

**IMPLEMENTATION ASSESSMENT REPORT
ON THE
ST. LOUIS COUNTY GREENBOOK INITIATIVE:
A COLLABORATION TO
ADDRESS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
AND CHILD MALTREATMENT**

*Prepared by:
Jeanie Thies, Ph.D.
Janice Hill, M.A., A.B.D.
Rose Bernardez, R.N., M.S.W.*

Submitted April 4, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: LESSONS LEARNED	3	
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION		
A. Federal Demonstration Project.....	8	
B. Relationship with the National Demonstration Project.....	9	
C. Overview of Research Design	10	
D. Definitions	11	
CHAPTER II: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXTUAL FACTORS		12
A. Project Background.....	12	
B. Description of the Study Site.....	12	
1. <i>Overview of St. Louis County</i>	12	
2. <i>Three Partner Systems</i>	12	
C. Preexisting Conditions	14	
CHAPTER III: PROGRAM THEORY		17
A. Project Objectives	17	
B. Logic Model	18	
CHAPTER IV: METHODOLOGY		20
A. Role of the National Evaluation Team.....	20	
B. Process Evaluation Research Questions.....	21	
C. Focus of Evaluation	21	
D. Study Limitations.....	22	
E. Research Design and Data Collection Methods	23	
1. <i>Structured Interview Protocols</i>	23	
2. <i>Direct Observation</i>	24	
3. <i>Document Review</i>	24	
4. <i>Client Interviews and Focus Groups</i>	24	
5. <i>Case Abstraction</i>	25	
6. <i>Focus Group with Deputy Juvenile Officers</i>	26	
7. <i>Feedback Protocols</i>	26	
8. <i>Surveys</i>	26	
9. <i>Logs</i>	27	
CHAPTER V: DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INITIATIVE		28
A. Staff.....	28	
B. Governance Structure.....	28	
1. <i>Steering Committee</i>	28	
2. <i>Implementation Committee</i>	30	
C. Conflict, Transition, and Resolution	31	

D.	Inputs.....	34
	1. <i>Planning Phase Inputs</i>	34
	2. <i>Off-Site Toolboxes, Conferences, and Site Visits</i>	37
	3. <i>Retreats</i>	39
E.	Strategies and Activities.....	40
	1. <i>Multidisciplinary Action Teams</i>	40
	2. <i>Training Activities</i>	41
	3. <i>Specialized Positions</i>	43
	4. <i>Domestic Violence Assessment Protocol (DVAP)</i>	47
	5. <i>Batterer Compliance Project Coordinator (BCPC)</i>	48
	6. <i>Multidisciplinary Consultation Case (MCC) Review Process</i>	49
	7. <i>DSS-CD Manual for Domestic Violence Advocates</i>	51
	8. <i>Child Order of Protection Protocol (COPP)</i>	52
	9. <i>Domestic Violence/Child Maltreatment Resource Directory</i>	52
	10. <i>Child Maltreatment Guidelines</i>	53
	11. <i>Other Activities</i>	54
 CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION		 56
A.	Progress Toward Goals	56
B.	Next Steps.....	59
 REFERENCES		 60
 ENDNOTES		 61
 APPENDICES		
Appendix A: Logic Model		
Appendix B: Self Study Executive Summary		
Appendix C: Appendix D: Ad Hoc Report on the Specialist Positions		
Appendix D: Multidisciplinary Case Consultation Pilot Project Report		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: LESSONS LEARNED

From 1998-99, The National Council of Juvenile & Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) convened an Advisory Committee and produced a set of recommendations for policies and practices related to the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence entitled, *Effective Intervention in Domestic Violence and Child Maltreatment Cases: Guidelines for Policy and Practice* (Schechter & Edleson, 1999). Now commonly known as the “Greenbook,” due to its green cover, the recommendations provide a framework for communities to develop interventions and measure progress as they seek to improve their responses to families experiencing domestic violence and child maltreatment. Shortly after the publication of the Greenbook, funding was secured from the U.S. Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services for the federal Greenbook Initiative for a period of three years. Proposals were solicited nationwide from communities hoping to bring about system changes as outlined in the Greenbook. Of the 90 community groups that submitted proposals, six demonstration sites were chosen for the Initiative: St. Louis County, Missouri; El Paso County, Colorado; Grafton County, New Hampshire; Lane County, Oregon; San Francisco, California; and Santa Clara County, California.

In 2001, the Family Court of St. Louis County, Missouri, received grant funding to implement the St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative to Address Domestic Violence & Child Maltreatment, a collaborative effort of the Family Court of St. Louis County, Office of Missouri Department of Social Services Children’s Division (DSS-CD),¹ and St. Louis area domestic violence service providers. In keeping with the practice of the program planners, the St. Louis County collaborative project will hereafter be referred to as “the Initiative.”

The Implementation Assessment Reports addresses activities from the beginning of the project in January 2001 through June 30, 2005. In the Executive Summary, we briefly summarize several key lessons that have emerged during the evaluation. These findings are derived from a variety of data sources that have been available thus far, described in more detail in the report. However, as discussed in Chapter IV, we have faced some limitations on data availability. During the final year of the Initiative, we anticipate opportunities to close some gaps in the data, as well as engage in other data collection activities that were intentionally delayed until the project’s final year.

As a result of evaluation activities to date, some key lessons have emerged. We summarize these below, and offer recommendations that build on the lessons learned.

- (a) ***Participants must understand the complexity of a community-based collaboration and channels of accountability, and be prepared for delays, setbacks and other adjustments to plans. Decision-making structures need to be flexible so as to facilitate the work of the project.***

Collaborations and federally funded initiatives require layers of approval before some activities can be implemented. This is inherent in large-scale collaborations and in many grant-funded projects, and is intended to ensure multi-system involvement in the work of the Initiative, quality control, and compliance with both local and federal expectations. However, the long

waiting periods between completion of draft products and final approval can be frustrating, and can result in loss of focus and diminished momentum. In the early stages, most decision-making and planning occurred at formal meetings and required participation of all key partners. Over time, other more flexible forums for planning and decision-making were relied upon to allow partners to move forward with implementation. Examples of this include a committee that “met” via conference calling, committee voting by e-mail, and reliance on smaller work groups and teams to carry out certain tasks.

(b) Cross-training should be implemented as early as possible and continued throughout projects requiring multi-system collaboration.

The Greenbook publication defines cross-training as “a process in which members of one system become exposed to the basic policies and practices of another system through training” (Schechter & Edleson, 1999, p. 122). The Initiative has been instrumental in creating a variety of cross-training and other training opportunities. Immediate feedback from these has been consistently positive. Many participants in the Initiative had worked for their respective agencies for years and had some experience with and knowledge of other systems, yet expressed surprise at how little they actually knew about partner agencies’ policies, practices, and staff roles. It is essential to offer multiple and varied forums in which cross-training can occur (formal trainings, panel presentations, shadowing, site visits), in order to promote empathy and understanding across members. In addition, cross-training creates opportunities for participants to meet informally, which are essential for building informal relationships, as discussed in (g) in this section.

Despite the breadth of training that has been available, neither the collaborative nor any single partner agency embarked on development of an actual training curriculum during the evaluation period. Moreover, there had not been sufficient opportunities for Initiative leadership, agency managers, and line personnel to explore “hot button” issues using case-based training forums. Our analysis suggests that the collaboration between the three partner systems became highly strained and clashes occurred over the more complex and challenging cases. It is strongly encouraged that Initiative leadership explore what local resources might be available for curriculum development, and consider allocating funds to support this activity. A small committee, with at least one representative from each partner system, should be designated to provide guidance and oversight to this activity. A well-organized, comprehensive training curriculum addressing co-occurrence, cross-training, and other pertinent issues would represent a major step towards institutionalizing the gains that have resulted from Initiative-sponsored training activities.

(c) It is critical to establish clear expectations as early as possible regarding roles and responsibilities of participants in a community-based collaborative, particularly with regard to leadership.

The Greenbook Initiative is a groundbreaking endeavor in many ways. As a result, demonstration sites embarked on their projects without strong models of collaboration or leadership to emulate. Although the Steering Committee (SC) has governance over the project, at times this committee has been stymied by its lack of authority over all partner agencies.

Second, due to uncertainty regarding how power is dispersed across leadership, some participants have objected to the processes through which key decisions have been made and questioned who has actual decision-making power. There was not always consensus regarding the responsibilities of those in leadership positions. Similarly, the committees that have been formed to address specific issues have struggled at times with defining the role of leaders and expectations of members, which has hampered their efficacy.

- (d) In a similar vein, the different organizational structures of collaboration partners can present challenges regarding how power, leadership, and duties are shared and how organizations are represented. It is critical to establish written agreements concerning roles of partner agencies in the early stages of planning that address issues of leadership and representation.***

At the time the grant was sought, the proposal identified the formal domestic violence services partner as a local shelter. The original Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the shelter and the other partners described the shelter executive director as serving as the “representative of the St. Louis area domestic violence service providers.” This included approximately 25 agencies during the evaluation period. According to the MOU, the representative agreed “within the scope of [her agency’s] powers, to oversee the participation of the other service providers in this project and their compliance with the decisions of the project governance committee and with the agreements represented in [this] memorandum.” Stakeholders report that this was to extend to all local domestic violence service providers in St. Louis City and County that were members of the Missouri Coalition Against Domestic Violence (MCADV).² This decision reflected a commitment to an inclusive, diverse collaboration, and created the opportunity for multiple agencies to participate in the Initiative. However, this inclusiveness presents some barriers to a smooth collaborative process. Leadership within the domestic violence community is diffuse, and each agency has its own organizational structure and leadership. The Initiative has struggled with developing suitable forums for communication among the multiple agencies that comprise the domestic violence community, and between this community and Initiative leadership. In 2003, a new MOU was drafted for domestic violence service providers. This served to define the responsibilities of all signatories, and to authorize some decision-making powers to representatives that served on the Steering Committee (SC). In late 2004, MCADV members were asked to again sign the MOU to indicate their continued commitment to the Initiative, and 15 domestic service providers eventually did so.

The Initiative has also been challenged to ensure balanced representation from all service providers participating. Executive directors and other agency staff have exerted influence within the Initiative in a variety of ways, and have expressed their views, some of which have been critical of the Initiative. In addition, some of their recommendations have run counter to the planned objectives, or involved new objectives that were not in the original project design and thus, were not within the scope of Greenbook funding. It has been difficult to gauge how representative the views expressed by these members were of the domestic violence advocacy community overall.

(e) Funders of large-scale collaborations and those agencies assuming leadership must help ensure there are sufficient support, time, resources, and opportunities for participants to carry out the work of the Initiative.

The participants in this Initiative are involved voluntarily. SC members have full-time obligations to their respective agencies, as do most members of the committees and work groups upon which leadership has relied. Despite the willingness of so many agency representatives to engage in Initiative processes by joining committees and work groups, reviewing and critiquing products, and attending trainings, most have had little time to devote to more detailed “hands-on” tasks -- such as writing protocols, curricula, drafting policy, and developing assessment tools. The Initiative has explored and tested different methods for ensuring important tasks are completed, which have been met with varying degrees of success.

The following suggestions may help ensure that Initiative activities can be carried out expediently, while allowing for all systems to be involved: (a) partner systems must be represented by persons with either the time to conduct relevant tasks or the authority to direct their staff to carry out the work; (b) there must be incentives for agency staff to engage in the work of the Initiative; (c) technical assistance provided by federal dollars must be structured in a flexible manner, and the pool of providers be varied enough so as to allow demonstration sites to select those providers who can best accomplish needed tasks; and/or (d) multi-system collaborations should engage paid staff or consultants to carry out the bulk of this type of work, with appropriate oversight and input from partner systems.

(f) Collaborations must address conflict promptly, establish channels and mechanisms for conflict resolution, and assess the efficacy of communication channels.

Failure to promptly address disagreements and concerns can threaten the foundation of collaborations and significantly impede progress. In late 2004, a conflict that had been building for some time escalated to a point at which the domestic violence community was on the verge of withdrawing from the Initiative. Members of the advocacy community, as represented by the Domestic Violence Work Group, asserted that there was a power imbalance in the Initiative and that their community was marginalized. Further, this group expressed dissatisfaction with the pace and course of the Initiative. Initiative leadership has made strides in addressing many of these points of dissatisfaction. The process of rebuilding trust has been slow, but gradual. The conflict interrupted Initiative activities for a period, and resulted in some domestic violence service providers opting to discontinue formal participation in the collaboration. It is noteworthy that leadership displayed a solid commitment to not isolate or marginalize dissatisfied partners, and has become, if anything, more open to dissenting opinions. Members of the St. Louis County Initiative are learning to regard conflict as a catalyst for positive change, and are working to create forums through which members can air and resolve differences and concerns in a timely, respectful, and constructive manner.

(g) Success of collaborations hinges on the quality of both formal and informal relationships among staff at partner agencies.

The Initiative has created multiple opportunities for managers and direct service workers to develop working relationships with their counterparts at other partner agencies. Repeatedly, participants have emphasized that the informal connections established with staff at these other agencies is invaluable, and facilitate collaboration in the absence of formal protocols and policies for drawing agencies together. When workers have a general or case-specific question, most prefer a single point of contact at other agencies, and are more likely ask for help and heed advice when the point of contact is someone with whom they are familiar and regard as trustworthy. However, informal relationships that are dependent on one-to-one connections between particular staff members tend to dissipate when there is turnover. Partner agencies should seek ways to institutionalize working relationships across agencies, which includes leveraging positive gains from informal relationships, designating staff as liaisons/primary points of contact, and creating protocols for seeking consultation and support from partner agencies.

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

A. Federal Demonstration Project

From 1998-99, The National Council of Juvenile & Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) convened an Advisory Committee and produced a set of recommendations for policies and practices related to the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence entitled, *Effective Intervention in Domestic Violence and Child Maltreatment Cases: Guidelines for Policy and Practice* (Schechter & Edleson, 1999). Now commonly known as the “Greenbook,” due to its green cover, the recommendations provide a framework for communities to develop interventions and measure progress as they seek to improve their responses to families experiencing domestic violence and child maltreatment. Shortly after the publication of the Greenbook, funding was secured from the U.S. Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services for the Greenbook Initiative for a period of three years. Proposals were solicited nationwide from communities hoping to bring about system changes as outlined in the Greenbook. Of the 90 community groups that submitted proposals, six demonstration sites were chosen for the Initiative: St. Louis County, Missouri; El Paso County, Colorado; Grafton County, New Hampshire; Lane County, Oregon; San Francisco, California; and Santa Clara County, California.

The St. Louis County Initiative was awarded its funding in December 2000. The three partner systems include the Family Court of St. Louis County; members of the St. Louis Metro Region of the MCADV (represented by the executive director of a local shelter agency, St. Martha’s Hall³), and the St. Louis County Department of Social Services Children’s Division (DSS-CD).

The federal Greenbook Initiative is far broader in scope and more ambitious than most grant-supported projects, which typically focus on a single program in which the principal activity is service delivery to a relatively narrow target population. In contrast, the Initiative encompasses a wide range of diverse activities, and proposes to introduce new policies, protocols, and practices across three major service systems. The target audience for the Initiative includes administrators, managers, and direct service workers at all partner agencies, as well as the judiciary. Ultimately, the system changes that emerge from the Initiative are expected to produce impacts at the client level.

The Initiative evaluation is designed to take into account the uniqueness of the Initiative, the range of activities and objectives, and the multiple impacts that are intended. Ideally, the evaluation would address both system- and client-level outcome measures. At this point, however, the extent to which we will be able to measure client-level changes is not clear. The early years of the Initiative have focused on laying a strong foundation and developing a sustainable structure. Due to the incremental nature of this work, client-level change may not be evident until the final stages of the Initiative. Much of the evaluation, therefore, focuses on the processes through which changes are occurring, and includes an examination of how the different systems are drawn into the collaboration, the structure and characteristics of the collaboration, and how activities are planned and carried out.

The federal grant required that all sites hire a local evaluator, called a Local Research Partner (LRP). Our LRP team, comprised of three researchers who jointly share this position, is conducting the evaluation of the St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative. Furthermore, a National Evaluation Team (NET) is conducting a cross-site evaluation. NET partners include Caliber Associates, the Educational Development Center, and National Center for State Courts. As will be described in more detail in Chapter IV, the LRPs from all six demonstration sites have worked closely with the NET to gather data for the national evaluation, but have also collected a considerable amount of evaluation data for purposes of the local evaluation.

This Implementation Assessment will report on activities from the beginning of the project in January 2001 through June 30, 2005. The intended audience for this report includes St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative local stakeholders, federal partners, and stakeholders at the other five national demonstration sites. Furthermore, we hope this report can be of use to communities that are considering implementing Greenbook recommendations or pursuing similar collaborative approaches by providing a case study of the accomplishments at this site and the challenges encountered.

This report covers the Planning Phase and implementation phase through June 2005. We must note that our current LRP team began to evaluate the Initiative in April 2002. Hence, our ability to report on activities before then is limited. Information related to activities in the Initiative's first year is derived from three sources: SC meeting minutes; the NET Interim Evaluation Report, which includes an Appendix of St. Louis site activities; and the *Discovery, Planning and Collaboration Building Report*.⁴

This report is structured as follows. Following the Executive Summary of the findings to date, Chapter I presents an overview of the Initiative; Chapter II describes the background of the St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative, including the conditions that preceded implementation, St. Louis County demographics, and existing conditions relevant to handling of co-occurrence cases at the time the grant was sought. Chapter III explicates the program theory, and Chapter IV, the methodology of the evaluation. Chapter V represents the core of this report, offering a description and analysis of the structure and dynamics of the collaboration and the Initiative's activities that have been implemented thus far. In Chapter VI, we present conclusions and very briefly discuss the next steps.

