

**RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR STATE-LEVEL ACTIVITIES TO COORDINATE
CALWORKS AND CHILD WELFARE SERVICES**

**December 2001
Combined Recommendations of the Work Groups
of the CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project**

Four of the five Work Groups of the CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project developed recommendations for state-level activities that would support increased or improved coordination of CalWORKs and Child Welfare Services (CWS).

A good deal can be accomplished at the county level to promote and implement coordinated services. At the same time, focused and strategic support from the California Department of Social Services, the County Welfare Directors Association, the Regional Training Academies, and other educational and training institutions that serve counties would not only direct a variety of resources to support coordinated services, but also help to mitigate some of the structural, financing, and organizational culture barriers that impede progress toward coordination of services to better serve families.

The Work Groups' state-level recommendations are presented in the following areas: Flexible Financing, Data Systems, Confidentiality, Coordinated Case Planning, and Organizational Change and Training.

STATE-LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS ON FLEXIBLE FINANCING

I. STATE AND FEDERALLY IMPOSED LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY LIMITATIONS

California state law limits the use of some funding streams in ways that are not limited in federal statute or regulation. At the same time, some federal statutes and regulations do not allow federal funding for certain benefits and services to many of California's needy families and vulnerable children.

1. Definition of Needy Families Used for CalWORKs Performance Incentive Funds

California's statute for welfare reform does not permit counties to utilize their CalWORKs Performance Incentive funds for all needy families to the full extent allowed by federal law. According to federal law, TANF funds may be used in any manner that is reasonably calculated to:

- (1) provide assistance to needy families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives;
- (2) end the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage;
- (3) prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies; and
- (4) encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families.

For goals one and two above, federal law allows the states to determine their own definition of needy families. Goals three and four do not have a needs standard, thus making services to meet those goals available to all families regardless of income or resources. With respect to the allowable uses of performance incentives (funds earned by the counties based upon their performance in helping families receiving CalWORKs to secure employment), California chose to define a needy family as one with an income less than 200% of the federal poverty level. However, California's one-size-fits-all income limit disregards the wide variation in cost of living within California.

Recommendation:

- The Work Group recommends that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and the California Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) jointly develop a legislative proposal for regionalizing the income standard used to define a needy family for the purpose of determining eligibility for services funded by performance incentives. Regionalizing the income standard would permit those counties with a high cost of living to set a needy family income standard higher than the current statewide standard of 200% of the federal poverty level.

2. Funding for Improved Linkages Between CalWORKs and Child Welfare Services

The current separation of the state's CalWORKs and child welfare *funding streams* reinforces the lack of *programmatic* coordination between the two programs. This lack of coordination is significant because a considerable number of families receiving services through CWS are also current or former participants in CalWORKs. Furthermore, many other low-income families in the CWS system do not receive a CalWORKs cash grant, but are eligible for certain CalWORKs funded services.

Recommendations:

The Work Group recommends that CDSS and CWDA jointly develop legislative proposals to provide the following assistance to counties in their efforts to coordinate CalWORKs and CWS services:

- Provide a separate one-time state allocation of \$50,000 per county. While modest, this allocation would provide an impetus for planning and implementation activities for linking

CalWORKs and CWS. Counties would be required to certify that these funds would be used to support the coordination of these two programs.

- Allow counties the flexibility to designate a portion of their CalWORKs Single Allocation and/or their CWS Emergency Assistance allocation to fund the coordination of CalWORKs and CWS programs. Counties opting for this flexibility would be required to incorporate this redirection of funding into their CalWORKs plan and, as appropriate, any CWS-related plan, with such plan modifications subject to review by CDSS.

The target population in the two recommendations above would include, but not be limited to, "dual system" families, i.e., families currently receiving both CalWORKs and CWS. Counties would be permitted to utilize these funds, allocated from the TANF Block Grant, in any manner allowable under federal law, consistent with the intent of promoting the coordination of CalWORKs and CWS.

- It is *further* recommended that CDSS and CWDA jointly determine an appropriate process for assessing the outcomes of the counties' activities, should the above recommendation be implemented. This assessment could be used to determine the potential impact of an ongoing coordination of already existing CalWORKs and child welfare funding streams.

3. Child Welfare Single Allocation

Another limitation is the current state funding arrangement that provides funds for specific programs with restricted uses and with little county flexibility to redirect funding as needed to meet broader goals and outcomes.

