February 2023

# Child and Family Journal of Innovative Practice and Research

CHILD AND FAMILY JOURNAL OF
INNOVATIVE PRACTICE AND
RESEARCH

# Table of Contents

# EDITORIAL BOARD

**CFJ, May 2022 (Volume 3, Issue 2)**

If you want to serve on the Editorial Board for *Child and Family Journal for Innovative Practice and Research*, please email Dr. Monit Cheung at mcheung@uh.edu with your curriculum vitae. We look forward to working with you as a team. **The first Volume** was published in May 2020 (Volume 1, Issue 1). All previous issues of this e-journal can be retrieved from this LINK.

# JOURNAL AIM

### *Child and Family Journal for Innovative Practice and Research*

*Child and Family Journal for Innovative Practice and Research* (CFJ) provides an integrated practice-research platform for all child and family programs, agencies, and institutions in the United States and globally to share child welfare innovatively practice and research experiences. It aims to provide updated information, creative practice, and research to promote child and family well-being in the community, universities, and clinical or research centers. Our contributors are scholars and practitioners working with children and families to share knowledge, practice insights, service outcomes, and sources of professional development from local to international.

### Background

The CFJ is sponsored by the Child and Family Center for Innovative Research (CFCIR) and the Graduate College of Social Work (GCSW) at the University of Houston (UH). The CFCIR research center aligns with the UH-GCSW to improve youth and family well-being, strengthen interpersonal relationships, and promote social justice. Under the center branches, Child Welfare Education Project (CWEP) is a program in partnership with federal Title IV-E programs to prepare Master's level social work students to pursue a child welfare career and promote workforce effectiveness in public child welfare, as well as develop reliable systems and professional networks locally, statewide, nationally, and international. Furthermore, the CFCIR supports faculty and social work researchers in conducting innovative research and practice for children and families. These multilevel connections highlight the Center's commitment to providing innovative micro, mezzo, and macro practice to children and families, empowering students, faculty, practitioners, and researchers to succeed in their careers, promoting social justice, and decreasing racial disparities in both local and global communities.

### Aim and Scope

Along with the mission of the CFCIR and GCSW-UH, the CFJ aims to provide an information exchange platform for describing the multilevel partnerships in the child and family sector. It also delivers updates on child and family practices, creative research ideas and outcome data, policy summaries, and educational development reflections that aim to strengthen and expand the field of child and family across the United States and the world.

The CFJ values summaries or progress reports of any form focusing on child and family services, such as short stories, case studies, poems, personal or professional reflections, artwork, photos, book reviews, and other innovative work with a significant impact on children and youth. All publications must reflect the core values and ethics of social work. One volume, each with two issues, will be distributed annually. Submission and publication are made online without additional cost or compensation to the contributors. The contributors must include a statement with their submission that it is their original work, not considered or published in other sources. Please include cited references in APA 7th Edition style.

### Mission

- Develop bridges to build practice linkages on a cyberspace platform to share innovative works, updates, and experiences among professionals, faculty, staff, and students for use in the field to work with children and families.
- Highlight the importance of child and family services through professional exchange among multilevel partnerships to promote social work practice and academic development.

# EDITORIAL: Recent Research in the Field

Monit Cheung, PhD, LCSW, Editor-in-Chief
Hannah Spear, MSW Candidate, Managing Editor

Research in the child welfare field fills the role of a touchstone for building treatments, procedures, and facilities. Child welfare research informs reliable treatments for families and children trusted by professionals to serve children and their families. This function calls for practice-oriented investigations to support and improve the child welfare profession as it has experienced a transitional period for system reform and service transformation. We must reflect on the system structure, worker motivation, and service quality for improving child and family well-being.

Child welfare professionals commit to presenting our experiences to improve services. In practice-based research and research-informed practice, we highlight child welfare achievements with a call for instances to help professionals engage in critical conversations and rethink future steps. These vital conversations give professionals the space to grow competencies, focusing on humanity, giving institutions information on where to invest. Researchers have been engaging in this process by disseminating work on child welfare reform, proposing ideas on what the future of the child welfare field should look like, what needs to change to get us there, and whom to involve in providing more information for promoting these changes. This work has sparked continuous dialogue between child welfare researchers and practitioners.

In this issue of the *Child and Family Journal for Innovative Practice and Research* (CFJ), the authors presented a sample of this discussion to further conversations among child welfare professionals. This issue also presents information related to child welfare reform and summarizes the findings and implications in a recent article on research in the child welfare field. This information is relevant to anyone working in child welfare, though it only gives a sliver of the larger picture. The topics in child welfare are more varied than those presented in this issue. Yet, the authors present data to support further investigations of the child welfare system, Title IV-E funding for "family-first" services and deliverables, and additional resources needed for improving training partnerships and retaining a quality workforce.

The goal of the CFJ is to provide a space of integration between research and the child welfare field in which professional conversations can focus on the intention and application of research goals, interventions, policies, and practice effectiveness. Discussions on child welfare service structures will continue to focus on the professional lives of the workers and the child and family services they provide.