B. Relationship with the Federal Demonstration Project

The federal initiative started with funding from eight federal partners, four in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and four in the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). Within DHHS, four entities have provided support to Initiative: the Children's Bureau and the Office of Community Services in the Administration for Children and Families, the Division of Violence Prevention, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE). Funding and support is also provided by four agencies within DOJ: the Violence Against Women Office (VAWO), the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC), the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Specifically, the Children's Bureau and VAWO funding went to the six demonstration sites. Federal dollars also support technical

assistance to the sites and funds the national cross-site evaluation. The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, and the Annie E. Casey Foundation provided additional funding in support of the project.

Throughout the demonstration project, technical assistance has been available to all participating sites, based on each site's identified needs and availability of resources. The three organizations responsible for providing technical assistance are the Family Violence Department of the National Council of Juvenile & Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ), American Public Human Services Association, and the Family Violence Prevention Fund. NCJFCJ coordinates delivery of technical assistance across sites.

C. Overview of Research Design

The evaluation design includes both a process evaluation and an outcome evaluation. The process evaluation will address questions about Initiative operations and activities, and will assess the efforts taken by the Initiative to achieve its stated goals. The process evaluation will address the question of whether the program was implemented as designed and if not, what happened instead. During the period covered in this evaluation, we have engaged in the following evaluation activities:

- Interviews, surveys, and focus groups with key representatives from the three partner systems relating to specific projects/activities
- Direct observation of meetings of the Steering Committee (SC), Implementation Committee (IC), work groups, ad hoc committees, training events, and retreats, as well as other events sponsored by the Initiative
- Document analysis of administrative policies and procedures, strategic plans, training materials, and protocols
- Review of minutes and reports from SC, IC, and other committees and ad hoc groups
- Review of task logs compiled by Greenbook-funded domestic violence specialists
- Interviews and focus groups with battered women
- Focus groups with batterers
- Case abstraction from a sample of DSS-CD files
- Case abstraction from a sample of batterers convicted of domestic assault misdemeanors

In addition to our own data sources, we had access to summary reports presenting findings from the NET's data collection efforts, which included stakeholder interviews conducted during site visits, a concept mapping exercise, direct service worker survey, network analysis survey, and a supervisor survey. However, we did not have access to the original data collected for these sources. Thus, while these reports informed the local evaluation to an extent, the majority of the conclusions are derived from those data we collected directly.

D. Definitions

Some explanations are in order regarding the terms used throughout this report. First, the terms *partner* or *partner agencies* includes the agencies representing the Initiative's three partner systems -- child welfare, dependency courts, and domestic violence service providers. These three systems collectively applied for and were awarded the Greenbook Initiative grant. St. Louis County Department of Social Services Children's Division (DSS-CD) represents child welfare; the Family Court of St. Louis County represents the dependency courts,⁵ and local domestic violence organizations that are members of the MCADV.

The term *participant* is used extensively, and is broadly defined so as to include all representatives from partner agencies that have been involved with Initiative activities through: serving on committees, work groups, and action teams; holding Greenbook-funded positions; and members of the "target audience" for Greenbook activities and/or recipients of Greenbook-sponsored services (such as trainings, facilitation, specialized positions). Members of this last group have also provided data for the evaluation via interviews, focus groups, and various surveys.

Stakeholders, too, is a fairly inclusive term as applied in this report. In evaluation parlance, stakeholders are those individuals or groups who may affect or be affected by a program and evaluation of the program. At minimum, stakeholders are members of the Initiative's SC, as well as other representatives from the three core partner systems that are involved in project activities, or from other community agencies that may experience impacts resulting from the Initiative.

For purposes of this report, *leadership* refers to the SC, which has ultimate authority over local Initiative activities, and the director, who is responsible for managing the Initiative day-to-day. Unless specified, leadership does not include chairpersons of other committees, groups, and teams that have worked on Initiative activities. Unless otherwise noted, federal leaders in the Greenbook Initiative are also not included in the definition of leadership used in this report.

Activities is used to describe a wide range of work that has been generated, coordinated, and/or supported by Initiative participants, as well as duties carried out by Initiative-funded staff and consultants. This includes the various training events, conferences, site visits, retreats, safety and accountability audits, consultations, development of protocols, assessment tools, guidelines; as well as implementation of Initiative-funded positions (e.g., the co-located domestic violence specialists) and tasks carried out by staff in these positions.

CHAPTER II. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXTUAL FACTORS

A. Project Background

The three partner systems were responsible for submitting the grant proposal as well as developing overall strategies addressing the goals and objectives outlined in the grant proposal. The Family Court administers the funds on behalf of the collaborative. The initial grant award covered a three-year period. In May 2003, St. Louis County was among the demonstration sites that received notice that federal funding had been granted for an additional two-year period. The St. Louis County Initiative has since received no-cost grant extensions, and at this writing, is projected to end September 30, 2007.

At the outset of the Initiative, the partners identified three major phases:

- Planning Phase (January 2001 - September 2002)
- Implementation Phase/Partner Agency System Change (October 2002 - October 2003)
- Community Outreach (October 2003 - September 2004)

The project has not unfolded as envisioned in these three discrete phases. As early as 2001, stakeholders recognized they could garner wider support and increase buy-in if they could demonstrate some visible accomplishments. Thus, some activities were implemented prior to September 2002. Also, a critical lesson that has emerged is that system change is a lengthy and incremental process. Full implementation of the Initiative goals represents a paradigm shift for participating systems, and it requires a great deal of time to achieve buy-in for this shift, build consensus, and pilot test new endeavors. Changes must permeate several layers of bureaucracy and institutional culture, and this process requires ongoing attention. In retrospect, the one-year implementation phase was overly ambitious. Implementation of various Greenbook activities is ongoing throughout the period covered in this report, and in fact, is expected to continue throughout the grant period. Over time, it appears the focus has shifted away from the plan to engage in a discrete community outreach phase, although some community outreach activities have been and will continue to be undertaken as opportunities arise.

B. Description of the Study Site

1. Overview of St. Louis County

At the time of the 2000 U.S. Census, St. Louis County had a population of 1,016,315. Eighty-five percent⁶ of this population reported their race as White; 11% as African-American; 2% as Hispanic/Latino; just under 2% as bi- or multi-racial; and the remainder, as Native American, Asian, or Pacific Islander. The county is politically and geographically independent from the City of St. Louis. It is Missouri's largest county, and includes 92 municipalities, most of which operate municipal courts that hear domestic violence cases.

2. Three Partner Systems

The Family Court of St. Louis County has been unified since 1993 and has jurisdiction over all domestic relationship 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. Child dependency cases are heard at the Family Court Center, and are brought before the court by the Child Protection Services (CPS) Unit. Civil proceedings for adult and child orders of protection are conducted in the Family Court as well, although at the county's main courthouse approximately one-half mile from the Center. Divorce proceedings and child custody matters are also handled at the main courthouse, as are criminal cases involving domestic violence. The Family Court –Juvenile Division has two judges and two commissioners that hear dependency cases.

DSS-CD is a state agency with four offices dispersed across St. Louis County, each with 30-100 employees. At the time the grant proposal was submitted, there was one office, staffed with approximately 150-160 social workers, 21 supervisors, and 6 managers. The St. Louis County DSS-CD director is based at one of these regional offices, and reports to the state central office in Jefferson City.

Most DSS-CD cases originate from a call placed to a central statewide hotline. Hotline calls originate from a variety of sources: mandated reporters at schools, daycare centers, and counseling agencies; law enforcement; the prosecuting attorney's office, and private citizens who know about or suspect a child is being abused or neglected. Hotline calls are investigated by DSS-CD or jointly by DSS-CD and law enforcement. If a case is substantiated and/or services are indicated, but the child is not believed to be in imminent danger, DSS-CD may open a case and offer services to the family that they can receive on a voluntary basis. When a case is deemed serious enough however, the case is referred to the CPS Unit of the Family Court so that court involvement up to and including protective custody may be sought. Most cases that are hot-lined are not serious enough to rise to the level of court involvement.

If the Family Court decides to take protective custody, DSS-CD is directed to present findings and recommendations to the court. If the court does not take legal or physical custody, DSS-CD has the option of offering the family services or closing the case. If the court takes legal or physical custody of the child, DSS-CD is assigned case management and monitoring responsibilities. A deputy juvenile officer from the CPS Unit (CPS DJO) is assigned to monitor compliance with court orders and case progress. This DJO serves as the liaison between DSS-CD, the clients, other service providers, and the court relevant to the case. As a result of these joint responsibilities in handling child abuse and neglect cases in which the children come under state custody, these two agencies had an extensive history of working together prior to the Initiative.

The domestic violence community includes approximately 25 organizations that provide shelter, support, and advocacy for victims of domestic violence. These organizations are members of the statewide MCADV. The number of local MCADV agencies has fluctuated, but has included approximately 25 agencies during this evaluation period. The domestic violence community further includes batterer intervention providers (BIPs) that belong to the Association of Batterer Intervention Providers (ABIP), a local association that promotes standards for working with batterers.

C. Preexisting Conditions

In developing the initial proposal for the Initiative, the three partner systems reviewed the existing status of their system’s response to co-occurrence. They relied primarily on the experience of the representatives from these systems who came together to write the grant to determine which problems were most critical, and to develop plans to address these concerns. They did not have data reflecting co-occurrence rates. However, it is reasonable to assume that national estimates of prevalence of co-occurrence would be roughly generalizable to families in St. Louis County. Comprehensive review of studies that have examined this issue suggests the overlap between domestic violence and child maltreatment is between 30% and 60%, (Appel & Holden, 1998; Edleson, 1999).

Data are available reflecting rates of child abuse and domestic violence independent of one another. Table 1 presents statistics on child abuse and neglect for 2000-2004 for St. Louis County, and Table 2 presents statistics on women served by for the St. Louis metropolitan region service providers from 2000-2004.

**Table 1:
Probable Cause Findings in Abuse and Neglect Cases Reported to St. Louis County DSS-CD
2000 - 2004**

<i>Abuse and neglect cases</i>	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Probable cause incidents originating from hotline	473	548	502	411	425
Number of child victims in probable cause incidents originating from hotline	614	719	605	537	560

Source: Missouri DSS – CD Child Abuse and Neglect Annual Reports

**Table 2: Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals received by Family Court of St. Louis County
2002-2006**

<i>Abuse and neglect referrals</i>	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Referrals to Family Court for child protective services	1372	1188	1210	1265	1047

Source: Family Court of St. Louis County- Child Protective Services

Table 3. Domestic Violence Services Provided in St. Louis Metropolitan Region, 2000-2004

<i>Services provided</i>	2001	2002	2003	2004
Adults sheltered	880	1,045	1,097	809
Children sheltered	1,190	1,187	1,377	1,066
Adults receiving nonresidential services	1,655	3,256	15,714	14,103
Children receiving nonresidential services	191	385	7,524	5,508

Source: Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence

It must be noted that these statistics do not necessarily reflect the prevalence of domestic violence or child abuse in the population but rather, may reflect increasing service provision or changes in how data are reported over time. For instance, the dramatic increase in persons

receiving domestic violence services in 2003 is a function of a larger number of agencies reporting statistics that year.⁷ Moreover, raw count data are subject to random variation in victim reporting as well as legislative and agency definitional changes. These numbers more likely reflect a greater willingness on the part of victims or other family members to turn to community services and the criminal justice system for assistance. The fact that these services are increasingly accessed supports the vital need for collaborative community initiatives to coordinate service provision for families living with violence.

The Initiative is designed to draw all partner agencies into closer collaboration and to collectively improve responses in co-occurrence cases. The grant proposal noted that the three primary systems entered the project with “differing perceptions, roles, legal mandates, internal constraints, approaches, and treatment paradigms.”⁸ The Greenbook Initiative funding was intended to establish common ground for system-wide collaboration between the child protection system, which in St. Louis County includes DSS and the Family Court, and domestic violence service providers. However, the baseline status of collaboration differed across the three partner systems. Stakeholders have noted that before this project, the status of working relationships between DSS-CD and Family Court was considerably stronger than between DSS-CD and the domestic violence community, or Family Court and the domestic violence community. DSS-CD and Family Court are formally independent partners on the Initiative, but are interdependent in day-to-day practices in many ways. As indicated previously, these two governmental agencies have joint responsibility in bringing resolution to child abuse and neglect cases. Further, both of these systems are bureaucracies with hierarchical governing structures that must respond directly to legislative mandates. Finally, these agencies have a shared mission -- child protection -- and similar underlying philosophies.

On the other hand, the mission of the domestic service providers is to provide safety and empowerment to battered women. While local domestic violence organizations often serve both women and their children, they have no formal mandates requiring they work with Family Court or DSS-CD,⁹ and the nature of working relationships between individual agencies and the court or DSS-CD varied widely. There is little baseline data available that speaks to the frequency with which DSS-CD and Family Court workers sought assistance from domestic violence advocates on specific cases, or that advocates reached out for help to child protective system workers to address needs of children prior to the implementation of the Initiative. Anecdotal evidence and comments from stakeholders at these agencies suggest such cross-consultation and help seeking occurred sporadically.

The grant proposal noted several problems that impeded optimal handling of co-occurrence cases. First, neither Family Court nor DSS-CD had a universal screening and assessment process for detecting domestic violence. The DSS-CD workers were required to complete a safety factors checklist while investigating cases, which included domestic violence among the factors.¹⁰ However, their information about the family dynamics at this stage could be quite limited, and workers often simply relied on self-report from the mother for this information, or assumed it was not a factor if it did not appear in the hotline report. They were not required or trained to proactively engage in more in-depth exploration of indicators suggesting domestic violence, or spot and probe for warning signs. CPS DJOs were also not required to conduct proactive screening and assessment for domestic violence in their cases.

A second critical weakness noted in the grant proposal was insufficient information linkages necessary for effective collaboration across the three systems. In fact, *intra*-system information sharing was far less effective than desirable. For instance, there was no common database across all Family Court units. Communication across the Adult Abuse Office, which handles Orders of Protection, and other units was fragmented. CPS cases were not automatically flagged to indicate current Orders of Protection and judges issuing OPs typically did not know if there is a child protection case on the family.

Yet another key issue concerned practices for keeping battered women and their children safe. The Greenbook holds that the safety of children of battered women is intertwined with that of their mothers, and challenges child protective services agencies to create solutions that ensure the mother's safety – which in turn will ensure the safety and well-being of her child(ren.). Traditional approaches may fail to take into account the interdependence of the mother's and child(ren)'s safety, and can even inadvertently increase risk to the mothers. Without solid baseline data regarding the prevalence of co-occurrence in DSS-CD and Family Court, it was not possible to assess the extent to which pre-Initiative case handling practices may have unintentionally compromised battered mothers' safety or unfairly penalized them for the impact of domestic violence on their children. For instance, there were no data regarding the frequency with which children were removed from the care of battered women. While the local advocacy community has repeatedly voiced concerns that these systems have a history of penalizing mothers for "failure to protect," there was not sufficient evidence to conclude this was a common practice prior to implementing the Initiative.

The problem of placing blame on battered mothers is closely tied to holding the appropriate party accountable -- the batterer. The grant authors noted that the court lacked effective measures for holding batterers accountable. When batterers were brought before the Criminal Court, there was no structure in place for referring them to intervention, tracking progress, or monitoring attendance and compliance. The Family Court was even less effective in directing batterers to intervention and tracking progress in cases in which Orders of Protection were issued. Most judges were not comfortable using the powers of the court to do this. Nor was the action taken with the batterer typically coordinated across the Family Court and Criminal Court judges (in cases in which there was parallel criminal prosecution).

The proposal also identified areas of concern within the domestic violence community. It was pointed out service providers did not have a coordinated response for addressing co-occurrence. There was no uniform protocol for identification and assessment of child maltreatment across agencies.

Given these problems and the expectations of Greenbook funders, several project objectives were developed. In the next chapter, we present and discuss these objectives in the context of the overall theory and logic model guiding the work of the Initiative.

CHAPTER III. PROGRAM THEORY

Governmental and social responses to child maltreatment in the 1970s and domestic violence in the 1980s produced services systems with differing philosophical and service delivery approaches. These differences and misunderstandings sometimes produced additional problems for victims, such as being required to leave a batterer in order to retain custody of their children, even if the victim is not abusing the children. The 1990s brought calls for cooperation and collaboration within and between systems. This new generation of interventions has been referred to as “comprehensive community initiatives.” These have the goal of promoting positive change in individual, family, and community circumstances, and generally utilize a framework that places more authority and responsibility at the community or neighborhood level (Kubisch, et al. 1995, p. 1; Chalk & King, 1998).

The federal Greenbook demonstration project funding community-based initiatives falls into this category of comprehensive community initiatives. The Greenbook Initiative is designed to blur the boundaries between local systems of law enforcement, the judiciary, domestic violence service providers, and child protective services. The St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative has focused on collaboration among the Family Court, domestic violence service providers, and the child protective services.