The state shares a commitment with the counties to financially support the cost of locally provided child welfare services. Each year, the state budget process appropriates authorized amounts of federal and state funds by program and/or service category for use by the counties. These funds are distributed to the counties through many separate program allocations, each with limits on who may be served and what types of services may be provided. Since most child welfare services activities can be charged to any one of the many allocations, it is a daunting task to fully utilize each allocation, but not exceed it.

Current state funding provided by CDSS for child welfare services comes to most counties through at least 14 separate programs (see Table 1). All are designed to ensure that children are not at risk of abuse and have a safe and stable home.

In this complex and fragmented financing structure, valuable resources are diverted from service delivery. Social workers and other service providers find that time that should be focused on delivering services is spent tracking and reporting expenditures. Funding that could be used for service delivery is increasingly devoted to administrative and clerical support to allocate, monitor, and report expenditures against multiple funding sources.

Table 1
Separate Allocations in Child Welfare

- Adoptions
- Non-recurring Adoptions
- Foster Family Home Licensing
- Child Welfare Services (CWS)
- CWS Group Home Visits
- Independent Living Skills Program
- Emancipated Youth Stipend
- Foster Parent Training and Recruitment
- Kinship Foster Care Emergency Fund
- Post Adoptions
- Family Preservation and Family Support (FPSP)
- State Family Preservation
- Supportive Therapeutic Options Program (STOP)
- Options for Recovery

Note: This list does not include individual grants offered by the state or federal government for similar purposes, such as Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment (CAPIT) and Kinship Support Services Program (KSSP).

Recommendation:

The Work Group recommends consolidating child welfare services allocations and funding streams aimed at protecting children at risk of abuse and neglect into a smaller number of allocations.

- Consolidating these child welfare services allocations would not impede a county's ability to continue to obtain Federal Title IV-E funding for the entire continuum of child welfare services. Furthermore, consolidation would reduce the considerable financial and data tracking and reporting now required for multiple and sometimes arbitrary funding streams, thus freeing counties to focus on services to maximize successful outcomes for children and families.¹
- It is further recommended that a joint task force of CDSS and the Fiscal and Children's committees of CWDA be convened to determine which funding streams could be consolidated in order to streamline management, maximize local flexibility, and enhance program outcomes.

4. Flexibility in the Federal Funding Structure

The current federal funding structure does not adequately support state and federal goals of assisting families to remain intact and ensuring child safety in a permanent and stable home. Federal Title IV-E Foster Care funds only pay for out-of-home care *and* only for children whose families would qualify for the former AFDC program, if the July 1996 eligibility criteria for AFDC remained in effect today. As a result of the restriction on allowable activities under Title IV-E, funding for child abuse prevention and family preservation is severely limited. This restriction on the allowable service population obligates counties to waste *scarce* resources determining the income and resources of families whose children are removed from their home.

The Work Group is concerned about providing a safe and stable environment for *all* children, not just for those who come from needy families. Funding for the out-of-home maintenance payment without funding for services does not acknowledge the need for services in order to move children to a permanent safe home. It is also shortsighted in that the potential for a reduction in length of stay in foster care and future cost avoidance may be greater if funds were available for services. If states were not required to expend resources on the activities necessary to meet the eligibility requirement of the AFDC connection for federal funds, those resources could be redirected into better services and outcomes for children.

In addition, rather than having limited (capped) federal funds for child abuse prevention and family preservation services, states would benefit from the ability to expand their efforts and services with shared financial responsibility and federal funding support.

Many other states have identified these same concerns and share California's desire to bring about a revised federal funding structure in support of improved outcomes for families and children. The American Public Human Services Association (APHSA), in the child welfare section of their recently released report, *Crossroads: Summary of Proposals*, makes several key observations and recommendations to address the shortfalls in the current federal funding structure, including the inconsistencies in federal law/guidelines between the funding criteria and the desired outcomes.

¹ The Work Group also considered the rather complex interplay of the CalWORKs Mental Health and Substance Abuse Treatment (MH/SAT) allocation and the CalWORKs Single Allocation. The Single Allocation provides TANF funding for eligibility determination, employment services, and child care and can be used to supplement MH/SAT, but not vice versa. The Work Group is not recommending changes to the use criteria for these two allocations at this time. The earlier recommendation relating to flexibility of CalWORKs Single Allocation and/or CWS Emergency Assistance funds, if adopted, would provide counties an opportunity to assess the results of more flexible use of TANF funds.