The conversations around child welfare structures, policies, and services will continue. It is essential to include the voices and experiences of children, families, and professionals based on their experiences within the child welfare system. We welcome your contributions!

: Meeting Families Upstream: Preparing a Preventive Child Welfare Workforce through Title IV-E Stipend Expansion

Erin Findley, PhD, Catherine A. LaBrenz, PhD, and Scott D. Ryan, PhD
School of Social Work
The University of Texas at Arlington

## Title IV-E & Family First Prevention Services Act

The federal Family First Prevention Services Act (FFPSA) has prioritized a prevention and early intervention approach to child welfare. Funds from Title IV-B and Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, previously earmarked for children in foster care, became available to support families in crisis before moving to out-of-home placement (Waid & Choy-Brown, 2021). Specifically, FFPSA enabled states to be reimbursed for evidence-based, trauma-informed services provided to families – services related to mental health, substance abuse, and parenting skills (Lindell et al., 2020). Yet, existing Title IV-E funds intended to support the professionalization of public child welfare (PCW) workers continue to target workers who serve children already removed from their families.

This commentary argues that the Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Program should be expanded to include investigation (INV) and family preservation services (FPS) workers, who are now increasingly on the frontlines supporting families in crisis. If the existence of Title IV-E Training funds is predicated on the belief that earning a social work degree is a valuable resource for PCW workers, INV and FPS units should be afforded the same opportunity to be equipped for their pivotal work with children and families. Using Texas as a case study, we explore these workers' roles to meet families in crises "upstream," working to preserve child safety and prevent child removal.

## Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Program

The Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Program was initiated in 1980 as part of the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act (Hartinger-Saunders & Lyons, 2013). The program provides federal funding through educational stipends for advanced education to PCW workers. In addition, it encourages state-university partnerships to foster innovative curriculum development, field instruction, and continuing education to better prepare and support graduates that work in PCW (Hartinger-Saunders & Lyons, 2013). Recipients can include existing child welfare workers who want to expand their education and those in educational programs preparing to become child welfare workers (Zlotnik, 2003). The Title IV-E Training Program was founded upon "the hypothesis that educating students and public child welfare employees in the field of social work makes a difference in terms of the unique services social workers provide to families and children" (Hartinger-Saunders & Lyons, 2013, pp. 276-277). However, some have noted that few outcome studies exist to validate this belief (e.g., Carr et al., 2019; Hartinger-Saunders & Lyons, 2013; Perry, 2006; Zlotnik, 2003), leading to a call for increased attention to outcome studies to justify needed ongoing federal support for Title IV-E (Leung & Cheung, 2018).

Studies that have examined the Title IV-E Training Program have primarily focused on areas such as worker retention (Barbee et al., 2018), 'intent to stay' (Carr et al., 2019), child welfare knowledge (Franke et al., 2009), and workforce diversification (Piescher et al., 2018), among others. One of the most significant areas of study is worker retention and 'intent to stay.' Studies suggest that Title IV-E recipients are more likely to stay with the agency or stay longer (Barbee et al., 2018; Madden et al., 2014). Carr and colleagues (2019) found that those with an MSW had a significantly lower 'intent to stay'

unless they were stipend recipients. The authors concluded that the stipend might buffer MSW-level child welfare workers' desires to leave. Similarly, in a sample of *n*=5,723 PCW workers in a southern state, Leung and colleagues (2021) found that workers who reported that the Title IV-E stipend encouraged them to stay at CPS were less likely to report intent to leave PCW. Lastly, in their study of *n*=9,195 PCW workers who began between 2001 and 2010 in Texas, Madden and colleagues (2014) found that Title IV-E alums had greater longevity in CPS roles than caseworkers, not in the stipend program. The authors inferred from this result that most stipend students fulfill their contractual responsibilities to the program and that the program is a beneficial recruitment and retention strategy (Madden et al., 2014).

The findings from each of these studies are relevant, given the problem of worker turnover and its negative consequences (Kothari et al., 2021; Leake et al., 2017). CPS parents report being more positively engaged with workers who establish a supportive relationship (Fuller et al., 2015; Schreiber et al., 2013), which is negatively impacted by caseworker turnover (Cheng & Lo, 2020). CPS youth report that caseworker turnover compounds their sense of instability and relational loss (Curry, 2019; Williams & Glisson, 2013). Finally, worker retention has a positive economic impact and promotes continuity of service delivery for children and families (Griffiths et al., 2020). Each of these areas stands to benefit positively from the Title IV-E program.

In addition to a greater likelihood of retention, Title IV-E recipients have demonstrated greater entry-level knowledge than their non-stipend counterparts (Bagdasaryan, 2012; Franke et al., 2009). Researchers have found that Title IV-E recipients report preparedness for their jobs (Trujillo et al., 2020), including for supervisory roles (Falk, 2021). Moreover, one study of *n*=679 PCW employees in Minnesota credited the Title IV-E program with helping promote workforce diversification; Piescher and colleagues (2018) found that a higher proportion of Title IV-E alumni in the child welfare workforce identified as people of color (16.7%) compared with only

8.4% of child welfare workers who did not participate in the Title IV-E program.