For the St. Louis County Initiative, the program impact theory flows from the Greenbook. The Greenbook contains 16 framing principles and 67 recommendations. The demonstration communities are required to implement recommendations from each section. As stated in the funding solicitation,¹¹ the core of the model to be tested is “putting in place a body of policies and practices, based on cross-system collaboration, in the identification, safety planning, case management, advocacy, protection, and proper use of information, perpetrator accountability, and service provision with battered mothers and their children.” Thus, the program theory for St. Louis County encompasses both the framing principles and the recommendations from the Greenbook.

A. Project Objectives

The grant proposal identified the explicit objectives for St. Louis County, which are listed below. In addition, at the request of the demonstration sites and with their subsequent approval, the national partners developed a set of Federal Greenbook Expectations in 2002, that consolidated the key recommendations of the Greenbook document and the objectives outlined in the original request for proposals. These expectations were shared with stakeholders and guide site activities.

- A. Establish a comprehensive, inclusive planning process whereby information can be communicated and input can be solicited from all agency staff from each of the systems that will be participating in the project and from the broader professional and citizen community.
- B. Develop standards for best practices in cases involving child maltreatment and domestic violence that involve collaborative efforts utilizing the strengths and expertise of both fields to provide for the safety of children and adults who are victims of domestic violence.
- C. Confidentiality policies and procedures will be formulated by the collaborative effort in compliance with state statutes and case law. The policies will focus on safety for victims of

- domestic violence while still protecting victims of child maltreatment from harm.
- D. Cross-training on the dynamics of domestic violence and child maltreatment will be provided on a broad basis to agencies and individuals responsible for protecting the well-being of children and families. The ultimate objective of the training will be to develop a shared vision among the partners about the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment and the responses that are most effective in terms of insuring adult and child safety and well-being.
 - E. The collaborative project will contract for a feasibility study to explore the possibility of total county access to data systems to support the effective collaboration of DSS-CD, the Family Court, and domestic violence service providers in assessing cases, developing safety and case plans, and monitoring progress on case plans.
 - F. The collaborative project will undertake community-wide outreach about domestic violence and child maltreatment and their co-occurrence.
 - G. Increase collaboration among batterer intervention programs and the participating partners so that referrals made pursuant to case plans can be monitored and perpetrators can be held accountable.
 - H. Develop a direct service component to assist domestic violence victims in securing services that will lead to self-sufficiency, such as housing, transportation, employment, and child care, that will give victims of domestic violence the option of leaving a perpetrator upon whom they may have been economically reliant.

B. Logic Model

All Greenbook-funded sites were required to develop a program theory logic model to provide a strategic framework for understanding the project, as well as a guide for the evaluation. A logic model is a graphic depiction of what the program is expected to produce, what things will be done to produce those expected results, and why those results are expected from those activities. The logic model identifies the explicit and implicit assumptions underlying the theory guiding the Initiative and link these to objectives and actions.

We developed the logic model for the local Initiative with input from the director, SC, and relevant stakeholders on the IC. The model was presented and explained to IC members at a retreat in January 2003. The program theory logic model developed for the Initiative is included in Appendix A.

The logic model is comprised of six components that explain the theory of change guiding the Initiative. *Conditions* is the term used to describe the existing needs or problems the program is attempting to alleviate. It is sometimes referred to as the *problem statement*. The term *Inputs* refers to reports, data, statistics, grant proposals, research, and other material that informs policy making or practice around the existing condition, as well as agencies, personnel, dollars, and other resources devoted to the project. *Strategies* refers to activities, or the specific types of programs and services in which the Initiative will engage. The phrase *Short-Term Outcomes* describes the results the Initiative hopes to achieve with the target population. In this case, the target population for the activities is primarily at the system level -- the Family Court, DSS-CD, and the domestic violence service providers, including batterer intervention programs. Finally, *Long-term Impacts* is the phrase used to describe broader results that are anticipated to eventually result from Initiative activities. These are the hoped-for impacts on victims of partner violence, children, and batterers. *Background or Contextual Factors*

(sometimes referred to as *antecedent variables*) refer to those existing factors or variables that define and influence the context in which the Initiative takes place. These factors can facilitate or hinder the goals of the Initiative. The logic model also graphically depicts the evaluation process. The *Process Evaluation* is designed to analyze *Short-Term Outcomes* at the system level, whereas the *Outcome Evaluation* will analyze *Long-Term Impacts* at the client-level.

The federal partners expressed hopes the logic model would play a significant role in guiding the strategy of the local projects, and would be a tool referenced and used against which to measure progress. Evaluators typically rely on logic models to guide their activities, and in formal reports, structure their analysis according to the model. However, several limitations of the program theory logic model approach have become apparent. First, the Initiative is far more complex than a single “program,” which has a narrower range of activities and target audience. The distinction between *strategies* and *outcomes* is more blurred than in traditional programs. For example, the co-located specialist positions, identified as a short-term outcome, were also significantly involved in protocol development, which were also identified as a short-term outcome. Second, leadership has not used the program theory logic model as envisioned by the federal partners. The logic model did not structure discussion at SC meetings, and has not been used as a “road map” to the Initiative’s overall strategy. This may be, in part, due to the late introduction of the logic model in the course of the project. Finally, in hindsight, the model should have included strategies geared at creating and maintaining the collaborative. Given the dearth of literature on evaluation of multi-system collaborations, we did not anticipate the amount of time and resources the Initiative would invest in such activities, such as forming and managing committees and work groups, and formal conflict resolution.

The logic model did help shape the Initiative Work Plan. It has further provided the basis for planning many of our evaluation tasks, and will continue to guide evaluation activities through the duration of the Initiative. However, due to the problems noted here, we have not structured the analysis in this report around the logic model. Rather, we have organized it to reflect the key activities that have emerged over the course of time.

CHAPTER IV. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation approach taken in this research has been termed *action evaluation* in which practitioners and researchers jointly determine research questions and develop and implement a research plan (McEwen, 1999). Action evaluation requires the evaluator to objectively observe and synthesize findings from data, and also provide feedback to program planners throughout the implementation of a project in an effort to identify problems and obstacles that can be addressed during implementation rather than at the end of the project. Throughout the course of the evaluation, we have actively engaged in a variety of research and evaluation activities. In the spirit of action evaluation, we have worked closely with the project leadership, particularly the director. We regularly solicit the input of the director and other relevant stakeholders in determining our evaluation tasks and in the development of all data collection tools. We routinely provide stakeholders with updates on relevant findings and ongoing activities via formal project reports, summaries of feedback protocols, and presentations at SC meetings, and offer recommendations to strengthen the Initiative.

A. Role of the National Evaluation Team

The NET is responsible for conducting the cross-site evaluation of the Initiative. A NET liaison from one of the three organizations that was awarded the federal contract to conduct the evaluation is assigned to each site. This liaison works closely with the LRPs to gather data for the cross-site evaluation. The LRPs, in turn, serve as the liaison between the NET and the Initiative director, the SC, and other stakeholders that participate in NET activities.

The NET and LRPs from all sites developed the NET's data collection tools collaboratively. The LRPs also identified the samples for most NET activities, based on jointly established parameters. During the course of the Initiative, the NET administered surveys to direct service workers, supervisors, and various stakeholders, and also conducted interviews during annual site visits. To reduce travel time and time spent on site, the NET relied on the LRPs to collect case file data from a sample of DSS-CD clients at three points in time, and to conduct some client interviews and focus groups. These activities are discussed in greater detail under their respective headings.

With the exception of the data the LRPs collected on the NET's behalf, the LRPs have not been granted access to the NET's raw data, pursuant to the agreement established with the NET's Institutional Review Board (IRB). We are, however, provided summary reports of the findings from NET activities based on data from our site only, in addition to the full cross-site findings. Our LRP team routinely shares all NET findings with the SC, and findings are made available to other interested partner system representatives upon request. The NET's activities have placed some constraints on local activities, as explained in Chapter V, Section D.

In this and the final evaluation report, we will not include discussion of the results of the NET activities, except for the case abstraction data we collected and on which we will conduct independent analyses.

B. Process Evaluation Research Questions

As stated previously, the evaluation design includes both a process evaluation and an outcome evaluation. This report describes results of the process evaluation through June 2005. Also known as *implementation assessment*, process evaluation addresses research questions related to the implementation of the treatment intervention or program. This process evaluation will address research questions in the following domains: program conceptualization, structure and collaboration, and implementation of activities. These overarching questions guide the course of the evaluation, methodology, and development of data collection instruments.

Program Conceptualization

- (a) What is the program theory used by the Initiative?
- (b) What are the stated goals of the Initiative?
- (c) How do stakeholders define *collaboration*? How do the Initiative activities both promote and reflect collaboration?

Structure and Collaboration

- (a) How is the Initiative organized?
- (b) What decision-making methods were adopted, and how effective have these been? What barriers have there been to effective decision-making?
- (c) How well does the governance and organizational structure support collaboration among the three systems?
- (d) What channels of communication link the three systems?
- (e) How effective do participants view the collaboration? What are viewed as strengths in the collaboration? What are the weaknesses? How have weaknesses and barriers to successful collaboration been addressed?
- (f) What channels of communication link the St. Louis Initiative with the national initiative and with other demonstration sites?

Implementation of Activities

- (a) What activities have been created, fostered, or stimulated as a result of the St. Louis County Initiative?
- (b) How do implementation activities align with what was planned (logic models, the Work Plan, goals and objectives, etc.)?
- (c) If implementation activities look different from what was planned or intended, why is this so? How are they different?
- (d) What are viewed as the principal successes of the Initiative?

C. Focus of Evaluation

Due to the complex nature of the Initiative, it has been necessary to designate certain significant activities as “core projects” and target these for more in-depth evaluation. In Chapter V, we have organized much of our discussion of implementation around those core

projects, which are also those projects to which we devoted the most evaluation resources. An activity was deemed a core project for evaluation purposes if it met the following criteria: (a) the activity was developed through or directly influenced by the Initiative; (b) the activity has a “high profile” in the Initiative, as evidenced by stakeholders’ level of awareness of the activity and level of resources devoted to implementation; (c) the activity is related to Initiative objectives, as presented in the program theory logic model; (d) there is a clear linkage between the activity and potential client impact;¹² and (e) the activity can be operationalized into one or more measurable outcomes.

The core projects are discussed in Chapter V, Section E. For the timeframe covered in this report, these core projects are: (a) Greenbook-sponsored training events (ongoing; discussion addresses activities collectively); (b) co-located specialist positions (2003-2004); (c) Batterer Compliance Project (BCP; 2003-ongoing); (d) Domestic Violence Assessment Protocol (DVAP; 2003-ongoing); (e) Multidisciplinary Case Consultation (MCC) Pilot Project (2004); (f) DSS-CD Manual for Domestic Violence Advocates (2003-ongoing); (g) Child Order of Protection Protocol (COPP; 2002-ongoing); (h) Domestic Violence/Child Maltreatment Resource Directory (2003-ongoing); and (i) Child Maltreatment Guidelines (2002-ongoing). Specific evaluation plans were developed for core projects, which reflect the unique objectives, participants, and target audience for each. Pursuant to some of these projects, we prepared individual evaluation reports. These included the Interim Report on the Evaluation of the Domestic Violence Specialist and Case Coordinator Positions; Ad Hoc Report on the Specialist Positions; and Report on the MCC Pilot Project. These reports are included in Appendices C–E.

D. Study Limitations

Several limitations to our evaluation must be noted. The Initiative is very broad in scope and purpose, and, relative to traditional social interventions, quite complex in design. At any given time, there are several activities underway simultaneously. It has not been possible to engage in systematic evaluation of every activity that has resulted from this Initiative. As stated above, we have prioritized certain activities and these have become the focus of our evaluation. There have been many other activities, primarily related to the process of building collaboration, individual trainings, off-site conferences, toolboxes, and site visits. Although we collected feedback related to participants’ immediate impressions following these events, we have not collected data to analyze the long-term impact these may have had on attitudes and practice in the workplace.¹³

Moreover, we have been mindful of the importance of not overburdening stakeholders and other subjects by repeatedly using them as data sources. This is challenging, as we are involved in evaluating multiple activities at any given time and that there is a great deal of overlap in participant involvement across activities. Thus, we have strived to be selective in choosing which subjects to engage in evaluation activities, and to leverage all data collection opportunities. For example, an interview protocol designed to evaluate a single activity will typically include a question about how the activity fits into the context of the overall Initiative, which leads to additional probe questions regarding, collaboration, leadership, and sustainability.

The NET activities have placed demands on participants' time, which has inhibited local evaluation efforts. Our local evaluation is simultaneously underway with the NET study. In the interest of increasing compliance with the cross-site study, we opted to forego some opportunities to collect data from participants that could inform the local evaluation. The most important data collection activity we have refrained from conducting thus far, in order to avoid duplicating NET efforts, is interviews with our site's key stakeholders. The LRPs are not permitted to observe interviews with stakeholders conducted during the NET's annual site visit, nor are we granted access to the original data from these. We receive summary reports, but these focus on issues relevant to all sites, and do not always tap into all areas that are of local interest or capture nuances of the local experience. Thus, our ability to fully evaluate certain aspects of the collaboration is constrained at this time. During the project's final year, in which there is not a NET site visit or other NET activities, we plan to conduct a series of stakeholder interviews. We anticipate that data from these interviews will close some gaps in our current state of knowledge regarding stakeholder perspectives on the Initiative.

E. Research Design and Data Collection Methods

The research design is triangulated, relying on multiple data sources, as well as multiple methods of data collection and analysis. We have collected primarily qualitative data, using structured interview guides, survey and focus group protocols, training feedback forms, direct observation, document review, and case record review.

All federally supported research involving human participants must adhere to Title 45 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 46, which requires approval of all such research by an Institutional Review Board, or IRB. The role of IRB approval is to assure confidentiality of the human subjects and their records, as well as to prevent researchers from engaging in potentially harmful activities without appropriate notice to and consent from the subjects. Because each major activity was evaluated separately, as well as data collection required by the national evaluation, several of these applications had to be completed during the course of the Initiative. These applications were submitted to the IRB at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, and approval was received for all research activities for which this was required.

1. Structured Interview Protocols

We conducted interviews with key informants from the three partner systems, using structured interview protocols, in regard to the following activities: (1) co-located specialist positions; (2) BCP; (3) MCC Pilot Project; and (4) COPP. Key informants included staff who engaged in the development, oversight, and/or direct implementation of the activities. The structured interview protocols varied some across subjects, depending on their particular role and relationship to the activity.

In addition to helping us gauge progress on the respective activities for which they were designed, these interview protocols were further used to gather information regarding how activities fit into the Initiative overall, and the role of collaboration in developing and carrying out activities. We assessed the extent to which activities reflected a multi-disciplinary approach, how they linked to goals, and the strengths and weaknesses of each.

Interview subjects were given assurances of confidentiality, including the use of consent forms if required by IRB guidelines. Subjects were advised that all data would be reported in aggregate form only, and that we would only quote them with their explicit permission.

2. Direct Observation

At least one member of our LRP team has attended the vast majority of SC and IC meetings since April 2002.¹⁴ This was deemed essential to the participatory evaluation goals related to this position. SC and IC meetings were observed in order to gather information regarding (a) committee structure and dynamics; (b) how members process information and make key decisions; (c) the role of Initiative objectives in guiding implementation decisions; (d) the extent to which principles of collaboration guide decisions; (e) how power is shared; (f) how conflict is managed, and (f) different forms of leadership manifested in meetings. We also have observed various other committees, teams, and work groups in action, including all meetings of the MCC. Furthermore, we attended many of the various trainings, seminars, and panel presentations that were developed, sponsored, or otherwise supported by the Initiative. These observations have provided valuable data on the overall status of the collaboration at various points, how system partners interact during Initiative activities, as well as data regarding the implementation of the specific activities observed.

3. Document Review

We reviewed a wide range of documents and materials throughout the evaluation period as these became available, in order to enhance our understanding of a new activity or issue under consideration. These included the grant proposal, reports submitted by the director to the federal partners, administrative policies and procedures of partner agencies, strategic plans, training materials, and protocols developed pursuant to Initiative recommendations. In addition, we reviewed all minutes from SC and IC meetings, the director's reports to SC, reports or minutes from ad hoc or other committees, the Planning Phase Report, and all reports prepared by the NET describing both cross-site and St. Louis-only findings.

4. Client Interviews and Focus Groups

We conducted focus groups with battered mothers, with batterers, and interviews with battered women whose children had been involved in child protective services. This was a cross-site activity, developed jointly by the LRPs from the demonstration sites and the NET. Data from these activities were submitted to the NET. Some of the clients interviewed had been involved with these systems prior to the inception of the Initiative, while others were still involved at the time they met with the evaluator. There was no expectation that the clients would have directly experienced impacts from the Initiative at the time they provided data. Rather, these activities informed our understanding of how clients experience the partner systems, what they perceive as barriers and limitations in the systems, and their perspectives on strengthening the system's responses to clients. In the words of a NET member, this was an effort to infuse the victims' "voice" into this work.

Respondents were recruited through fliers posted at the Family Court, DSS-CD, or posted or handed out by staff at domestic violence service agencies. Respondents were given \$25 gift certificates in exchange for their involvement in an interview or focus group. Every attempt was made to schedule these events at a time and place convenient to the women. Nevertheless,

recruitment of battered women was difficult. Only a small number of women agreed to be interviewed. Some of these did not report to the interview location as scheduled, even after repeated re-scheduling. During the evaluation period, only three women were interviewed. Two focus groups were convened, with just two women each. We requested opportunities to interview women at times when they were on site at domestic violence service agencies, but did not receive any responses from local agencies indicating women were available for this.