Recommendations:

California should join with other states to facilitate changes in the federal funding structure that would make Title IV-E funds available to:

- Serve all children requiring out-of-home care without regard to income by eliminating the linkage of Title IV-E to the former AFDC eligibility criteria; and
- Be used in any manner currently allowed under Title IV-B and, thus, provide federal support for a range of services for all children in order to ensure that they are living in a safe and stable home. This would allow counties to use federal funds to support family preservation, family maintenance, counseling, teaching and demonstrating homemaking skills, whole family foster care, and other services directed toward keeping children safe.

II. INFORMATION SHARING

As part of the devolution created under CalWORKs, California gave counties substantial responsibility for welfare-to-work program design and implementation, and many counties took the initiative to develop systems and programs to address the needs of families accessing both CalWORKs and CWS.

However, there has been little sharing of information among counties and the state about the availability and use of various funding streams that support families in both CalWORKs and CWS, and there is no central repository of information in the state that catalogues specific activities and services, including prevention services, that can be funded with TANF and CWS funds.

Recommendations:

- The Work Group recommends that CDSS form a committee to determine the most effective process for regularly collecting and publishing, via the internet and elsewhere, information from counties and other states about funding the coordination of CalWORKs and CWS.
 - The published information should include data on demographics, economic conditions, geographic circumstances, and policy priorities that influenced the local coordination.
 - An ongoing CDSS/CWDA Committee should review information collected for appropriateness and applicability.
- The Work Group recommends that the CWDA Fiscal Committee sponsor “Information Sharing” seminars for county fiscal and program staff on the funding and accounting aspects of coordinating CalWORKs and CWS. Where appropriate, such training should include state and local partners.

III. TOOLS TO OPERATIONALIZE FUNDING OF COORDINATED SERVICES

Currently, counties planning and developing innovative CalWORKs/CWS collaborative programs must also independently research the use of funds criteria and develop the fiscal tools necessary to implement those programs. As a result, it is more difficult for counties to implement such collaborative programs than it would be if there were statewide tools that counties could utilize to assist them in designing their service delivery approach.

The challenge for counties goes beyond identifying available funding, as many counties would value technical and operational information on the “back room” accounting and reporting procedures needed to braid funding streams.² The Work Group has determined that many counties are currently struggling either with designing new systems that allow for coordination or with spending large amounts of resources to make current coordinated systems more efficient. The creation of a Tool Kit that outlines fund sources and their uses, provides a list of resources and specific examples of financial policies and procedures, and presents case studies of how some counties efficiently charge against funding streams in a coordinated system would go a long way in assisting counties to operationalize the funding of coordinated CalWORKs/CWS service systems.

Recommendations:

- The Work Group recommends the formation of a joint CDSS/CWDA Committee comprised of individuals with fiscal, data systems, and program expertise to identify and develop tools that would assist counties in accomplishing the financial coordination of CalWORKs and CWS. Such tools might include, but not be limited to, a catalogue or library of useful resources, case studies, specific matrices on uses of TANF and Title IV-E, narrative information on strategies for maximizing funds, and listings of County Fiscal Letters that contain funding and claiming instructions/clarifications.

During the process of developing such tools, the Committee may discover and pursue opportunities for the adoption of more cost-effective claiming and data-reporting methods for coordinated service systems.

The Flexible Financing Work Group developed first drafts of possible tools as discussed above, including case studies of accounting practices and a matrix of coordinated programs that can be supported by Performance Incentive Funds (see the Appendices in the Flexible Financing document).

- The Work Group also recommends that this joint CDSS/CWDA Committee include representatives from other statewide agencies and associations, as Committee members believe appropriate.

² As many counties move forward with integrated, collaborative programs, the challenge goes beyond the ability to identify the availability of funding. The key to effective utilization of all available funds is to match them up to the target population and services to be provided. Then staff must select the strategy that *most likely* will achieve the desired program outcomes and develop the means to capture data in support of expenditures without overburdening program staff.

STATE-LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS ON DATA SYSTEMS

I. SHARING DATA BETWEEN CALWORKS AND CWS/CMS DATA SYSTEMS

The identification of mutual clients³ and the ability to share relevant and useful information between CWS and CalWORKs has been identified as an important first step to achieve increased coordination between these two programs. Only after a mutual client is identified can caseworkers and other providers work together to share information about that client's needs.

