-Study, completed in July 2002 and reported to the full Implementation Committee on July 24, 2002, is

now forming the foundation of St. Louis County's project priorities and its local evaluation. The Self-Study findings are rich (identifying challenges and strengths in each system), and the community investment through the process appears to have grown, at minimum illustrated by evolution from a Steering Committee of four representatives plus project staff to more than 70 individuals involved in the system Self-Study. Through this process of assimilating and refining themes and issues highlighted in the Self-Study, the project has established programmatic priorities. The themes that emerged may form the basis of new tasks for the existing system-defined work groups or may be the basis for new multidisciplinary team work groups to be formed around the issues of cross training, batterer accountability, and case assessment and screening.

St. Louis County has demonstrated during this project phase great commitment to the Initiative (both nationally and locally), perseverance in the face of challenges, and a willingness to make essential mid-course corrections. The next phase of the local initiative will illustrate even more fully what all the local and national investment can yield in this site.

APPENDIX G:
Network Analysis Overview

The analysis in this report focuses on four questions from the Network Analysis survey—each of these questions refer to relationships with other organizations during the past six months. The questions used to operationalize the network measures are as follows:

1. Any Interaction

Please indicate (with a “yes” or “no” answer) whether or not your organization had contacts with each of these organizations in the course of performing any of its routine functions relating to responding to situations of domestic violence and child maltreatment. The following set of activities might count as contacts: client referrals, information exchange through telephone calls, personal meetings, letters/emails/faxes, technical assistance, use of other organization’s personnel, etc. For this item, the interviewer read a list of all organizations that had been previously identified for the survey. Respondents were also able to add organizations to the list. This item was a dichotomous yes/no measure. No was scored as 0, while yes was scored as 1.

What does this indicator tell us?

- A) **Network Density:** A key question for collaboration is the level of “connectedness” of the system. One such measure is the density of the network. *Density is a measure of the proportion of the actual linkages to the total possible linkages between the organizations in the network.* Network density can range from 0 to 100, with zero percent indicating that none of the organizations are interacting with one another, and 100 percent meaning that every possible pair of organizations is interacting. Therefore, the closer the percentage is to 100, the higher the levels of collaboration between the organizations/agencies that participated in the survey.
- B) **Balance:** “Indegree” and “outdegree” scores assess the connection between individual organizations and other organizations in the network. Any discrepancies between the indegree and outdegree scores can provide insights into the nature and balance of the collaboration.
- C) **Centralization:** Numbers can range from 0 to 100. A number closer to 0 indicates a very decentralized process, while a number closer to 100 indicates a centralized process.

2. Frequency of Communication

How frequently have people in your organization routinely communicated or been in contact with people in each of the following organizations? Please choose from the following options: “1-2 times total,” “about monthly,” “about weekly,” and “about daily.” The scoring was as follows:

0	1	2	3	4
Not at all	1-2 times Total	About Monthly	About Weekly	About Daily

3. Importance of Relationship

For your organization to best serve the needs of families affected by the co-occurrence of child abuse and domestic violence, how important is the relationship between your organization and each of the following organizations? Please rate on a scale of 0 to 4, where 0 is not at all important and 4 is very important. The scoring was as follows:

0	1	2	3	4
Not at all important		Somewhat important		Very important

4. Barriers to Relationships

For each of the following organizations, please describe any barriers to interaction with that organization during the past 6 months. This was a qualitative measure, and respondents were prompted to identify even minor obstacles to collaboration.

APPENDIX H

**List of major group events planned, provided, and hosted by the Greenbook
Technical Assistance Team (January 2001 – June 2002)**

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE LIST OF ACTIVITIES

March 23-24, 2001	Greenbook Policy Advisory Committee Meeting	San Francisco, CA
April 4-6, 2001	All-Sites Orientation Meeting	Washington, DC
July 6, 2001	All-Sites Pre-Planning Meeting	St. Louis, MO
July 13, 2001	Judges Toolbox Meeting	Monterey, CA
July 21-22, 2001	APHSA's Domestic Violence Working Group	Washington, DC
August 8-10, 2001	Southeast Regional Leadership Forum	Atlanta, GA
September 6-7, 2001	Community Organizing Meeting	San Francisco, CA
September 28, 2001	Greenbook Policy Advisory Committee Overrepresentation Subcommittee Meeting	Minneapolis, MN
October 17-19, 2001	All-Sites Conference	St. Louis, MO
October 19-20, 2001	Greenbook Policy Advisory Committee Meeting	St. Louis, MO
November 4-7, 2001	Greenbook Judicial Institute	San Antonio, TX
January 30-31, 2002	Southwest Regional Forum	Albuquerque, NM
February 25-26, 2002	Institutional Safety Audit Meeting	Colorado Springs, CO
March 8-9, 2002	Greenbook Policy Advisory Committee Meeting	Sonoma, CA
April 11-12, 2002	Northwest Regional Forum	Seattle, WA
April 28-30, 2002	Domestic Violence Leadership Retreat	Boston, MA
May 6-7, 2002	Project Coordinators Meeting	Reno, NV