The batterers were recruited with assistance from two local BIPs. The directors of these agencies permitted us to hold one focus group at each location just following or prior to a group session. The batterers that took part were also given the \$25 gift card incentives.

Clients who participated in interviews and focus groups were given assurances of confidentiality. They signed detailed consent forms explaining that their identity would not be revealed, all data would be reported in aggregate form only, and their participation would in no way affect current or future relationships with any Greenbook partner agencies.

5. Case Abstraction

In accordance with NET expectations, we collected data from a sample of DSS-CD case files at three points in time, two of which were during this evaluation period (2001 and 2003). The NET provided some limited analysis of site-specific data and results of the cross-site analysis. Time 1 data is intended as a baseline against which to compare Time 2 and Time 3 data. Clients whose cases were reviewed at Time 2 were served by DSS-CD so early in the Initiative that we would not expect there to be measurable impacts that we can link to the work of the Initiative. Thus, we do not propose to conduct any analysis of data from Time 1 to Time 2 beyond that which the NET completed. Indeed, due to the multiple influences that are likely to have a bearing on case handling practices and case outcomes, we anticipate it will be very difficult to attribute observed changes from Time 1 to Time 3 and from Time 2 to Time 3 directly to Initiative activities. Nevertheless, to the extent that this is feasible, we will present some descriptive comparisons and analysis of these data in the Final Evaluation Report.

We also collected data from a sample of offender files as part of the evaluation of the BCP. The sample included a group of offenders convicted of domestic abuse misdemeanors for whom compliance hearings were held in 2003 and 2004. We also collected data on a second group of offenders convicted of domestic abuse misdemeanors who were not monitored via compliance hearings. We collected general descriptive data on the offender and type of offense, on BIP involvement, and on number of hearings and whether the offender attended. Ideally, we propose to collect outcome data on these cases that will allow us to assess whether those offenders for whom compliance hearings were held were more likely to complete BIPs and less likely to re-offend. However, we have not yet received permission from the Circuit Court to access data on re-arrests.

Finally, we collected data on a very small sample of cases that involved co-occurrence and for which a CPS DJO sought a Child Order of Protection (COP).¹⁵ Due to the small sample size, we have not conducted an analysis of these cases. It is not clear whether there will be a large enough sample to conduct any meaningful analysis on this activity during the Initiative.

6. Focus Group with Deputy Juvenile Officers

A focus group was conducted with CPS DJOs following the resignation of the domestic violence specialists, one of whom had been assigned to the Family Court to work with the CPS Unit. The focus group protocol addressed specific concerns about these positions and other resources that could benefit the unit. The group also provided more general data regarding how they handled co-occurrence cases, how the Family Court could improve in this regard, and the impact of the Initiative on their work. DJOs that were in the focus group were given the same assurances of confidentiality that interview subjects were, as described above.

7. Feedback Protocols

Over the course of the Initiative, grant funds have been used to send representatives from all partner systems to other jurisdictions to observe programs or activities being implemented (termed *site visits* herein), or to attend meetings with their counterparts from other demonstration sites (Toolbox meetings, described in further detail in Chapter V), or to participate in the bi-annual Greenbook All-Sites Conferences. We required that attendees to these events complete a feedback protocol upon their return. These protocols varied slightly depending on the nature of the event. Typically, we asked that attendees report on the objectives of the event they attended, what they learned, and ways in which they planned to share new ideas and concepts within their organizations. Additionally, we solicited suggestions on new resources that they recommend the Initiative bring to St. Louis. We also routinely administered training surveys to attendees at local Greenbook-sponsored trainings. Attendees were generally asked to rate the quality of the training experience, its usefulness to their current position, assess strengths and weaknesses, and offer recommendations for future trainings.

Finally, we administered feedback protocols to the IC members following Greenbook retreats, asking that they rate the event and recommend ideas for improving future meetings or the work of the Initiative.

8. Surveys

We created surveys as part of our evaluation of three activities. First, pre/post surveys were administered to staff identified as the target audience for the domestic violence specialists. The baseline surveys were administered from August - September 2003, and post-surveys, in October - November 2004. These surveys were designed to measure changes in knowledge and attitudes about dynamics of domestic violence and co-occurrence., Respondents were also asked about interaction with these positions, and whether they regarded them as useful and important to their agencies. Second, we developed two surveys to evaluate the MCC Pilot Project. One was intended for team members, and assessed their perceptions of the experience

and of team dynamics. The second survey was designed to measure how effective the staff member presenting cases to the team perceived the activity. Because only one consultation was held, these were administered only on this occasion. The third survey was administered to local BIPs in May 2005, and was designed to assess their familiarity with and perceptions of various activities related to batterer accountability.

9. Logs

During their tenure, the co-located domestic violence specialists were expected to complete weekly logs breaking down specific types of tasks in which they engaged. These logs provided implementation data regarding how the positions evolved, key tasks, and to the extent to which workers relied on the specialists as resources.

CHAPTER V. DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INITIATIVE

A. Staff

In March 2001, a hiring committee comprised of representatives from the three systems interviewed candidates and selected the Initiative director. An administrative assistant was hired the following July. The federal grant mandated a project evaluation, to be conducted via a team or individual position termed the *local research partner* (LRP). The LRP was intended to be a hybrid position responsible for both the local evaluation and general research tasks for the Initiative. This position was filled in March 2001, though the original LRP left the project in November of that same year. While the site worked to re-fill the position, the NET site liaison functioned as interim LRP for the site, meeting with the SC in January 2002 and with the IC in February 2002. In April 2002, our current three-person team was hired. The team includes a principal LRP, who works half time, and two associates who collectively work half time. This team has undergone one change in personnel since, but has otherwise remained intact.

B. Governance Structure

During the time period covered by this report, the organizational structure of the collaborative has included a small Steering Committee (SC), comprised of representatives from key leadership positions within the partner systems, and a larger IC.

1. *Steering Committee*

The SC has the following responsibilities:

- Establish local policy in compliance with national GB policy.
- Approve mission and vision of Initiative; develop long-range plans and strategies; hold IC and staff accountable for completion of plan.
- Ensure Initiative operates within budget and according to grant guidelines.
- Recruit, hire, and evaluate the Initiative director; review and approve personnel policies
- Review grant requirements on a regular basis, recruit new members for SC as needed, and maintain a record of meetings.
- Represent the Initiative to the community and approve public relations materials.
- Approve all recommended system changes to partner agencies and programs and monitor progress toward achievement of grant goals.

For the duration of the Initiative, the SC has had at least one representative from each of the three primary partners. The original SC was comprised of the following four members:

- Chair: Family Court administrative judge
- Director of the Family Court Child Protective Services Unit
- Executive director of two battered women's shelters, St. Martha's Hall/Kathy J. Weinman Shelter for Battered Women and Their Children (representing multiple domestic violence service providers)
- DSS-CD regional office manager

The committee has undergone a number of changes. The original domestic violence representative resigned in January 2002. The nominee for the new domestic violence representative, the director of Legal Advocates for Abused Women (LAAW), joined the committee in February 2002. In March 2003, the SC agreed to add another domestic violence representative. This was partly in response to concerns raised by the advocacy community regarding balance of power on the SC. It was anticipated this new member would help share the workload with the existing representative in terms of communicating relevant updates to the domestic violence community and representing their interests. The new representative, the director of Redevelopment Opportunities for Women (ROW), joined in April 2003, and served in this capacity through December 2004. A director of a local batterer intervention program agreed to replace her and formally came on board in March 2005. He continued to serve through the evaluation period, but submitted his resignation effective June 30, 2005.

There have been changes in regard to how the other systems are represented as well. The Family Court administrative judge continued serving as the chair until she left office at the end of 2003. The new administrative judge replaced her in January 2004, but, anticipating limited time to attend committee meetings, appointed the Family Court administrator to the SC as well. The director of the Family Court's CPS Unit left her position, and hence the SC, in mid-2004. A judge with the Circuit Court joined in October 2004, and the CPS director's replacement was approved as a permanent member in September 2005.¹⁶ In addition, a second DSS-CD manager, representing another office in the county, joined the committee in April 2003. The original DSS-CD representative retired in April 2004, and was subsequently replaced by a unit manager from yet a different county office. As of June 2005, membership on the SC included seven individuals representing the three partner systems.

The SC has met regularly since the Initiative began, with infrequent exceptions due to holidays or other activities that affect multiple members' availability. Most members attend regularly, as do the Initiative director and the principal LRP. It is rare that all three systems are not represented at SC meetings. Meetings are conducted in accordance with an agenda prepared by the Initiative director. Standard agenda items include key decisions to be made, the director's report on the status of projects, and the LRP report on current and upcoming evaluation activities. Members also provide updates regarding their respective systems and new developments that may have an impact on the Initiative or their role in it.

The committee operates on a consensual model. Typically, the director confers with the SC Chair in advance regarding decision items. She presents an advance agenda, and the decision items along with relevant background information to the full SC. It has been observed that members often reach consensus on the majority of decisions after only brief discussion. However, occasionally, they may debate an issue, request additional information, or defer a decision pending other action or for a period of consideration. The SC does not move forward with any plan that does not have the support of all members. Despite the transitions in membership and some friction within the Initiative (as discussed in Chapter V, Section C) the SC has worked diligently to sustain the core of the collaboration, and persevered in carrying out the work of the Initiative.

2. Implementation Committee (IC)

The SC developed the model for the IC, which was convened in February 2002 at a kick-off retreat. IC members were recruited from the three system partners and the community. The committee initially was comprised of 19 members, but grew over time. Growth resulted from a targeted expansion beginning in late 2002, culminating in a membership of 31 by January 2003. At its inception, the SC chair agreed to provide leadership for the initial meetings. In April of that year, two SC members -- the Family Court CPS director and LAAW director -- assumed joint leadership of the IC.

The IC was charged with developing strategies and structures for implementing the goals and objectives of the Initiative at the practitioner level. The IC approved a Mission Statement and Vision statement at its February 2003 meeting, as follows:

To implement Greenbook recommendations for system change that will result in the development of a collaborative system between the Division of Family Services, the courts, and the domestic violence community. This collaborative system will build trusting relationships that facilitate staff competency, appropriate information linkages between agencies, and community awareness. The goal of our work is to achieve perpetrator accountability and provide a greater level of safety, stability, and well being for children and families impacted by domestic violence.

Vision Statement: There is a reduction in domestic violence and child maltreatment due to a seamless system of service delivery that provides consistent responses and focuses on safety, accountability, community education, and prevention.

The IC was larger than the SC and reflected greater diversity in terms of the type of agencies and members' positions with their respective agencies. For example, members included Family Court judges and commissioners, mid-level supervisors with Family Court and DSS-CD, directors of domestic violence agencies (including batterer intervention providers), directors of community agencies that serve children, a municipal court administrator, and a domestic violence survivor.

During 2002-2003, the IC supervised two sets of ad hoc committees. The first were system-specific work groups planned at the February 2002 kick-off event with the goal of coordinating a Self Study to be conducted by each system. The Self Study (described in Chapter V, Section D) was completed in the spring of 2002. Based on the Self Study findings regarding gaps in the three systems' responses to co-occurrence, a preliminary Work Plan was developed at a retreat in July 2002. The SC approved this Work Plan in September 2002, which led to formation of the second set of ad hoc committees which were termed "Multidisciplinary Action Teams" (discussed in Chapter V, Section E).

The IC met on a monthly basis through July 2004. At that time, the committee agreed they could continue to monitor Initiative activities through quarterly meetings. However, in the months following this decision, a serious conflict emerged among members of the collaborative that caused leadership to reconsider how representation was structured. The SC subsequently

determined the IC would not reconvene. However, leadership remained committed to keeping those partners that had been represented on the IC engaged in the Initiative.

C. Conflict, Transition, and Resolution

The Initiative has experienced some tension and conflict and made adaptations as a result. While these adaptations have not markedly changed the course of the Initiative or significantly reshaped priorities, they have not been without consequence. In fact, some level of tension and dissent has pervaded many aspects of the Initiative since its inception. Certainly, this is not unexpected in this kind of large-scale community collaboration, and considering the differences among partner systems in their missions, mandates, historical roots, and institutional influence. Because of the degree to which conflict has affected the overall structure of the collaborative and influenced project activities, key events related to conflict are summarized here.

In late 2002, the domestic violence community expressed concerns about a key SC decision that unfolded differently from how they had been led to believe it would. This decision involved recruitment of two Greenbook-funded positions. It soon emerged that dissatisfaction over this decision was symptomatic of wider dissatisfaction within the domestic violence community regarding how Initiative leadership communicated developments and decisions. This incident raised questions about the role of SC members and how power was shared. The difficulties were in part due to the burden placed on the sole domestic violence representative. Up to this point, this representative had grappled with how to best convey information between the SC and multiple stakeholders in the advocacy community in a manner that was sufficiently comprehensive, accurate and timely.

A federal Technical Assistance (TA) provider was consulted to help resolve the issue. She conducted a series of interviews with the relevant stakeholders, and ultimately concluded that the presenting situation reflected several issues that demanded prompt attention. These included increasing partners' trust, enhancing partner and Initiative communication, clarifying the role of SC members, and discussing how to share power equally among the partners. Through a series of problem-solving meetings with the TA provider, concerns related to trust, power, and fair representation were aired and an action plan was created. By March 2003, leadership agreed that:

- A second representative from the domestic violence community would join the SC;
- Initiative director and SC domestic violence representatives would develop a new Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) that outlined terms of participation for service providers from this community and authorized SC representative to make some decisions on behalf of them;
- Initiative director would work more closely with the two domestic violence representatives on the SC; and
- A more adaptable structure for SC meetings would be created.

As noted in Chapter V, Section B, the second domestic violence representative joined the SC in April 2003. In May 2003, a new MOU was drafted, and the majority of local MCADV service

providers signed this agreement. The other two steps (listed above) have continued to unfold over the course of the Initiative.

Despite these adjustments, tensions continued to percolate, and some advocates became increasingly frustrated with what they perceived as marginalization of their system and disregard for their expertise and input. In August 2004, a meeting was convened with the purpose of exploring divisive issues and achieving some resolution on these. The meeting included SC members, some IC and work group members, and other interested stakeholders. The Domestic Violence Work Group¹⁷ presented attendees with a letter and accompanying packet of materials which delineated problems they perceived in regard to the Family Court's and DSS-CD's handling of co-occurrence cases, and lack of progress in fulfilling Initiative goals. The Work Group letter also challenged the handling of some recent co-occurrence cases by the Family Court and DSS-CD. Though examples cited in the letter reflected actions of both DSS-CD and Family Court, the letter focused more closely on the Family Court, particularly the CPS Unit. Many of the problems noted and allegations made by the Domestic Violence Work Group were refuted by DSS-CD and Family Court staff, and were never fully investigated and validated.

Advocates had previously suggested court practices were not in compliance with Greenbook recommendations, and conflict over this had been building for some time. Yet, despite the allegations raised in the letter, survey and focus group data revealed that the CPS DJOs generally endorsed the Greenbook principle that the child's safety and welfare is contingent on ensuring the mother's safety, as well as other core Greenbook principles. Yet, they struggled with how to best achieve this. Up to this point in the Initiative, there had been many opportunities for advocates to interact with court and DSS-CD personnel, and for these systems to share insights and consider best practices for handling co-occurrence in a *general* way. However, there had been limited forums for Initiative leadership, agency managers, and line personnel to explore "hot button" issues relevant to *specific* cases (or in deference to client confidentiality, specific types of cases or mock/composite cases). The Multidisciplinary Case Consultation (MCC) represented the best opportunity for this to occur, but this group had only reviewed one case by August 2004.

Our analysis suggests that the collaboration between the three partner systems became highly strained and clashes occurred over the more complex and challenging cases. Co-occurrence cases involve different dynamics than relationships in which there is intimate violence but no children in the home, or those in which the children have not been abused. Co-occurrence cases require a more complex response than simply overlaying established practices that have been successful with women who voluntarily seek domestic violence services. There is often fundamental disagreement between DV advocates and child protection service professionals as to what constitutes risk in the child's life, and how aggressive child welfare intervention should be. These disagreements have widened the chasm between these systems and diminished the chances of meeting the overarching Greenbook goals of keeping battered women and children safe, and enhancing family stability. DSS-CD, court personnel, and DV advocates have all noted there have been co-occurrence cases on which they have worked effectively. However, the lessons learned from these experiences are seldom discussed in meetings and other forums

and have not been carefully analyzed. They have been overshadowed by the more complicated cases (such as those cited in the Work Group letter) that have sparked conflicts.

The letter stipulated that certain Initiative activities be suspended until their concerns were resolved, or the domestic violence community would withdraw from the Initiative. Leadership responded quickly with efforts to bridge differences and draw the collaborative back together. A second meeting was held in September 2004 to consider how the systems could continue working in partnership. The Initiative director sent an open letter to MCADV members inviting them to engage in constructive resolution, and the SC sent a response to the Work Group addressing each point raised and reaffirming common goals.