## Investigation, Preservation & Permanency Workers

Although the Title IV-E program has traditionally served permanency workers, there are two other prominent areas of child welfare work: investigations and preservation. Investigation workers are tasked with assessing the level of risk present to a child, often with an actuarially based risk assessment (RA) to standardize decision-making (Bosk, 2018). However, RA implementations may vary in a real-world context wherein workers exercise a certain amount of clinical judgment (Bosk & Feely, 2020), meaning cases may be screened differently – and thereby routed differently – based on an RA implementation. Once a case has been investigated, if maltreatment occurs, the priority, whenever possible, is to preserve the family and provide family-based (e.g., in-home) services. For families across all dimensions of child welfare (investigations, preservation, and permanency), complex challenges are often present, such as substance abuse, domestic violence, or mental illness (Lawson, 2019; Mowbray et al., 2017; Victor et al., 2021). Many families may also face the added burdens of poverty (Briar-Lawson et al., 2021; Fong, 2017; Kang et al., 2019) or systemic racism (Dettlaff & Boyd, 2020; Feely & Bosk, 2021). Yet, only permanency workers are eligible to receive Title IV-E Training funds. Given the shifts in policy to prioritize family preservation and in-home services to prevent children from entering foster care, it is imperative that the child welfare workforce in investigations and preservation services can access the same professionalization resources as those in permanency.

## Case Study in Texas

As of September 1, 2021, H.B. 567 changed the Texas Family Code definition of neglect (Bernstein et al., 2021). The new law makes it more difficult for children to be removed from home based solely on neglect allegations, as neglectful supervision criteria have been changed. For example, rather than "substantial risk," an incident must now place a child in

"immediate danger" to constitute neglect (Bernstein et al., 2021). Workers are to use a list of seven factors, which broadly includes a child's age, physical or psychological functioning, history of abuse or neglect, and the efforts of the caregiver to ensure the child's safety in determining immediate danger (Title 40 TAC §707.467, 2022). Further, a parent must show "blatant disregard" (e.g., tangible and significant harm to a child's well-being due to an act or omission by a caregiver) for the consequences of their actions impacting a child's physical health or safety (Bernstein et al., 2021; TDFPS, 2021b).

These changes, which may likely decrease the number of children coming into care and increase the number of families receiving in-home prevention services, are now reimbursable under FFPSA. Initial reports also reflect a change in caseloads; families that traditionally would have experienced removal and been transferred to conservatorship workers in Texas are now receiving family-based safety services—the Texas version of FPS. Therefore, the FFPSA focus on preventive services, coupled with the change in Texas Code, has led to more responsibilities for preservation workers tasked with supporting at-risk families and providing services to ensure they can remain together safely. These workers inherit families "upstream" whom conservatorship workers would have previously served prior to the more stringent burden of child removal. As federal and state policy shifts toward preventive efforts and families traditionally served once children were removed are given the opportunity to be preserved, there is an increased need for more in-depth, targeted training of preservation workers and their predecessors—investigators. Indeed, if the broader system is shifting its resources to prioritize prevention and family preservation services, should the Title IV-E stipend program not do the same?

TexProtects (n.d.), a nonprofit child abuse and neglect advocacy organization, estimates that each departing Texas DFPS staff member costs $54,000. The same organization posits that children with more than one caseworker go from a 74.5% chance of achieving permanency in a year (with one caseworker) to a 17.5% chance (TexProtects, n.d.). In this, we see the significance of the turnover problem identified in the literature. In Fiscal Year 2021, the overall turnover rate for Texas Department Family and Protective Services (TDFPS) employees was 23.8% (TDFPS, 2022). Within positions, TDFPS experienced the highest turnover among investigation workers (43.2%), whose rate was almost double the organizational rate. The turnover rate for conservatorship workers was 24.6%, while the rate for family-based workers was slightly lower (21.3%) (TDFPS, 2022). However, over the last eight fiscal years, the turnover rate for family-based workers has exceeded conservatorship workers in five reporting periods, highlighting a need to invest in strategies to retain quality family-based/preservation workers. **Table 1** displays the turnover rates over the past eight years in Texas.

**Table 1.** *Texas Department of Family and Protective Services Employee Turnover Comparison Report, by Position (FY 2014-FY 2021)*

|  | FY14[a] | FY15[a] | FY16[a] | FY17[a] | FY18[a] | FY19[a] | FY20[b] | FY21[c] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All DFPS Employees | 19.0% | 19.6% | 19.3% | 16.2% | 17.8% | 19.3% | 18.5% | 23.8% |
| CPI/INV Worker | - | - | - | - | 25.7% | 30.2% | 28.8% | 43.2% |
| CPS CVS Caseworker | 22.6% | 22.6% | 22.6% | 16.5% | 17.4% | 17.1% | 24.7%[d] | 24.6% |
| CPS FBSS Caseworker | 23.0% | 27.9% | 25.0% | 16.0% | 19.9% | 23.3% | 18.6% | 21.3% |

a. (Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, 2020)
b. (Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, 2021a)
c. (Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, 2022)
d. Note. The FY 2020 turnover rate for CVS caseworkers includes workers transferring to Community Based Care providers who took over case management responsibilities (Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, 2021a).

