

CR-Sen +
8-23-88

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

OFFICE OF

Child

A B U S E
P R E V E N T I O N

111380

JANUARY 1988

111380

Office of Child Abuse Prevention

Report to the Legislature

January 1988

State of California
Health and Welfare Agency
Department of Social Services

NCJRS

MAY 18 1983

ACQUISITIONS

111380

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

California Department of
Social Services

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Report Mandates

1. Welfare and Institutions Code Section 18956 requires that the Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) submit a report to the Legislature in January 1982 and subsequent even-numbered years.
2. The Supplemental Report to the 1987 Budget Act requires the Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) to provide the Legislature specified information regarding the projects authorized by Chapter 1398, Statutes of 1982, and Chapter 1638, Statutes of 1984.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) was established in May 1977, pursuant to the California Child Abuse Prevention Act of 1974. The original goal was to develop innovative child abuse prevention services. Since 1977, the OCAP has expanded to a statewide center for the coordination of public and private child abuse prevention activities by:

Contributing to family and children's services policy developed by the Department of Social Services (DSS) and serving as the Department's liaison to individuals and agencies which provide child abuse prevention services.

Funding effective child abuse prevention programs operated by private, community and public agencies emphasizing those which incorporate the cultural values of the persons serviced and which are responsive to the special needs of California's children and their families.

Serving as a source of information on child abuse prevention programs and activities.

When established in 1977, the OCAP was staffed by eight permanent, full-time employees (1 Chief, 3 Specialists in Child Abuse Prevention, 2 Staff Services Analysts, and 2 Stenographers). The OCAP selected and funded four child abuse and neglect treatment and prevention projects. Today, with a staff of 28 employees, the OCAP funds and monitors nearly 300 child abuse and neglect treatment and prevention projects based in communities throughout the State and has implemented the nation's first statewide school-based child abuse prevention and education training program.

With a budget approaching \$25 million, the OCAP administers the following programs:

Child Abuse Prevention Intervention and Treatment Program (CAPIT)
Chapter 1398, Statutes of 1982

State Children's Trust Fund Projects
Chapter 1399, Statutes of 1982
Chapter 1082, Statutes of 1983

In-Home Intensive Services Program
Chapter 1618, Statutes of 1984

Child Abuse Prevention Training Act (CAPTA)
Chapter 1638, Statutes of 1984

The OCAP continues activities intended to develop a child abuse prevention and education system which will complement and enhance the public child welfare system.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. The Growth of the OCAP	1
B. Budget	3
C. Philosophy	4
D. Goals	4
E. Committee on Child Abuse Prevention, State Social Services Advisory Board	4
F. Summary of Projects	6
II. CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION, INTERVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAM (CAPIT), CHAPTER 1398, STATUTES OF 1982 WELFARE & INSTITUTIONS CODE SECTIONS 18962 and 18963	6
A. Introduction	6
B. Update of CAPIT	6
1. a. Innovative Projects	6
b. Video	7
2. Reverted County Projects	7
3. Training and Technical Assistance	8
4. County Projects	9
5. Evaluation of CAPIT Innovative Projects	9
C. Supplemental Report to the 1987 Budget Act	9
III. CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION TRAINING ACT (CAPTA) CHAPTER 1638, STATUTES OF 1984 WELFARE & INSTITUTIONS CODE SECTIONS 18975-18979	13
A. Introduction	13
1. Legislative Funding Provisions	13
B. Implementation of CAPTA	13
1. Primary Prevention Programs	13
a. Preliminary Findings	13
2. Training Centers	15
a. Southern California Child Abuse Prevention Training Center	15
b. Northern California Child Abuse Prevention Training Center	15

	<u>Page</u>
C. Evaluation	16
a. High School Curricula	16
b. Preschool and Elementary School Curricula	16
D. Supplemental Report to the 1987 Budget Act	17
IV. IN-HOME INTENSIVE SERVICES PROGRAM	
CHAPTER 1618, STATUTES OF 1984	
WELFARE & INSTITUTIONS CODE SECTIONS 18964, 18964.1	
AND 18964.5-18964.7	18
A. Introduction	18
B. Implementation	19
C. Evaluation	19
D. Recommendation	19
V. STATE CHILDREN'S TRUST FUND (SCTF) AND COUNTY	
CHILDREN'S TRUST FUND (CCTF)	
CHAPTER 1399, STATUTES OF 1982	
CHAPTER 877, STATUTES OF 1983	
CHAPTER 1082, STATUTES OF 1983	
WELFARE & INSTITUTIONS CODE SECTIONS 18965-18971 and	
18980-18984	19
A. Funding and Administrative Provisions	19
B. Implementation of the SCTF	20
1. Perinatal Projects	20
2. Evaluation of Perinatal Child Abuse	
Prevention Projects	21
3. State-of-the-State Directory	21
4. Videos	21
a. Focus: Child Abuse Reporting Law	21
b. Focus: Latino Communities	22
c. Focus: The Clergy	22
d. Focus: The Deaf	22
VI. FEDERAL GRANTS	23
A. National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN)	
Basic Grant	23
B. Federal Challenge Grant	23
VII. PROGRAMS, PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES	23
A. Research	23
1. Family Welfare Research Group (FWRG)	23
2. Fresno Valley Medical Center	24

- B. Projects
 - 1. California Self-Help Center at the University of California, Los Angeles, (CSCH) 24
- C. Professional Training and Public Awareness 25
 - 1. Child Pornography and Sexual Exploitation Pamphlet 25
 - 2. Reporting Responsibilities for Professionals ... 25
 - 3. Child Abuse..And You--What Happens When A Report is Made? 26
 - 4. Interagency Forum 26
- D. Legislation, Policy and Regulation 27
 - 1. Overview 27
 - 2. Liaison to Committees 28
 - a. Institutional Child Abuse Prevention Project Advisory Committee - California Association of Services for California 28
 - b. California Community Colleges Residential Group Home Training Project 28
 - c. Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) 28
 - d. Child Development Advisory Committee 29
 - e. Task Force on Juvenile Arson and Firesetting 29
- VIII. Request for Additional Information 30

APPENDICES

- A. Summary List of Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) Projects
- B. Summary List of CAPIT County Projects Funded by the Office of Child Abuse Prevention
- C. CAPIT Management Information System Data for January 1985 through June 1986
- D. CAPIT Management Information System Quarterly Report Forms
- E. Services Categories and Program Activities for CAPIT Management Information System Quarterly Report Forms

This report is submitted in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code Section 18956 which requires that the Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) of the Department of Social Services (DSS) submit a report to the Legislature in January of 1982 and subsequent even-numbered years. This report covers the activities and accomplishments of the OCAP for calendar years 1986 and 1987.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The Growth of OCAP

The following are excerpts from a speech delivered by Ms. Linda McMahon, Director of the Department of Social Services, at the State-of-the-Art in Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment Conference conducted February 19 and 20, 1987 in Los Angeles. It provides an overview on the growth of the OCAP and how it has impacted the delivery of social services.

"When I had the pleasure of addressing this conference two years ago I characterized our investments of resources to prevent child abuse as a war. War it was and war it remains. The attention of the print and electronic media has decreased; our victories and defeats are no longer constant front page or prime time news items. This we knew would happen. That it has neither reduces the urgency of the problems we struggle with nor dilutes the strength of our dedication to their solution.

"I know that many of you who were here in 1985 were veterans then; many of you have become so since. I invite you to consider with me in the few minutes we have now just where it is we have been, where we are and where we may be going as we continue our combat on the age old, always mysterious battleground of the human heart and mind.

"Legislation was chaptered in 1982 that authorized the establishment of community-based programs in every one of our counties. Today more than 180 of these programs are in operation. During that same legislative session and in the succeeding three years, legislation was passed and signed by the Governor to:

"establish Children's Trust Funds at both the State and County level;

"create pilot programs to test whether children who would otherwise be removed could safely remain with their families if intensive social services were made available;

"fund other pilot programs for the development of training and other techniques to enhance the safety, security and well being of children who are at times left unavoidably without the care of an adult;

"implement the nation's first statewide school-based primary prevention training program;

"give priority at the local level to the funding of child abuse councils; and

"provide the means to fund councils and other high priorities by passing Federal Challenge Grant monies through to the counties.

"When we launched the Child Abuse Prevention Training Act in December of 1985, we knew we were entering largely uncharted waters. A few hardy souls had gone before and their experience was encouraging but did not provide the sort of hard data needed to manage a statewide program.

"I have instructed the Office of Child Abuse Prevention to pursue every opportunity for the objective evaluation of this program's impact. We need to know in depth the answers to such questions as:

"How lasting is the impact of the training at various age levels?

"Which curricula are most effective with which student populations?

"How can we ensure that the training is culturally relevant? (In a multi-ethnic state such as ours, this is of critical importance.)

"What is the impact of this program on other components of the system charged with the protection of our children?

"The Federal government has been the source recently of an added infusion of funding to further strengthen the system. Authorized by the 1984 amendments to the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, Challenge Grants were made available to states having Children's Trust Funds. Nationwide, the grants totaled \$4.8 million. This State was not only remarkable for drawing down nearly double the amount we would have received had the distribution been based on population, we were unique in the way we distributed the funds. In no other state were these Federal dollars passed directly through to local government for child abuse prevention.

"We know that child abuse prevention funding levels are at least temporarily static. This may sound discouraging yet, in a very real sense, it is to our advantage. Our programs have grown so quickly and in so many directions that we need a moment to catch our breath - to take stock of our strengths and weaknesses. Let us use this lull in program growth to reconsider the decisions we

have made. Do the arguments, pro and con, that led us to them still appear valid? Have the actions taken as a result yielded the outcome we sought? Do other options now exist that were not available before?

"It is not only the fall-off in revenue growth that places this obligation in our path. In part it is due to our success in raising public awareness of the existence of child abuse in our communities - even in the very homes where children have the right to feel secure and loved - that reports of suspected child abuse have soared in number. The increase threatens the ability of local child protection agencies to respond.

"You have a key role to play in the creation of the improved system. In at least two aspects, your participation is central. First, you must maintain your commitment to prevention. It is all too easy to fall into the trap of emphasizing the identification of instances where the suspicion of abuse exists. Don't misunderstand me. Whenever that suspicion is reasonable it must be reported. But your unique contribution is the design and implementation of effective prevention strategies.

"Second, you must maintain an emphasis on exercise of professional judgment in carrying out your duty to report. Too often we hear of instances in which mandated reporters practice the equivalent of defensive medicine. That is fearing the consequences of not reporting, they suspend professional judgment and slavishly follow the letter, not the spirit of the reporting law. It is my belief that a substantial portion of the increase in unfounded reports is due to this misapplication of the law.

"In closing, let me commend you to each other. Each of you has knowledge and skill to share. Each of you brings a reservoir of experience and understanding to communicate. Each of you has courage and commitment to dedicate. In fact, as I look into your faces, I think I see something. I think I see the State-of-the-Art."

B. Budget

Until 1983, the OCAP was funded solely by a Federal grant pursuant to the Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (Public Law (PL) 93-247, as amended). The enactment of Chapter 1398, Statutes of 1982, provided the first major commitment of State General Fund dollars and increased the annual budget from approximately \$1 million to over \$11 million. In Fiscal Year 1986-87, with the implementation of Chapter 1638, Statutes of 1984, and Chapter 1618, Statutes of 1984, as well as funds appropriated to the State Children's Trust Fund, the budget approaches \$25 million. Discussion of the legislation is provided in later sections of this report.

C. Philosophy

Working with members of the Committee on Child Abuse Prevention, State Social Services Advisory Board, the OCAP follows this philosophy:

1. Every effort should be made to keep children with their natural families. If this is not possible, another permanent family setting should be the second priority.
2. All children have a right to grow in a healthy environment.
3. Government has a role in ensuring that a healthy and safe environment is provided to all children.
4. All children have a right to grow in an environment which respects their cultural values.
5. A growing body of knowledge exists on child development which can help parents learn to raise children to be healthy adults.

D. Goals

The goals of the OCAP are:

1. To increase child abuse prevention activities, including those directed to professional training and public awareness.
2. To improve communications among the various elements of the child abuse and neglect prevention network.
3. To contribute to the body of knowledge in the area of child abuse and neglect.
4. To ensure equity in the geographic distribution of child abuse and neglect prevention resources.
5. To ensure child abuse and neglect prevention services are culturally relevant.
6. To ensure the appropriateness of child abuse and neglect prevention services received by persons with special needs.

E. Committee on Child Abuse Prevention, State Social Services Advisory Board

The Committee on Child Abuse Prevention consists of seven members, five appointed by the Governor and one each by the Speaker of the Assembly and Senate Rules Committee. The members serve at the pleasure of their appointing power.

During 1986 and 1987, the Committee set and accomplished the following goals and objectives:

1. Identify, assess and prioritize child abuse prevention needs in the following areas: research, evaluation, response and treatment.
2. Provide for effective and ongoing communication with the OCAP.
3. Monitor existing efforts in child abuse prevention in areas of legislation, education, research, treatment, and response, with a high priority being given to primary prevention.
4. Advocate for the development of adequate response and treatment resources.
5. Increase public awareness regarding the Committee.

In order to meet some of these goals and objectives, the Committee has solicited grass roots participation and input from individuals and agencies involved in the field of child abuse prevention. This has been accomplished through community input sessions scheduled as a regular item on the agenda at Committee meetings, the holding of public hearings, and the solicitation of written testimony.

An example of the activity of this Committee which supported their goals and objectives was the formulation of prioritized recommendations to the OCAP on the distribution of State Children's Trust Fund (SCTF) monies.

In terms of other activities, Committee members have participated on other advisory committees and task forces, including the Blue Ribbon Advisory Committee to the Little Hoover Commission, the Child Victim Witness Judicial Advisory Committee, the Senate Bill 1195 Task Force and the Child Development Programs Advisory Committee.

At the December 1986 Committee meeting, written testimony was solicited regarding perceptions of the three most critical issues and problems today in this field, including service gaps, and proposed solutions to these problems. The Committee received approximately 100 responses to this request. Recurring themes and issues which have emerged from the responses received include: 1) the need for more funds for preventive services; 2) the need for more funds for treatment of child abuse victims and their families; 3) the need for shared information and coordination efforts among professionals in the field; 4) the need for more training for professionals dealing with victims and their families; 5) the need for programs dealing with neonatal drug withdrawal babies and substance abuse by parents; and 6) the need for more foster homes and the training of foster parents. The Committee is in the process of analyzing the responses received. The Committee has monitored legislation relating to child abuse, and has taken positions, making these positions known to each bill's author and the Committee's appointing powers.

The Committee has continued its practice of awarding Certificates of Commendation during Child Abuse Awareness Month (each April) to outstanding individuals in the child abuse prevention field who have been nominated by their local child abuse council. The Certificates are jointly awarded by DSS Director Linda McMahon and the Committee.

F. Summary of Projects

Appendix A displays the range of projects funded since the OCAP's inception, the growth in their number and the funds involved. It reflects only the most visible aspects of OCAP's accomplishments.

Projects operating during the period January 1, 1986 to December 31, 1987 are outlined in Sections III, IV, V, VI and VII.

Appendix B displays a listing of county projects funded by the OCAP.

II. CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION, INTERVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAM (CAPIT)
CHAPTER 1398, STATUTES OF 1982
WELFARE & INSTITUTIONS CODE SECTIONS 18962 AND 18963.

A. Introduction

Sections 18962 and 18963 of the Welfare and Institutions Code were enacted effective October 1, 1982, as an urgency measure with a \$10 million appropriation to establish child abuse prevention and intervention programs statewide. The OCAP was designated in the law as responsible for its implementation and monitoring.

A total of 168 projects were funded statewide with the initial appropriation. The largest share (138) were selected, funded and monitored by County Boards of Supervisors and their designated agencies as the law provides. A current list of these projects appears in Appendix B.

Because most projects did not begin operation until after July 1, 1983, the original appropriation covered costs through FY 1983-84. The Budget Act for FY 1984-85 appropriated \$8.75 million, which continued CAPIT programs at an annualized rate of \$10 million. The FY 1985-86 Budget Act provided a four percent cost-of-living adjustment and appropriated \$10.4 million for these programs. The appropriation has remained at \$10.4 million for each year since.

B. Update of CAPIT

1.

a. Innovative Projects

Beginning August 1983, the OCAP funded 10 innovative projects throughout the State. The original projects

were continued through December 31, 1986 at which time their funding was terminated and nine new innovative projects were selected.

As of January 1, 1987, the nine new innovative projects began providing services to Asian, Latino and developmentally disabled populations. A current list of these projects appears in Appendix A.

b. Video

The OCAP is completing production of a documentary video which highlights the activities of ten original innovative projects which were funded from 1984-87. The video is directed to professionals in the field to acquaint them with the types and diversity of prevention and intervention strategies being used in California. Distribution is scheduled for December 1987.

2. Reverted County Projects

The enabling statute appropriated \$9 million to be divided among the 58 County Boards of Supervisors for subcontracting with public and private nonprofit agencies. Counties were given the option of administering the funds locally or reverting them back to the Department for administration. Eleven counties initially chose to revert.

Those original 11 counties were again given an option regarding administering the established projects in the early part of 1985. For FY 1985-86, one additional county decided to revert their funds and two chose to accept responsibility locally.

The OCAP conducted a competitive process in the reverted counties. These grants, started in FY 1986-87, will be for three years. At the end of that time the competitive process will be conducted again. A list of the projects is presented in Appendix A.