Several key events occurred in the wake of the conflict:

- Plans to conduct a case audit – Following a site visit in October 2004, the federal monitor and the TA team recommended the site engage in a “case review” process to assess how policy and case handling practices aligned with Greenbook principles. Leadership subsequently entered into dialogue with Praxis, International to conduct a case audit.
- Specialists’ resignation – The specialists (discussed in Chapter V, Section E) resigned in tandem in October 2004, citing problems similar to those documented in the Work Group letter. Shortly thereafter, the SC began developing plans for a new consulting service/position to be based at DSS-CD, with important modifications based on lessons learned from implementation of the Specialist.
- Suspension of some Initiative activities – The DVAP (see Chapter V, Section E) implementation was delayed pending cross-training and further review of the protocol. Also, the MCC Pilot Project (see Chapter V, Section E) was discontinued, pursuant to a recommendation from the federal monitor to develop a new model for case consultation. Other activities continued. As stated previously, IC meetings were also discontinued and the committee was not reconvened.
- MCADV partners were invited to sign the MOU again to demonstrate their willingness to remain in the collaborative. As of March 2005, 15 MCADV members signed the agreement. However, some agency directors did not, including the director of two area shelters (and original SC member) and the manager of the Victim Services Unit of the county Prosecuting Attorney’s Office (and former IC member).

In the immediate aftermath of this conflict, stakeholders expressed varying perceptions of the Initiative’s success to that point, and some trepidation regarding its future. However, throughout the first half of 2005, several formal Initiative activities were underway, and the members of the collaborative steadily began to work together again. The SC continued to meet regularly and work toward Initiative goals with what might be described as cautious optimism.

D. Inputs

1. Planning Phase Inputs

The Planning Phase of the Initiative, from January 2001 to September 2002, involved establishing the operational and organizational structures to carry out the work of the Initiative; conducting agency self-studies and developing a Work Plan; and engaging in various baseline data collection activities. During this phase, a number of activities were carried out in regard to educating partner agencies about the Initiative, increasing consensus around project objectives, gathering baseline data, and stimulating the formation of cross-agency relationships that would carry forward the work of the Initiative.

Many of these activities were conducted prior to the hiring of our current LRP team, and hence no data were available to assess the extent to which they were effective. We did note that during the Self Study conducted in 2002 (see Chapter V, Section E, below), stakeholders and key informants demonstrated a high level of awareness of the Initiative and the general goals and expectations set forth in the Greenbook. However, there was not as high a level of knowledge regarding the specific objectives of the project, nor was there consensus among stakeholders regarding priorities. Given the fact the project was still in its early stages, and the IC was only recently formed, this was not an unexpected finding.

Some examples of ongoing activities during the Planning Phase include:

- ***Development of promotional materials*** – Promotional materials were designed to raise awareness and educate system partners and other community organizations about goals of the federal Greenbook and the local Initiative. These included an Initiative Fact Sheet that presented an overview of the Greenbook and the objectives for St. Louis, a bookmark with similar information in a more condensed form and including general facts about co-occurrence, and a list of Greenbook “Buzzwords.” Furthermore, the director and administrative assistant developed a newsletter that was disseminated periodically to partners from July 2001 – February 2004.
- ***Updates to St. Louis County Domestic and Family Violence Council*** - This entity works to build a collaborative community process to increase the awareness and understanding of domestic and family violence and its consequences, and to reduce the incidence of domestic and family violence in St. Louis County. The Council is comprised of appointed representatives from the domestic violence community, courts, DSS-CD, the Missouri Division of Probation & Parole, and the Victim Services Unit of the County Prosecutor’s office. The Initiative director presented project updates to the Family Violence Council throughout the Planning Phase.
- ***Initiative director’s “Tour of the World”*** - From May 2001 and through the Planning Phase, the Initiative director conducted interviews with approximately 50 key stakeholders associated with the three partner systems and community-based organizations serving children and families. These interviews, which were collectively termed “Tour of the World,” were designed as a means for the director to meet the stakeholders, develop an enhanced understanding of these agencies, acquaint agency

leadership with the goals of Initiative, and informally gather baseline information about the status of collaborative efforts around domestic violence and child maltreatment. The director organized baseline information around the core objectives of the grant proposal, and summarized findings in the Planning Phase Report. These findings were useful in determining the next steps in moving forward.

- ***Planning Phase retreats*** – A series of retreats was held during the Planning Phase in order to solicit broader input from partner agencies on activities to implement, to increase buy-in and ownership, and to assess progress. The first of these retreats, held in July 2001, was a general planning retreat intended to introduce the Initiative to community agencies, and included 42 representatives of the three partner systems, as well as law enforcement, and other community-based organizations. This was followed by three SC and two IC retreats. Our LRP team was not yet hired when most of these retreats were held, and little data are available with which to evaluate the impacts of these retreats. However, in retrospect, we were able to observe some clear outcomes of these retreats. Specific outcomes were: initiation of the IC in February 2002; formation of the system-specific Work Groups, also in February 2002; and completion of a NET activity, Concept Mapping, in January 2002.

We were on hand to observe the July and September 2002 retreats and formally collected feedback from participants at the September event. The retreats were well attended, with balanced representation from partner systems. Professional facilitators, who worked closely with the director and our LRP team in planning agendas and activities, facilitated both. Overall, participants offered positive feedback about the retreats and reported they were constructive. Activities that were directly tied to moving the project forward, such as small group exercises to form committees, were regarded more favorably than icebreaker activities or activities that participants viewed as recaps, or for which they did not fully understand the purpose (e.g., presentation on the logic model).

- ***Three System Self Study*** - From April through June 2002, we coordinated a Self Study of the three system partners to gauge current functioning with regard to policies, procedures, practices, and viewpoints related to the system change process. Overall, approximately 90 participants were included in the study, which utilized a two-tiered approach. First, each of the three systems examined the extent to which their policies and practices were in compliance with Greenbook recommendations specific to their system. Second, we collected data in regard to compliance with several cross-system issues. A full report documenting the findings of the Self Study was presented to the SC and IC. An executive summary of this report is in Appendix B.

The following common themes emerged as areas of relatively high priority and relatively low compliance: (a) cross-training and skill-building for all systems; (b) screening and assessment protocols for all systems; (c) confidentiality protocols within the court and DSS-CD; (d) information linkages across all three systems, and within the Family Court; (e) court and DSS-CD measures for holding batterers accountable; (f) DSS-CD case management and monitoring; (g) strengthening collaboration; (h) scope

of services available in domestic violence community; (i) availability of community-based services for families experiencing co-occurrence; and (j) cultural competence.

Notably, the Self Study findings reflected the problems noted in the original grant proposal, and confirmed partners' willingness to address these areas. Moreover, themes that emerged were quite similar to those the Initiative director identified during her *Tour of the World* activity. However, the Self Study resulted in a greater degree of specificity about system gaps and problems. Also, it was important that these problems and gaps emerged from *within* the systems, and that agencies were willing to assume ownership for these.

Based on the Self Study findings, a preliminary Work Plan was developed and presented at the July 2002 IC retreat. The SC approved the Work Plan for the Initiative at its September 2002 meeting. This Work Plan became the basis for the Implementation Strategies (projects and activities) the Initiative undertook during the remainder of the period covered in this report.¹⁸

- **Technical Assistance: Praxis Mini-Audit** - In February 2002, representatives from the site attended a two-day training conducted by Praxis, International, in Colorado Springs, CO. The purpose was to introduce Greenbook sites to a methodology developed by Dr. Ellen Pence, founder of Praxis, for conducting safety and accountability "audits" in co-occurrence cases. These audits are a method of looking at structural problems within systems that present barriers to safety and accountability. As a result of this training, the site requested technical assistance from Praxis to provide consultation around the issue of batterer accountability. The focus was narrower in scope and of shorter duration than audits typically conducted by Praxis, and was termed a "mini-audit."

In September 2002, staff of Praxis International spent three days in St. Louis County gathering information from a sample of practitioners and clients, in order to identify and analyze the systemic problems associated with co-occurrence cases, with an emphasis on holding batterers accountable. Dr. Pence and her associate conducted nine focus groups (130 subjects) that included representatives from the judiciary, domestic violence organizations (including BIPs), criminal justice systems, child protection services, court services, and community service organizations. Interviews were also conducted with a battered woman and with men who had used violence in their intimate relationships.

The Praxis audit resulted in findings and recommendations in regard to these issues: (a) universal screening and assessment tools were needed to aid DSS-CD workers to identify and intervene appropriately in cases with domestic violence; (b) DSS-CD and court-mandated assessment and services often did not meet the needs of battered women, and placed undue strain on battered women; (c) the burden of responsibility for protecting the child is frequently placed on the non-offending parent because DSS-CD workers are not institutionally organized to directly intervene with batterers (particularly men who used violence and who were not a legal party to the case); (c)

weak coordination among DSS-CD, courts (including Family and Criminal Court), and batterer intervention programs in ensuring monitoring of batterer compliance with court orders; and (d) partner agencies need to engage in cross-training before they could successfully implement needed changes.

The mini-audit lasted only three days. However, these were labor-intensive days that required extensive preparation by Initiative staff. There was a great deal of anticipation among stakeholders as to what the audit would reveal and how the experience would guide the Initiative forward. The Praxis findings confirmed some of the problems identified in the grant-seeking stage, Tour of the World, and Self Study. In the initial aftermath of the report on audit findings, a few stakeholders expressed disappointment that some of the findings revealed nothing new; these were problems partner systems were already aware of; and/or they pointed to long-standing systemic problems -- such as high turnover and resources shortages at DSS-CD -- that were beyond the scope of the Initiative to address.

Despite these concerns, the audit had some clear and significant impacts on the site. Initiative leadership immediately moved forward on the recommendation to strengthen the connection between courts and BIPs. The Family Court applied for and received a grant through Missouri's Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA) to secure a position to coordinate referrals between the Adult Abuse Division of the Family Court and BIPs. The Batterer Compliance Coordinator position was implemented in January 2003. This project is discussed in Chapter V, Section E.

Second, while there had been some training conducted in regard to Child Orders of Protection (COP) in April and May 2002, the mini-audit appeared to solidify leadership's resolve to encourage greater use of the COP as a legal mechanism to limit the offender's access to children, and by extension, to the battered mother. Dr. Pence's observations and recommendations in this regard have frequently been reiterated in subsequent discussions regarding using COPs, and helped inform development of the COP Protocol in 2004 (discussed in Chapter V, Section E). Similarly, the Praxis recommendations reinforced the need to develop a screening and assessment protocol. Finally, the concept of "structural problems within systems" as impediments to safety and accountability appears to resonate with Initiative leadership, and has been raised in a variety of contexts related to the work of the Initiative. By June 2005, preparations were underway to engage the services of Praxis in conducting a broader-based audit for the site.

2. Off-Site Conferences, Toolboxes, and Site Visits

The national Greenbook Demonstration Project has sponsored several training events for the six demonstration sites. All-Sites Conferences provided opportunities for multiple representatives and the Initiative staff from each of the systems from all six sites to discuss challenges and approaches in doing this type of collaborative work. These conferences also included workshops on model programs, plenary and panel presentations, and research updates. The first All-Sites Conference was held in St. Louis (2001) and drew representatives from Initiative partner systems as well as from other service providers in the community that work

with families and co-occurrence issues. The director, at least one member of the LRP team, and representatives from the SC and IC attended the 2003 All-Sites in Lane County, OR, and 2005 conference in Colorado Springs, CO. Feedback by attendees to All-Sites Conferences was quite positive. While it is difficult to pinpoint precise ways in which participant experience has informed and directly furthered the work of the Initiative, some general themes from these conferences have been raised and considered in regard to Initiative activities. For example, several site representatives attended a presentation on safety and accountability audits at the 2005 event on audits, and material from this was referenced in the early planning stages for the second Praxis audit.

The NET convened cross-site meetings at which project directors and LRPs could discuss issues specifically related to evaluation. The NET also presented their evaluation plans and invited input, and attendees shared updates on activities at their site, including evaluation activities. Some time on the agenda is also devoted to refining the cross-site evaluation and for participants to review and respond to cross-site findings.

In addition, the St. Louis County Initiative has sponsored attendees from all partner systems at other national conferences, site visits, and cross-site meetings. Examples include separate “toolbox meetings” for the various disciplines involved in the work of the Initiative; a site visit to the Massachusetts Department of Social Services (Mass DSS) to learn about their domestic violence specialist program; a site visit to Louisville, KY to observe a multidisciplinary case consultation; a site visit to Dade County, FL, to learn about a domestic advocacy program within the dependency court; and a training by Lundy Bancroft on batterer accountability in child protection cases held in Jefferson City, MO.

The TA team developed and led various Toolbox Meetings for participants from all key systems at the demonstration sites. These provided a forum for attendees to examine critical issues, build capacity, consider system-specific needs, share information on developments at their sites, and develop action plans to enhance and complement current efforts.

Site visits to other jurisdictions have proven to be quite productive and can be linked to direct activity. The site visits are intended to link the demonstration site with best practices and innovative programs and policies in action. Representatives from all three partner systems participated in site visits to observe activities the St. Louis Initiative was considering replicating. The site visit to Massachusetts DSS, during which participants learned about the domestic violence program at that agency, played a vital role in the development of the specialist positions that were based at DSS-CD and the Family Court, and lessons learned were used in crafting the job descriptions for these positions. In a similar vein, representatives who observed the multidisciplinary case consultation in Louisville based their development of the St. Louis MCC Pilot on lessons learned in Louisville. The Louisville experience influenced decisions in regard to MCC Team membership and confidentiality.

All participants on site visits, at toolboxes, and at other off-site trainings were asked to complete feedback protocols, and the majority did so. Respondents provided feedback regarding resources that could be useful at their agencies or to Initiative activities, general insights gleaned at the conferences or meetings, plans to implement ideas from the event into

their work, and how they planned share what they learned with colleagues. We provided summaries of the feedback to the director and reports on these at SC meetings. Participant suggestions have resulted in the purchasing of books and other materials, and have led to development of similar trainings in St. Louis. However, there is little evidence as to the longer-term impacts these meetings and trainings have had on the Initiative. In retrospect, it would have been useful to conduct six-month follow-up surveys with participants to determine if they had made any changes in practice or were interested in Initiative support to help implement changes.¹⁹

3. Retreats

In addition to the planning retreats, all-day retreats have been held throughout the course of the Initiative on approximately a semi-annual basis. Some retreats include only the SC, while others have been open to the IC as well. Retreats have been a key strategy in formulating or refining the Initiative's work plan and in helping members of the collaborative develop a shared vision.

A professional facilitator worked closely with the Initiative director in planning retreats, preparing detailed agendas, and facilitating these events. Depending on what topics are on the agenda and what activities are planned, the facilitator has also met with our LRP team and SC members in advance as well.

Retreats were well-organized, lively, and dynamic events. Those observed during the evaluation period typically opened with introductions and an ice-breaker exercise. Generally, retreat activities can be classified into two types: (a) activities that focused on the collaboration overall, such as presentations on key features of successful collaborations, or exercises in which stakeholders rate various aspects of the collaboration or their level of agreement with certain issues; and (b) activities related to planning for specific projects, such as a small group exercise in which participants discussed plans for acting on Self Study findings.

Occasionally SC members have questioned the value of all-day retreats, and whether they produced sufficient results to justify a full day out of the office and the resulting strain on very busy work schedules. Most Initiative stakeholders are administrators, directors, judges, high-ranking supervisors, or fulfill other roles of significant responsibility at their respective agencies. Essentially, all volunteer to take part in the Initiative and this has placed considerable demands on their time. Ironically, though, at the conclusion of retreats, a common observation has been that there was not sufficient time to accomplish needed business.

It will become increasingly important to ensure that all future retreats are carefully planned to ensure maximum benefits. It is recommended that all members of the target audience be permitted to give input into what should be the focus of retreats, as well as the kind of activities in which they are less interested. Also, some agenda items and activities are undoubtedly of greater interest to some participants than others, and it would be helpful to provide prospective participants with a detailed agenda in advance in the event they wish to opt out of some activities.

E. Strategies and Activities

By January 2003, the Initiative was ready to begin implementing strategies identified in the Implementation Work Plan. In order to accomplish this, the IC was charged with supervising the work of three Multidisciplinary Action Teams.

1. *Multidisciplinary Action Teams*

- ***Client Services Action Team*** – This team was co-chaired by a DSS-CD manager and an IC member who was a domestic violence survivor. Goals were to: develop effective assessment tool for co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment; develop protocols for three partner systems, including confidentiality and reasonable efforts; create MOU for partner agency collaborations; develop best practices model for use by guardians ad litem (GALs) and court-appointed special advocates (CASAs); and develop DSS-CD Manual for use by domestic violence advocates. This team divided into two groups, one that focused on assessment tools and the other to address reasonable efforts and confidentiality.
- ***Cross-training Action Team*** - A Family Court CPS Unit manager and director of a domestic violence service provider served as co-chairs for this team. Goals included: understand training needs for each system; recommend training and cross-training standards, including who should receive what types of training; recommend a cross-training model for content and training delivery; develop a DV/CM Resource Manual; develop a partner Agency Mentoring Project; and oversee training on the COPP. This group subdivided into three teams to examine training needs of each partner system.
- ***Batterer Accountability Action Team*** – A Circuit Court judge and BIP director co-chaired this team. The team set the following goals: understand how batterers enter the system and how each system intends to respond to them; pilot a Criminal Court DV Compliance Program (using referral to a BIP at a bond hearing); and pilot a Family Court Compliance Program based on the Praxis recommendations. The committee formed two groups – one to guide the Criminal Court compliance program and the other to work on the Family Court project.