In light of similar considerations, the National Association of Social Workers, Texas Chapter published a brief in 2014 calling for expanding the Title IV-E Education Program to family-based workers and investigators (NASW, 2014). With the passage of FFPSA and the recent changes in the Texas code, the NASW call becomes even more critical.

## Expansion of Title IV-E As Part of an Agenda to Promote Family Preservation

As child welfare systems across the United States continue to roll out FFPSA, it is important to have a strong workforce prepared to implement family-centered, trauma-informed practices. The Title IV-E stipend program is in a unique position to expand on already-existing education programs contributing to the development of a workforce equipped to partner with parents to support family preservation and maintenance. Likewise, this promising strategy for caseworker retention has timely implications for a child welfare workforce struggling in the aftermath of the pandemic.

## References

Bagdasaryan, S. (2012). Social work education and title IV-E program participation as predictors of entry-level knowledge among public child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*(9), 1590-1597. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2012.04.013

Barbee, A., Rice, C., Antle, B. F., Henry, K., & Cunningham, M. R. (2018). Factors affecting turnover rates of public child welfare front line workers: Comparing cohorts of title IV-E program graduates with regularly hired and trained staff. *Journal of Public Child Welfare, 12*(3), 354. https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2018.1457589

Bernstein, J. Moench, D., & Corbin, A. (2021, July 22). *Children's Commission update on CPS-related matters* [Presentation]. 87th Texas Legislative Session. Austin, Texas.

Bosk, E. A. (2018). What counts? Quantification, worker judgment, and divergence in child welfare decision making. *Administration in Social Work, 42*(2), 205-224. https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2017.1422068

Bosk, E., & Feely, M. (2020). The goldilocks problem: Tensions between actuarially based and clinical judgment in child welfare decision making. *The Social Service Review (Chicago), 94*(4), 659-692. https://doi.org/10.1086/712060

Briar-Lawson, K., Pryce, J. A., & Raheim, S. (2021). Family-centered anti-poverty strategies to address child neglect. *Child Welfare, 98*(6), 145-175.

Carr, L. C., Leung, P., & Cheung, M. (2019). Hot topic: Title IV-E MSW education and intent to stay in public child welfare. *Social work*, *64*(1), 41–51. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swy051

Cheng, T. C., & Lo, C. C. (2020). Collaborative alliance of parent and child welfare caseworker. *Child Maltreatment, 25*(2), 152-161. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559519865616

Curry, A. (2019). "If you can't be with this client for some years, don't do it": Exploring the emotional and relational effects of turnover on youth in the child welfare system. *Children and Youth Services Review, 99*, 374-385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.01.026

Dettlaff, A. J., & Boyd, R. (2020). Racial disproportionality and disparities in the child welfare system: Why do they exist, and what can be done to address them? *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 692*(1), 253-274. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716220980329

Falk, D. S. (2021). Child welfare supervisors empowered through MSW education: Graduates of a statewide title IV-E MSW program for public child welfare supervisors describe their learning. *Journal of Public*

*Child Welfare, 15*(5), 693-728. https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2020.1802387

Feely, M., & Bosk, E. A. (2021). That which is essential has been made invisible: The need to bring a structural risk perspective to reduce racial disproportionality in child welfare. *Race and Social Problems, 13*(1), 49-62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-021-09313-8

Fong, K. (2017). Child welfare involvement and contexts of poverty: The role of parental adversities, social networks, and social services. *Children and Youth Services Review, 72*, 5-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.10.011

Franke, T., Bagdasaryan, S., & Furman, W. (2009). A multivariate analysis of training, education, and readiness for public child welfare practice. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31*(12), 1330-1336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2009.06.004

Fuller, T. L., Paceley, M. S., & Schreiber, J. C. (2015). Differential response family assessments: Listening to what parents say about service helpfulness. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 39*, 7-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.05.010

Griffiths, A., Collins-Camargo, C., Horace, A., Gabbard, J., & Royse, D. (2020). A new perspective: Administrator recommendations for reducing child welfare turnover. *Administration in Social Work, 44*(5), 417-433. https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2020.1786760

Hartinger-Saunders, R. M., & Lyons, P. (2013). Social work education and public child welfare: A review of the peer-reviewed literature on title IV-E funded programs. *Journal of Public Child Welfare, 7*(3), 275-297. https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2013.798246

Kang, J. Y., Romich, J., Hook, J. L., Lee, J., & Marcenko, M. (2019). Family earnings and transfer income among families involved with child welfare. *Child Welfare, 97*(1), 61-84.