3. Training and Technical Assistance

The original statute contains a provision requiring that three percent 1/ of the funding be dedicated to statewide training and technical assistance operated by private nonprofit agencies. Three nonprofit agencies representing statewide networks provided these supportive services to the local child abuse prevention community from January 1, 1983 to June 30, 1987. Effective July 1, 1987 one agency was selected to provide these services, the California Consortium of Child Abuse Councils.

1/ Chapter 1310, Statutes of 1987 reduced this formula to one and one-half percent.

Training and Technical Assistance Project (T & TA)
California Consortium of Child Abuse Councils

This T & TA project has used a variety of approaches in meeting the needs of CAPIT projects. During 1986 and 1987 the project ran a total of 25 conferences aimed at bringing state-of-the-art information to professionals working in child abuse programs. These ranged from two annual, two-day Statewide conferences in San Francisco and Los Angeles that attracted nearly 1,500 participants to four regional conferences in different parts of the State (averaging over 200 participants) to a series of smaller conferences aimed at specific groups of professionals. These smaller conferences were developed specifically for project administrators, parent aides, parenting educators, and treatment specialists.

In addition to conferences, the T & TA project responded to direct requests for staff training or technical assistance from individual CAPIT agencies. Over 125 site visits were conducted by T & TA project staff, Board members, and consultants in order to meet the specific needs identified by the staff of the projects. These included such diverse issues as appropriate use of anatomically detailed dolls in interviewing children, reviews of bookkeeping and accounting systems, techniques for conducting medical examinations of molested children, and developing protocols to coordinate functions of professionals from different disciplines.

Early in 1987, the T & TA project completed a long-standing goal by assisting in the establishment of viable child abuse prevention coordinating councils in every county in California. These councils are designed to promote the coordination of services to child abuse victims and their families, to keep the public informed about child abuse issues, to facilitate professional trainings on child abuse, and to advocate locally for an appropriate spectrum of services to meet the needs within each county. The Project has produced a Directory of Child Abuse Councils, as well as a Directory of CAPIT Projects, and distributed both to the field.

The T & TA project has added staff and an office in Los Angeles to complement the existing staff and office in Sacramento. It has also created a Steering Committee of representatives from CAPIT projects to help make sure that the trainings provided by the T & TA project meet the most pressing needs of the projects that provide direct services to children and their families.

Overall, this T & TA project serves as a vehicle to bring the most current information on child abuse to CAPIT projects and to support child abuse prevention activities in every county in California.

4. County Projects

In 48 counties, the Boards of Supervisors select the projects funded by the CAPIT to serve children at high risk of abuse and neglect. A current list of those projects appears in Appendix B. Additional details may be obtained from the agency delegated responsibility by each County Board of Supervisors.

5. Evaluation of CAPIT Innovative Projects

Beginning in January 1987, the OCAP began utilizing self-evaluation tools developed by the Family Welfare Research Group (FWRG), University of California, Berkeley. Please reference Section VII A.1., of this report for further details regarding these instruments. Further discussion regarding FWRG evaluation efforts is provided in Section II C.

C. Supplemental Report to the 1987 Budget Act

The Supplemental Report to the 1987 Budget Act requires a report of:

"Conclusions drawn from information made available from self-evaluations performed by 10 specified projects."

Among the efforts extended in its support of CAPIT project operations, the OCAP has funded development of self-evaluation modules for use by the projects. The principal purpose of these modules is to enable project administrators to collect and analyze information on their own project in a structured way. By using the modules, projects can identify ways to improve their operations along several dimensions.

In the Spring of 1986, a request was issued to the community-based agencies receiving CAPIT monies. The request was for volunteers to field test these self-evaluation modules which had been designed by the Family Welfare Research Group (FWRG) at the University of California, Berkeley. From the pool of applicants, ten agencies were chosen to use as field sites. These projects constitute a good cross section of the range of child abuse prevention services that exist in the State. They were both small single service agencies and large multiservice agencies located in rural and urban settings offering primary, secondary and tertiary services.

FWRG's evaluation modules present a systems approach to evaluation in which a program's inputs, process, or outcomes are assessed.

An input evaluation measures: (a) how closely the program's staff, clients, and service system fit the agency's goals and objectives; (b) the extent to which services reflect a useful response to documented community needs; and (c) the degree to which they embody standards of best practice.

A process evaluation assesses how closely a program's service delivery system or staff management practices correspond with best standards practices in the field; how program resources are allocated; the unit cost of services; and how efficiently a program operates.

An outcome evaluation measures a program's attainment of their stated goals.

The interests of the projects were as diverse as the projects themselves. The evaluation questions arose from such things as problems the programs were experiencing, questions from their boards, interests in future funding, requests from funding sources, pending administrative decisions and a desire to ascertain their effectiveness in achieving their stated goals. The projects wanted answers to such questions as:

- o How does our service delivery system impact our clients?
- o Do we deliver our service consistently?
- o Does our service delivery system reflect best practice standards in the field?
- o How well do staff, clients, and program resources support the program's goals and objectives?
- o How good is our agency's intraorganizational communication?
- o Was our program effective in modifying the knowledge and attitudes of our clients?
- o Was our program effective in achieving the ultimate goal of preventing child abuse and neglect?

The following provides a sample of the kind of findings that were generated from the self-evaluations of the 10 CAPIT agencies:

Inputs:

Program trends demonstrate a change in the source of clientele. A greater percentage of clients are self-referred compared to two years ago. More clients present themselves to the program prior to State intervention than had previously been the case. This suggests that clients may be more motivated and that agencies should consider revising their service techniques to accommodate a more motivated group. In the last two years, persons providing services on behalf of this project have changed from predominately trained counselors and graduate student interns to community volunteers. This finding suggests that additional effort should be devoted to the project's volunteer training and supervision components. The racial profile

of clients corresponds to that of the volunteer staff. Both feature a sizeable percentage of Caucasians which does not reflect the demographics of the county. This suggests that more outreach could be done in the minority community for clients and volunteer staff.

Process:

Projects were adhering to their own policies and procedures on service delivery, thereby offering consistent services to their clientele: Their strength was in their service provision. They delivered their services at regular, frequent intervals; staff continuity was high; and services were coordinated with collateral agencies. Findings did reveal that weaknesses lie in the area of case documentation and written treatment plans. One project studying their staff management practices scored 100% compliance with best practice standards in the area of supervisory behavior, staff morale, and staff participation and interaction. Staff perceived the agency moving over the last few years to a more participative organizational model. Aspects of the communication process needing attention were the extent to which communications are accepted by subordinates and a need for a supplementary upward communication system.

Outcomes:

A comparison of the before and after scores on a standardized measure combined with noted observations of parents and clinicians indicated that the project's goal (an increase in self-esteem and sexual abuse prevention knowledge) had been attained. Clients benefited from this program. Given the caseload sizes combined with the nature of the clients accepted for treatment, this project does best with reactive crisis intervention, rather than a model of proactive case planning and follow through. The internal evaluations conducted at the agencies fostered organizational growth and development. Some of these changes that were made in the projects as a result of their evaluations were:

The clarification and articulation of program's mission statements, goals and objectives; the creation of written agency policy and procedures; the transformation of agency practices to reflect best practice standards; the adoption of radically different service delivery techniques; the hiring of clinical staff consultants; and changes in program curricula. These CAPIT projects looked critically at their services and initiated substantial modifications to their programs on the basis of their own evaluation findings.

The Supplemental Report also called for:

"Conclusions drawn from data collected by the AB 1733 Management Information System which will include data related to client characteristics, units of service, and funding levels."

The Budget Act of 1984-85 required the Department to develop and implement by February 1, 1985, a system to collect information on CAPIT clients, services, costs, etc. The system which was in operation between January 1985 and June 1986 included five quarterly reports. All projects were required to report information on the cost and services reports. In addition, projects that carried client caseloads and maintained case records that included case plans and treatment goals were required to report client characteristics and client feedback information. Projects with public education programs were required to report information on their presentations. This system was revised effective July 1986 by simplifying four of the five reports and including the public education information in the services report.

The summary tables in Appendix C include data from an average of 140 CAPIT projects per quarter for the period January 1985 through June 1986. Some highlights of this data are:

- o Over half of the public education presentations made by CAPIT funded projects are made to groups of children (Table 1A).
- o Half of the households served by projects that report caseload information are single-parent households (Table 4B).
- o Three-fourths of the adults served by projects reporting caseload information are female (Table 5A).
- o Fifty-seven percent of the adults served by these projects are Caucasian, twenty-five percent are Hispanic, and twelve percent are Black (Table 5C).
- o Over half of the children served by these projects are under six years old (Table 6B).
- o The principal referral source to these projects is the local Child Protective Services or other public agency (Table 7B).
- o Nearly half the cases are closed in less than three months while thirty percent are open for six months or more (Table 14).
- o Most clients reported feeling very satisfied with the services they received from the CAPIT project (Tables 15-17).
- o Thirty-eight percent of CAPIT funding dollars provided treatment services, seventeen percent provided general casework activities, twelve percent provided community activities and 9 percent provided support services to these activities. Twenty-two percent of CAPIT funding dollars were used for project operations including administration (Table 24).
- o The relative costs for types and numbers of services may be ascertained by comparing units of service data on Tables 18 through 22 with costs and resource data on Tables 23 and 24.

III. CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION TRAINING ACT (CAPTA)
CHAPTER 1638, STATUTES OF 1984
WELFARE AND INSTITUTIONS CODE SECTIONS 18975 - 18979

A. Introduction

Chapter 1638, Statutes of 1984, authorized and funded primary prevention programs (PPPs) for the voluntary training and education of children, parents and school staff intended to reduce the general vulnerability of children with regard to abuse, neglect and abduction.

1. Legislative Funding Provisions

The law specified the funds be distributed as follows:

Primary Prevention Programs (PPPs)

\$9,500,000 to be distributed in grants by competitive bid through the OCAP to provide PPPs for child abuse prevention education in school districts. School district participation is voluntary as are workshops for school staff, parents and children in state-funded preschools and in kindergartens and grades 1-12. Included as part of the prevention training are post-workshop sessions in a school setting for any child who on a voluntary basis may want to individually talk with classroom presenters. Reports and referrals to appropriate child protective service agencies are made pursuant to State law. These sessions do not provide any therapy or other forms of treatment. Chapter 189, Statutes of 1985, included staff of PPPs as mandatory reporters under the provisions of the Child Abuse Reporting Law.

Prevention Training Centers

Two prevention training centers are supported for the purpose of providing ongoing information, training, technical assistance, and other services to PPPs and the OCAP.

The prevention training centers and the PPPs collaborate in the selection of appropriate program models, expansion of programs, technical assistance, training, and information development and dissemination. One training center is located in Los Angeles and one is in Berkeley. These centers will be discussed in detail later in this text.

B. Implementation of CAPTA

1. Primary Prevention Programs (PPPs)

a. Preliminary Findings

During the initial grant year (December 1, 1985 to November 30, 1986) the PPPs were called upon to assume expanded responsibilities in developing relationships with school districts, law enforcement, child welfare services, et cetera. Completion of these tasks required that they invest major portions of their time and resources. In addition, these new programs were called upon to select and, in some cases, develop curricula to meet the needs of their target populations and the concerns of their communities. Their ability to meet the first year objectives regarding the number of children to be trained was sometime compromised as a result. In many cases, the problems PPPs addressed, particularly access to school districts, were extremely challenging. Generally speaking, school districts which were awarded grants as PPPs were the most successful in meeting their objectives.

Despite these obstacles, the first seven to eight months ended with PPPs having working curricula responsive to the legislative mandates. Further, they had, nearly without exception, been successful in recruiting and training staff to provide educational services to children. In addition, a large percentage had memoranda of agreement with local law enforcement and child welfare agencies, and most had developed public awareness materials to be disseminated to their schools and communities.

As a result of these initial efforts, PPPs had developed to the point that they could realistically expect to begin the 1986/87 school year with a focus on the principal purpose for which they were funded--primary child abuse prevention training.

One of the most significant achievements of establishing a comprehensive network of State-funded programs to reduce the incidence of child abuse and abduction has been heightened awareness on the parts of children and their families regarding definitions of abuse, its damaging effects, alternatives to abuse, prevention concepts, and resources.

Work continues in order to improve program effectiveness and enhance prevention within budgetary constraints. What ages of children best benefit from a classroom prevention program model? What is the minimum amount of classroom time required for effective learning? How can classroom and parent follow-up be further cultivated to reinforce the child's learning? What program designs assure quality and cost effectiveness?

The answers to these and similar questions will not only help improve the program, they will broaden the potential for the involvement of other institutions in its refinement.

2. Training Centers

a. Southern California Child Abuse Prevention Training Center (SCCAPTC)

For the past two years the SCCAPTC has provided services to the 81 PPPs which includes subcontractors in the ten Southern California counties.

As a resource and training center, the SCCAPTC has a state-of-the-art information center with films and video tapes on the topic of child abuse and neglect. The SCCAPTC has books, sets of professional, teacher and parent curricula, and sets of child abuse curricula for children of all ages. They have translated parent handout materials and some curricula into Spanish, Vietnamese, Tagalog and Korean. These materials are available to PPPs throughout California.

Technical assistance requests by PPPs have included curriculum development, networking with the child abuse and neglect system, post workshop session content, statistical information and advise on the special needs and the cultural aspects of child abuse and neglect. Statistics regarding all of the training activities of the PPPs are compiled on a quarterly basis.

Over the past two years, the SCCAPTC has provided training workshops on a wide range of child abuse prevention and intervention topics. In 1987, the SCCAPTC has focused on developing advanced training packages and audio-visual training modules.

b. Northern California Child Abuse Prevention Training Center (NCCAPTA)

For the past two years, the NCCAPTC has provided services to the 53 PPPs in the 48 northern California counties.

The NCCAPTC has developed a state-of-the-art child abuse prevention and technical resource library that includes child abuse prevention curricula, child abuse prevention books, related periodicals and resources, child abuse prevention audio-visual materials, and child abuse prevention children's activity materials. Materials are loaned to an average of 20-30 PPPs per quarter.

The NCCAPTC has provided technical assistance for a range of program and administrative issues throughout 1986 and 1987. Assistance is provided in the form of on-site visits; office visits; telephone contact and written communication; resource and referral; and materials development.

Finally, the NCCAPTC has also conducted statewide conferences, published newsletters and facilitated networking with child protective services, law enforcement, school districts and community leaders.

C. Evaluation

a. High School Curricula

The OCAP has executed a two-year grant effective July 1, 1987 with the Family Welfare Research Group (FWRG) associated with the University of California at Berkeley to conduct a study of high school level CAPTA programs. This study will examine five representative PPPs. The study is designed first to describe the organization of the PPPs, their goals and curricula. Second, the study will measure the effectiveness of the program in teaching students new skills, knowledge and behaviors that will help them avoid abuse. It will measure the retention of learning over a year-long period following the initial program. Third, it will compare the effectiveness of various programs given such student characteristics as race, sex and geographic location, to estimate what programs work best with particular student populations. Fourth, it will draw upon other data sources to determine the cost effectiveness and social impact of the CAPTA programs. Child abuse reports and data collected by the PPPs will be examined for this purpose.

b. Preschool and Elementary School Curricula

The FWRG is also conducting comprehensive evaluations of preschool and elementary school CAPTA programs. Both the preschool study, a two-year study funded by the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN), and the elementary school study, a three-year study funded by the Walter Johnson Foundation, have been designed to assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of interviews directly with the children, their parents, their teachers, prevention program providers and child welfare workers in the communities in which the target prevention programs are administered. FWRG researchers are investigating the effect that the programs have upon the children as seen from several perspectives as well as the effect they are having upon specific aspects of the surrounding community, i.e., the schools and child protective services.

Children in each study are interviewed using a set of assessment instruments designed by members of FWRG. The instruments, The Child Abuse Researchers' Evaluation Series (CARE Series)--Preschool and Elementary School Versions, investigate whether exposure to a child abuse prevention program affects the children's knowledge, attitudes and prevention skills as well as their ability to generalize the information conveyed by the programs to situations beyond the common stereotypes such as accepting candy from strangers. In analyzing the data the focus is upon measuring change in the children's knowledge and responses before and after participating in the prevention program and upon analyzing the children's responses to the dominant concepts presented by the programs to determine how well they are comprehended at each developmental level.

Parents of the children who participated in the evaluation are interviewed using the CARE series--Preschool and Elementary School Parents' Version, in order to gain further, collaborative material about the child and to ascertain parents' level of awareness of abuse issues before and after the parent workshops and the children's classroom presentations. After the workshops and presentations, parent interviews are conducted to work toward determining the degree to which the parents' awareness and knowledge has changed and to obtain their observations of their children's post prevention program behavior.

Further, the children's teachers are interviewed in order to look at the impact that the programs are having upon classrooms and to get yet another perspective upon the specific classroom presentations. The final component involves interviews with child protection agency staff in the communities involved in the study to inquire into the impact the programs are having upon these agencies.

At present the preschool project is in the final stages of data analysis and the final report is expected to be available around the first of the year. The elementary school study is in the beginning states of data collection in the schools.

D. Supplemental Report to the 1987 Budget Act

The Supplemental Report to the 1987 Budget Act requires a report on:

"Findings and/or preliminary conclusions on the (a) revised program performance goals, (b) curricula evaluations, and (c) ability of Primary Prevention Programs to track child abuse reports resulting from primary prevention education."