These teams were multidisciplinary, reflecting the collaborative spirit of this Initiative. This brought a wider range of perspectives to issues at hand, and increased the likelihood of buy-in from all partner systems. The teams met regularly, and Initiative staff provided support to help organize meetings, prepare agendas and other materials, and conduct background research as requested.

The teams' effectiveness in meeting outcomes was mixed. At the final meeting, each team provided a series of recommendations for ongoing efforts, as well as written feedback regarding their experiences as team members and their assessment of the team's effectiveness. Some of these recommendations did not differ markedly from the original recommendations the committees were expected to carry out. Also, not all goals were pursued. One reason given was that the scope of work was too broad, and they simply did not have time to address all

goals. The Client Services Action Team, in particular, struggled with the scope of tasks originally assigned. However, even groups with more limited objectives had some difficulty. Also, committee members reported problems with leadership, decision-making, clarity of goals, and defining members' roles. The team chairpersons lacked authority over other members, and typically did not delegate work to be done in between meetings. The chairpersons and members all faced the routine demands of their jobs and had little time to devote to the tasks needed to successfully complete team goals. Also, apparently some team members understood that the expectation of them as members was to make recommendations and offer input – and that tasks would then be completed outside of the committee. Nevertheless, some members made commendable efforts in completing committee tasks. Examples of this are the Reasonable Efforts Protocol, a draft of a domestic violence screening tool, and forms for use with the courts to monitor offender compliance in BIPs. All teams made progress toward some of the goals during the six-month period, and a number of Initiative-related developments can be traced to efforts of the Action Teams -- notably the DVAP, MCC, DSS-CD Manual for advocates, Reasonable Efforts and COP Protocols, the BCP, various cross-training activities, and the DV/CM Resource Manual.

2. Training Activities

The Greenbook Initiative has developed, sponsored, or provided assistance in coordinating a wide range of training activities. Following are some highlights of training activities:

- ***Child Order of Protection Training*** - In April and May 2002, the Initiative contracted with MCADV to provide a three-part luncheon series to educate Family Court personnel on the use of COP in co-occurrence cases. In October 2003, the court case coordinator (co-located position at the Family Court, described below) conducted trainings on COPs for the Family Court legal staff and GALs who represent children.
- ***Stop Court & Train Conferences*** - Stop Court & Train is an annual one-day training event sponsored by the Family Court and attended by staffs of the Family Court, DSS-CD, and community-based organizations that serve families. In June 2001, representatives from the Initiative presented three workshops as part of this event. In June 2002, the theme was “Family Violence – It Touches Us All,” and the Initiative co-sponsored the event. The Initiative funded the keynote speaker, Olga Trujillo, who is a nationally recognized expert on family violence. Thirteen of the 20 workshops addressed issues of domestic violence and child maltreatment. In keeping with the theme, local DV service providers were invited to attend and present at the conference for the first time. The 2003 Stop Court & Train theme was cultural diversity, and the Initiative invited the director of cultural competence for the Child Welfare League of America, Jorge Velazquez, as keynote speaker. Mr. Velazquez also met with Initiative stakeholders at a luncheon session and facilitated action planning on how to incorporate cultural competence into the work of the Initiative.
- ***Batterer Intervention Providers Panel*** - In August, September, and November 2002, local BIPs made presentations to the judiciary, DSS staff, and Family Court DJOs, offering an overview of the work they do with batterers and how men can be referred to these programs.

- ***Joint Training on Multidisciplinary Case Consultation*** - The director worked with the site's federal TA liaison to coordinate training on MCC in conjunction with the City of St. Louis MCC team. All MCC planning committee members, most of whom went on to serve on the MCC team, attended this one-day event in January 2004.
- ***Domestic Violence Institute: Multidisciplinary Strategies with Men Who Batter*** - This two-day Institute was held in October 2004. A multidisciplinary committee worked with the TA team to plan and develop the Institute. In order to minimize disruptions to members' schedules, and increase their availability to participate, the committee conducted most of its meetings via teleconference calls. Two national experts on batterer intervention and fathering after battering, Juan Carlos Arean and Fernando Mederos, led the training. In addition to DSS-CD workers from St. Louis County, adjacent counties, and the city, the audience included BIP staff, Family Court DJOs, and domestic violence advocates. Also, Mr. Arean conducted a dinner meeting with the local ABIP on fathering after battering, and Mr. Mederos conducted a session at a judicial luncheon titled, "*Maximizing the Power of the Judiciary: Fair and Compassionate Judicial Management of Men and Fathers Who Batter.*"
- ***"Let's Talk About It: Domestic Violence in the Center of the Room" and "Effects of Domestic Violence on Children"*** - This two-part training was developed by a team of local advocates and offered to Family Court and DSS-CD personnel in May 2005.

As discussed in Chapter V, Section E, we collected feedback from attendees at most training events sponsored or organized by the Initiative. The majority of attendees that completed these feedback surveys or otherwise shared their perceptions described training activities in very positive terms. Overall, attendees viewed these activities as enlightening, engaging, well organized, and as having relevance to their jobs. Attendees also tended to rate the trainers highly. Recommendations and requests for more training were very common following Initiative-related training events. The DSS-CD staff in particular valued training opportunities and reported being eager for more.

Clearly, the Initiative has brought training on a variety of pertinent topics to a varied audience. Training has played an important role in bridging the differences across partner systems and helping participants better understand the philosophical underpinnings, mandates, policies, and limitations of the other systems. It is noteworthy that in the months following the meetings to address the conflict that erupted in August 2004, training was one of the key activities that continued, and one on which system partners demonstrated an openness to collaboration.

Trainers have developed agendas and outlines that reflect the general themes they will address, Power Point presentations, and handouts for audiences, all of which have enhanced the quality of the sessions. Yet neither the collaborative nor any single partner agency embarked on development of an actual training curriculum during the evaluation period. Curriculum development is a major endeavor that requires expertise in training development and writing, as well as on the subject matter of the proposed training. Further, it requires a significant amount of time. Most partner agencies do not have the luxury of dedicating staff to take on a task of

this scope. Nor has technical assistance been available to develop curricula. Nevertheless, it will be difficult to replicate trainings with consistency and adherence to desired standards if trainers are not equipped with core curriculum materials.

Direct service workers and managers at both the DSS-CD and Family Court have indicated that while the basic training offered by the local and regional domestic violence agencies has been valuable, it has not fully met their needs relative to domestic violence in child protection cases. Initiative participants continue to request intermediate and advanced training. Certainly, training on “the basics” is essential for some members at the target audience, and can lay the groundwork for more advanced levels. But some Family Court and DSS-CD staff has reported dissatisfaction with repeated exposure to basic training on historical/philosophical roots and dynamics of domestic violence. This is especially true when the content of training has differed from what staff expected when they enrolled in the training. Court staff reported higher levels of dissatisfaction than has DSS-CD staff. This may be a function of the higher rate of staff turnover at DSS-CD, and the fact that there is greater percentage of DSS-CD attendees at any one event who may have had no prior domestic violence training. Moreover, feedback from court DJOs indicates they are more likely to have had previous training on domestic violence, and are interested in learning more about services that are available and how to respond to cases with co-occurrence. They have requested guidance on “messy” and complicated cases, including cases in which: the mother remains in a relationship with the batterer; the batterer is not the child[ren]’s father; the mother is a known or suspected perpetrator of the child abuse; and/or the mother has been in previous relationships with a batterer in which the children were maltreated.

Multilevel training on co-occurrence should be a top priority for partner agencies. If not properly trained in co-occurrence, workers are not fully prepared to use consultation and expert assistance in co-occurrence cases, and to work collaboratively with domestic violence agencies. Training should include a forum for reviewing complex case issues and for debate and discussion regarding possible responses to difficult cases. We recommend using composite or closed cases with special features that increase the complexity of the case.²⁰

It is strongly encouraged that the Initiative leadership explores what local resources might be available for curriculum development, and consider allocating funds to support this activity. A small committee, with at least one representative from each partner system, should be designated to provide guidance and oversight to this activity. A well-organized, comprehensive training curriculum addressing co-occurrence, cross-training, and other pertinent issues represents a major step towards institutionalizing the gains that have resulted from Initiative-sponsored training activities.

3. Specialized Positions

By late 2002, members of the SC agreed to pursue development of two co-located positions and began to create detailed job descriptions for each position. These positions were funded exclusively by the Initiative, though all three partner systems provided some in-kind donations.

The following objectives were associated with the specialist positions: (a) raise awareness and understanding of the dynamics of domestic violence and co-occurrence with child

maltreatment; (b) improve screening and assessment procedures; (c) strengthen service delivery to families affected by domestic violence and child maltreatment; and (d) reduce incidence of “failure to protect” and other ineffective responses in cases involving domestic violence and child maltreatment.

The domestic violence specialist position was designed as a resource for DSS-CD, while the court case coordinator was intended to work with Family Court personnel, primarily CPS DJOs. The Family Court entered into a contract with ROW to assume primary responsibility for hiring and supervising these positions, although a multidisciplinary group oversaw the actual recruitment, interview, and selection process. The specialist began work at DSS-CD in June 2003. Initially, she was assigned to one of the DSS-CD county offices, but gradually, she became a resource for all four offices. The court case coordinator started in her position in July 2003, and was located at the Family Court. These positions/individuals were collectively referred to as *the specialists* and we use that term in this report, unless it is necessary to distinguish certain aspects or activities associated with one of the positions.

The specialists were active on several Greenbook committees and ad hoc committees. Both routinely attended IC meetings, and both served on the MCC Planning Committee and MCC Team, the DVAP Ad Hoc Committee, and the multidisciplinary group that planned the Domestic Violence Institute. The specialists are credited with the following accomplishments:

- Child OP training for Legal Department of Family Court
- Child OP training for GALs
- Domestic violence basic training for new CASAs
- Multiple in-service trainings with DSS-CD staff (DV specialist provided several “mini in-service trainings” at staff meetings)
- Development of the COPP (developed jointly by the court case coordinator and the Family Court administrator)
- Significant contributions to the DVAP, particularly in development of materials to complement the screening and assessment tools and provide context for its use
- Drafting policies and materials to advance the work of the MCC (the court case coordinator and MCC chair jointly developed a protocol to guide the MCC Team)

It must also be noted that another position, a full-time DJO, was hired in May 2003 to address co-occurrence issues, through a grant from the Department of Justice’s Office of Violence Against Women. For much of this evaluation period, this DJO was assigned to the CPS Unit of the Family Court, managing a caseload of child maltreatment cases involving domestic violence. Planning for this position overlapped with planning for the court case coordinator. In hindsight, there was not enough consideration given to the precise roles of each in regard to providing input on CPS cases, and how the positions could best work together in a collaborative and complementary manner. Despite some early efforts the court case coordinator and the DV DJO made to collaborate, role confusion created conflicts between the two, and the professional relationship was strained for much of the evaluation period.

Both specialists resigned their positions in October 2004 (as noted in Chapter V, Section C). In the month immediately following the specialists’ resignations, we conducted a series of

interviews with the specialists themselves and key agency staff responsible for oversight for these positions, and held a focus group with CPS DJOs. We reported findings to the SC, and these were used to inform the creation of a slightly different consulting position/service that would replace the specialist at DSS-CD. The SC had created a full description and begun recruitment, but had not made a final selection for the position, by June 2005. The Family Court opted to not replace the court case coordinator.

Our evaluation revealed there was considerable disagreement and confusion across key informants (including the specialists themselves) as to what the precise expectations and objectives for these positions were.²¹ The specialists felt thwarted in their ability to carry out key duties and meet expectations listed in their job description. One reason for this was that there were various iterations of the job descriptions generated during the planning stages. Though a final description was generated at some point, some people continued to work from earlier versions. In fact, some key informants reported they had never seen job descriptions that others relied on as the final or “correct” version.

Another problem was that lack of preparation (specifically cross-training and basic domestic violence training) impeded collaboration and contributed to misperceptions about roles and system mandates. It is imperative that persons in these kinds of jobs have an understanding and appreciation of the policies, mandates, limitations, and bureaucratic structure of the Family Court and DSS-CD. Also, they require a solid grasp of the roles and responsibilities of the front-line worker, as well as other staff with whom they are working. There was a perception among DSS-CD and Family Court staff that the specialists may not have fully recognized or appreciated how their agency/unit operates, as well as their mandates in regard to protecting children. Reciprocal cross-training is equally essential – agency staff must understand the roles and responsibilities of consultants, specialists, or advocates assigned to assist them. In addition, agency staff must have at least the basic level of training on domestic violence dynamics and recommended best practices *prior* to implementing co-located positions, or in the initial stage of implementation. These types of training did not occur before implementing the positions. Once the plan for developing these positions was final, Initiative leadership was eager to move forward and introduce positive change in the systems.

The specialists’ perceptions regarding how much autonomy they would be granted to introduce change were markedly different from that of managers and administrators at DSS-CD and the Family Court. To an extent, the specialists’ areas of professional interest and expertise shaped their perceptions about which activities they should focus on, and this produced conflicts with managers whose expectations differed. Also, they may not have been prepared to accept that paradigm change occurs slowly in large, bureaucratic systems.

The specialists engaged in protocol development, and stakeholders recognized their work in this area with the Family Court and DSS-CD as a significant achievement. The specialists, though, found the process for protocol development to be cumbersome and time-consuming. They asserted this process moved very slowly and was micro-managed by Initiative leadership. One specialist suggested the DVAP Ad Hoc Committee was unnecessary, and that it would have been more efficient if she and the other specialist could have fully written the protocol and simply submitted a completed draft for the SC or other committee to review. The input, review,

and critique process involved multiple meetings with the ad hoc group and several stages of revision. It is not clear whether this kind of committee work and extensive oversight is indeed essential to multi-system collaboration or rather a function of bureaucratic systems. However, it is not surprising that it is frustrating to persons unaccustomed to working in bureaucratic, hierarchal systems or with large collaborations.

As a result of these problems, the specialists felt their services were undervalued and underutilized. Though the specialist at DSS-CD reported being consulted more often than did the court case coordinator -- and described more positive experiences -- this was a frustrating role for both. The specialist at DSS-CD noted she was given opportunities to provide advice only in a "piecemeal" way -- on a single aspect of a case -- and was not asked to continue advising throughout the duration of a case. The court case coordinator felt her advice was primarily sought by DJOs seeking to validate a course of action they had already selected, and that her advice was not used if it differed from that course.

Ideally, these positions were intended to fuse the specialists' expertise in DV with the CPS workers' expertise on child welfare. Unfortunately, this did not happen as smoothly as envisioned, and the specialists and CPS workers were divided on the best approaches in some cases. Key informants suggested that some workers did not always seek assistance because they were already properly trained on DV dynamics and responses, and did not routinely require assistance on all co-occurrence cases. Or, they may have needed advice on only one aspect or at only one critical stage of the case. Those workers who sought the specialists' advice may have benefited from the information they received and were able to continually apply it to other aspects of the case. In fact, one informant indicated that this is how she envisioned consultation would work -- as a form of training the worker could then continue to apply, thus reducing that worker's need for ongoing consultation.

A final barrier to successful implementation was the dual supervision structure. For both positions, there does not seem to have been consensus as to the chain-of-command through which the specialists were to report problems, raise concerns, or through which other staff could bring concerns about them. Thus, many of these concerns were not addressed and resolved in a timely manner, and critical stakeholders who could have brought resolution to some problems were, at times, left "out of the loop." It appeared that these problems would percolate for a period, and then reach the SC for resolution. In some cases, the direct supervisors were not included in this process and were not always given the opportunity to troubleshoot and curtail problems.

Only anecdotal evidence -- which was mixed -- was available regarding results of consultation provided. It is difficult to persuade staff of the benefits of consultation without examples showing how it has been used effectively, and the impact on the workers and the families. Furthermore, without documentation of consultation, and tracking and analysis of outcomes, it is not possible to identify those recommended approaches that were not effective in certain cases, and plan more effective responses.

We did observe that, during their tenure, both specialists were committed to educating and enlightening DSS-CD and court personnel regarding domestic violence issues. They worked

diligently to promote empathy and awareness of the plight of battered women. Collective evidence suggests these efforts provoked important discussions among their target audience and promoted closer examination of policies and practices – in ways that other Greenbook activities had not.

4. Domestic Violence Assessment Protocol

The partner systems' lack of universal screening and assessment tools was noted in the grant proposal, and was reinforced by the Self Study data. DSS-CD and Family Court stakeholders noted that domestic violence appeared to be underrepresented in their casework because they did not have tools for early identification. The likelihood that domestic violence was identified in the early stages rested heavily on the expertise of the individual worker, the victim's willingness to self-disclose, and/or the particular features that brought the case to the attention of child protection (e.g., if domestic violence was reported on the hotline call). During a hotline investigation, CD workers were required to complete a checklist documenting risk factors in the home, including domestic violence. However, there was no specific protocol for completing this checklist. Workers could ask the client if there was domestic violence in the home, make the assessment based on other evidence, or use both methods. However, the checklist was completed during the investigation, at which time there was little opportunity for the worker to build rapport with the client and gain trust, rendering victim self-disclosure unlikely. DSS-CD workers had no direct access to databases to check for arrest history or past or current petitions seeking Orders of Protection.²² Nor did the Family Court CPS Unit have a formal policy or commonly used method for assessing domestic violence in new cases.