Kothari, B. H., Chandler, K. D., Waugh, A., McElvaine, K. K., Jaramillo, J., & Lipscomb, S. (2021). Retention of child welfare caseworkers: The role of case severity and workplace resources. *Children and Youth Services Review, 126*, 106039. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2021.106039

Lawson, J. (2019). Domestic violence as child maltreatment: Differential risks and outcomes among cases referred to child welfare agencies for domestic violence exposure. *Children and Youth Services Review, 98*, 32-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.12.017

Leake, R., Rienks, S., & Obermann, A. (2017). A deeper look at burnout in the child welfare workforce. *Human Service Organizations, Management, Leadership & Governance, 41*(5), 492-502. https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2017.1340385

Leung, P., & Cheung, M. (2018). Title IV-E education: Past, present and future of public child welfare. *Journal of Public Child Welfare, 12*(3), 233. https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2018.1467860

Leung, P., Cheung, M., & Olson, L. (2021). Social work degrees and title IV-E stipends: Predictive factors for worker retention in public child welfare. *Child Welfare, 98*(5), 75-92.

Leung, P., & Willis, N. (2012). The impact of title IV-E training on case outcomes for children serviced by CPS. *Journal of Family Strengths, 12*(1), 1-16.

Lindell, K. U., Sorenson, C. K., & Mangold, S. V. (2020). The family first prevention services act: A new era of child welfare

reform. *Public Health Reports (1974), 135*(2), 282-286. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033354919900892

Madden, E. E., Scannapieco, M., & Painter, K. (2014). An examination of retention and length of employment among public child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review, 41*, 37-44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.02.015

Mowbray, O., Ryan, J. P., Victor, B. G., Bushman, G., Yochum, C., & Perron, B. E. (2017). Longitudinal trends in substance use and mental health service needs in child welfare. *Children and Youth Services Review, 73*, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.11.029

National Association of Social Workers (2014). *Improve education incentives for CPS caseworkers.* https://cdn.ymaws.com/naswtx.site-ym.com/resource/resmgr/GovtTPACE/2014_IV-E.pdf

Perry, R. E. (2006). Education and child welfare supervisor performance: Does a social work degree matter? *Research on Social Work Practice, 16*(6), 591-604. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731506290548

Piescher, K. N., LaLiberte, T., & Lee, M. (2018). The role of title IV-E education and training in child protection workforce diversification. *Journal of Public Child Welfare, 12*(3), 333. https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2018.1447529

Schreiber, J. C., Fuller, T., & Paceley, M. S. (2013). Engagement in child protective services: Parent perceptions of worker skills. *Children and Youth Services Review, 35*(4), 707-715. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2013.01.018

Texas Department of Family and Protective Services. (2020). *House Appropriations Committee request for information impact of recent targeted salary increases on employee turnover.* https://capitol.texas.gov/tlodocs/86R/handouts/C0302020080500002/44a516ba-26f6-4b94-bb3a-9f1db40ade20.PDF

Texas Department of Family and Protective Services. (2021, September). *Rider 8 87th legislature, regular session bi-annual report: Human resources management plan FY 2020 - FY 2021 third quarter.* https://www.dfps.texas.gov/About_DFPS/Reports_and_Presentations/Rider_Reports/documents/2021/2021-09-30_Rider_8_Report.pdf

Texas Department of Family and Protective Services. (2021, October). *Definition of terms.* Child Protective Services Handbook. https://www.dfps.state.tx.us/handbooks/CPS/Files/CPSDefinitions.asp#CPS_Other_CPS_Definitions

Texas Department of Family and Protective Services. (2022, September). *Rider 8 87th legislature, regular session bi-annual report: Human resources management plan FY 2022 third quarter.* https://www.dfps.state.tx.us/About_DFPS/Reports_and_Presentations/Rider_Reports/documents/2022/2022-09-30_Rider_8_Report.pdf

TexProtects. (n.d.). *Child protective services: Texas by the numbers.* TexProtects.org. https://www.texprotects.org/issues/child-protective-services/

Title 40 Tex. Admin. Code Rule §707.467 (2022).

Trujillo, K. C., Bruce, L., de Guzman, A., Wilcox, C., Melnyk, A., & Clark, K. (2020). Preparing the child welfare workforce: Organizational commitment, identity, and desire to stay. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 110*(Pt 3), 104539. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2020.104539

Victor, B. G., Resko, S. M., Ryan, J. P., & Perron, B. E. (2021). Identification of domestic violence service needs among child welfare–involved parents with substance use disorders: A gender-stratified analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(5-6), NP2908-NP2930. https://doi.org/10.1177/088626051 8768569

Waid, J., & Choy-Brown, M. (2021). Moving upstream: The family first prevention services act and re-imagining opportunities for prevention in child welfare practice. *Children and Youth Services Review, 127*, 106098. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth. 2021.106098

Williams, N. J., & Glisson, C. (2013). Reducing turnover is not enough: The need for proficient organizational cultures to support positive youth outcomes in child welfare. *Children and Youth Services Review, 35*(11), 1871-1877. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.20 13.09.002

Zlotnik, J. L. (2003). The use of title IV-E training funds for social work education: An historical perspective. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 7*(1-2), 5-20. https://doi.org/10.1300/J137v07n01_02

# RESEARCH REVIEW: Misconceptions of Child Welfare System Transformation: A Review of a Recent Journal Article

Hannah Spear, MSW Candidate
Graduate College of Social Work
University of Houston

## Introduction

Recent publications have been tackling conversations around child welfare (CW) reform. The crux of these conversations is challenging because they include debating ways to use data to clarify the impact of the child welfare system and its obligations. Many child welfare studies have recently addressed this discourse about the impact of CW on child and family outcomes.