While the Work Group's research indicates that identification of mutual clients and data sharing can and do take place without automation, it is also clear that once county providers begin the information-sharing process, they prefer some degree of automation to ensure accuracy, increase efficiency, and improve client outcomes.

Unfortunately, the CalWORKs data systems and the CWS data system have not been designed for easy compatibility. Just as CalWORKs and CWS are traditionally two distinct divisions within county departments of social services, the two divisions' data systems are also separate. Moreover, there has never been a legislative mandate, nor have any regulatory requirements been issued, that require the two divisions to have compatible data systems to support automated data sharing.

There *is* a federal mandate in the Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System regulations that requires a statewide Title IV-E Foster Care payment and accountability system. In California, this federal requirement has not currently been achieved statewide, but some capacity exists for coordination between the CWS data system (CWS/CMS) and the two welfare data systems – ISAWS (the state's Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System) and LEADER (the Los Angeles County welfare data system).

Though complicated to initiate, there are many benefits to the automation of data sharing between CalWORKs and CWS, including the ability to:

- Identify clients that are mutual to both CWS and CalWORKs;
- Provide comprehensive services to the family with little or no duplication;
- Access appropriate funding streams based on accurate information; and
- Gain a more complete understanding of the family or client.

Only after a mutual client is identified can caseworkers and other providers work together to share information about that client's needs.

³ In this document, the term "mutual clients" is used to describe those program participants who receive services from both CalWORKs and CWS.

The Data Systems and Confidentiality Work Group makes the following recommendation.

Recommendation:

- A Data Systems Coordination Task Force that includes major stakeholders needs to be formed by CDSS, CWDA, and the Health and Human Services Data Center (HHSDC) to move the state and counties toward a vision of compatible data systems that support a coordinated service delivery model. The primary focus of this Task Force would be to make policy recommendations at a programmatic level and to recommend a vision, mission, and desired outcomes.

Stakeholders should include, but not be limited to:

- CWDA – California Welfare Directors Association
- CDSS – California Department of Social Services
- HHSDC – Health and Human Services Data Center
- DHS – Department of Health Services
- DMH – Department of Mental Health
- AOD – Alcohol and Other Drug Administration
- EDD – Employment Development Department
- CDE – California Department of Education
- Board of Corrections/ Probation
- Judicial Council
- Chancellor’s Office
- CBOs

The Data Systems Coordination Task Force must be intent on the following outcomes:

- Identification and development of policies and procedures defining the automation needs of an integrated service delivery model and the recommended strategy for accomplishing information sharing across multiple agencies and programs. Commitment to launch a joint strategic planning process for CWS/CMS and SAWS that would include a component for ongoing evaluation of compatibility issues for system development or modification in either system. With the participation from HHSDC, a high level of coordination and communication could be established between the projects.
- Cost benefits, feasibility studies, and an effort analysis (what should be automated vs. what should remain a manual process).
- A protocol to ensure that the development or modification of any new data system or data component will be undertaken with the requirement that, whenever possible, it will be made compatible with existing systems.
- Direction, from a programmatic standpoint, to a working technology group supporting CalWORKs and CWS implementation.

The strategic plan should define the following:

- Data standardization policies, which clearly define the data elements from each program that need to be accessible to the other. The policy must conform to federal reporting and coding standards so that data will be collected and reported in a consistent fashion.
- The importance of implementing the CalSERV Middleware project along with SAWS.

- Two-way interface capability between the systems with the focus on reduction of duplicative data entry without degradation of data integrity.
- The need for a unique client identification number that could be universal within all data systems within the state's service delivery system.

II. IDENTIFICATION OF CLIENTS COMMON TO BOTH CALWORKS AND CWS

The ability to identify families participating in both CalWORKs and CWS programs has been recognized as the first step towards coordination of service delivery. It has proven to be a difficult task, not only because of the cultural separation within the agency, and because the SAWS and CWS/CMS systems do not interface at the present time, but also due to client's mistrust of the agencies and fear of potential loss of custody of their children. The only truly statewide system, tracking limited CalWORKs data, is the Medi-Cal Eligibility Determination System (MEDS) operated by the Department of Health Services. The research done by this Work Group indicates that MEDS data has possibilities for use in identification of mutual clients. County size, number of clients, and availability of staff with technical expertise can also contribute to the degree of ease or difficulty in producing this mutual client match.