Throughout the first year data concerning service goals show that factors related to startup, school scheduling and varying relationships with school districts have influenced program success.

While the language of the law can be read to mean that the intent of the Legislature was to provide child abuse prevention educational services to 1.3 million children, experience has shown this to be an overly ambitious first year goal. Reports still being compiled indicate that approximately half of that number were trained.

As noted above, the Family Welfare Research Group (FWRG) of Berkeley, is evaluating preschool prevention curricula. A private foundation is also supporting FWRG evaluation of elementary grade curricula. A portion of the State Children's Trust Fund is being utilized to fund evaluation of high school curricula. These efforts have proceeded concurrently with the first year program operations. Curricula evaluations now underway will enable the program to target specific groups. They will afford the OCAP the information needed to assess the kinds of curricula available and needed to serve particular groups. Please reference Section III C. Evaluation for more detailed information regarding these evaluations.

The OCAP, in the second year of program operation, required the majority of the projects to make efforts to follow-up on reports of child abuse that have resulted from their presentations. Projects have informed the OCAP that county welfare departments have stated that to track primary prevention program reports specifically will entail a great deal of additional work on their part. County welfare departments interpret substantiated and unfounded cases differently, a fact which has significant bearing upon the face validity of any information that might be received. Therefore, the OCAP is reviewing the situation to identify alternative means to develop this information.

IV. IN-HOME INTENSIVE SERVICES PROGRAM CHAPTER 1618, STATUTES OF 1984, WELFARE AND INSTITUTIONS CODE SECTIONS 18964, 18964.1, and 18964.5-19864.7

A. Introduction

This legislation funds two types of pilot projects. Three projects are funded to provide training designed to maximize the safety, security, comfort and quality of life of children aged 14 and under who are in self-care during hours of parental employment or other unavoidable absences. Eight projects provide intensive in-home services to families whose children would be removed from the home for abuse or neglect in the absence of these services. These services are designed to be available on a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week basis. Trained therapists provide or supervise the services for a limited period of time, normally four to six weeks.

No more than one of each type of pilot project is located within a single county. One of each type of pilot project is located in a rural county. Projects are funded for a period of three years. The self-care training pilot projects are funded at an average of \$75,000 per year. The in-home service pilot projects are funded at an average of \$150,000 per year.

B. Implementation

The original legislation was enacted in January 1985. Cleanup legislation, Chapter 1068, Statutes of 1985, was introduced and enacted as an urgency statute in September 1985. The projects began operation on July 1, 1986.

The program has undergone a review by the Office of the Auditor General. The Office of the Auditor General reported its findings to the Legislature on November 1987.

C. Evaluation

An independent evaluation of these projects is separately supported through the State Children's Trust Fund. The evaluation will assess quality and outcome of services along with cost effectiveness of the programs as compared to conventional child welfare services and their viability for future replication.

D. Recommendation

One issue that became evident during implementation of these projects was the need for an extended start-up period. The time required for development of an effective working relationship between the OCAP, the evaluator, the county social service department, the project and the family was underestimated. It is recommended that any future legislation which mandates programs of this complexity include careful consideration of the time required for initial implementation.

V. STATE CHILDREN'S TRUST FUND (SCTF) AND COUNTY CHILDREN'S TRUST FUND (CCTF), CHAPTER 1399, STATUTES OF 1982, CHAPTER 877, STATUTES OF 1983 AND CHAPTER 1082, STATUTES OF 1983 WELFARE AND INSTITUTIONS CODE, SECTIONS 18965-18971 and 18980-18984

A. Funding and Administrative Provisions

The State Children's Trust Fund (SCTF) and the County Children's Trust Funds (CCTF) were established effective January 1, 1983. Authority for the Trust Funds was established by Chapter 1399, Statutes of 1982, and clarified by Chapter 877, Statutes of 1983.

The funds exist at two levels, County and State. At both, \$4 of the \$9 fee paid to the County or State Registrar for a certified copy of a birth certificate is deposited into a Children's Trust Fund. Other funding sources to County and State Children's Trust Funds include gifts, grants and bequests from private sources as well as funds appropriated by the Legislature. Chapter 1074, Statutes of 1986 provides that each County Children's Trust Fund receives funding from the Federal Challenge Grant received from the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN). Children's Trust Funds are used to support child abuse and neglect prevention and intervention programs operated by private nonprofit organizations or public institutions of higher learning with recognized expertise in fields related to child welfare.

The use of County Children's Trust Funds is entirely the responsibility of each county; the State plays no role in their collection or disbursement. Each Board of Supervisors designates a local board to establish priorities for child abuse and neglect prevention and intervention programs. Thus, local child abuse and neglect prevention projects reflect the service needs of their communities.

The use of monies in the State Children's Trust Fund (SCTF) is subject to the same statutory guidelines as are the County Trust Funds. In addition to birth certificate receipts, the SCTF is supported by individual taxpayers who contribute by means of a check off on Forms 540 and 540A (California State Tax Form). The SCTF project activities are in large part guided by recommendations provided by the Committee on Child Abuse Prevention, State Social Services Advisory Board.

B. Implementation of the SCTF

Projects currently funded through the SCTF include:

1. Perinatal Projects

Four perinatal child abuse projects have been funded through the Spring of 1988. Funding was also awarded for an independent evaluation of these four demonstration programs.

These programs provide preventive services to families who are identified during the weeks prior to or after the birth of the infant, as being at risk for child abuse. The primary goals of the programs are to promote bonding between parent and infant, to provide in-home counseling, parenting skills instruction and to make information available regarding parental support programs and other important community resources.

2. Evaluation of Perinatal Child Abuse Prevention Projects

As part of the overall perinatal project, a longitudinal independent evaluation of the four programs described above has been funded. This research will attempt to answer questions as to the relative effectiveness of individual programs in reducing the likelihood for child maltreatment, the specific services that contribute to client gains, the combination of services that prove most successful and the most effective organizational strategies and resource allocations for perinatal interventions. This evaluation is projected to be five years in duration and will result in a final report in 1990. It is the first in what the OCAP hopes will be a series of assessments of primary and secondary prevention services.

3. State-of-the-State Directory

Throughout California, many programs and resource organizations are involved in child abuse prevention, intervention and treatment. Until 1985, there had never been an effort to compile information on these activities.

In 1985, the Committee on Child Abuse Prevention, State Social Services Advisory Board, recommended to the OCAP as a first priority that a study be funded through the State Children's Trust Fund to compile a directory of these providers. As a result, a 1986 State-of-the-State Directory has been produced. The Directory includes services provided, service availability and accessibility, fee charged, if any, and experience in serving particular ethnic and cultural minority groups.

A 1987 Directory is currently being compiled. It is scheduled for release in January 1988.

4. Videos

In an effort to continue to expand effective service delivery methods, the OCAP is developing videos in the area of child abuse and neglect. The following four videos are being developed for use in small sessions, broadcast television, as well as home usage. The Committee on Child Abuse Prevention, State Social Service Advisory Board, assisted the OCAP in identifying the target populations and subject matter.

a. Focus: Child Abuse Reporting Law

This video consists of two, 27-minute videos dealing with the issues of reporting child abuse. One video will focus on the legal/technical issues of reporting and the second on the clinical and emotional issues arising as a

result of reporting. This video will be produced by the J. Gary Mitchell Film Company. The intended audience for this two-part video is all mandated reporters. The video will be available April 1988.

b. Focus: Latino Communities (Spanish with English subtitles)

The point of this 27-minute video is to assist the Latino community to better deal with issues surrounding child abuse. Included are ways to deal with cultural differences in regard to child rearing, including discipline which is not permitted under California Child Abuse Reporting Law. The video will address awareness/sensitivity to existence of child abuse in the Latino community, child abuse laws and intervention when child abuse is suspected. The intended audience for this video includes Spanish-speaking parents and caregivers, and professionals serving the Latino community. This video will be produced by Catholic Charities of San Francisco with Full Frame Productions as subcontractor. The video will be available June 1988.

c. Focus: The Clergy

This 27-minute video on the subject of the clergy and child abuse issues will focus on assisting clergy to better deal with child abuse and will include ways to define abuse, reporting responsibilities, dynamics of abusive families and available resources. It is intended for use by clergy of all faiths. This video will be produced by the J. Gary Mitchell Film Company. The video will be available April 1988.

d. Focus: The Deaf Community

This 27-minute video deals with issues of identifying, reporting and preventing child abuse in the deaf community. The focus of this video is on providing information to the deaf and hearing-impaired population, and to service providers regarding the dynamics of child abuse among the deaf, the availability of help and the obligation to report. This video is intended for deaf and hearing-impaired adults and older children, hearing parents of deaf children, child welfare service providers, private sector providers and the general public. The contractor is California Association for the Deaf. Funding for the video is provided by the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN) in the amount of \$60,000. The video will be available June 1988. (The funding for this video is provided by NCCAN, not the SCTF. This video is reported here for purely organizational reasons.)

6. Evaluation of In-Home Intensive Services Program

This is reported under Section IV C. Evaluation.

VI. FEDERAL GRANTS

A. National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN)
Basic Child Abuse and Neglect Grant

As discussed under Section I, Budget, until 1983, the OCAP was solely funded by a federal grant pursuant to the Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (PL 93-247, as amended).

At this writing, California is no longer eligible for this grant. Compliance with federal "Baby Doe" requirements have created a situation with so many competing and contradictory interests that legislative efforts to bring California into compliance have not been successful.

B. Federal Challenge Grant (PL 98-473)

Public Law (PL) 98-473 authorized Federal Challenge Grants to States with established children's trust funds. California's 1986 grant was \$1.1 million; in 1987, the grant was just over \$860,000. Chapter 1074, Statutes of 1986, directs the allocation of these federal monies to counties. Just as with locally generated children's trust funds, the use of these funds is determined locally. Federal regulations provide general guidelines.

VII. PROGRAMS, PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

A. Research

1. Family Welfare Research Group (FWRG)
July 1, 1984 to February 28, 1988

An Interagency Agreement between the School of Social Welfare at the University of California, Berkeley, and the OCAP was executed to explore a number of critical policy and program issues surrounding public intervention into the problem of child maltreatment. The resulting project, Family Welfare Research Group (FWRG), draws upon the multi-disciplinary resources of the University to address issues related to child abuse treatment and prevention.

The FWRG seeks to provide knowledge and training that would assist the OCAP in developing, strengthening and carrying out effective child abuse prevention and treatment programs. Among other things, this project has accomplished the objectives summarized below:

- a. Sponsorship of five invitational Child Abuse Prevention Seminars at the University during 1986-87 resulted in papers addressing local policies and practices which were presented and discussed among the participants.
- b. Development and dissemination of evaluation and educational modules to assist administrators, line staff and volunteers to function more effectively in child abuse prevention programs. These modules are now available to community-based child abuse prevention projects statewide.

Each evaluation module has been developed to assist in determining the appropriateness or effectiveness of intervention in three principal areas. They are inputs, or those elements relevant to determining the suitability of a program's services and staff given its target population; process, or those elements relevant to determining the appropriateness of how a program delivers its services and allocates its resources; and outcomes, or those elements which capture the impact of services on clients, policy, or other service delivery systems.

Each of the modules has been designed to work independently to address very specific programmatic or policy questions as well as to work collectively in providing program managers and administrators with a comprehensive assessment of program performance.

2. Fresno Valley Medical Center

The OCAP has contracted with the Fresno Valley Medical Center to develop standards for use of pediatric colposcopes. A colposcope is a 35 millimeter camera fitted with special lenses for the purpose of medical examination and photographic documentation of human anatomy. Its use has grown rapidly over the last few years. This increasingly widespread use has created a need to establish comparative norms against which the evidence in particular cases can be compared. The study will be presented to the State Board of Medical Examiners in January 1988 for consideration as the standard for forensic examination of sexually abused children.

- B. Projects

1. California Self-Help Center at The University of California, Los Angeles (CSHC)

The CSHC is one of five statewide self-help research centers in the nation. This center develops, supports and promotes self-help groups to foster the mental and physical health of Californians.

The Child Abuse Prevention Project expanded CSHC's existing program to include information on child abuse prevention, intervention self-help groups statewide and to evaluate the impact of these groups. With its toll free number and computerized data bank, the CSHC can connect callers with self-help groups involved with child abuse and with support groups of all types statewide. Public education services include conferences, media promotion, a quarterly newsletter, and a resource library of manuals, pamphlets and audio tapes. Resource development activities are directed toward skills needed for starting and managing self-help groups.

Under the current funding, the Center has developed a child abuse brochure to inform the public about self-help groups. This brochure is widely disseminated throughout the state. The current grant also provides funds to establish groups for child abuse prevention among low-income Latinos in the greater Los Angeles area by training leaders of self-help groups, to develop an accompanying training manual with a section in Spanish, and to evaluate the impact of both.

C. Professional Training and Public Awareness

1. Child Pornography and Sexual Exploitation Pamphlet
Publication No. 150.

In August 1985, the OCAP was awarded a discretionary grant from the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN). The grant was used to develop and distribute a public information pamphlet entitled "Questions and Answers About the Sexual Exploitation of Children." The pamphlet, printed in September 1986, contains answers to commonly asked questions concerning sexual abuse and exploitation including signs and symptoms of sexual exploitation, rules parents can establish to decrease the likelihood of abuse and community contacts if exploitation or abuse is discovered.

2. Reporting Responsibilities for Professionals
Publication No. 132.

The OCAP staff provided clinical and technical editorial assistance in a major revision of the popular booklet, "The California Child Abuse Reporting Law: Issues and Answers for Professionals" by Eliana Gil, Ph.D. This pamphlet was originally produced by the OCAP in June 1983.

This reporting booklet continues to address issues of great concern to the professionals mandated to report child abuse. Amendments to the California Child Abuse Reporting Law as well as a demand by professionals for more specific information on this complex topic prompted the revision. Additions to the

booklet include identification of maltreatment, guidelines for assessment, a sample of the Department of Justice reporting form, sample confidentiality policies, community resources, a bibliography and statewide reporting statistics for the past five years.

This booklet continues to be popular with professionals who routinely come into contact with children by virtue of their employment. Additionally, the booklet is widely distributed at child abuse conferences and seminars.

3. Child Abuse...And You--What Happens When A Report Is Made?
Publication No. 129.

The OCAP, under a grant awarded by NCCAN, has authored and published a 12-page pamphlet titled "Child Abuse...And You--What Happens When A Report Is Made?" Although written for the general public, the information is also helpful for professionals as it is designed to reflect current child abuse legislation and child welfare services policy and practice in California.

The pamphlet briefly describes child abuse and why, how, when and to whom it should be reported. The discussion highlights on the roles of county child welfare services, law enforcement and the judicial systems. It answers some of the most frequently asked questions about what happens to children and parents after a report of suspected child abuse is made.

The first printing has been exhausted and a second printing is in process.

4. Interagency Forum

State funding for child abuse and neglect prevention program components existed in many State agency budgets. The need for interagency communication and coordination was widely recognized. In response, the OCAP hosted an Interagency Forum in February 1987 to lay the foundation for the exchange of information with respect to child abuse prevention, education, intervention and treatment resources. The Forum was attended by staff from 25 State offices and encouraged communication between agencies regarding program areas of mutual interest.

Representation included the following State agencies:

- Department of Social Services
- Department of Health Service
- Office of Criminal Justice Planning
- Department of Justice

- California Youth Authority
- Department of Corrections
- Department of Developmental Services
- Department of Drug and Alcohol
- Department of Education

The Interagency Forum was followed by a telephone conference in September 1987 that involved participating agencies in a discussion of existing training programs for child abuse professionals, the possibilities for better coordination and implementation of training resources statewide and the impact of proposed legislation upon those professional groups.

D. Legislation, Policy and Regulation

1. Overview

The primary focus in legislation for child abuse prevention and treatment for the past two years has been on improving procedures through more of explicit definitions of reportable offenses, identification of correlates of high risk, clear administrative guidelines and procedures, and use of the most seasoned, competent workers as intake workers and improved staff training.

Two major bills were chaptered during the 1987 Session; namely, Chapter 1485, Statutes of 1987 (SB 243), and Chapter 1310, Statutes of 1987 (SB 834). These new laws were a product of the SB 1195 Task Force (Chapter 1122, Statutes of 1986) which charged the Senate Select Committee on Children and Youth to establish a task force to review the inter-relationship between the statutes relating to child abuse reporting, dependent children, and child welfare services. The task force is to identify problem areas in the law and by January 1, 1988, submit a report to the Legislature recommending statutory revisions to strengthen the child welfare system in California.

Chapter 1485, Statutes of 1987 (SB 243) amends the Civil Code and the Welfare and Institutions Code and makes several major changes in California's child welfare and adoptions procedures. The law redefines who is eligible for dependency, modifies the permanency planning process and revises the termination of parental rights process.

Chapter 1310, Statutes of 1987 (SB 834) establishes a Child Welfare Training Center to oversee regional training programs for public and private nonprofit social work practitioners and to develop curricula for training such practitioners who are engaged in the delivery of the entire range of child welfare services. The Center will also provide such other supportive

services as acting as a clearinghouse for information, technical assistance and consultation on request; ongoing program development and maintenance; and dissemination of resources and references. The Center will receive assistance from a nine-member Child Welfare Advisory Board appointed by the Director.