In a 2021 article, Barth et al. (2021) present research relevent to the discussion. Their objective is to support the need for making child welfare reformation decisions from conclusions driven by research how child welfare already been changing. They also address misconceptions by examining recent child welfare literature. The following is a summary of their discussions. This summary does not include all misconceptions about child welfare reform but focuses on research contributions.

## Are Low-Income Children Inappropriately Referred to Child Protective Services (CPS) Due to Implicit Bias?

Low-income children have been reported to CPS at disproportionately higher rates than other children for decades. A debate has started to examine whether this phenomenon resulted from class bias or other risk factors impacting children in low-income families and neighborhoods. Pelton (2015) identified a consensus to this discussion, concluding that low incoming children are at higher risk for abuse and neglect, explaining this because of their increased contact with the public agencies that funnel them into the child welfare system (Pelton, 2015).

To measure implicit bias, Barth et al. looked at a 2019 meta-analysis comparing observer maltreatment CPS reports and self-reported maltreatment (Baldwin et al., 2019). This study found that self-reported maltreatment cases occur at higher rates in low-income households, which Barth et al. assert counters the argument that elevated rates of child maltreatment reports in low-income homes results primarily from bias.

Barth and colleagues compare the proportion of low-income children CPS serves to those other institutions serve. They present data demonstrating that low-income children receiving services from CPS experience adverse well-being outcomes at similar or lower rates than children served by other child-serving institutions (Chaudry & Wimer, 2016; Drake et al., 2011; Reno & Hyder, 2018). CW is not unique in its struggle to address structural racism and hundreds of years of inequalities.

## Is Child Neglect Synonymous with Family Poverty?

Barth and colleagues discuss the misconception that child neglect is an excuse to punish low-income families for their class status (Riley, 2020). They highlight the differences between poverty and neglect as research factors that, when separated, independently contribute to children's well-being.

Barth et al. also report data from a birth cohort study from 2020 which controlled for socio-economic status. The study found that neglect positively correlated with poor outcomes in children (Strathearn et al., 2020). Another study found that mental health, criminal justice involvement, academic outcomes, poverty, and

neglect impact children differently into adulthood (Nikulina et al., 2011).

Barth and colleagues cite research that low income was one of many factors reported for neglect. Still, other factors, such as family instability and less parental warmth, also contribute to the use of corporal punishment (Slack et al., 2004). To add to this point, Barth et al. cited a study that physically neglected children were more likely to live in a lower-quality neighborhood, have parents experiencing depression, and have parents who experienced maltreatment themselves in childhood (Shanahan et al., 2017). Neglect does not arise from poverty alone, in their view.

Barth et al. address the variations in how each state defines neglect and references the call for a national agreement on what constitutes child neglect (Milner & Kelly, 2020; Wald, 2014). They ask the question of how many states make a distinction for involuntary neglect in cases where maltreatment arises from conditions that stem exclusively from the factors of poverty (Rebbe, 2018). They also report that the majority of low-income families provide well for their children that "[t]aken together, the evidence overwhelmingly suggests that neglect is a marker for conditions that may be associated with, but are distinct from, poverty" (Barth et al., 2021, open access).

**Are Research-Supported Practices Effective for Families of Color?**

Barth et al. (2021) raise a critical question about how to develop research-supported treatments (RSTs). Many professionals working in child welfare follow RSTs to design services for children and families, hoping to set a high standard of care. It raises an eyebrow at how treatments are culturally/ethnically appropriate and applicable for families of color. Researchers expect that more research with diverse populations is needed.

Barth and colleagues approach this topic by acknowledging the unease but counter it by citing research studies that show effectiveness across people from different races and cultures (e.g., Huey et al., 2014). Barth et al. cited two randomized control trials that challenge the argument that RSTs are ineffective treatment approaches for families of color, specifically within the child welfare system (Chaffin et al., 2004; Painter, 2009). Barth et al. urge us to continue identifying various types of RSTs in child welfare to demonstrate intervention effectiveness among diverse populations.

Barth et al. (2021) also report factors contributing to the efficacy of practice applications. Child welfare worker motivation and training are among the most predictive factors of outcome success (Myers et al., 2020). Barth et al. further emphasize the importance of balancing fidelity and flexibility.

**Does Foster Care Cause Poor Outcomes for Children and Youth?**

Studies of children who have entered the foster care system have highlighted the long-term adverse outcomes experienced by those children as they enter adulthood (Widom, 2014). Some have used these studies to make the argument that it is the foster care system that is triggering adverse outcomes. Barth and colleagues (2021) point out that childhood maltreatment that leads to involvement in the foster care system has many similar long-term adverse effects. To understand the impact of the foster care system on outcomes, a researcher, first, needs to study child maltreatment as a predisposing factor added to the effect of the foster care system on children.