The Client Services Action Team began work on assessment and screening tools in 2003. The DVAP Ad Hoc Committee was subsequently formed to refine the drafts the Action Team created and to plan implementation. Building on the work of the Action Team, the ad hoc committee produced an initial assessment screen and three assessment tools, one for the domestic violence victim, the child(ren), and the batterer. The specialists served on this committee and wrote guidelines to provide some context for use of the tools. This document provides general instruction on use of these tools, as well as interviewing techniques and a model safety plan. It further addresses documentation of assessment and confidentiality and service planning for clients. Furthermore, an IC member who served on the Client Services Team wrote a Reasonable Efforts Protocol that was incorporated into the DVAP. This protocol has received the approval of the SC, but they have not yet authorized a plan for its dissemination.

Collectively, the tools and the guidelines are referred to as the DVAP. The intended users of the DVAP are the child welfare workers at DSS-CD and the CPS Unit DJOs at the Family Court. Its purpose, as described in the guidelines, is to “provide guidance to the DSS-CD and Family Court staff in managing cases involving the co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence, especially during the investigation, assessment, and service planning stages.”

We developed a plan to evaluate the DVAP and, with stakeholder input, identified the following objectives: (a) CPS cases are routinely screened for co-occurrence; (b) CPS workers' abilities to recognize DV in child maltreatment cases are enhanced; (c) indicators of co-occurrence are followed through with a more thorough assessment of the non-offending parent,

child(ren), and if appropriate, the batterer; (d) CPS workers' response to indicators of DV are consistent across workers and agencies; (e) CPS workers respond appropriately to identification of co-occurrence, with these responses reflecting Greenbook principles and best practices; (f) service delivery to families affected by child maltreatment and domestic violence is improved, through institutionalization of best practices; and (g) safety of non-offending parents and children and family stability are enhanced.

However, as noted in Chapter V, Section C, the DVAP was delayed pending cross-training pursuant to a stipulation in the Domestic Violence Work Group letter. As of June 2005, implementation was still on hold, as cross-training plans had not yet unfolded. We anticipate that we will evaluate any screening and assessment procedures that are implemented in the course of the Initiative, although our evaluation plan may require some modifications.

5. Batterer Compliance Project Coordinator (BCPC)

In October 2003, the Family Court implemented a position to monitor batterer compliance with Adult Orders of Protection. The position, the Batterer Compliance Project Coordinator (BCPC), was originally funded by Missouri's OSCA. When funding lapsed, the SC agreed to permit use of Initiative funds to support the position beginning in 2005. Under the OSCA grant, the position was designed to work with cases in which Adult Orders of Protection were sought as a result of intimate partner violence. When the Initiative took over funding, the BCPC began offering her services in domestic violence assault cases in the criminal court and CPS cases in the Family Court as well.

The project was created as a means to systematically monitor batterer compliance with court orders, particularly in regard to participation in batterer intervention offender programs. ROW supervises the BCPC under a contractual agreement with the Family Court, but she also reports to the manager of the Family Court's Domestic Relations Office. She routinely attends hearings and consults with judges regarding batterer compliance issues. When an offender is referred to her, she conducts orientation regarding the BCP, completes intake forms for enrollment in a BIP selected by the offender, and then monitors compliance in completing the BIP. She serves as the liaison between the court and the BIP throughout the offender's enrollment and advises judges of noncompliance. Though most requests for monitoring originate from the judiciary, she also works with attorneys, victim service providers, and Domestic Relations staff.

In late 2003/early 2004, two judges with the Circuit Court began conducting compliance review hearings in domestic violence misdemeanor cases. These judges often engage the services of the BCPC in monitoring BIP compliance in these cases. Following initial review, the offender may be scheduled for subsequent reviews at the court's discretion. If an offender fails to appear for a review hearing, the judge can issue a warrant for his or her arrest. Both judges are active in the Initiative; one sits on the SC and the other co-chaired the Batterer Accountability Action Team. Both have indicated they had considered conducting review hearings with these offenders prior to the Initiative, but were encouraged to begin doing so through information received via Initiative activities. Moreover, the Domestic Violence Supplement and Judgment forms developed by the Action Team, and improved channels of communication with BIPs, have facilitated their experience conducting these hearings.

We developed an evaluation plan to assess the effectiveness of the BCPC and the compliance review hearings. We have collected data from a sample of cases in which compliance reviews were held and a sample in which they were not. Though we propose to collect outcome data related to re-arrests in these cases, we have been unable to do so to date. We will also analyze data relative to intermediate outcomes -- whether offenders complied with court directives and completed probation -- but this is on hold pending availability of the data related to long-term goals.

The BCPC has maintained her own service delivery statistics and has tracked intermediate outcomes. As of June 2005, she reported 82 persons had been referred to the program, and five of these had successfully completed a BIP. She continually seeks opportunities to meet with members of the judiciary in order to educate them about the program, ways in which she can assist them, and the benefits of active monitoring. Over time, more judges have begun requesting her services for case monitoring. In the first half of 2005, she noted that referrals were at the highest since the inception of the program, with a rate of 6.75 per month.

We are unable to report yet on the effectiveness of the BCP, and have not formally assessed stakeholder perceptions of this project or position. However, stakeholders have cited the BCPC as one of the Initiative's more successful activities. There appears to be a high degree of satisfaction associated with the BCPC in terms of duties and how the position is structured, the performance of the individual in the position, and her efforts in raising awareness of batterer compliance issues among the judiciary.

6. Multidisciplinary Consultation Case (MCC) Review Process

The Cross-Training Multidisciplinary Action Team recommended developing a consultation model that would include a panel of representatives from partner systems. This panel would serve as a resource for direct service workers handling complex cases involving co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence. The MCC Planning Committee, comprised of representatives from the three partner systems, was appointed to launch this project. This committee met from September -December 2003. Partner systems selected the MCC Team permanent members, and this group held its first meeting in February 2004.

As described in their statement of purpose, the MCC Team was a collaboration "united by principles of victim safety and accountability, to provide education, resources, and support to their staff to improve responses and outcomes." The consultation process was further viewed as a means through which team members could learn more about one another's systems and agencies, consider one another's perspectives, and better understand the rationale behind decisions made by direct service workers. Ideally, this would lead partner systems to explore new and innovative responses to co-occurrence cases and improve outcomes for families served. The committee chairperson drafted the protocol with assistance from the court case coordinator. The committee then reviewed, revised, and approved the final protocol. The objectives were to: (a) improve safety for families and hold batterers accountable for their actions; (b) provide a consistent forum for staff to receive education and information about co-occurrence and obtain best practices guidance and practical resources; (c) maximize staff effectiveness and improve intersystem coordinated responses to provide better, lasting

outcomes for families; and (d) collaborate, cross-train, and problem-solve among professionals by sharing expertise, perspectives, and resources from multiple disciplines.

The initial team was comprised of: (1) two supervisors from DSS-CD, (2) the director and a supervisor from the Family Court CPS Unit, (3) two domestic violence advocates, (4) one batterer intervention provider (BIP) representing ABIP,²³ and (5) the two specialists. Shortly after the team was selected, one domestic violence community representative left her position with her agency. The SC chose a replacement who had served on the Planning Committee.

All three Initiative partner systems were eligible to submit cases, provided these conditions were met: (1) the family was experiencing co-occurrence of child maltreatment and domestic violence, and (2) two or all of the partner systems were involved. The protocol further included a six-step process for submitting cases. The MCC model was distinct from consultation or training models with which participating agencies had experience. One key distinction was the composition of the team as a panel of consultants who would review and advise on cases, rather than a group of service providers with active involvement on the case. The team members agreed their role was advisory, and understood that workers had discretion to act on their recommendations or not. Further, the team recognized that case-handling decisions are made by direct service workers within the framework of agency policies, mandates, and available resources, and that the team did not have the authority to compel the worker to take any actions. This reflected the notion of the consultation as a case-based training tool, with the aim of educating workers on better approaches rather than dictating case-handling and service provision. Thus, the Planning Committee did not see a need for reaching consensus, voting, or prioritizing recommendations in order to arrive at a single plan of action or set of actions. Rather, they agreed that all members could offer suggestions to the worker during the consultation. These would be recorded in a report prepared subsequent to the session and provided to the worker.

The team worked with the Initiative project director to create a job description for a coordinator/facilitator for this project. The SC approved the description and funding for this part-time contractual position for a 12-month pilot period, and the position was filled in April 2004. The principal role of the coordinator/facilitator was to manage the team process during the consultation. She was also responsible for scheduling meetings, distributing case review information, preparing reports summarizing the team's recommendations, and disseminating these reports.

While still in the planning stage, the team experienced conflict. Communication broke down and the team suffered setbacks due to misunderstandings, lack of clarity regarding decision-making processes, and some members' failure to keep abreast of business conducted at meetings they missed. The MCC process often stalled when persons who had missed a meeting attended the subsequent meeting and learned of a decision or decisions s/he did not support.

One significant issue the team struggled with revolved around confidentiality issues. Concerns regarding how to maintain client confidentiality when facing a situation requiring "duty to report" surfaced repeatedly. Because a central criterion for case referral was that two or more Initiative partner systems be involved in a case, it was inevitable that a case presented by a

domestic violence service provider would have either Family Court or DSS-CD involvement. This presented the possibility that a domestic violence service provider could inadvertently reveal details about a case/family during a consultation that a Family Court or DSS-CD direct service worker or supervisor might be able to identify. While this was often framed as a mandated reporter problem, more in-depth discussions revealed the issue to be more complex. At the heart of the conflict were the team members' different perceptions of risk. Battered women's advocates and child welfare professionals perceive risks to battered women and children differently. DV service workers often see a woman as capable of protecting her child in circumstances that child protective service workers view as threatening to the child. These differences in perspectives impeded formation of trusting and fully collaborative relationships.

The team received only one referral during an approximate six-month period in which they were inviting referrals, which was actively solicited by one of its members. This suggests that a voluntary referral system may produce a very low referral rate. Line staff will not always recognize cases for which consultation could be beneficial, or may avoid seeking assistance from a new resource until it is well established. Further, in the absence of a mandate *or* incentive for staff to bring these cases forward, it may be seen as extra work that is not necessary, given that issues requiring immediate attention have already been addressed.

The team met over a period of several months under the guidance of the coordinator/facilitator. The single case consultation was held in July 2004. For this consultation, we collected feedback from team members. Six of the eight respondents offered overall positive feedback, indicating the process was balanced, there was adequate information to provide input/suggestions, they learned of new resources, and they felt respected by fellow team members. However, two members stated they were unsure as to whether the family's confidentiality was protected. The case was ultimately transferred to another jurisdiction, so we were unable to collect data as to whether the team's recommendations were followed and if so, the resulting impact on the family.

MCC Team activities were put on hold shortly after distribution of the Domestic Violence Work Group letter, and the team was disbanded in December 2004. Following a site visit to St. Louis in October 2004, the federal monitor for the Initiative recommended adopting a consultation model that has been successfully implemented in the St. Louis City office of DSS-CD and the St. Louis Neighborhood Network, funded through a Community Partnership grant. As of this writing, partners were exploring development of this model. Development was pending in anticipation of filling the new domestic violence consultant position noted in Chapter V, Section E.

7. DSS-CD Manual for Domestic Violence Advocates

The DSS-CD Manual was developed as a tool for advocates to help battered women navigate DSS-CD and two other divisions of DSS, the Family Support Division and Child Support Enforcement. There is also a section dealing with the Family Court.

MCADV agreed to develop the manual, which was then co-written by four domestic violence advocates and a graduate student. DSS-CD and Family Court personnel reviewed the manual

for accuracy and provided input. The SC reviewed the completed version and approved it for publication. As of June 2005, the manual was still in the process of being published.

8. Child Order of Protection Protocol

In cases in which an adult poses a threat to a child, Missouri statutes permit DJOs and GALs to seek child orders of protection (COP) on behalf of clients who are children. In April and May 2002, MCADV staff provided training to enable DJOs and Family Court Legal staff to better understand this statute, the benefits of a COP, and the process for applying for one. The Praxis mini-audit in September 2002 reinforced the merits of this as a tool in certain types of child protection cases – such as when a batterer is also abusing his intimate partner’s children and is not their father.

The court case coordinator and Family Court administrator developed a protocol to guide the application process in cases in which the COP was deemed useful. The coordinator created other materials to increase buy-in from DJOs, Family Court attorneys, and GALs, including a table delineating ways in which the COP differed from Chapter 211²⁴ proceedings and a document responding to common concerns about using COPs in CPS cases. The coordinator trained DJOs and GALs on use of this protocol.

As of the end of the evaluation period, little was known about staff’s willingness to use this tool and its ultimate effectiveness. One Family Court supervisor who was interviewed shortly after the protocol was developed suggested that it had limited utility, and was only appropriate or needed in very specific types of cases that occur infrequently. Other stakeholders were not optimistic there would be strong enforcement around these orders. While DSS-CD workers and DJOs can report violations of the COP (removing the onus to do so from the battered woman), successful enforcement still hinges on law enforcement’s willingness to arrest and the county prosecutor’s willingness to prosecute. It is not surprising then that DJOs have reported seeking COPs in a few cases. It has been challenging to determine precisely how many and to gather data on these cases. DJOs have not consistently reported such cases to us, and we have limited resources to monitor if they apply for COPs. However, it is likely that the total sample of CPS cases with COPs will be too small for quantitative analysis. We propose to do case study analysis on those cases in which data are available during the final year of the Initiative.

9. Domestic Violence/Child Maltreatment Resource Directory

The Domestic Violence and Child Maltreatment Resource Directory (DV/CM Resource Directory) was created in response to one of the planned Initiative’s strategies, defined in the logic model as: *Create information linkages to permit greater access to court and criminal justice information and to victim resources and services.* Specific plans to create this Directory grew out of a recommendation from the Cross-training Action Team for a specialized directory of community services available to families experiencing both DV and child maltreatment. A multidisciplinary committee, which included representatives from the three partner systems and other community agencies that work with families, met to produce the manual from 2003-2004.

The Directory is intended as a comprehensive resource for multiple service providers in the community. In the purpose statement (DV/CM Resource Directory, page i), it is described as a “user-friendly resource for front line workers engaged in service planning for families

experiencing co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment.” The foremost goal is to “promote service planning that is appropriate, holistic, and well-coordinated in terms of meeting the diverse and unique needs of DV/CM families.”

Indeed, the Directory is quite comprehensive, and is organized into five sections as follows: Domestic Violence Resources for Victims and Perpetrators, Legal Resources, Child Maltreatment Resources for Children and Families, Emergency Services for Families, Medical and Healthcare Services, Education and Employment Resources for Adults, and Special Services. Listings are organized alphabetically within subcategories for each section. For example, Section I is divided into shelter and residential services for battered women; nonshelter support and intervention; related services for battered women; and batterer intervention programs for both men and women. Child maltreatment resources include such services as child day care, crisis care, support groups, and mental health services. A telephone number, website/e-mail address if available, and a brief description of relevant services accompany each listing. In most cases, an address or post office box is provided; however, if such information is not commonly listed in other community directories, it is not included in the Directory. If an organization charges service fees, these are generally stated.

Further, the Directory offers an introduction to co-occurrence and includes key Greenbook principles, components of a model service plan, best practice guidelines, information on impact on children, and some basic statistics on domestic violence and child maltreatment.

One of the agencies represented on the committee, Women’s Support and Community Services, agreed to assume responsibility for updating and sustaining the Directory. It was also posted on the Initiative’s website (which is hosted on the St. Louis County website), and will remain there for the duration of the Initiative. At the close of the evaluation period, plans were underway for a Resource Fair that was intended to acquaint area service providers with many of the organizations listed in the Directory. At this event, the Directory was to be disseminated on a CD-Rom to all attendees.

10. Child Maltreatment Guidelines

From June 2003-January 2004, the Initiative funded a consultant to develop child maltreatment guidelines to aid domestic violence service providers in their work with battered women and their children. The consultant, who was supervised via a contractual arrangement with ROW, conducted a review of practices and policies relevant to local domestic violence service providers’ response to co-occurrence. As a result of this review, she recommended a set of guidelines to optimize service providers’ responses. Recommendations were in the areas of:

- (a) assessment questions or tools for identifying child maltreatment when working with persons seeking services from domestic violence organizations;
- (b) protocol for assessing whether children receiving services from domestic violence organizations were victims of maltreatment;
- (c) advocacy work with mothers once child maltreatment has been identified, including cases in which the mother is perpetrator, and/or another parent (custodial or non-custodial) is the perpetrator;

- (d) information-sharing between advocates and CPS workers at DSS-CD and the Family Court, including recommendations with regard to “informed consent;” and
- (e) advocacy work on behalf of a child who has been abused or neglected.

During the time the consultant was engaged, parallel discussions took place at the level of the SC and IC regarding a child welfare specialist position. This position was envisioned as a counterpart to the domestic violence specialists -- a co-located position to serve domestic violence service providers. Whereas the specialist positions were conceived to infuse expertise into the child welfare system and provide assistance to CPS workers, the child welfare specialist would assist domestic violence service workers in improving their system’s responses to abused and neglected children who were served by their agencies, or whose mothers were.