2. Liaison to Committees

- a. Institutional Child Abuse Prevention Project Advisory Committee - California Association of Services for Children (CSC).

The OCAP has been serving as a member of this advisory committee. The project is designed to replicate Federally demonstrated child abuse prevention strategies in California group homes. CSC is an association of placement providers (group homes and residential settings) which has an active training and peer review component. The project's achievements in the first year of funding included a statewide training of trainers on prevention and investigation of child abuse in group homes. In addition, they have developed protocols and complaint mechanisms for institutions.

- b. California Community Colleges Residential Group Home Training Project

July 1, 1986 - June 30, 1987

The OCAP has been serving as a member of this project's steering committee. The project was funded by the DSS's Community Care Licensing Division to develop training materials and implement training statewide through the community colleges. The training is designed for group home staff and is intended to focus on child abuse detection, reporting, and prevention. The steering committee's task was to assist in the development and implementation of the training.

- c. Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST)

The OCAP served on the POST Child Abuse Advisory Committee. Penal Code Sections 13516 and 13517 require POST to prepare guidelines establishing standard procedures which may be followed by law enforcement agencies in the detection, investigation, and response to cases in which a minor is a victim of an act of abuse, neglect, sexual abuse, or sexual exploitation.

The POST Child Abuse Advisory Committee updated the guidelines to reflect current law and accepted practices for investigation of reported child abuse offenses.

d. Child Development Advisory Committee

The OCAP continues to serve as a liaison to this committee. Members of the committee include parents, providers, public members and representatives of State departments. The four subcommittees are Resources, Regulations, Health/Protective Services, and Special Needs.

The committee prepared a report titled "The Role of Child Care in Child Abuse Prevention." Following release of this report, it invited representatives from local child welfare services agencies, Community Care Licensing, the Office of the Attorney General and local law enforcement to address the child abuse subcommittee regarding procedures followed when a child abuse report is made. Upon further review, it was determined that there is often confusion regarding areas of responsibility of State and County agencies. As a result, the committee has compiled a California services directory, "A Guide to Agencies and Programs Involved in Child Abuse", listing all State and County departments, agencies and programs involved in child abuse policy-making and service provision. The purpose of this directory is to advise persons of appropriate services and to provide a tool for policy makers to maximize available resources.

e. Task Force on Juvenile Arson and Fire Setting

The OCAP serves as a representative on the Task Force on Juvenile Arson and Fire Setting. The Task Force was established in response to the need to address the juvenile arson and fire-setter problem in California. The following three major areas of study were identified by the Task Force and the State Fire Marshal: (1) The extent and impact of the juvenile arson and fire-setting problem in California; (2) the criminal justice system as it relates to juvenile arsonists and fire setters; and (3) the effectiveness of existing intervention and treatment programs and the determinants of fire setting. In June 1987, the Task Force submitted a report to the Legislature on their findings and recommendations.

VII. REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Requests for additional information regarding this report may be directed to:

STEVEN C. BAILEY
Deputy Director, Legislation
State Department of Social Services
744 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

a1239a

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY LIST OF OFFICE OF CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION PROJECTS

Projects Funded Since OCAP's Inception
1977 through 1987

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
The Richstone Center	7-1-77 to 6-30-81	\$ 199,686	Child Abuse Treatment Program (see 1982 Report to the Legislature)
San Francisco Child Abuse Council	6-30-78 to 12-31-79	\$ 167,632	Child Abuse Treatment Program (see 1982 Report to the Legislature)
Santa Clara Child Sexual Abuse Demonstration and Training Project	10-1-78 to 9-30-79	\$ 792,872	Child Sexual Abuse Treatment Program (see 1982 Report to the Legislature)
Memorial Hospital/ Medical Center of Long Beach	2-29-79 to 8-31-83	\$ 41,969	Support to the activities of the California Consortium of Child Abuse Councils (see 1984 Report to the Legislature)
Westminster Neighborhood Association, Inc., Treatment Program	4-1-79 to 12-31-79	\$ 174,300	Child Abuse Treatment Program (see 1982 Report to the Legislature)
Family Resource Center Seaside	5-14-79 to 6-30-85	\$ 651,024	Respite Care (see 1984 Report to the Legislature)
Family Service Agency San Francisco	5-14-79 to 6-30-85	\$ 623,656	Respite Care (see 1984 Report to the Legislature)
Humboldt Child Care Council	5-14-79 to 6-30-85	\$1,130,594	Respite Care (see 1984 Report to the Legislature)
Kings County Community Action Organization Hanford	5-14-79 to 6-30-85	\$ 346,526	Respite Care (see 1984 Report to the Legislature)
Fresno County Child Sexual Abuse Project	6-1-79 to 12-31-79	\$ 153,088	Child Sexual Abuse Treatment Project (see 1982 Report to the Legislature)

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
Plaza Community Center	6-15-79 to 9-30-81	\$ 231,000	Child Sexual Abuse Program (see 1982 Report to the Legislature)
Parents Anonymous of California	6-18-79 to 3-31-82	\$ 64,762	Child Abuse Treatment Program (see 1984 Report to the Legislature)
Berkeley Planning Associates	6-29-79 to 8-30-81	\$ 29,965	Evaluation of a Child Abuse Treatment Program (see 1982 Report to the Legislature)
Parents United, Inc.	7-1-79 to 10-30-79	\$ 21,990	Child Abuse Treatment Program (see 1982 Report to the Legislature)
Multi-Cultural Coordinating Council for Children and Families	5-1-81 to 4-30-82	\$ 12,000	Conference, Newsletter and Meetings (see 1984 Report to the Legislature)
Charles R. Drew Post-graduate Medical School	7-1-81 to 6-30-85	\$ 412,000	Respite Care (see 1984 Report to the Legislature)
Plaza Community Center	10-1-81 to 12-31-83	\$ 89,151	Sexual Abuse Research Program (see 1986 Report to Legislature)
Charles R. Drew Post-graduate Medical School	10-1-81 to 6-30-83	\$ 89,451	Sexual Abuse Research Program (see 1986 Report to the Legislature)
Bilingual Cine-Television	12-1-81 to 11-30-83	\$ 72,660	Spanish Language Film - "Poca Cosa" (see 1984 Report to the Legislature)
Office of Criminal Justice Planning	2-22-82 to 2-30-83	\$ 20,000	Interagency agreement to cosponsor a sexual abuse training conference (see 1984 Report to the Legislature)
Office of Criminal Justice Planning (Harbor-UCLA Medical Center)	1-1-83 to 6-30-87	\$ 615,760	AB 1733 and AB 2443 Interagency agreement to fund sexual abuse treatment and crisis projects

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
Charles R. Drew Post-graduate Medical School	9-1-82 to 1-31-84	\$ 133,628	Nonaccidental head trauma in children (See 1986 Report to the Legislature)
Multi-Cultural Coordinating Council for Children and Families	1-1-83 to 6-30-87	\$ 414,000	CAPIT Training and Technical Assistance Project
California Child Care Resource and Referral Network	1-1-83 to 6-30-87	\$ 204,000	CAPIT Training and Technical Assistance Project
California Consortium of Child Abuse Councils	1-1-83 to 6-30-88	\$ 924,000	CAPIT Training and Technical Assistance Project
Humboldt County Rape Crisis Team	9-15-83 to 6-30-86	\$ 81,693	CAPIT Reverted Project
Humboldt Child Care Council	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 38,486	CAPIT Reverted Project
Yuba/Sutter Parent and Child Services	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 202,828	CAPIT Reverted Project
Modoc County Department of Social Services	10-3-83 to 6-30-88	\$ 235,278	CAPIT Reverted Project
Behavior Development Center/Coastal Family Development Center	9-15-83 to 6-30-88	\$ 119,156	CAPIT Reverted Project
Plumas Rural Services	9-15-83 to 6-30-88	\$ 239,334	CAPIT Reverted Project
Siskiyou Child Care Council	9-15-83 to 6-30-88	\$ 239,334	CAPIT Reverted Project
Trinity County Human Response Network	9-29-83 to 6-30-88	\$ 238,320	CAPIT Reverted Project
San Luis Obispo County Health Department	10-19-83 to 6-30-88	\$ 253,200	CAPIT Reverted Project
San Luis Obispo Child Development Center	9-15-83 to 6-30-88	\$ 136,176	CAPIT Reverted Project
Mountain Family Services Calaveras County	7-1-85 to 6-30-88	\$ 152,121	CAPIT Reverted Project

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
Lassen Child Care Resource and Referral	10-3-83 to 6-30-88	\$ 237,306	CAPIT Reverted Project
San Fernando Valley Child Guidance Clinic	8-17-83 to 6-30-87	\$ 328,923	CAPIT Innovative Project
Family Care Resource Center, a Program of San Diego Youth and Community Services, Inc., (San Diego)	8-17-83 to 6-30-87	\$ 203,918	CAPIT Innovative Project
Project Sanctuary (Ukiah)	8-17-83 to 6-30-87	\$ 147,202	CAPIT Innovative Project
Porterville Youth, Inc., (Porterville)	8-17-83 to 6-30-87	\$ 208,236	CAPIT Innovative Project
Family Stress Center (Children's Council Concord)	8-17-83 to 6-30-88	\$ 335,736	CAPIT Innovative Project
San Francisco Medical Center Outpatient Improvement Program, Inc., (San Francisco)	8-18-83 to 6-30-88	\$ 541,817	CAPIT Innovative Project
Family Resource Center (Salinas)	8-18-83 to 6-30-87	\$ 257,230	CAPIT Innovative Project
Lutheran Social Services of Northern California and Nevada (Sacramento)	8-18-83 to 6-30-88	\$ 356,695	CAPIT Innovative Project
Family Services Association (Chico)	8-18-83 to 6-30-87	\$ 288,824	CAPIT Innovative Project
Plumas Rural Services Inc., (Quincy)	8-18-83 to 6-30-87	\$ 237,378	CAPIT Innovative Project
Union of Pan Asian Communities of San Diego County	1-1-87 to 6-30-88	\$ 168,000	CAPIT Innovative Project
Humboldt Child Care Council	1-1-87 to 6-30-88	\$ 168,000	CAPIT Innovative Project
Para Los Ninos	1-1-87 to 6-30-88	\$ 168,000	CAPIT Innovative Project

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
Developmental Disabilities Center (Orange County)	1-1-87 to 6-30-88	\$ 168,000	CAPIT Innovative Project
Catholic Council for the Spanish Speaking of the Diocese of Stockton	1-1-87 to 6-30-88	\$ 168,000	CAPIT Innovative Project
California Human Development Corporation	1-1-87 to 6-30-88	\$ 168,000	CAPIT Innovative Project
Family Welfare Research U.C. Berkeley, School of Social Welfare	7-1-84 to 2-29-88	\$ 504,825	Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Policy Project
Valley Medical Center of Fresno	3-31-87 to 3-30-88	\$ 10,000	Anatomical Standardization Study
California Self-Help Center, University of California, Los Angeles	9-30-85 to 12-31-87	\$ 150,000	Self-Help Project
California Association for Deaf	3-31-87 to 6-30-88	\$ 60,000	Video for Deaf and Hearing Impaired
J. Gary Mitchell Film Co.	3-11-87 to 4-14-88	\$ 200,000	Child Abuse Reporting and Clergy Video
Family Welfare Research Group, U.C. Berkeley School of Social Welfare	7-1-87 to 6-30-89	\$ 150,000	Primary Prevention Program High School Curriculum Evaluation
Catholic Charities San Francisco County	7-1-87 to 6-30-88	\$13,918.55	Child Abuse Video for the Hispanic Community
Department of Education Parent Support Projects			
a. San Juan Unified School District	3-1-84 to 12-31-85	\$ 10,000	Child Abuse Curriculum for Teens (see 1986 Report to the Legislature)
b. Youth and Family Center of the Centinela Valley YMCA	3-1-84 to 12-31-85	\$ 40,000	Pregnant Teens Video (see 1986 Report to the Legislature)

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
Northern California Child Assault Prevention Training Center-Oakland	1-1-85 to 6-30-88	\$1,268,750	Primary Prevention Training Center
Auxiliary Services Enterprises, Inc., California State University Los Angeles	1-1-85 to 6-30-88	\$1,318,750	Primary Prevention Training Center
Child Guidance Centers Inc., (Santa Ana)	6-16-85 to 5-13-88	\$ 174,354	SCTF Perinatal Project
Memorial Medical Center (Long Beach)	5-15-85 to 5-15-88	\$ 170,956	SCTF Perinatal Project
Humboldt Child Care Council (Eureka)	4-1-85 to 3-31-88	\$ 173,917	SCTF Perinatal Project
Early Childhood Mental Health Program (Richmond)	5-1-85 to 4-30-88	\$ 170,552	SCTF Perinatal Project
Berkeley Planning Associates	2-28-85 to 1-31-91	\$ 241,465	SCTF Perinatal Evaluation Project
Price Waterhouse	10-1-85 to 9-30-87	\$ 212,863	SCTF State of the State Project
Child Assault Prevention	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 506,518	Primary Prevention Project
Bay Area Women Against Rape (Alameda)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 286,082	Primary Prevention Project
Placer County Women's Center (Alpine)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 20,000	Primary Prevention Project
Amador-Tuolumne Community Action (Amador)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 20,000	Primary Prevention
Rape Crisis Intervention (Butte)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 106,400	Primary Prevention Project
Mountain Family Services Agency (Calaveras)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 21,400	Primary Prevention Project
Colusa County Super- intendent of Schools (Colusa)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 20,000	Primary Prevention Project

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
CAPP of Contra Costa County, Inc., (Contra Costa)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 247,024	Primary Prevention Project
Rape Crisis Center of West Contra Costa (Contra Costa)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 262,855	Primary Prevention Project
Del Norte Unified School District (Del Norte)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 20,000	Primary Prevention Project
Women's Space Unlimited of El Dorado (El Dorado)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 80,000	Primary Prevention Project
Rape Counseling Service of Fresno (Fresno)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 512,200	Primary Prevention Project
Rape Crisis Intervention of Glenn (Glenn)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 21,600	Primary Prevention Project
Humboldt County Rape Crisis Team (Humboldt)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 82,400	Primary Prevention Project
Imperial County Child Abuse Prevention Council (Imperial)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 108,400	Primary Prevention Project
Wild Iris Women's Services of Bishop (Inyo)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 20,000	Primary Prevention Project
Henrietta Weill Memorial Child Guidance Clinic (Kern)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 410,800	Primary Prevention Project
Kings County Community Action Org., Inc., (Kings)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 76,400	Primary Prevention Project
Lake County Child Assault Prevention Training (Lake)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 33,800	Primary Prevention Project
Lassen Unified School District (Lassen)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 20,000	Primary Prevention Project
Bridge - A Way Across (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 496,024	Primary Prevention Project

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
Pomona Unified School District (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 119,708	Primary Prevention Project
Rowland Unified School District (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 120,026	Primary Prevention Project
Los Angeles County Office of Education (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$1,149,182	Primary Prevention Project
Community Family Guidance (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 183,796	Primary Prevention Project
Richstone Center (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 139,186	Primary Prevention Project
Charles Drew (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 502,296	Primary Prevention Project
Los Angeles Unified School District (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$1,259,096	Primary Prevention Project
East LA Rape Hotline (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 321,594	Primary Prevention Project
El Nido Services (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 166,046	Primary Prevention Project
Didi Hirsch Psychiatric Service (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 486,737	Primary Prevention Project
Long Beach Unified School District (Los Angeles)	12-1-86 to 11-30-87	\$ 144,932	Primary Prevention Project
Intercommunity Child Guidance Center (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 322,720	Primary Prevention Project
Pasadena Foothill Valley YWCA (Los Angeles)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 131,450	Primary Prevention Project
Madera County Government Center (Madera)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 70,400	Primary Prevention Project
Dept. of Health & Human Services (Marin)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 117,200	Primary Prevention Project

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
Mariposa County Dept. of Social Welfare (Mariposa)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 20,000	Primary Prevention Project
Project Sanctuary (Mendocino)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 63,400	Primary Prevention Project
Merced County Dept. of Human Resources (Merced)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 148,600	Primary Prevention Project
Modoc Joint Unified School District (Modoc)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 20,000	Primary Prevention Project
Mono County Office of Education (Mono)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 20,000	Primary Prevention Project
Monterey Rape Crisis (Monterey)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 111,220	Primary Prevention Project
Women's Crisis Center of Salinas (Monterey)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 124,180	Primary Prevention Project
Volunteer Center of Napa County (Napa)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 63,400	Primary Prevention Project
County of Nevada Dept. of Social Services (Nevada)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 42,600	Primary Prevention Project
Community Service Programs Inc., (Orange)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$1,303,538	Primary Prevention Project
Placer Women's Center Inc., (Placer)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 111,400	Primary Prevention Project
Child Assault Prevention Project (Plumas/Sierra)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 40,000	Primary Prevention Project
County Superintendent of Schools (Riverside)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 215,922	Primary Prevention Project
Youth Service Center (Riverside)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 225,746	Primary Prevention Project
Riverside Rape Crisis Center (Riverside)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 183,332	Primary Prevention Project