Barth et al. (2021) also acknowledge that this is more challenging to communicate to the public. Studies that have asked foster children about their perception of their experience in the system result in neutral or, most often, favorable outcomes (Chapman et al., 2004; Dunn et al., 2010; Fox & Berrick, 2007). Despite this, the stories that do not

have favorable outcomes resonate most and linger in the minds of folks who might otherwise have considered becoming foster parents or supporting the foster system. Barth et al. emphasize that any foster child who has a negative experience is too many. For these authors, foster care is not what it could be or should be but, nor is there compelling evidence that it is generally harmful.

## Conclusion

Barth and colleagues (2021) contribute to the discussion around child welfare reform based on what it will take to shape it. As child welfare professionals continue to discuss corrections and improvements, we must start on the fundamentals of improving the child welfare system, focusing on evaluating service impacts on children and families.

## References

Barth, R. P., Berrick, J. D., Garcia, A. R., Drake, B., Jonson-Reid, M., Gyourko, J. R., & Greeson, J. K. P. (2021). Research to consider while effectively re-designing child welfare services." *Research on Social Work Practice, 32*(5). https://doi.org/10.1177/10497315211050000

Baldwin, J. R., Reuben, A., Newbury, J. B., & Danese, A. (2019). Agreement between prospective and retrospective measures of childhood maltreatment: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry, 76*(6), 584–593. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.0097

Chaffin, M., Silovsky, J. F., Funderburk, B., Valle, L. A., Brestan, E. V., Balachova, T., & Bonner, B. L. (2004). Parent-child interaction therapy with physically abusive parents: Efficacy for reducing future abuse reports. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72(3), 500–510. https://doi.org/10.1037/ 0022-006X.72.3.500

Chapman, M. V., Wall, A., & Barth, R. P. 2004). Children's voices: The perceptions of children in foster care. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 74*(3), 293–304. https://doi.org/10.1037/0002- 9432.74.3.293

Chaudry, A., & Wimer, C. (2016). Poverty is not just an indicator: The relationship between income, poverty, and child well-being. *Academic Pediatrics, 16*(3), S23–S29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2015.12.010

Drake, B., Jolley, J. M., Lanier, P., Fluke, J., Barth, R. P., & JonsonReid, M. (2011). Racial bias in child protection? A comparison of competing explanations using national data. *Pediatrics, 127*(3), 471–478. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2010-1710

Dunn, D. M., Culhane, S. E., & Taussig, H. N. (2010). Children's appraisals of their experiences in out-of-home care. *Children and Youth Services Review, 32*(10), 1324–1330. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2010.05.001

Fox, A., & Berrick, J. D. (2007). A response to no one ever asked us: A review of children's experiences in out of home care. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 24*(1), 23–51. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-006-0057-6

Huey, S. J., Tilley, J. L., Jones, E. O., & Smith, C. A. (2014). The contribution of cultural competence to evidence-based care for ethnically diverse populations. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 10*(1), 305–338. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurevclinpsy-032813-153729

Milner, J., & Kelly, D. (2020). It's time to stop confusing poverty with neglect. Children's Bureau Express, 20(10), 5474. https:// cbexpress.acf.hhs.gov/index.cfm?event=website.viewArticles&issueid=212&sectionid=2&articleid=5474

Myers, C., Garcia, A., Beidas, R., & Yang, Z. (2020). Factors that predict child welfare caseworker referrals to an evidence-based parenting program. *Children and Youth Services Review, 109*, 104750. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.104750

Nikulina, V., Widom, C. S., & Czaja, S. (2011). The role of childhood neglect and childhood poverty in predicting mental health, academic achievement, and crime in adulthood. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 48*, 309–321. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-010-9385-y

Painter, K. (2009). Multisystemic therapy as community-based treatment for youth with severe emotional disturbance. Research on Social Work Practice, 19(3), 314–324. https://doi. org/10.1177/1049731508318772

Pelton, L. H. (2015). The continuing role of material factors in child maltreatment and placement. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 41*, 30–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.08.001

Rebbe, R. (2018). What is neglect? State legal definitions in the United States. *Child Maltreatment, 23*(3), 303–315. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559518767337

Reno, R., & Hyder, A. (2018). The evidence base for social determinants of health as risk factors for infant mortality: A systematic scoping review. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 29*(4), 1188–1208. https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2018.0091

Riley, N. S. (2020, March 26). There's a big difference between child poverty and neglect.

