

Q&A on Applying as a Research and Capacity Building Project



The production of this webinar was funded through the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau, Grant #90CA1850-01. The content of this webinar does not necessarily reflect the view or policies of the funder, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products or organizations imply endorsement by the US Department of Health and Human Services.

QIC-Domestic Violence in Child Welfare (QIC-DVCW)

- Purpose:
 - To test innovative, collaborative models and responses to improve how child welfare agencies work with community partners to serve families who are experiencing DV or co-occurring DV and child maltreatment; and
 - To evaluate the impact of these collaborative models and responses on outcomes for children and families.

Research Questions

- Does a **collaborative, adult and child survivor-centered approach** -- that includes safely engaging and establishing accountability of the DV offender -- improve adult and child survivor safety, child permanence, and child and family well-being for child welfare involved families experiencing DV?
- For **which families, and in which social contexts**, does an adult and child survivor-centered approach improve these outcomes?

Research Questions (cont.)

- What **factors are associated with successful implementation and sustainability** of an adult and child survivor-centered approach?
- What are the **costs associated with the implementation and maintenance** of an adult and child survivor-centered approach, and how do these compare to the costs of "practice as usual"?

Research and Capacity Building Projects (Projects)

- Build capacity in child welfare agencies and among community partners
 - Required partners: DV programs that serve survivors, DV offender intervention programs, dependency courts
 - Additional partners may include early childhood programs, other child-serving organizations/systems (e.g., schools), immigrant and refugee programs, faith communities, culturally specific organizations, mental and behavioral health partners, substance misuse treatment programs, etc.
- Evaluate the impact of the adult and child survivor centered



Adult and Child Survivor-Centered Approach

- Cross-System Collaboration
- DV Risk and Protective Factors Framework
- DV Offender Accountability and Positive Change Framework

Who Can Apply?

- State, county or tribal child welfare agencies from the U.S.
 - Child welfare systems are **strongly** encouraged to partner with a domestic violence agency or coalition as co-applicant
 - Child welfare applicants who do not have a DV partner agency as a co-applicant will need to justify their decision in their application.
- DV programs must co-apply with a public child welfare entity. They are not eligible to apply as the sole lead applicant

Benefits to Research and Capacity Building Projects

Financial support in the range of \$125,000-150,000 per year, over 4 years

Substantial training and technical assistance (TTA) to:

- Strengthen and build collaborative capacity
- Develop policy and practice
- Strengthen judicial and dependency court leadership
- Enhance responses of DV programs that serve survivors and offenders
- (Negotiated with Projects) Enhance responses of other community-based organizations
- Begin to examine disparities in DV practice and access to services
- Evaluate the impact of enhanced practice on outcomes for families

Participation in a Learning Community

Training and Technical Assistance

- Establish Management and Implementation Teams
- Explore current practice and policy, strength of existing collaborations
- Determine interests of Projects
- Develop and execute Project Implementation and Evaluation Plans to:
 - Meet Project needs

Examples of Data Collection at Projects

- Child welfare agency administrative data
- Web-based surveys of child welfare workers and supervisors
- In-person computer-assisted interviews of survivors, survivors' partners, and/or children
- Qualitative interviews or focus groups of child welfare caseworkers, supervisors, and managers; survivors; survivors' partners; and/or community partners

Evaluation-Related Criteria

- Set of conditions and tasks to ensure the rigor of the evaluation (i.e., ability to evaluate impact of intervention)
- Evaluation-related criteria will be used to assess an applicant's "evaluation readiness"
- Additional evaluation-related tasks and responsibilities listed in RFA

Evaluation-Related Criteria (cont.)

- Note, criteria are not thresholds or cut-offs
- Each criteria describes a continuum, ranging from preferred (ideal) to not preferred (worst case)

**Preferred =
ideal**

(i.e., supports our ability
to evaluate impacts)



**Not preferred =
worst-case**

(i.e., undermines our
ability to evaluate impact)

Evaluation-Related Criteria (cont.)

Criteria	Preferred	Not Preferred
Two equivalent project sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Project with 2 participating sites (i.e., communities / offices)— Participating sites that are “equivalent” with respect to their service capacity, population needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Single site— Sites that are substantively different

Evaluation-Related Criteria (cont.)