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
Rape Crisis Center (Sacramento)	12-1-85 to 11-30-86	\$ 228,001	Primary Prevention Project
Sacramento Women's Center (Sacramento)	12-01-86 to 11-30-87	\$ 228,001	Primary Prevention Project
San Juan Unified School District (Sacramento)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 210,998	Primary Prevention Project
Bridge Counseling Center (San Benito)	12-1-85 to 11-30-86	\$ 13,300	Primary Prevention Project
Bridges Inc. (San Bernardino)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 60,216	Primary Prevention Project
Family Service Agency of San Bernardino (San Bernardino)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 339,088	Primary Prevention Project
City of Chino (San Bernardino)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 453,814	Primary Prevention Project
Morongo Valley Unified School District (San Bernardino)	3-1-87 to 11-30-87	\$ 2,986	Primary Prevention Project
Needles Unified School District (San Bernardino)	12-1-86 to 11-30-87	\$ 16,609	Primary Prevention Project
Cajon Valley Union School District (San Diego)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 267,536	Primary Prevention Project
Escondido Youth Encounter (San Diego)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 198,154	Primary Prevention Project
San Diego YWCA (San Diego)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 452,706	Primary Prevention Project
San Diego Unified School District (San Diego)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 520,204	Primary Prevention Project
Children's Self Help (San Francisco)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 305,600	Primary Prevention Project
Women's Center Coalition (San Joaquin)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 338,200	Primary Prevention Project

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
San Luis Obispo County Rape Crisis (San Luis Obispo)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 110,000	Primary Prevention Project
Child Advocacy Council (San Mateo)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 346,000	Primary Prevention Project
Klein Bottle (Santa Barbara)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 92,590	Primary Prevention Project
Santa Maria Valley Youth & Family Center (Santa Barbara)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 115,010	Primary Prevention Project
Bridge Counseling Center (Santa Clara)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 108,478	Primary Prevention Project
Santa Clara YWCA (Santa Clara)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 600,752	Primary Prevention Project
Mid-Peninsula YWCA (Santa Clara)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 293,770	Primary Prevention Project
Parent's Center, Inc. (Santa Cruz)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 140,000	Primary Prevention Project
North Valley Parent Educ. Network (Shasta)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 107,400	Primary Prevention Project
Siskiyou Health Associates, Inc. (Siskiyou)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 36,400	Primary Prevention Project
Of Southern CAPP Solano Co. (Solano)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 215,000	Primary Prevention Project
Sonoma Women Against Rape (Solano)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 232,400	Primary Prevention Project
Stanislaus County Dept. of Mental Health (Stanislaus)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 259,000	Primary Prevention Project
Tehama County CAPP (Tehama)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 36,000	Primary Prevention Project
Trinity County CAPP (Trinity)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 20,000	Primary Prevention Project

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
Tulare County Dept. of Education (Tulare)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 266,200	Primary Prevention Project
Motherlode Women's Crisis (Tuolumne)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 28,000	Primary Prevention Project
Rape and Sexual Abuse Center of Ventura Co. (Ventura)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 466,200	Primary Prevention Project
Yolo County Sexual Assault Center (Yolo)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 81,000	Primary Prevention Project
Casa de Esperanza (Sutter/Yuba)	12-1-85 to 11-30-87	\$ 96,200	Primary Prevention Project
Hillsides Home for Children	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 319,000	In-Home Care Project
Turning Point of Central California, Inc.	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 319,000	In-Home Care Project
Sacramento Children's Home	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 319,000	In-Home Care Project
San Mateo Co. Mental Health Services Division	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 319,000	In-Home Care Project
Victor Valley Child Abuse Task Force	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 319,000	In-Home Care Project
Families First, Inc.	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 319,000	In-Home Care Project
Home Start, Inc.	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 319,000	In-Home Care Project
Eastfield Children's Center	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 319,000	In-Home Care Project
Kern Community College District	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 161,740	Self-Care Project

<u>Name of Agency</u>	<u>Funding Period</u>	<u>Cumulative Amount</u>	<u>Program Purpose</u>
Child Assault Prevention of Contra Costa County, Inc.	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 160,566	Self-Care Project
Tahoe Human Services, Inc.	7-1-86 to 6-30-88	\$ 161,739	Self-Care Project
Walter R. McDonald and Associates, Inc.	7-15-86 to 7-14-88	\$ 161,267	In-Home and Self-Care Projects Evaluation

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY LIST OF CAPIT COUNTY PROJECTS
FUNDED BY THE
OFFICE OF CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION

CAPIT County Projects

<u>County</u>	85-86	Allocation 86-87	87-88
<u>ALAMEDA</u>	\$333,403	\$333,403	\$333,403
1. Children's Hospital and Medical Center			
2. Parental Stress Services, Inc.			
<u>ALPINE</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,346	\$ 53,346
1. Alpine Children's Center			
2. Alpine County Sheriff's Department			
3. Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California			
<u>AMADOR</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,346	\$ 53,346
1. Amador/Tuolumne Community Action Agency			
<u>BUTTE</u>	\$ 94,536	\$ 94,596	\$ 94,596
1. Parent Education Network			
<u>CALAVERAS</u>			
OCAP-administered as a reverted (direct) project (see Appendix A).			
<u>COLUSA</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Colusa County Superintendent of Schools			
<u>CONTRA COSTA</u>	\$223,632	\$223,632	\$223,632
1. We Care Society			
2. Child and Family Therapy Center			
3. Early Childhood Mental Health Program			
4. Family Stress Center			
5. Rape Crisis Center of West Contra Costa			
<u>DEL NORTE</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Del Norte Unified School District			
<u>EL DORADO</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. El Dorado County District Attorney			

<u>County</u>	85-86	Allocation 86-87	87-88
<u>FRESNO</u>	\$250,002	\$250,002	\$250,002
1. Comprehensive Youth Services			
2. Centro La Familia			
3. Valley Medical Center			
4. Comprehensive Sexual Awareness and Treatment Team (CSATT)			
5. Fresno Amicus Program			
6. Prote S Training and Employment, Inc.			
7. Rape Counseling Services			
<u>GLENN</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Parent Education Network			
<u>HUMBOLDT</u>			
OCAP-administered as a reverted (direct) project (see Appendix A).			
<u>IMPERIAL</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Imperial County Child Abuse Prevention Council			
<u>INYO</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Inyo County Health Department			
2. Toiyabe Indian Health Projects, Inc.			
<u>KERN</u>	\$159,625	\$159,625	\$159,625
1. Kern Child Abuse Prevention Council, Inc.			
2. Community Connection for Child Care			
3. Henrietta Weill Memorial Child Guidance Clinic			
4. Desert Counseling Clinic			
<u>KINGS</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Kings County Community Action Organization			
2. Kings County Superintendent of Schools			
<u>LAKE</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. A.W.A.R.E.			
<u>LASSEN</u>			
OCAP-administered as a reverted (direct) project. (see Appendix A).			

<u>County</u>	Allocation		
	85-86	86-87	87-88
<u>LOS ANGELES</u>	\$2,290,116	\$2,290,116	\$2,290,116

1. Antelope Valley Domestic Violence Council
2. Assistance League Family Services
3. Cedar House
4. Center for the Improvement of Child Caring
5. Center for Pacific Asian Family
6. Youth and Family Center
7. Charles R. Drew Post Graduate Medical School Pediatric Department
8. Children's Bureau of Los Angeles
9. Children's Institute International
10. Didi Hirsch Community Mental Health Center
11. El Centro Human Services Corporation
12. El Nido Services
13. Employment Readiness Support Center
14. Family Services Coalition
15. Foothill Family Services
16. Hacienda/La Puente Unified School District
17. Haven Hills
18. Home-SAFE Child Care, Inc.
19. Los Angeles Child Guidance
20. Memorial Medical Center of Long Beach
21. Mid-Valley Community Mental Health Council
22. Para Los Ninos
23. Plaza Community Center
24. Richstone Family Center
25. San Fernando Valley Child Guidance
26. St. John's Hospital and Health Center
27. Santa Nita Family Services
28. Santa Clarita Valley Special Children's Center
29. South Bay Center for Counseling
30. Su Casa Family Crisis
31. UCLA Department of Pediatrics
32. Volunteers of America at Los Angeles
33. 1736 Family Crisis Center

<u>MADERA</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
---------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

1. Madera County Department of Public Welfare

<u>MARIN</u>	\$ 86,211	\$ 86,211	\$ 86,211
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

1. Novato Human Needs Center
2. Canal Child Care Center
3. Parents United
4. Parents Anonymous
5. Pregnancy to Parenthood

<u>County</u>	85-86	Allocation 86-87	87-88
<u>MARIPOSA</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Mariposa County Mental Health Department			
<u>MENDOCINO</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Mendocino County Department of Social Services			
2. Mendocino County Youth Project			
<u>MERCED</u>	\$119,558	\$119,558	\$119,558
1. Merced County Department of Human Resources			
<u>MODOC</u>			
OCAP-administered as a reverted (direct) project (see Appendix A).			
<u>MONO</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Mono County Office of Education			
2. Toiybe Indian Health Project, Inc.			
<u>MONTEREY</u>	\$140,296	\$140,296	\$140,296
1. Family Resource Center			
<u>NAPA</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. C.O.P.E., Inc.			
2. Aldea, Inc.			
<u>NEVADA</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Domestic Violence Coalition			
2. Nevada County Department of Social Services			
3. Nevada County Mental Health Department			
<u>ORANGE</u>	\$443,044	\$443,044	\$443,044
1. Family Service Organization of Orange County			
2. The Gary Center			
3. Child Guidance Centers, Inc.			
<u>PLACER</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Roseville Community Hospital			
2. Placer County Sexual Abuse Treatment Program			

<u>County</u>	Allocation		
	85-86	86-87	87-88
<u>PLUMAS</u>			
OCAP-administered as a reverted (direct) project (see Appendix A).			
<u>RIVERSIDE</u>	\$256,787	\$256,787	\$256,787
1. Youth Service Center			
2. Inland Counties Family Learning Center			
3. Riverside County Department of Mental Health			
4. Family Service Association of Riverside, Inc.			
5. Lao Family Community, Inc.			
<u>SACRAMENTO</u>	\$280,533	\$280,533	\$280,533
1. Sacramento Child Sexual Abuse Treatment Program			
2. UCD Medical Center Department of Pediatrics			
3. Sacramento County Health Department			
4. Sacramento Children's Home			
5. Sacramento County Department of Social Welfare			
6. Parent Support Program			
7. Diogenes Youth Services			
<u>SAN BENITO</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Chamberlain's Children Center, Inc.			
<u>SAN BERNARDINO</u>	\$357,212	\$357,212	\$357,212
1. San Bernardino County Department of Health			
2. Family Service Agency			
3. Victorville Parents United			
4. Morongo Basin Family Services			
<u>SAN DIEGO</u>	\$538,447	\$538,477	\$538,477
1. Escondido Youth Encounter			
2. New Alternatives			
<u>SAN FRANCISCO</u>	\$177,548	\$177,548	\$177,548
1. Children's Home Society			
2. Family Service Agency of San Francisco			
<u>SAN JOAQUIN</u>	\$152,649	\$152,649	\$152,649
1. Women's Center of San Joaquin County			
2. San Joaquin County Child Abuse Prevention Council			
3. Valley Community Counseling Services, Inc.			

<u>County</u>	85-86	Allocation 86-87	87-88
<u>SAN LUIS OBISPO</u>			
OCAP-administered as a reverted (direct) project (see Appendix A).			
<u>SAN MATEO</u>	\$146,633	\$146,633	\$146,633
1. Family Service Agency			
<u>SANTA BARBARA</u>	\$112,325	\$112,325	\$112,325
1. Shelter Services for Women, Inc.			
2. Family Services Agency of Santa Barbara			
3. Santa Barbara Family Care Center			
4. KBSAY			
5. Santa Maria Valley Youth and Family Center			
<u>SANTA CLARA</u>	\$315,289	\$325,289	\$225,289
1. Santa Clara County Department of Social Services			
2. County Executive Office			
3. Emergency Housing Consortium			
4. Institute for the Community as Extended Family			
5. Santa Clara County Probation Department			
6. South County Mental Health			
<u>SANTA CRUZ</u>	\$ 98,371	\$ 98,371	\$ 98,371
1. Parents Center, Inc.			
<u>SHASTA</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Shasta County Welfare Department			
<u>SIERRA</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1. Sexual Abuse Treatment Coordination			
2. Toddler Towers Preschool			
<u>SISKIYOU</u>			
OCAP-administered as a reverted (direct) project (see Appendix A).			
<u>SOLANO</u>	\$112,581	\$112,581	\$112,581
1. Families First, Inc.			
2. Community Treatment Center			
3. Solano County Probation Department			
4. Crawford E. Tucker			

County	Allocation		
	85-86	86-87	87-88
<u>SONOMA</u>	\$130,183	\$130,183	\$130,183
1.	California Parenting Institute		
2.	Community Child Care Council		
3.	Sonoma County Dependent Unit		
4.	Sonoma County Public Health Department		
5.	True to Life Counseling		
6.	Family Service Agency		
7.	YWCA - A Special Place		
8.	YWCA - Parental Stress Service		
<u>STANISLAUS</u>	\$146,633	\$146,633	\$146,633
1.	Children's Crisis Center of Stanislaus County		
2.	Parents United, Inc.		
3.	Creative Alternatives, Inc.		
4.	Therapeutic homes, Inc.		
5.	Stanislaus County Department of Public Health		
<u>SUTTER</u>			
	OCAP-administered as a reverted (direct) project (see Appendix A).		
<u>TEHAMA</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1.	Tehama County Probation Department		
<u>TRINITY</u>			
	OCAP-administered as a reverted (direct) project (see Appendix A).		
<u>TULARE</u>	\$140,168	\$140,168	\$140,168
1.	Family Service to Tulare County		
2.	Tulare Youth Service Bureau, Inc.		
3.	Potterville Mission Project		
<u>TUOLUMNE</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1.	Mother Lode Women's Crisis Center		
2.	Tuolumne County Welfare Department		
3.	Infant/Child Enrichment Services, Inc.		
<u>VENTURA</u>	\$177,484	\$177,484	\$177,484
1.	Interface Community		
2.	CAAN		
<u>YOLO</u>	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376	\$ 53,376
1.	CAN STOP		

APPENDIX C

CAPIT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DATA
FOR JANUARY 1985 THROUGH JUNE 1986

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The Management Information System

As discussed earlier in this text, Chapter 1398, Statutes of 1982 established child abuse and intervention programs with an appropriation of \$10 million. These programs have been continued annually via the Budget Act. There are over 170 CAPIT projects which provide a wide variety of child abuse prevention services. The Budget Act of 1984-85 required the Department to develop and implement a system to collect information on these projects to be in place by February 1, 1985.

A management information system (MIS) was developed that included five quarterly summary reports. Two of these were required of all CAPIT projects. The other three reports were only required of projects providing specific types of services. The MIS has since been simplified and reduced to a four-form system.

The forms on which this report is based are:

- The Public Education/Awareness Programs Summary Report (SOC 356) provided information about numbers and types of community and media presentations together with the estimated number and characteristics of the persons reached. This report was required only for programs contracted to provide, for example, parent education and community presentations, or newsletters. Data elements for this report were later incorporated into the Units of Service Report (SOC 360).
- The Client Characteristics Information Summary Report (SOC 354) provides information on demographic characteristics, family stresses and other information. This report is required only for programs which keep client case records which include case plans, treatment goals, etc.
- The Client Feedback Questionnaire Summary Report (SOC 357) is a summary of information collected on the Client Feedback Questionnaire (SOC 356). For the period of this report, this questionnaire was given only to clients who completed case plans in the projects mentioned above which kept client case records. Client feedback information from self-referred clients and from referred clients is reported separately.
- The Units of Service Report (SOC 360) provides information on numbers of service units in various program activity areas. The report is required of all projects. Projects report units of service provided under each of the service categories for which the project is specifically funded under CAPIT. See Cost Report information below for these categories.

The Cost Report (SOC 360) is also required of all projects. Projects divide the amount invoiced to CAPIT into personnel and nonpersonnel costs under the service categories for which the project is specifically funded under CAPIT. These include one or more of the following categories: Public Education/Awareness, Parenting Services, Counseling/Self-Help Services and Day/Respite/Shelter Care Services. Personnel and nonpersonnel costs also are reported for Media Services and Project Operations.

In addition to costs, projects report personnel and nonpersonnel resources for their CAPIT projects. Resources include the required in-kind match, the value of time donated by volunteers, consultants and others, and the value of donated building space, donated furniture and equipment, for example. A comparison of costs and resources is one way of looking at the effectiveness of child abuse prevention program efforts.

B. Purpose of Report and Description of the Data Base

This report is a summary of data from an average of 140 projects per quarter from January 1985 through June 1986. Not all projects are represented in the data base as some projects either did not report data or reported data that was not useable. It should be emphasized that the purpose of this system is to look at CAPIT projects statewide rather than individually.

All projects are required to submit quarterly a Cost Report (SOC 359) and an Units of Service Report (SOC 360). Additionally, depending on the services each project is funded to perform under CAPIT, projects may submit one or more of the following quarterly reports: A Public Education/Awareness Programs Summary Report (SOC 356), a Client Characteristics Information Summary Report (SOC 354), and a Client Feedback Questionnaire Summary Report (SOC 357). The requirements for submitting each of these summary reports are explained in the results section of this report.

C. Management Information System Objective and Statements of Purpose

In response to the Budget Act requirements, the Department developed an MIS system designed to:

- . document project activities and populations served;
- . analyze personnel costs and resources; and
- . assess client outcomes and community impacts.