Research launched by the Partnership Project has determined that some counties have already pioneered methods to accomplish this matching process, using both automated and manual approaches. However, because there are four different CalWORKs' data systems, there is not one common methodology for producing a match. Sharing information on available practices for client matching is important, as counties not yet matching clients can take advantage of the experience and knowledge of their neighbors and not expend resources to "reinvent the wheel."

For this reason, the Data Systems Work Group recommends the following:

Recommendations:

- That CDSS, in partnership with CWDA, host and facilitate several forums in different geographic locations within the state to assist counties in understanding the existing methodologies to match mutual clients. All counties should be encouraged to participate by providing detailed information on how a mutual client matching process is done in their county (if matching is done). A document could be produced that would be distributed as a tool for technical assistance.
- That a browser-based, statewide client match service be developed, possibly by a technology work group of the Data Systems Coordination Task Force. Data from MEDS, CWS/CMS, and the Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project (WDTIP) would be used in the matching process to identify clients in both CWS and CalWORKs.

STATE-LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS ON CONFIDENTIALITY LAW AND REGULATIONS

I. CENTRALIZED CODE SECTION ON CONFIDENTIALITY

Confidentiality provisions are found in *many* legislative code sections, not in only one location. References to confidentiality can be found in the Welfare & Institutions Code, the Family Code, the Evidence Code, and others.

Fortunately, there are two publications that provide complete and comprehensive information on all aspects of confidentiality, including organizing confidentiality provisions into one section for easy reference. The two publications are:

- *Glass Walls: Confidentiality Provisions and Interagency Collaborations*, Youth Law Center, 1993.
- *Confidentiality: A Manual for the Exchange of Information in a California Integrated Children's Services Program*, Cathie Wright Technical Assistance Center, 1999.

Nevertheless, on a regular basis, county counsels and caseworkers face numerous challenges in being confident that they have considered all confidentiality codes when making sensitive decisions.

Recommendation:

- Because of the importance of identifying and applying appropriate confidentiality provisions, the Work Group recommends that the Senate and/or Assembly Judiciary Committee(s) consider legislative action to create a comprehensive "Confidentiality Code" that would gather confidentiality codes into one location. This would make it more likely that an important section or detail of confidentiality law would not be overlooked – and, ultimately, would better protect families' rights to privacy.

II. LACK OF CONSISTENCY AMONG COUNTIES ON CONFIDENTIALITY LAW

The Work Group consistently heard that county counsel offices often make different interpretations about confidentiality law, despite the fact that the same state and federal laws apply in all 58 counties.

Recommendation:

- The Work Group recommends that the California Department of Social Services and county counsel associations come together to develop educational materials on confidentiality issues for staff, clients, and CBOs that can be tailored to the specific needs of counties.

STATE-LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS ON COORDINATED CASE PLANNING

The Work Group also developed a number of recommendations to support coordinated case planning for implementation within counties and at the state level.

I. FUNDING COORDINATED CASE PLANNING SERVICES

1. Decisions About Funding Stream Issues

The Work Group recommends that the state and counties take action to assist service delivery workers in their ability to focus on providing families with needed services which are within the scope of the service plan, rather than on trying to determine which funding stream to bill. The Work Group recognizes that caseworkers must be mindful of budgeted resources, but it should be the responsibility of fiscal and contract staff, not caseworkers, to make decisions about funding stream issues.

II. TRAINING FOR DELIVERING COORDINATED CASE PLANNING SERVICES

1. Core Curriculum

There needs to be a core curriculum for training CalWORKs and CWS workers for coordinated case planning. A recent survey of regional training academies by the Center for Human Services at U.C. Davis Extension inquired about training for integrated services and found that no such curricula were in use. The Work Group recommends that the state and county work together to ensure the availability, at minimum, of the following training content:

- Basic orientation of both CWS and TANF – an overview of the “other program,” including goals, objectives, legislative mandates and regulations, staff responsibilities, job descriptions, and daily experiences
- Organizational culture – How to Build Bridges?
- Client identification and referral
- Team development and communication
- Client and family assessment
- Development of a coordinated service plan
- Case management and case resolution
- Family group decision making
- Conflict resolution
- Meeting facilitation
- Confidentiality

2. Orientation Materials

The training curriculum should include the basics of each program for the partner staff, e.g., basic CalWORKs information for CWS staff and vice versa. The Work Group recommends that the CalWORKs and Child Welfare Services *Primers* being developed at the California Center for Research on Women and Families be provided to the Regional Training Academies, county social service departments, the Center for Family-Focused Practices, and other training entities.