Criteria	Preferred	Not Preferred
Two equivalent project sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Project with 2 participating sites (i.e., communities / offices)— Participating sites that are “equivalent” with respect to their service capacity, population needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Single site— Sites that are substantively different
Random assignment of supervisory units	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Full random assignment of supervisory units	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Unwilling or unable to facilitate random assignment

Evaluation-Related Criteria (cont.)

Criteria	Preferred	Not Preferred
Two equivalent project sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Project with 2 participating sites (i.e., communities / offices)— Participating sites that are “equivalent” with respect to their service capacity, population needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Single site— Sites that are substantively different
Random assignment of supervisory units	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Full random assignment of supervisory units	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Unwilling or unable to facilitate random assignment
Identification of DV	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Site’s CAN screening processes (i.e., hotline) have, or can incorporate, questions about domestic violence— Process can be established to notify evaluators about DV cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Site cannot incorporate questions about DV into their CAN screening processes— Site cannot establish reliable, timely notification process

Evaluation-Related Criteria (cont.)

Criteria	Preferred	Not Preferred
Two equivalent project sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Project with 2 participating sites (i.e., communities / offices) — Participating sites that are “equivalent” with respect to their service capacity, population needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Single site — Sites that are substantively different
Random assignment of supervisory units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Full random assignment of supervisory units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Unwilling or unable to facilitate random assignment
Identification of DV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Site’s CAN screening processes (i.e., hotline) have, or can incorporate, questions about domestic violence — Process can be established to notify evaluators about DV cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Site cannot incorporate questions about DV into their CAN screening processes — Site cannot establish reliable, timely notification process
Continuity of case assignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Continuity of evaluation group assignment during transfer from investigation to ongoing services units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — No continuity of assignment from investigation to ongoing services units

Evaluation-Related Criteria (cont.)

Criteria	Preferred	Not Preferred
Two equivalent project sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Project with 2 participating sites (i.e., communities / offices) — Participating sites that are “equivalent” with respect to their service capacity, population needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Single site — Sites that are substantively different
Random assignment of supervisory units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Full random assignment of supervisory units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Unwilling or unable to facilitate random assignment
Identification of DV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Site’s CAN screening processes (i.e., hotline) have, or can incorporate, questions about domestic violence — Process can be established to notify evaluators about DV cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Site cannot incorporate questions about DV into their CAN screening processes — Site cannot establish reliable, timely notification process
Continuity of case assignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Continuity of evaluation group assignment during transfer from investigation to ongoing services units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — No continuity of assignment from investigation to ongoing services units
Minimal unit interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Minimal substantive interaction or dependencies among case management units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Lots of interaction or dependencies between units

Evaluation-Related Criteria (cont.)

Criteria	Preferred	Not Preferred
Two equivalent project sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Project with 2 participating sites (i.e., communities / offices) — Participating sites that are “equivalent” with respect to their service capacity, population needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Single site — Sites that are substantively different
Random assignment of supervisory units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Full random assignment of supervisory units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Unwilling or unable to facilitate random assignment
Identification of DV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Site’s CAN screening processes (i.e., hotline) have, or can incorporate, questions about domestic violence — Process can be established to notify evaluators about DV cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Site cannot incorporate questions about DV into their CAN screening processes — Site cannot establish reliable, timely notification process
Continuity of case assignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Continuity of evaluation group assignment during transfer from investigation to ongoing services units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — No continuity of assignment from investigation to ongoing services units
Minimal unit interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Minimal substantive interaction or dependencies among case management units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Lots of interaction or dependencies between units

Timeline

- Project selection: By end of October 2017
- Pre-implementation work: November 2017 -- March 2018
- Implementation – April 2018 – End of projects

*Dependent on availability of federal funding, projects will continue through September 2021 with 12-month budget periods.

Application Process

Optional

Submit a Letter of Intent to Apply **by Sep 8, 2017.**

Required

Submit an application by **September 29nd, 2017.**

Email Letters of Intent and Applications to Wendy Gutierrez at: WGutierrez@futureswithoutviolence.org.

Selected Research and Capacity Building Projects will be notified by October 30th, 2017.

Contact

Shellie Taggart, Project
Director QIC-DVCW

Futures Without Violence

50 Milk Street, 16th Floor

Boston, MA 02109

STaggart@futureswithoutviol
ence.org

(413) 336 – 6767

For more information:

<https://www.futureswithoutviolence.org/children-youth-teens/quality-improvement-center-domestic-violence-child-welfare-advancing-adult-child-survivor-centered-practice/>