II. MIS RESULTS

A. Public Education/Awareness Programs Summary Report (SOC 356)

Projects funded by CAPIT to perform public education and awareness programs were required to submit the SOC 356 to the DSS on a quarterly basis. These included such programs as: programs that provided training through the schools prior to the establishment of the CAPTA Program in December 1985, community presentations on child abuse, presentations to professionals on child abuse, and newsletters, brochures or pamphlets. Some projects may provide some of these services through a speakers' bureau, for example, as an adjunct to another CAPIT program but may not be funded specifically to perform public education and awareness programs. These projects would not have submitted this form. However, these projects would report their public education and awareness activities on the Units of Service Report Form (SOC 360).

Data on the types of programs presented and the numbers of persons reached are displayed in Table 1. Estimated population characteristics appear in Tables 2A and 2B, and estimated ethnicity data appear in Table 3. It is important to note that the information in Tables 1B, 2A, 2B and 3 is based on estimates made by the projects.

The minority estimates on Table 3 appear low in comparison to California population estimates. This may be due to low estimates of the targeted populations made by the projects.

B. Client Characteristics Information Summary Report (SOC 354)

Specific criteria must be met before a project is required to submit a quarterly SOC 354 to the DSS. The project must carry a "social work-type" client caseload where case records are kept on clients or families and a case plan and treatment goals are set for each case. For example, a project that conducts parent education classes and keeps minimal records on those receiving services is not required to submit the SOC 354. As a result, the following data is a sample of clients served by CAPIT projects statewide.

1. Household Data

Table 4A is a summary of clients served during the report period. Terms are defined as follows. New Clients refers to cases opened or reopened during a quarter. Continuing Clients refers to cases opened in a previous quarter and remaining open for at least a portion of the report quarter. Directly Served refers to those who directly participate in services. Indirectly Served refers to other household members who benefit in an indirect manner even though they do not directly participate in services.

A few projects keep records on persons but not on households. As a result, these projects report data on clients (parent/adults and children) but do not report data on households. It would not be accurate, therefore, to make comparisons between data on persons and households.

2. Household Composition and Family Profile Information

Tables 4B through 9B contain information on NEW CLIENTS ONLY. That is, cases on these clients were opened, or, in a few instances, reopened during the report period. Only Tables 10 through 12 contain information on all clients, new and continuing.

3. Referral Data

Tables 7A and 7B contain information on referral sources. Some projects are unable to provide data on referral sources, so not all projects are represented here. Totals are not presented on these two tables as clients may have more than one referral source and totals would therefore yield misleading information.

4. Stresses on the Families

Projects are asked to provide information on the stresses experienced by their clients/families at the time cases are opened. Clients may be experiencing a combination of these stresses.

5. Problems and Severity at Time of Case Openings

Tables 9A and 9B display information on the Types of Problems and Severity of Problems that were assessed by project personnel at the time cases were opened. Projects are to assess the most severe harm to any child in the family and then make an assessment as to the severity of that harm. This is a difficult assignment, particularly in those cases where project personnel have limited knowledge of household members who may not receive services through their project.

In cases where child abuse or neglect is suspected or known, projects are required to report to child protective agencies.

Tables 10 through 12 include information on new and continuing clients who received CAPIT services.

6. Services Data

Table 10 indicates the types and numbers of services received by households tracked in client case records. Information on Units of Service by types of services and numbers of unit measures is presented in Tables 16 through 20.

7. Occurrence/Reoccurrence of Abuse/Neglect

Tables 11A and 11B display information on the occurrence or reoccurrences of abuse or neglect among current and closed cases. Projects are asked to report the number of cases where they are certain that abuse or neglect has or has not occurred. They are also asked to report how these determinations are made. Project personnel are required to report any known or suspected child abuse to a child protective agency.

It should be mentioned that the numbers of "no" responses are higher than would be expected as staff would need to live with clients to say with certainty that no abuse or neglect has occurred, and only a few projects maintain this level of contact.

C. Client Feedback Questionnaire Summary Report (SOC 357)

The CAPIT projects were instructed to submit summary data only for those cases where the case plan was completed and the case was terminated. This limitation was made because persons meeting these criteria are more accessible than those who stop coming to projects for services. While it is preferable to obtain feedback from clients who "drop out," experience by CAPIT projects has shown that former clients rarely respond to requests for feedback.

Just as more information is provided on sources of referral for referred clients than self-referred clients, projects provide more feedback information from referred clients than from self-referred clients. It may be that referred clients are more motivated to complete all aspects of a program in order to cooperate with requirements made by referring agencies. Whether or not referred clients actually outnumber self-referred clients in CAPIT projects is unknown.

Feedback from self-referred clients is distinguished from referred clients at the request of project administrators. Many referred clients are required by Child Protective Services (CPS) or by the courts to participate in child abuse prevention programs, and project administrators felt that these clients were more likely than others to give negative feedback and thereby affect overall client feedback. The data, however, does not support this concern.

D. Units of Service Report (SOC 360)

The Units of Service Report depicts information on program activities, unit measures and service categories. Program activities consist of: Community Activities which include education and awareness outreach presentations to community and professional groups, etc.; General Casework Activities; Treatment Service, which include counseling to individuals, couples, families, hotline counseling, crisis intervention, parent education classes, etc; and Support Activities, which include

child care, advocacy and advocacy follow-up, and referral and referral follow-up services. In addition, the SOC 360 collects data on Media Activities --the number of households exposed to media messages from TV, radio, newspapers, etc., and Project Operations Activities.

All CAPIT projects are required to submit quarterly SOC 360s to DSS. If a project is funded to provide services which fall into more than one service category, then it must report all activities for each service category.

Data on the types of program activities, media activities and project operations are displayed in Tables 16 through 20.

E. Cost Report (SOC 359)

The Cost Report which is required of all projects includes information on costs and resources for the CAPIT projects. In completing the report, projects separate the amount invoiced to CAPIT for each quarter into personnel, nonpersonnel and purchased service costs for program activities under each service category. In addition to providing costs for CAPIT-funded program activities, projects are asked to provide the Department with estimates of the value of personnel and nonpersonnel resources. Personnel resources include, for example, the value of volunteer time and time donated by consultants and others. Nonpersonnel resources include such things as the value of donated office space, office equipment and utilities, and donated facility space used for classes and meetings. The value and effectiveness of the CAPIT programs may be determined in part by comparing costs to the amount of resources generated by the programs.

Service categories and program activities are specified in Appendix E.

1. Costs and Resources by Service Categories

Projects are to report costs and resources for program activities under the service category or categories for which they receive CAPIT funds. Projects also report costs and resources for media activities and project operations. Because of this restriction, some projects report costs and resources under one service category, plus media activities and project operations, while others report costs and resources under two or more service categories, plus media activities and project operations. Regardless of the number of service categories which apply to a project, the total costs reported must equal the total CAPIT monthly invoices for a quarter for that project. By having projects report their costs in this manner and then combining the information statewide, it is possible to gain an overall picture of how CAPIT child abuse prevention monies are expended.

Although costs and resources are reported by projects under personnel and nonpersonnel categories, these amounts are combined in order to provide an overview for this report.

2. Costs and Resources by Program Activities

Within each of the four services categories, projects further separate costs and resources into four program activity areas. These are combined in Table 22 to provide an overall view.

The tables mentioned in this text now follow.

TABLE 1 : TYPES OF PUBLIC EDUCATION/AWARENESS PROGRAMS
AND NUMBER OF PERSONS REACHED

1A GROUP PRESENTATIONS	NUMBER OF TIMES PRESENTED		NUMBER OF PERSONS REACHED	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
TARGET GROUP:				
PARENTS	1,592	18.40	29,800	14.50
PUBLIC	800	9.24	32,144	15.64
CHILDREN	4,687	54.16	114,716	55.80
TEACHERS	784	9.06	12,796	6.22
OTHER PROFESSIONALS AND MANDATED REPORTERS	791	9.14	16,129	7.85
TOTALS	8,654	100%	205,585	100%

TABLE 2A : ESTIMATED POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS
REACHED BY AB 1733 PUBLIC EDUCATION/AWARENESS PROGRAMS

2A URBAN/RURAL POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS	PERCENT
RURAL	47.76
URBAN	52.24
TOTAL	100%

TABLE 2B : ESTIMATED POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS
REACHED BY AB 1733 PUBLIC EDUCATION/AWARENESS PROGRAMS

2B SEX	PERCENT
MALE	35.56
FEMALE	64.44
TOTAL	100%

TABLE 3: ESTIMATED ETHNICITY CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS REACHED
 BY AB 1733 PUBLIC EDUCATION/AWARENESS PROGRAMS

ETHNICITY	PERCENT
CAUCASIANS	68.50
BLACK	6.58
HISPANICS	16.25
ASIAN/INDOCHINESE	3.51
AMERICAN INDIAN	1.60
PACIFIC ISLANDERS	.47
OTHER	.73
UNKNOWN	2.36
TOTAL	100%

TABLE 4A: HOUSEHOLD DATA

NUMBER OF CLIENTS SERVED	NEW CLIENTS	CONTINUING CLIENTS	TOTAL CLIENTS
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	12,054	16,561	28,615
NUMBER OF PARENTS/ADULTS DIRECTLY SERVED	14,167	18,961	33,128
NUMBER OF PARENTS/ADULTS INDIRECTLY SERVED	4,936	5,862	10,798
NUMBER OF CHILDREN DIRECTLY SERVED	15,998	23,323	39,321
NUMBER OF CHILDREN INDIRECTLY SERVED	9,554	6,041	20,084

TABLE 4B: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	NUMBER	PERCENT
NUMBER OF SINGLE-PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	6,041	50.12
NUMBER OF TWO-PARENT HOUSEHOLDS	4,192	34.78
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE PARENT PLUS STEPARENT OR OTHER ADULTS	1,753	14.54
NUMBER OF UNKNOWNNS	68	.56
TOTALS	12,054	100%

TABLE 5A: SEX OF PARENTS/ADULTS

SEX OF PARENTS/ADULTS	NUMBER	PERCENT
MALE	3,589	25.33
FEMALE	10,578	74.67
UNKNOWN	0	.00
TOTALS	14,167	100%

TABLE 5B: AGE OF PARENTS/ADULTS

AGE OF PARENTS/ADULTS	NUMBER	PERCENT
17 YEARS AND LESS	438	3.09
18-19 YEARS	579	4.09
20-24 YEARS	2,714	19.16
25-29 YEARS	3,722	26.27
30-34 YEARS	3,095	21.85
35-39 YEARS	1,845	13.02
40-49 YEARS	1,158	8.17
50-59 YEARS	272	1.92
60 YEARS AND OVER	110	.78
UNKNOWN	234	1.65
TOTALS	14,167	100%

TABLE 5C: ETHNICITY OF PARENTS/ADULTS

ETHNICITY OF PARENTS/ADULTS	NUMBER	PERCENT
CAUCASIAN	8,062	56.91
BLACK	1,663	11.74
HISPANIC	3,581	25.28
ASIAN	367	2.59
AMERICAN INDIAN	153	1.08
PACIFIC ISLANDERS	123	.87
OTHER	155	1.09
UNKNOWN	63	.44
TOTALS	14,167	100%

TABLE 5D: RELATIONSHIP OF CARETAKER TO CHILD

RELATIONSHIP OF CARETAKER TO CHILD	NUMBER	PERCENT
NUMBER THAT WERE: MOTHERS	9,681	68.33
FATHERS	2,695	19.02
FOSTER PARENTS	173	1.22
STEPPARENTS	546	3.85
GRANDPARENTS	277	1.96
OTHER RELATIVES	117	.83
SIBLINGS	26	.18
FOSTER SIBLINGS	2	.01
NOT RELATED	138	.97
UNKNOWN	512	3.61
TOTALS	14,167	100%

TABLE 6A: SEX OF CHILDREN

SEX OF CHILDREN	NUMBER	PERCENT
MALE	7,606	47.54
FEMALE	8,389	52.44
UNKNOWN	3	.02
TOTALS	15,998	100%

TABLE 6B: AGE OF CHILDREN

AGE OF CHILDREN	NUMBER	PERCENT
0-2 YEARS	4,413	27.58
3-5 YEARS	3,977	24.86
6-8 YEARS	2,708	16.93
9-11 YEARS	2,077	12.98
12-14 YEARS	1,634	10.21
15-18 YEARS	1,153	7.21
UNKNOWN	36	.23
TOTALS	15,998	100%

TABLE 6C: ETHNICITY OF CHILDREN

ETHNICITY OF CHILDREN	NUMBER	PERCENT
CAUCASIAN	8,185	51.16
BLACK	2,146	13.41
HISPANIC	4,433	27.71
ASIAN	340	2.13
AMERICAN INDIAN	239	1.49
PACIFIC ISLANDERS	141	.88
OTHER	404	2.53
UNKNOWN	110	.69
TOTALS	15,998	100%

TABLE 7A: SELF-REFERRAL SOURCES

SELF-REFERRAL SOURCES	NUMBER
HOW SELF-REFERRAL CLIENTS LEARNED OF SERVICES (THERE MAY BE MORE THAN ONE REFERRAL SOURCE FOR EACH CLIENT)	
NUMBER VIA PUBLIC EDUCATION AND AWARENESS PRESENTATIONS	419
NUMBER VIA MEDIA (TV, RADIO, NEWSPAPERS)	237
NUMBER VIA FLYERS/BROCHURES, ETC	443
NUMBER VIA WORD OF MOUTH	1,178
NUMBER VIA OTHER	828
NUMBER VIA UNKNOWN SOURCES	421

TABLE 7B: REFERRAL SOURCES

REFERRAL SOURCES	NUMBER
SOURCES OF REFERRALS (THERE MAY BE MORE THAN ONE REFERRAL SOURCE FOR EACH CLIENT)	
NUMBER COURT ORDERED	1,929
NUMBER CWD/CPS OR OTHER PUBLIC AGENCY	5,312
NUMBER FROM PRIVATE, NONPROFIT AGENCIES	1,684
NUMBER FROM OTHER MANDATED REPORTERS (CHILD CARE PROVIDERS, MDS, NURSES, LAW ENFORCEMENT, ETC)	1,585
NUMBER FROM OTHER REFERRAL SOURCES	908
NUMBER FROM UNKNOWN SOURCES	151

TABLE 8: STRESSES AT TIME OF CASE OPENINGS

STRESSES AT TIME OF CASE OPENINGS	NUMBER	PERCENT
NUMBER WITH:		
FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES	5,476	16.26
WORK-RELATED DIFFICULTIES	830	2.46
FIGHTING OR CONFLICT IN HOUSEHOLD	4,448	13.21
HEAVY CHILD CARE RESPONSIBILITIES	3,764	11.18
STRESSES OF MIGRATION	863	2.56
NO FAMILY SUPPORT SYSTEM	3,906	11.60
NO SUPPORT SYSTEM OUTSIDE OF FAMILY	3,338	9.91
SUBSTANCE ABUSE	2,317	6.88
CONSTANT MOVING	926	2.75
PHYSICAL PROBLEMS	1,078	3.20
MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS	2,196	6.52
CHILD WITH UNUSUALLY DEMANDING CHARACTERISTICS	2,303	6.84
OTHER	1,532	4.55
UNABLE TO ASSESS	705	2.09
A. TOTAL NUMBER OF IDENTIFIED STRESSES	33,682	100%
B. TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	12,054	
C. AVERAGE NUMBER OF IDENTIFIED STRESSES PER HOUSEHOLD	2.79	

TABLE 9A: PROBLEMS

TYPES OF PROBLEMS	NUMBER	PERCENT
NUMBER WITH:		
POTENTIAL PHYSICAL ABUSE	1,844	15.30
POTENTIAL PHYSICAL NEGLECT	1,499	12.44
CURRENT PHYSICAL ABUSE	1,342	11.13
CURRENT PHYSICAL NEGLECT	770	6.39
POTENTIAL EMOTIONAL ABUSE OR NEGLECT	1,653	13.71
CURRENT EMOTIONAL ABUSE OR NEGLECT	815	6.76
SEXUAL ABUSE	2,083	17.28
FAILURE TO THRIVE	225	1.87
UNABLE TO ASSESS	1,323	10.98
UNKNOWN	500	4.15
TOTALS	12,054	100%

TABLE 9B: SEVERITY OF PROBLEMS

SEVERITY OF PROBLEMS	NUMBER	PERCENT
NUMBER WITH:		
IMPACT NOT DETECTABLE IN CHILD	2,984	24.76
INJURY OR EMOTIONAL DAMAGE NOT REQUIRING MEDICAL OR PSYCHOLOGICAL TREATMENT	1,573	13.05
INJURY OR EMOTIONAL DAMAGE REQUIRING MEDICAL OR PSYCHOLOGICAL TREATMENT	4,495	37.29
PERMANENT INJURY OR EMOTIONAL DAMAGE	201	1.67
NO IMPACT AT THIS TIME	1,867	15.49
UNKNOWN	934	7.74
TOTALS	12,054	100%

TABLE 10: SERVICES RECEIVED BY HOUSEHOLDS

TYPES OF SERVICES	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	PERCENT*
PARENT/HOMEMAKING EDUCATION	11,990	16.35
COUNSELING - INDIVIDUAL	13,063	17.81
COUNSELING - GROUP	6,817	9.29
SELF-HELP (E.G., PARENTS ANONYMOUS)	1,392	1.90
ALCOHOL/DRUG COUNSELING	937	1.28
CRISIS INTERVENTION (INCLUDING HOTLINE)	6,427	8.76
CHILD DEVELOPMENT/PLAY THERAPY	4,013	5.47
24-HOUR CARE	663	.90
RESPITE CARE	3,340	4.55
THERAPEUTIC DAY CARE	897	1.22
TRANSPORTATION SERVICES	3,313	4.52
ADVOCACY AND ADVOCACY FOLLOW-UP SERVICES	7,866	10.72
REFERRAL AND REFERRAL FOLLOW-UP SERVICES	9,487	12.93
OTHER	3,142	4.28
A. TOTAL SERVICES	73,347	100%
B. TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	28,615	
C. AVERAGE NUMBER OF TYPES OF SERVICES PER HOUSEHOLD	2.56	

* PERCENTS ARE BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS

TABLE 11A: OCCURRENCE/REOCCURRENCE OF ABUSE/NEGLECT AMONG CURRENT CASES

AMONG CURRENT CASES	NUMBER	PERCENT
YES	649	2.27
NO	7,164	25.04
UNKNOWN	20,802	72.70
TOTALS	28,615	100%

TABLE 11B: OCCURRENCE/REOCCURRENCE OF ABUSE/NEGLECT AMONG CLOSED CASES

AMONG CLOSED CASES	NUMBER	PERCENT
YES	137	-
NO	1,733	-
UNKNOWN	DATA NOT AVAILABLE	-
TOTALS	DATA NOT AVAILABLE	-

TABLE 12: LENGTH OF TIME CASES REMAINED OPEN

TIME CASES REMAINED OPEN	NUMBER	PERCENT
LESS THAN ONE WEEK	550	6.50
ONE WEEK TO LESS THAN TWO WEEKS	294	3.47
TWO WEEKS TO LESS THAN FOUR WEEKS	808	9.55
ONE MONTH TO LESS THAN THREE MONTHS	2,410	28.47
THREE MONTHS TO LESS THAN SIX MONTHS	1,805	21.32
SIX MONTHS TO LESS THAN NINE MONTHS	1,079	12.75
NINE MONTHS OR MORE	1,519	17.94
TOTALS	8,465	100%

TABLE 13 : DID CLIENTS GET WHAT THEY WANTED TO GET?