Institute for Family Studies Blog. https://ifstudies.org/blog/theres-a-big-difference-between-child-povertyand-neglect

Shanahan, M. E., Runyan, D. K., Martin, S. L., & Kotch, J. B. (2017). The within poverty differences in the occurrence of physical neglect. *Children and Youth Services Review, 75*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.02.014

Slack, K. S., Holl, J. L., McDaniel, M., Yoo, J., & Bolger, K. (2004). Understanding the risks of child neglect: An exploration of poverty and parenting characteristics. *Child Maltreatment, 9*(4), 395–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559504269193

Strathearn, L, Giannotti, M, Mills, R, Kisely, S, Najman, J, & Abajobir, A (2020). Long-term cognitive, psychological, and health outcomes associated with child abuse and neglect. *Pediatrics, 146*(4). https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2020-0438

Wald, M. S. (2014). Beyond maltreatment: Developing support for children in multi-problem families. In Korbin J. E., & Krugman R. D. (Eds.), Handbook of child maltreatment (pp. 251–280). New York: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7208-3_13

Widom, C. S. (2014). Long term consequences of child maltreatment. In Korbin J. E., & Krugman R. D. (Eds.), *Handbook of child maltreatment* (pp. 225–247). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7208-3_12

Author's Note: The attached submission is my review of an original article previously published. This article is not submitted to or published in other sources.

# RESOURCES FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

## Child Welfare Information Gateway

An important aspect of child welfare work is the engagement of youth and teen voices who have experienced the adoption and foster care system. The Child Welfare Information Gateway provides an avenue for incorporating these voices and perspectives into professional discussion.



**Child Welfare Information Gateway**

**Resources for Child Welfare Professionals**

---

## Three Kinship Programs



There are three Kinship Programs that look supportive and promising. These programs can be found underneath the tab KINSHIP and filtered with the KINSHIP NAVIGATOR at this link.

---

## Resources for Indigenous and Native College Students

There is a multitude of challenges facing students attempting to further their education. Still, there are Indigenous and Native American college students who meet a particular set of representation and face financial, mental health, and mentorship challenges. The following is a compilation of resources designed to bridge the gap and make college entrance and success more attainable for Indigenous and Native students.

**College Guide for Indigenous and Native American Students**

This guide is put together by Best Colleges, and it organizes resources supporting Indigenous learners.

**Bureau of Indian Education**

The BIE has information on schools, college preparatory courses, and education events.



**National Indian Education Association**

The NIEA works to advance culture-based educational opportunities for American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians.



**American Indian College Fund**

There are many scholarship opportunities available. The AICF has a scholarship application that is open to any full-time student Native American citizen who is a member or descendant of a state or federally-recognized tribe with at least a 2.0 grade point average.

# CALLS FOR PAPERS

The *Child and Family Journal of Innovative Practice and Research* (CFJ) aims to build a platform for sharing innovative ideas in child and family welfare. We invite scholars and practitioners to submit manuscripts, practice notes, case studies, teaching/educational notes, stories, personal or professional reflections, and other innovative works that share clinical experiences in child and family services. The past year has brought dynamic social change through the pandemic, significantly influencing child and family service delivery. The CFJ loves to hear experiences from the field to share with the audience to advocate for our workers, clinicians, clients, and their families. We invite short articles (within 1-2 single-spaced pages) with the following focuses on publishing in future issues. Submissions received before **May 1, 2023** will be given priority for inclusion in the upcoming issue.

The *Submission Guidelines for Authors* can be found here or on the journal webpage.

**CWOP**

Previous CFJ issues have examined the Children Without Placement (CWOP) issues in Texas. Continuing this theme, the CFJ would like to examine the impact of the privatization of child welfare practices on children and families in the country. Suggested topics include but are not limited to –

1) experiences of children and families in the foster care system who have experienced a mismatch in child placement
2) impact of public child welfare workers whose positions were or will be privatized
3) experiences of public child welfare workers working with children without placement
4) experiences on public policy professionals working on the issue of protecting children without placement
5) explorations of how and why the "children without placement" population has increased in your state/location and how this trend compares across states nationally

Possible Interview Questions:

1) Has the reduction in child placement sites impacted child welfare professionals?
2) Why did Heightened Monitoring decrease the capacity to house children in foster care?
3) What does your state deal with when abused children under custody do not have a placement under state custody? What are the characteristics of these children and their families?

**Impact of Child Protective Services**

Due to the increase in the academic discourse on the effectiveness of child protective services in decreasing childhood trauma and abuse, the CFJ is interested in contributing to this topic by introducing voices from the practice field. Suggested topics include but are not limited to --

1) stories from children and families about their experiences interacting with Child Protective Services
2) interviews with caseworkers, supervisors, foster parents, adoptive parents, or former foster children
3) public child welfare workers' experiences and how the current practice impacts their work.
4) social work students' experiences, especially those interested in child welfare and its redesign
5) an analysis of how/if the role of child welfare workers is changing and how to support them

Possible Interview Questions:

1) What motivated you to get involved in child welfare, and what has been your experience?
2) What are the definitions of child abuse and neglect in your state? How do these definitions impact child welfare aiming at protecting children and family-based services interacting with family involvement?
3) How do the state definitions of neglect impact child removal decisions related to child neglect alone or compounded by other types of abuse?
4) Have you experienced any shifts in the child welfare system since you first became involved?