A job description was developed for a child welfare specialist, a newly created position to provide support to the domestic violence community and to implement the guidelines in the domestic violence community. The description did not include a clear explanation as to where the position would be based, how the specialist would serve multiple agencies, or how organizations would be encouraged to use the service. Though the position was advertised, recruitment was put on hold as a result of tensions from the DV Work Group letter. Further, although the SC domestic violence representatives were supportive of the position, some members of the domestic violence community expressed doubts as to whether it was needed. They pointed out those organizations that served children already had some child-specific services available, and some had clear guidelines for assessing and reporting abuse, as well as staff specialized in work with children. Consequently, the child welfare specialist position was not implemented during the evaluation period.

In June 2005, a TA provider reviewed the guidelines and reported some concerns to the site. Primarily, she questioned the appropriateness of advocates conducting the kind of in-depth assessment with children recommended therein. As a result, she recommended the site consider using other, similar tools that in her opinion, better serve the purpose intended for the guidelines. The child welfare specialist and implementation of the guidelines were placed on hold pending further review by the local advocacy community.

11. Other Activities

It is important to note that other activities have resulted from the work of the Initiative, which have not consistently had an ongoing formal relationship to the Initiative, and/or have not risen to a level at which we would devote evaluation resources to these. Some of these can be characterized as “spin-off” projects -- projects that had their genesis with the Initiative, but received funding from another source, or for other reasons did not remain formally connected. The extent and nature of the Initiative’s role in “planting seeds” for these projects varied. Generally, though, spin-off projects were created when (a) relationships formed as a result of the collaborative led to planning for joint projects across partner systems, (b) some need/problem identified through the work of the Initiative led to a plan for a new project/position, and/or (c) partners learned of new resources or grant opportunities through their involvement with the Initiative. Examples of spin-off projects include the grant received in 2003 from the Violence Against Women Office to fund the Family Court CPS DJO

specializing in domestic violence; the 2003 grant from OSCA for the BCPC; and a grant to a partner agency, the Family Resource Center, to fund a domestic violence specialist in 2001.

These spin-offs have not all remained separate. The BCPC was funded with a grant from Missouri's OSCA that the Family Court was inspired to apply for in order to comply with recommendations from the Praxis mini-audit in September 2002. The position operated independent of Initiative funding initially, though the duties were closely tied to activities that stemmed from the Batterer Accountability Action Team. When OSCA funding ended, the Initiative took over funding for the position.

Other activities have resulted from relationships that developed via the Initiative. Some of these have been subsumed into the day-to-day operations of one or more partner agencies, and are not funded or actively monitored by the collaborative and do not draw on Initiative resources. One example concerns the decision by DSS-CD to designate a caseworker as the liaison to the Weinman shelter, which was made in the very early stages of the Initiative. This worker²⁵ has been responsible for handling all hotline calls that involved children at the Weinman shelter, including calls originating from shelter staff, and addressing other questions and concerns raised by shelter staff. The worker is permitted to come on-site to conduct investigations at the shelter when needed. Stakeholders have noted this arrangement as a positive development that emerged somewhat informally, but one that has nevertheless endured and that DSS-CD plans to sustain.

Such projects do not rise to the level at which they can be evaluated, but nevertheless represent a positive accomplishment. Further, when such activities are absorbed into day-to-day operations and do not require special funds or other support, they have a stronger probability of being sustained, provided the relationships between the relevant systems remain positive.

CHAPTER VI. CONCLUSION

A. Progress Toward Goals

By mid-2005, the Initiative had been underway for just over four years. This section presents an assessment of the status of progress at that point in time on the eight goal areas identified in the original grant proposal.

- (a) Establish a comprehensive, inclusive planning process whereby information can be communicated and input can be solicited from all agency staff from each of the systems that will be participating in the project and from the broader professional and citizen community.*

There is abundant evidence of efforts toward this objective. Collaboration building has been ongoing throughout the project, and has been the focus of much of the director's efforts and technical assistance the site has received. All of the key project activities, as described in Chapter V, have either been developed through a multidisciplinary process, or have required review and approval by all system partners. Partners have included DSS-CD, the Family Court system, and the domestic violence service providers in keeping with federal expectations, but also batterer intervention providers and community organizations that serve children. Also notable was the inclusion of a domestic violence survivor, who sat on the IC and co-chaired a Multidisciplinary Action Team, and two representatives from the DSS central office, who served on some committees.

All partner systems have taken advantage of opportunities to attend training on- and off-site, to engage in system-specific meetings with counterparts from other Greenbook communities, and to observe model programs at other sites. Leadership has organized periodic retreats to bolster interest, build morale, and refresh the collaboration, including a retreat in which a national expert on collaboration shared techniques for creating and sustaining a strong, viable, and "nimble" collaboration.²⁶

Despite persistent efforts by leadership to build and maintain a comprehensive, inclusive, and cohesive planning collaborative, the process has not always been smooth. Domestic violence advocates challenged the extent to which the process is truly inclusive and balanced, and as a result, some domestic violence service providers chose to withdraw from formal participation in the Initiative. Following the eruption of the conflict, leadership expended considerable effort to use the experience constructively, including being more proactive in addressing issues of potential conflict. The SC and director sought technical assistance to address these concerns, and have been responsive to advice from TA providers and recommendations from the federal partners in regard to the conflict.

At the close of the evaluation period, the SC was engaged in a number of activities in direct response to the concerns raised – namely, planning for cross-training prior to implementing the DVAP or other new activities, engaging in dialogue with Praxis International for assistance on a "case audit," and creating a new consultant service involving co-located domestic violence professionals.

At the mid-point of 2005, the collaborative remained intact despite having weathered some significant difficulties and setbacks. All core systems were still actively involved, meeting regularly and pursuing core activities, and the SC was beginning to explore sustainability.

(b) Develop standards for best practices in cases involving child maltreatment and domestic violence that involve collaborative efforts utilizing the strengths and expertise of both fields to provide for the safety of children and adults who are victims of domestic violence.

Certainly, a wide range of activities, as discussed in Chapter V, has been carried out in pursuit of this goal. However, progress on these activities has been uneven. Some stakeholders have been critical of the pace at which projects have been developed and carried out. In part, delays can be attributed to the fact that collaborative members simply do not have time to do the “hands-on” work required in writing curricula, policies, protocols, etc. Smaller committees that took on these tasks were not always organized so that work could be delegated to members, or members did not understand what was expected of them. Also, activities were suspended or revamped in response to the domestic violence community’s contention that greater preparation and cross-training was needed before launching these.

In regard to objectives (a) and (b), it is critical to stress that setbacks and conflict are inevitable in collaborative work of this complexity. Delays are to be expected when multiple levels of approval are required -- or at least desired -- to ensure all partners give input. In short, early expectations of progress may have been too high. The Greenbook sites are carving out new territory in their efforts to draw three very different systems together to address critical issues, some which have been the source of conflict and controversy for decades. The sites had no template as to how to proceed or definitive model as to what the “finished product” -- a successful Greenbook site -- should look like. In the NET Interim Evaluation Report,²⁷ it was observed that all six Greenbook sites had progressed more slowly than expected, and in fact, had experienced similar conflicts as they struggled to create and sustain a balanced and vibrant collaboration, while attempting to carry out projects in accordance with their original plans.

It is likely the St. Louis County collaboration will continue to experience some conflict and disappointments for as long as they continue this work, though ultimately these efforts can be very rewarding and produce significant benefits for battered mothers and their children.

(c) Cross-training on the dynamics of domestic violence and child maltreatment will be provided on a broad basis to agencies and individuals responsible for protecting the well-being of children and families. The ultimate objective of the training will be to develop a shared vision among the partners about the co-occurrence of domestic violence and child maltreatment and the responses that are most effective in terms of insuring adult and child safety and well-being.

The Initiative has been responsible for providing numerous training opportunities to representatives from all partner systems. These have been diverse in terms of both the format/structure of the training and the topics offered. Leadership has been very responsive to requests for additional trainings. Attendees have consistently praised the caliber of training and

trainers, and by and large, regard these as valuable learning experiences. However, as discussed in Chapter V, Section E, there were some limitations as to what was offered during the evaluation period. Further, the trainings have not strictly corresponded to the Greenbook definition of cross-training, in which “members of one system become exposed to the basic policies and practices of another system through training.” The failure to engage all partners in this kind of systematic training prior to embarking on other projects has impeded the successful implementation of some projects. Comprehensive cross-training should be designed to help partners understand one another’s mandates, resources, and limitations. If cross-training is to be institutionalized, some consideration must be given to developing full curriculum. In addition, stakeholders have indicated a preference for case-based training, and we believe this can best be achieved through the use of adapted but real case scenarios. We believe it is imperative to create a forum in which partners can fully explore their differing perceptions of the risk faced by children in homes with domestic violence, and examine the merits of specific responses, through the training process.

(d) Confidentiality policies and procedures will be formulated by the collaborative effort in compliance with state statutes and case law. The policies will focus on safety for victims of domestic violence while still protecting victims of child maltreatment from harm.

The Client Services Action Team initially planned to develop model policies, procedures, and forms for all partner systems to protect confidentiality. Team members shared information on their existing practices, circulated forms currently in use, and reviewed model forms. In part because this team was overburdened in meeting other business, this objective was not realized. Subsequently, during the MCC Pilot Project, confidentiality became a key point of contention between the court and the domestic violence community. This conflict was not satisfactorily resolved prior to disbanding the MCC. There were no formal efforts underway to develop confidentiality policies and protocols by the close of the evaluation period, though stakeholders have periodically noted the issue is still of interest.

(e) The collaborative project will contract for a feasibility study to explore the possibility of total county access to data systems to support the effective collaboration of DSS-CD, the Family Court, and domestic violence service providers in assessing cases, developing safety and case plans, and monitoring progress on case plans.

This goal has remained on hold during the evaluation period. In 2004, the director proposed contracting with a consultant (the same consultant who coordinated the MCC) to begin preliminary interviews exploring feasibility, but the SC did not approve this. One reason cited was a statewide project that was underway. OSCA was (and as of this writing, still is) in the midst of an extensive project for which the eventual goal is a common database linking Missouri courts. It is anticipated this will impact St. Louis County’s current database systems. Hence, court leadership is understandably reluctant to embark on making any changes to these databases until more is known about the impact of the OSCA project. At this time, it is projected this goal will not be part of Initiative activities in the final year.

(f) The collaborative project will undertake community-wide outreach about domestic violence and child maltreatment and their co-occurrence.

Community outreach thus far has been limited. The original grant proposal does not offer a clear vision as to what was intended in this regard, i.e., how far-reaching these efforts would be and the role of partner agencies. During the evaluation period, outreach has consisted of efforts to acquaint the community with the work of the Initiative and generally raise awareness of co-occurrence. The director made numerous presentations at workshops, conferences, and in similar forums to various groups in the community. The principal LRP and other SC members co-presented at some of these events as well.

As of June 2005, another activity was on the horizon to engage the community. During the April 2005 retreat, the facilitator proposed that the collaborative develop a relationship with a local school district, the Ladue School District, to explore strategies schools might use to prevent and intervene when it is believed a student is exposed domestic violence in the home. It was agreed the director would pursue this relationship, though this remained in the early planning stage as of June 2005.

(g) Increase collaboration among batterer intervention programs and the participating partners so that referrals made pursuant to case plans can be monitored and perpetrators can be held accountable.

The BCP has slowly but steadily gained acceptance with judges. The BCPC reported that judges sought her services in monitoring 82 cases during the evaluation period, and an increasing number of judges were seeking her services over time. As of mid-2005, two judges who handled criminal case dockets were conducting routine compliance review hearings of domestic violence misdemeanants.

(h) Develop a direct service component to assist domestic violence victims in securing services that will lead to self-sufficiency, such as housing, transportation, employment, and child care, which will give victims of domestic violence the option of leaving a perpetrator upon whom they may have been economically reliant.

This objective had not been addressed during the evaluation period.

B. Next Steps

The St. Louis County Greenbook Initiative has received a funding extension through September 2007. Despite some setbacks and barriers to implementation barriers encountered during the Initiative's first four years, a variety of projects and activities have been set into motion. The Initiative has directly and indirectly shaped practices within the three partner systems, and stimulated cross-system dialogue regarding how collaboration can best be achieved and how to effect meaningful change in the lives of the families these systems serve. In our final evaluation report, we will assess progress over the full course of the Initiative, and evaluate system- and client-level outcomes that emerge from June 2005 – June 2007.

REFERENCES

- Appel, A. E. and Holden, G. W. (1998). "The co-occurrence of spouse and physical child abuse: A review and appraisal." *Journal of Family Psychology*, 12(4), 578-599.
- Chalk, R. and King, P.A., eds. (1998). *Violence in Families: Assessing Prevention and Treatment Programs*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Edleson, J. L. (1999). "The overlap between child maltreatment and woman battering." *Violence Against Women*, 5(2), 134-154.
- Kubisch, A.C., Weiss, C. H., Schorr, L.B., and Connell J. P. (1995). "Introduction." Pp. 1-21 in *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives: Concepts, Methods, and Contexts*. J. P. Connell, A.C. Kubisch, L.B. Schorr, and C. H. Weiss, eds. Washington, D.C.: The Aspen Institute.
- McEwen, T. (1999). "Factors that Add up to Success." *National Institute of Justice Journal*, January 1999, pp. 2-10.
- Schechter, S, and Edleson, J. L. (1999). *Effective Intervention in Domestic Violence and Child Maltreatment Cases: Guidelines for Policy and Practice*. Reno, NV: The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges/Family Violence Department.

ENDNOTES

¹ During much of the period covered in this report, this division operated under the name “St. Louis County Children’s Services Division of the Missouri Division of Family Services.” It was renamed Department of Social Services - Children’s Division following restructuring within the agency in January 2004. To avoid confusion, we refer to it by DSS-CD throughout the report.

² In April 2006, this organization was renamed the Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (MCADSV). Throughout this report, however, we will refer to it by the name it went by during this evaluation period.

³ The executive director also served as director of another area shelter, the Kathy J. Weinman Shelter for Battered Women and Their Children. The original MOU, dated August 2000, identifies the formal partner as St. Martha’s Hall, however.

⁴ This report disseminated in March 2003, and was authored by the Director Norma Ellington-Twitty, Local Research Partner Jeanie Thies, and Donna Coble, a consultant for the Initiative.

⁵ Judiciary from the Criminal Court Division of the Circuit also participate in the Initiative. However, only the Family Court is a partner for purposes of the grant agreement.

⁶ Percentages are rounded.

⁷ MCADV staff increased efforts to collect data from all member agencies in St. Louis that year. Fifteen agencies that had not submitted in previous years began submitting in 2003.

⁸ Much of the preceding paragraph was derived from the grant proposal dated August 4, 2000.

⁹ However, some staff at domestic violence partner agencies is mandated to report any child abuse or neglect, which they learn about to the DSS-CD hotline.

¹⁰ This section concerns “existing conditions” at the time the grant was written, and for the sake of consistency, the past tense is used to describe these. Some of these conditions are still present at the close of this evaluation period, however. This will be discussed later in this report.

¹¹ Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, “A Demonstration Initiative to Test the Implementation of Guidelines from the National Council of Juvenile and FC Judges: A Call for Concept Papers,” 2000.

¹² However, we do not yet have sufficient client-level data from which to draw conclusions about impact.

¹³ However, in the final year of the Initiative we propose to conduct some follow-up with individuals who participated in some of these activities.

¹⁴ At least one LRP is expected to attend all meetings of these committees. The only exceptions have been when due to schedule conflicts or illness, no team member was available to attend.

¹⁵ There is no database or “flag” in files to facilitate identification of these cases. We relied on self-reports from CPS DJOs, and periodically solicit information from them on any such cases. The sample may not reflect all those co-occurrence cases for which COPs were sought during the Initiative.

¹⁶ The new CPS director had previously attended SC meetings and was involved in Initiative activities prior to this, however.

¹⁷ This group was originally formed in 2002 to conduct the Self Study, and had continued to meet to discuss concerns of the domestic violence community.

¹⁸ The Work Plan has continued to guide activities through the 2006 calendar year, though has underwent some modifications

¹⁹ We plan to conduct some follow-up with toolbox, training, and site visit participants in the final year of the Initiative.

²⁰ Of course, participating systems must agree upon measures to protect the confidentiality of clients.

²¹ Much of the subsequent discussion in this section is excerpted from the Ad Hoc Report on Specialist Positions: Summary of Findings and Recommendations, prepared and submitted to the SC in November 2004. See Appendix D.

²² This describes the status of assessment both pre-Initiative and during the period covered by this report.

²³ The MCC proposal stipulated that one of the DV members must represent the local Association of Batterer Intervention Providers.

²⁴ Chapter 211 is the section of the Missouri statutes that gives juvenile and family courts legal authority to intervene in families in which children are abused or neglected.

²⁵ The actual worker has changed since this arrangement began, due to personnel turnover. However, the basic agreement and protocol used remains intact.

²⁶ This refers to the September 2003 retreat led by Karen Ray, author of *The Nimble Collaboration: Fine-Tuning Your Collaboration for Lasting Success (2002)*: St. Paul, MN: Wilder Publishing Center.

²⁷ Caliber Associates, Education Development Center, and The National Center for State Courts. 2002. *Greenbook Process Evaluation Report Phase I: Planning and Goal Setting*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, U. S. Department of Justice.