CLIENT RESPONSES	SELF-REFERRED CLIENTS		REFERRED CLIENTS	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
YES, COMPLETELY	403	48.97	1,186	50.58
FOR THE MOST PART	290	35.24	681	29.04
SOMEWHAT	59	7.17	181	7.72
MADE A START	43	5.22	151	6.44
MADE NO PROGRESS	7	.85	41	1.75
DON'T KNOW	8	.97	57	2.43
CHANGED MY IDEA OF WHAT I WANTED	13	1.58	48	2.05
TOTALS	823	100%	2,345	100%

TABLE 14 : HOW DID CLIENTS FEEL ABOUT SERVICES RECEIVED?

CLIENT RESPONSES	SELF-REFERRED CLIENTS		REFERRED CLIENTS	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
VERY SATISFIED	447	54.31	1,189	51.29
SATISFIED	320	38.88	897	38.70
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	33	4.01	122	5.26
VERY DISSATISFIED	4	.49	15	.65
NO PARTICULAR FEELINGS ONE WAY OR THE OTHER	19	2.31	95	4.10
TOTALS	823	100%	2,318	100%

TABLE 15 : HOW DID CLIENTS FEEL THINGS WERE NOW COMPARED TO WHEN THEY FIRST CAME TO THE AGENCY?

CLIENT RESPONSES	SELF-REFERRED CLIENTS		REFERRED CLIENTS	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
MUCH BETTER	395	48.00	1,223	52.09
SOMEWHAT BETTER	319	38.76	737	31.39
UNCHANGED	68	8.26	234	9.97
SOMEWHAT WORSE	8	.97	19	.81
MUCH WORSE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER	0	.00	6	.26
BETTER IN SOME WAYS WORSE IN OTHERS	33	4.01	129	5.49
TOTALS	823	100%	2,348	100%

AB 1733 UNITS OF SERVICE REPORT (SUC360)
 TABLE 16: TYPES OF COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

		SERVICE CATEGORIES					
		PUBLIC EDUCATION AWARENESS	PARENTING SERVICES	COUNSELING/ SELF-HELP SERVICES	DAY CARE/ SHELTER/ RESPITE CARE SERVICES	TOTAL *	
PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	UNIT MEASURES	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	
EDUCATION AND AWARENESS OUTREACH TO COMMUNITY GROUPS	NUMBER OF PERSONS ATTENDING	136,654	34,889	31,211	37,622	240,376	
EDUCATION AND AWARENESS OUTREACH TO COMMUNITY GROUPS	NUMBER OF PERSONS ATTENDING	27,957	14,102	13,479	2,980	58,518	
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND CONSULTATION TO COMMUNITY/ PROFESSIONAL GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS	NUMBER OF CONTACTS ^{1/}	12,981	6,745	6,482	401	26,609	

^{1/} The number of meetings or number of phone calls, for example.

* TOTALS may include duplicated counts.

AB 1733 UNITS OF SERVICE REPORT (SOC360)
TABLE 17 : GENERAL CASEWORK ACTIVITIES

		SERVICE CATEGORIES					
		PUBLIC EDUCATION AWARENESS	PARENTING SERVICES	COUNSELING/ SELF-HELP SERVICES	DAY CARE/ SHELTER/ RESPITE CARE SERVICES	TOTAL *	
PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	UNIT MEASURES	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	
INTAKE AND DIAGNOSIS	NUMBER OF CASE INTAKES	318	6,967	14,737	1,886	23,908	
CASE MANAGEMENT/ REVIEW/ MULTIDISCIPLINARY TEAM REVIEW FOLLOW-UP	TOTAL CASELOAD THIS QUARTER	623	16,673	29,068	2,856	49,220	

* TOTALS may include duplicated counts.

AB 1733 UNITS OF SERVICE REPORT (SOC360)
TABLE 18: TYPES OF TREATMENT SERVICES

		SERVICE CATEGORIES				
		PUBLIC EDUCATION AWARENESS	PARENTING SERVICES	COUNSELING/ SELF-HELP SERVICES	DAY CARE/ SHELTER/ RESPITE CARE SERVICES	TOTAL *
PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	UNIT MEASURES	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS
INDIVIDUAL/ COUPLES/FAMILY/ CHILD COUNSELING AND THERAPY	NUMBER OF COUNSELING SESSIONS	18	21,001	124,730	3,654	149,403
PARENT AIDE/LAY THERAPIST COUNSELING	NUMBER OF CONTACTS	22	40,781	13,780	1,647	56,230
ALCOHOL DRUG/ WEIGHT COUNSELING	NUMBER OF COUNSELING SESSIONS	2	2,013	1,530	13	3,558
HOTLINE COUNSELING	NUMBER OF CALLS	932	9,532	12,256	5,158	27,878
GROUP THERAPY	NUMBER OF PERSON SESSIONS ^{2/}	547	14,018	113,900	2,883	131,348

^{2/} The number of individual persons attending multiplied by the number of sessions each one attended.

* TOTALS may include duplicated counts.

AB 1733 UNITS OF SERVICE REPORT (SOC360)
TABLE 18 : TYPES OF TREATMENT SERVICES (CONTINUED)

		SERVICE CATEGORIES					
		PUBLIC EDUCATION AWARENESS	PARENTING SERVICES	COUNSELING/ SELF-HELP SERVICES	DAY CARE/ SHELTER/ RESPITE CARE SERVICES	TOTAL *	
PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	UNIT MEASURES	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	
CRISIS INTERVENTION	NUMBER OF CONTACTS	913	4,877	5,041	4,801	15,632	
PARENTS ANONYMOUS	NUMBER OF PERSON SESSIONS	0	645	13,279	46	13,970	
PARENT EDUCATION CLASSES	NUMBER OF PERSON SESSIONS	364	61,843	11,407	1,600	75,214	
DAY CARE	NUMBER OF CHILD DAYS ^{3/}	0	1,597	7,780	67,871	77,248	
CRISIS NURSERY	NUMBER OF CHILD DAYS	0	0	6	9,429	9,435	
CHILD DEVELOPEMENT PROGRAM	NUMBER OF CHILD SESSIONS	13	2,972	4,435	17,139	24,559	

^{3/} Each day a child is in day care, regardless of the number of hours spent in day care.

* TOTALS may include duplicated counts.

AB 1733 UNITS OF SERVICE REPORT (SOC360)
 TABLE 18: TYPES OF TREATMENT SERVICES (CONTINUED)

		SERVICE CATEGORIES					
		PUBLIC EDUCATION AWARENESS	PARENTING SERVICES	COUNSELING/ SELF-HELP SERVICES	DAY CARE/ SHELTER/ RESPITE CARE SERVICES	TOTAL *	
PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	UNIT MEASURES	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	
PLAY THERAPY	NUMBER OF CHILD SESSIONS	3,147	1,925	10,113	793	15,978	
SHELTER CARE/ RESPITE CARE (MORE THAN 24 HOURS)	NUMBER OF CHILD/PERSON OVERNIGHTS	0	176	3,761	28,031	31,968	
MEDICAL SERVICES/ CARE	NUMBER OF CONTACTS/ VISITS	0	2,368	1,826	335	4,529	

* TOTALS may include duplicated counts.

AB 1733 UNITS OF SERVICE REPORT (SOC360)
TABLE 19: TYPES OF SUPPORT SERVICES

		SERVICE CATEGORIES					
		PUBLIC EDUCATION AWARENESS	PARENTING SERVICES	COUNSELING/ SELF-HELP SERVICES	DAY CARE/ SHELTER/ RESPITE CARE SERVICES	* TOTAL	
PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	UNIT MEASURES	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	
HOMEMAKING (INCLUDING IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES)	NUMBER OF CONTACTS SESSIONS	609	20,618	4,316	249	25,792	
CHILD CARE (DURING MEETINGS, CLASSES, ETC)	NUMBER OF CHILD HOURS	131	25,518	16,079	4,190	45,918	
TRANSPORTATION	NUMBER OF RIDES	74	7,963	12,264	2,244	22,545	
ADVOCACY AND ADVOCACY FOLLOW-UP	NUMBER OF CONTACTS	1,032	19,195	14,113	1,261	35,601	
REFERRAL AND REFERRAL FOLLOW-UP	NUMBER OF CONTACTS	6,569	22,126	32,180	2,610	63,485	

* TOTALS may include duplicated counts.

AB 1733 UNITS OF SERVICE REPORT (SOC360)
TABLE 20: MEDIA ACTIVITIES AND PROJECT OPERATIONS

		SERVICE CATEGORIES					
		PUBLIC EDUCATION AWARENESS	PARENTING SERVICES	COUNSELING/ SELF-HELP SERVICES	DAY CARE/ SHELTER/ RESPITE CARE SERVICES	TOTAL	
PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	UNIT MEASURES	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	# OF PERSONS/ CONTACTS	
MEDIA ACTIVITIES							
TV, RADIO, NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES, ETC	^{4/} NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS EXPOSED TO MEDIA MESSAGE	61,047,075 *	22,053,472 *	13,263,110 *	1,010,578 *	97,374,235 *	
PROJECT OPERATIONS							
STAFF DEVELOPEMENT AND TRAINING, PROGRAM PLANNING, ADMINISTRATION, GENERAL MANAGEMENT	NUMBER OF PERSON DAYS	8,237	12,874	17,624	4,504	43,239	

^{4/} Obtained from TV, radio stations, newspaper circulation departments, etc.

* Duplicate counts.

TABLE 21: COSTS AND RESOURCES BY SERVICE CATEGORIES

SERVICE CATEGORIES	COSTS			RESOURCES		
	\$	% OF SERVICE COSTS	% OF TOTAL COSTS	\$	% OF SERVICE RESOURCES	% OF TOTAL RESOURCES
I. PUBLIC EDUCATION/AWARENESS	1,147,492	12.70	9.71	458,066	10.48	7.45
II. PARENTING SERVICES	2,683,089	29.70	22.71	1,027,493	23.51	16.72
III. COUNSELING/SELF-HELP SERVICES	4,331,571	47.94	36.67	2,262,826	51.77	36.82
IV. DAY/RESPITE/SHELTER CARE SERVICES	873,165	9.66	7.39	622,505	14.24	10.13
TOTAL I-IV SERVICES	9,035,317	100%	-	4,370,890	100%	-
V. MEDIA SERVICES	121,270	-	1.03	127,534	-	2.08
VI. PROJECT OPERATIONS	2,655,851	-	22.48	1,646,559	-	26.80
GRAND TOTAL	11,812,438	-	100%	6,144,983	-	100%

TABLE 22: COSTS AND RESOURCES BY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	COSTS			RESOURCES		
	\$	% OF ACTIVITY COSTS	% OF TOTAL COSTS	\$	% OF ACTIVITY RESOURCES	% OF TOTAL RESOURCES
A. COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES	1,415,566	15.67	11.98	558,556	12.78	9.09
B. GENERAL CASEWORK	2,012,268	22.27	17.04	721,470	16.51	11.74
C. TREATMENT SERVICES	4,488,538	49.68	38.00	2,528,443	57.85	41.15
D. SUPPORT SERVICES	1,118,945	12.38	9.47	562,421	12.87	9.15
TOTAL PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	9,035,317	100%	-	4,370,890	100%	-
V. MEDIA SERVICES	121,270	-	1.03	127,534	-	2.08
VI. PROJECT OPERATIONS	2,655,851	-	22.48	1,646,559	-	26.80
GRAND TOTAL	11,812,438	-	100%	6,144,983	-	100%

APPENDIX D
CAPIT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM
QUARTERLY REPORT FORMS

AB 1733 CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS INFORMATION SUMMARY REPORT

FOR SDSS USE ONLY		
RECORD 0 2 ①	PROJECT ②	QUARTER ③

AB 1733 PROJECT NAME	DATE SUBMITTED
NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING REPORT	PHONE NUMBER ()

- 1/ NEW CLIENT means the case was opened or reopened this quarter.
- 2/ CONTINUING CLIENT means the case was opened in a previous quarter and remained open for at least a portion of the current quarter.
- 3/ DIRECTLY SERVED refers to those who directly participate in services (meetings, classes, counseling sessions, home visits, etc.)
- 4/ INDIRECTLY SERVED refers to other household members.

QUARTER (CIRCLE ONE)

1 JULY—SEPT	2 OCT—DEC	3 JAN—MAR	4 APR—JUNE
----------------	--------------	--------------	---------------

CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS INFORMATION

1. Household Data

- a. Total number served:
- 1) Number of households
 - 2) Number of parents/adults directly served 3/
 - 3) Number of parents/adults indirectly served 4/
 - 4) Number of children directly served
 - 5) Number of children indirectly served

NEW CLIENTS 1/	CONTINUING CLIENTS 2/	TOTAL CLIENTS
④	⑤	
⑥	⑦	
⑧	⑨	
⑩	⑪	
⑫	⑬	

QUESTIONS 1.b. THROUGH 6. - Provide information on NEW CLIENTS ONLY for this section.

b. Household composition

Total households with:

1) Single Parent
 2) Two Parent
 3) One parent plus stepparent or other adult(s)

⑭ ⑮ ⑯

c. Family profile - For PARENTS/ADULTS directly served, please provide the following information.

Sex - Number that were:

1) Male
 2) Female

⑰ ⑱

Age - Number that were:

1) 17 and less
 2) 18-19
 3) 20-24
 4) 25-29
 5) 30-34
 6) 35-39

⑲ ⑳ ㉑ ㉒ ㉓ ㉔

7) 40-49
 8) 50-59
 9) 60 and over

㉕ ㉖ ㉗

Ethnicity - Number that were:

1) Caucasian
 2) Black
 3) Hispanic
 4) Asian
 5) American Indian
 6) Pacific Islanders

⑳ ㉙ ㉚ ㉛ ㉜ ㉝

7) Other

㉞

Relationship (Caretaker to Child) - Number that were:

- 1) Mother (35) 2) Father (36) 3) Foster Parent (37) 4) Stepparent (38) 5) Grandparent (39)
- 6) Other Relative (40) 7) Sibling (41) 8) Foster Sibling (42) 9) Not Related (43) 10) Unknown (44)

For CHILDREN directly served, please provide the following information.

Sex - Number that were:

- 1) Male (45) 2) Female (46)

Age - Number that were:

- 1) 0-2 years (47) 2) 3-5 (48) 3) 6-8 (49) 4) 9-11 (50) 5) 12-14 (51) 6) 15-18 (52)

Ethnicity - Number that were:

- 1) Caucasian (53) 2) Black (54) 3) Hispanic (55) 4) Asian (56) 5) American Indian (57) 6) Pacific Islanders (58)
- 7) Other (59)

2. Referral Sources (There may be more than one for each client.)

a. Total number of self-referrals (60)

How did self-referred clients learn of services? Number through.

- 1) Public education and awareness presentations (61) 2) Media (TV, radio, newspapers) (62) 3) Flyers, brochures, etc. (63)
- 4) Word of mouth (64) 5) Other (specify, if possible) _____ (65) 6) Unknown source (66)

b. Total number of clients referred to this agency.