III. STATE SUPPORT FOR COORDINATED CASE PLANNING

1. Working Definition

CDSS should formally endorse coordinated case planning between CalWORKs and Child Welfare Services as a Best Practice and adopt and publish a flexible working definition.

2. Removing Barriers

CDSS should support the voluntary implementation of coordinated case planning by counties by removing administrative, regulatory, and policy barriers as follows:

- CDSS should publish a Coordinated Case Planning Fiscal Claiming Handbook with instructions on time studies, training, allocations, and provision of direct services.
- CDSS should publish an inter-program Case Planning Confidentiality Handbook for distribution to both County Welfare Directors and County Counsel Offices.
- CDSS should, where appropriate, include a coordinated case planning section with specialized instructions in all new regulations, All County Letters, All County Information Notices and County Fiscal Letters.
- CDSS in conjunction with the California Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) should sponsor an annual training conference on coordinated case planning during the early years of implementation.

IV. CWDA Role

1. Committee Structure

The CWDA committee structure often separates CWS and CalWORKs program staff, a practice that does not promote coordination of services. A CWDA Task Force should be created that specifically examines the roles of each CWDA committee, looks for opportunities to support coordinated case planning, and works with CDSS and those counties that want to increase coordinated case planning. For example, the Task Force could look at the Fiscal Committee's role in reviewing County Fiscal Letters and consider whether that committee should add a step to the decision-making process that examines whether the policies in the letters are supporting or conflicting with coordinated case planning.

STATE-LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS ON ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE AND TRAINING

I. TRAINING RESOURCES

To improve counties' access to training resources, the Organizational Change and Training Work Group offered recommendations related to the development of training resources and capacity, identifying efforts that might be undertaken by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), educational institutions that serve counties, and the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA).

1. The Resources Development and Training Bureau of the Child Protection and Family Support Branch of CDSS is requested to provide leadership and coordination regarding counties' training needs related to services coordination.

In this effort, the Bureau might consider hosting a planning meeting to assess training needs and available resources for coordinated services training. Participants might include members of the CDSS Interface Advisory Committee, training staff and managers from counties involved in coordinated services planning and implementation, and representatives from Regional Training Academies (RTAs), the Center for Family-Focused Practice at U.C. Davis Extension, and other universities and community colleges that provide training to counties. Suggested outcomes for this planning meeting include:

- Arrange for an inventory and review of available training resources and model curricula to support counties in both identifying their own training gaps and providing training for coordinated services. Identify strengths that should be preserved or enhanced.
- Assess the capacity *and* resources of the RTAs and other training organizations to provide training on coordinated services.
- Develop checklists or guidelines for counties to assist them in securing training on coordinated services, evaluating coordinated services training, and working with training providers to tailor training to best meet their needs.

2. The U.C. Davis Resource Center for Family-Focused Practice is requested to consider developing a core “training for trainers” curricula for CalWORKs/CWS coordination.

3. The County Welfare Directors Association and its Human Resources Committee, in consultation with CDSS, is asked to:

- Examine the role of CWDA as an important advocate for and representative of counties who wish to implement coordinated services delivery in a broad, prevention-focused manner.
- Commit staff resources to work on training and related issues regarding coordinated services. This may include collaborating with CDSS, the RTAs, and other training organizations to maximize federal, state, and local funds to provide training to staff of county and community agencies.
- Approach foundations for funding to assist with curricula development and to sponsor a series of regional trainings on coordinated services.

4. The California Community College Chancellor's Office and the Community College Foundation, in collaboration with other institutions (such as the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC), the RTAs, CDSS, and CWDA), are requested to host a statewide meeting or conference to evaluate and expand collaborations between counties and community colleges to increase educational credentials of county staff and understanding of family-focused practice (e.g., the Family Development Credential Program).

5. CalSWEC is requested to focus on the integration of the competencies and skills required for coordinated service delivery into social work curricula at the bachelor's and master's degree levels.