Source of referrals:

- 1) Court ordered (67) 2) CWD /CPS or other public agency (68) 3) Private non-profit agency (69) 4) Other mandated reporters (child care providers, M.D.'s, nu law enforcement, etc.) (70)
- 5) Other (specify, if possible) _____ (71) 6) Unknown source (72)

3. Total number of case reopenings (For purposes of this question, count a case as reopened only if the case has been previously opened and closed on a family by this AB 1733 project.) (73)

- a) Number of cases opened once before (74) b) Number of cases opened twice before (75) c) Number of cases opened three or more times before (76)

4. Employment data for all parents/adults directly served.

- a) Total number parents/adults unemployed (77) b) Total number parents/adults employed full-time (150+ hours per month) (78)
- c) Total number of parents/adults employed part-time (less than 150 hours per month) (79) d) Total number of parents/adults employed seasonally (80)
- e) Total number parents/adults under-employed (81) f) Total number parents/adults retired/disabled (82) g) Data not available/unknown (83)

5. Stresses at time of case opening. (There may be more than one for each household.) — Number with:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (84) a) Financial difficulties (including uneven/ sporadic income, i.e., seasonal work) | <input type="checkbox"/> (85) b) Work-related difficulties | <input type="checkbox"/> (86) c) Fighting or conflict in household (including spouse abuse) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (87) d) Heavy child care responsibilities | <input type="checkbox"/> (88) e) Stresses of migration | <input type="checkbox"/> (89) f) No family support system (breakdown of extended family) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (91) h) Substance abuse (alcohol/drugs) | <input type="checkbox"/> (92) i) Constant moving | <input type="checkbox"/> (93) j) Physical problems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (95) l) Child with unusually demanding characteristics (e.g. disabled child or child with behavior problems or other health problems) | <input type="checkbox"/> (96) m) Other (please specify) _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> (97) n) Unable to assess |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> (90) g) No support system outside of family (social isolation) |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> (94) k) Mental health problems (suicidal, depression, etc.) |

6. Problem at time of case openings. (For each case, determine most appropriate response, i.e., most severe harm to any child in the family)

a. Type of problems - Number with:

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (98) 1) Potential physical abuse | <input type="checkbox"/> (99) 2) Potential physical neglect | <input type="checkbox"/> (100) 3) Current physical abuse | <input type="checkbox"/> (101) 4) Current physical neglect |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (102) 5) Potential emotional abuse or neglect | <input type="checkbox"/> (103) 6) Current emotional abuse or neglect | <input type="checkbox"/> (104) 7) Sexual abuse | <input type="checkbox"/> (105) 8) Failure to thrive |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> (106) 9) Not at risk |

b. Severity - Number with:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (107) 1) Impact not detectable in child | <input type="checkbox"/> (108) 2) Injury or emotional damage not requiring medical or psychological treatment | <input type="checkbox"/> (109) 3) Injury or emotional damage requiring medical or psychological treatment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (110) 4) Permanent injury or emotional damage | <input type="checkbox"/> (111) 5) Death | <input type="checkbox"/> (112) 6) No impact at this time |

QUESTIONS 7-10 - Provide information on ALL CLIENTS (i.e., NEW and CONTINUING) for this section.

7. Number of households receiving each type of service. (There may be more than one per household.)

- | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (113) a) Public education and awareness | <input type="checkbox"/> (114) b) Parent/homemaking education | c) COUNSELING: (specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> (115) Individual | <input type="checkbox"/> (116) Group |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (117) d) Self-help (e.g., Parents Anonymous) | <input type="checkbox"/> (118) e) Alcohol/drug counseling | <input type="checkbox"/> (119) f) Crisis intervention (including hot line) | <input type="checkbox"/> (120) g) Child development play therapy | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (121) h) 24-hour care | <input type="checkbox"/> (122) i) Respite care | <input type="checkbox"/> (123) j) Therapeutic day care | <input type="checkbox"/> (124) k) Transportation services | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (125) l) Advisory and/or advocacy follow-up services | <input type="checkbox"/> (126) m) Referral and/or referral follow-up services | <input type="checkbox"/> (127) n) Other (please specify): _____ | | |

8. Was there any occurrence/reoccurrence of abuse/neglect among current cases?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (128) Number YES | <input type="checkbox"/> (129) Number NO | <input type="checkbox"/> (130) Number UNKNOWN |
|---|--|---|

For those YES and NO responses, please explain how the determinations were made. _____

9. Was there any occurrence/reoccurrence of abuse/neglect among closed cases?

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (131) Number YES | <input type="checkbox"/> (132) Number NO | <input type="checkbox"/> (133) Number UNKNOWN |
|---|--|---|

For those YES and NO responses, please explain how the determinations were made. _____

10. Case Closing Information - For those cases that were closed during this report quarter, how long had they remained open?

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a) Less than 1 week | <input type="checkbox"/> b) 1 week to less than 2 weeks | <input type="checkbox"/> c) 2 weeks to less than 4 weeks | <input type="checkbox"/> d) 1 month to less than 3 months | <input type="checkbox"/> e) 3 months to less than 6 months | <input type="checkbox"/> f) 6 months to less than 9 months | <input type="checkbox"/> g) 9 months or more |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|

**SB 1733
CLIENT FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE
SUMMARY REPORT**

FOR SDSS USE ONLY		
RECORD 0 3 ①	PROJECT [][] ②	QUARTER [][] ③
(✓) Check one below <input type="checkbox"/> SELF-REFERRED CLIENTS ④ <input type="checkbox"/> REFERRED CLIENTS ⑤		

1733 PROJECT NAME	DATE SUBMITTED
NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING REPORT	PHONE NUMBER ()

QUARTER (Circle One)

1 July-Sept	2 Oct-Dec	3 Jan-Mar	4 Apr-June
----------------	--------------	--------------	---------------

Did clients get what they wanted to get?

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a) YES, completely
⑥ | <input type="checkbox"/> b) For the most part
⑦ | <input type="checkbox"/> c) Somewhat
⑧ | <input type="checkbox"/> d) Made a start
⑨ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e) Made no progress
⑩ | <input type="checkbox"/> f) Didn't know
⑪ | <input type="checkbox"/> g) Changed idea of what was wanted
⑫ | |

How did clients feel about the services received?

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a) Very satisfied
⑬ | <input type="checkbox"/> b) Satisfied
⑭ | <input type="checkbox"/> c) Somewhat dissatisfied
⑮ | <input type="checkbox"/> d) Very dissatisfied
⑯ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e) No particular feelings one way or the other
⑰ | | | |

How did clients feel things were now compared to when they first came to the agency?

- | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a) Much better
⑱ | <input type="checkbox"/> b) Somewhat better
⑲ | <input type="checkbox"/> c) Unchanged
⑳ | <input type="checkbox"/> d) Somewhat worse
㉑ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e) Much worse
㉒ | <input type="checkbox"/> f) Better in some ways, worse in others
㉓ | | |

Please relate any comments shared by clients: _____

4. Which services were most helpful/useful for the clients?

CLIENT RESPONSES		NUMBER ESTIMATED BY PROJECT
SERVICE	NUMBER OF CLIENT RESPONSES	

AB 1733 UNITS OF SERVICE REPORT

FOR SDSS USE ONLY			
RECORD		QUARTER	
0	5		
(1)		(2)	
QUARTER (Circle One)			
1	2	3	4
July-Sept	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun

NOTE: A separate "Units of Service" report must be completed for each service category for which your project is receiving AB 1733 funds.

AB 1733 PROJECT NAME	DATE
NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING REPORT	PHONE ()

SERVICE CATEGORY: (✓) Check below:

- Public education/awareness
 Parenting services
 Counseling/self-help services
 Day care/shelter/respite care services

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	UNIT MEASURES	NUMBER
Community Activities		
Education and awareness outreach to community groups	Number of persons attending	(07)
Education and awareness outreach to professional groups	Number of persons attending	(08)
Technical assistance and consultation to community/professional groups and organizations	Number of contacts ^{1/}	(09)
General Casework Activities		
Intake and diagnosis	Number of case intakes	(10)
Case management/review/multidisciplinary team review/follow-up	Total caseload this quarter	(11)
Treatment Services		
Individual/couples/family/child counseling and therapy	Number of counseling sessions	(12)
Parent aide/lay therapist counseling	Number of contacts	(13)
Alcohol/drug/weight counseling	Number of counseling sessions	(14)
Hotline counseling	Number of calls	(15)
Group therapy	Number of person sessions ^{2/}	(16)
Crisis intervention	Number of contacts	(17)
Parents Anonymous	Number of person sessions	(18)

^{1/} The number of meetings or number of phone calls, for example.
^{2/} The number of individual persons attending X the number of sessions each one attended.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	UNIT MEASURES	NUMBER
Treatment Services (Continued)		
Parent education classes	Number of person sessions	(19)
Day care	Number of child days ^{3/}	(20)
Crisis nursery	Number of child days	(21)
Child development program	Number of child sessions	(22)
Play therapy	Number of child sessions	(23)
Shelter care/respite care (more than 24 hours)	Number of child/person overnights	(24)
Medical Services/care	Number of contacts/visits	(25)
Support Services		
Homemaking (including in-home supportive services)	Number of contacts	(26)
Childcare (during meetings, classes, etc.)	Number of child hours	(27)
Transportation	Number of rides	(28)
Advocacy and advocacy follow-up	Number of contacts	(29)
Referral and referral follow-up	Number of contacts	(30)
Media Activities		
TV, radio, newspapers, magazines, etc.	Number of households exposed to media message. ^{4/}	(31)
Project Operations		
Staff development and training, program planning, administration, general management	Number of person days	(32)

3/ Each day a child is in day care, regardless of the number of hours spent at day care.

4/ Available from TV and/or radio stations, newspaper, circulation department, etc.

AB 1733

Units of Service Report Instructions

General Information

This report must be completed for each service category for which your agency is receiving AB 1733 funds. 1/ For example, if you are specifically funded for the provision of "Parenting" services only, you will submit one "Units of Service" report. However, if you are specifically funded by AB 1733 for "Parenting" services as well as "Day/Shelter/Respite Care" services, you will submit two separate "Units of Service" reports - one for each service category for which you are funded under AB 1733.

Instructions

For each program activity (ie, Community Activities, Casework Activities, Treatment Services, and Support Services) as well as for the Media Activities and Project Operations categories, indicate the total number of unit measures as specified on the form. For example, under "Community Activities", "Education and awareness outreach to community groups", the unit measure is number of persons attending. If your project is funded to provide "Parenting" services and you made five outreach/awareness presentations before community groups in the quarter, and a total of 100 people attended these sessions, the number of people attending is 100. This number would be entered on the appropriate line of the Units of Service report submitted for "Parenting Services".

1/ A service category is defined as those services that your agency is specifically funded to provide with AB 1733 monies.

PERSONNEL		NON-PERSONNEL			TOTALS	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pd Staff Costs	Voluntary In-kind Resources	Paid Costs	Donated/ In-kind Resources	Purchased Services Costs	Costs (1 + 3 + 5)	Resources (2 + 4)
(64)	(65)	(66)	(67)	(68)		
(69)	(70)	(71)	(72)	(73)		
(74)	(75)	(76)	(77)	(78)		
(79)	(80)	(81)	(82)	(83)		
SUB-TOTAL						

IV. DAY/RESPIRE/SHELTER CARE SERVICES

- A. Community Activities
- B. General Casework
- C. Treatment Services
- D. Support Services

V. MEDIA SERVICES

(84) (85) (86) (87) (88)

SUB-TOTAL

VI. PROJECT OPERATIONS

(89) (90) (91) (92) (93)

SUB-TOTAL

GRAND TOTAL 4/

4/ GRAND TOTAL "Costs" in column 6 must equal the total amounts claimed on the monthly AB 1733 invoices for the quarter

AB 1733

Cost Report Instructions

General Information

1. There are six service categories (i.e., Public Education/Awareness Services; Parenting Services; Counseling/Self-help Services; Day/Respite/Shelter Care Services; Media Services and Project Operations) delineated on the cost report. These categories are defined on Attachment A.
 - (a) All projects will complete costs for the "Project Operations" category (VI) and most projects will have costs related to the "Media Services" category (V).
 - (b) The other services categories, (I-IV) will be completed only if a project is **specifically funded** for the provision of the specified service(s). For example, a project funded only for "Parenting Services" will complete items II (a,b,c,d), VI (a) and, possibly V(a). Although a project funded only to provide parenting services may also perform some public education and awareness as part of their parenting program, these costs/resources would be allocated to community activities (a) under "Parenting Services" category (II). Further, if this project also provides some counseling services as part of their parenting program, the costs/resources for these would be allocated to treatment services (c) under the "Parenting Services" category (II).
2. Refer to Attachment B for definitions of "program activities", (i.e., community activities, general casework, treatment services and support services).
3. Definitions of "Costs" and "Resources" are provided on the Cost Report.

General Instructions

1. Determine the service categories (I-IV) for which the project is specifically funded. The project may be funded to provide more than one of the service categories. If you are not clear about which services categories to complete, call your Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) consultant at the Department of Social Services (SDSS).
2. Service category V (Media Services) will probably be completed by most projects and service category VI (Project Operations) must be completed by all projects.
3. Grand Total Costs at the bottom of column 6 must equal the total amounts claimed on the monthly invoices for the report quarter. **Note:** Please keep in mind that the invoices and the cost report are two separate forms.

Specifics

Column 1 — Personnel, Paid Staff Costs

1. Determine how many hours each paid individual worked on the program activities within each appropriate service category. (Program activities include community activities, general casework, treatment services and support services. Service categories include public education/awareness services parenting services, counseling/self-help, day/respice/shelter care services, media services and project operations.)
2. Allocate the person's hourly salary and fringe benefits among the program activities as indicated by the proportion of time spent on each activity.
3. Add the cost for all paid personnel for each activity to establish total paid staff costs.

Column 2 — Personnel, Volunteer/In-kind Resources

1. For those not paid by the program, (i.e., volunteers), estimates of what they would have been paid should be made. Determine the value of volunteer resources by following the same steps above for paid staff. For those paid by other funding sources, compute as for Column 1 and add to estimated value of volunteer time.

Column 3 — Non-Personnel, Paid Staff Costs

1. Identify all non-personnel costs (i.e., rent, telephone, printing, postage, office supplies, etc.). Estimate how each cost should be allocated across program activities. For example, with a parenting program:

If \$200 were spent during the month on printing and if 50% of the printing was for community action activities, 30% for in-home services and 20% for case management, allocate \$100 to community activities costs, \$60 to treatment services costs and \$40 to general casework costs.

NOTE: While accuracy is important, precision in allocating these costs is not essential. Allocations should be made to the nearest 5% to 10%.

Column 4 — Non-Personnel, Donated/In-Kind Resources

1. Identify all non-personnel resources, (i.e., donated building space, donated furniture and equipment, etc.) and allocate in the same manner as described above for non-personnel costs.

Column 5 — Purchased Services Costs

1. If services are purchased, such as homemaking, day care, consultants, trainers, etc., allocate the cost of these purchased services to the appropriate program activity(ies). For example:

If homemaking services are purchased for a parenting program, the total cost of the homemaking services would be allocated to "Support Services", under the "Parenting Services" service category. If, for example, a clinical psychologist was hired to update skills of staff, the total costs for this training would be allocated to "Project Operations".

Column 6 — Total Costs

1. Add costs in columns 1, 3 and 5 obtain total costs paid for by AB 1733 funds.
2. Determine sub-totals for I-VI as appropriate.

Column 7 — Total Resources

1. Add resources in columns 2 and 4 to obtain the value of total resources donated, given in-kind, or paid for by funds other than AB 1733.
2. Determine sub-totals for I-VI as appropriate.

GRAND TOTAL

1. Determine the grand total costs by adding together the sub-total costs in column 6.
2. Determine the grand total resources by adding together the sub-total resources in column 7.

APPENDIX E
SERVICES CATEGORIES AND PROGRAM ACTIVITIES
FOR
CAPIT MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

SERVICES CATEGORIES

For Use With AB 1733 Cost Report

Please note: This list gives examples of the types of services to be included in each service category. Since each program is unique, the list may not be all inclusive.

I. Public Education/Awareness

- CAPP programs
- Other programs providing training through schools
- Parent education presentations in the community
- Community presentations on child abuse
- Presentations to professionals on child abuse
- Newsletters, brochures, pamphlets

II. Parenting Services

- Parent aides
- In-home teaching and demonstrating homemakers
- Parent education groups and services for high-risk parents and expectant parents
- Parental stress lines

III. Counseling/Self-Help Services

- Individual and family counseling services
- Group counseling
- Parent support groups
- Therapeutic services to children at risk and abused children

IV. Day/Respite/Shelter Care Services

- Day and respite care to children at risk
- 24-hour shelter care services
- Therapeutic day care services

V. Media Services

- Preparation and presentation of videos, tapes, interviews, etc., for the media.

VI. Project Operations

- Staff development and training
- Program planning
- Administration
- General management

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

For Use With AB 1733 Cost Report

Please note: This list illustrates the range of activities which might be found in a child abuse/neglect prevention project. Since every program has a unique set of services, this list may not be all inclusive.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	ACTIVITIES INCLUDE
A. Community Activities:	Community education Professional education Technical assistance and consultation
B. General Casework Activities:	Intake and initial diagnoses Clinical supervision Case management and ongoing case review Multidisciplinary team case reviews Follow-up
C. Treatment Services:	Individual counseling Couples counseling Family counseling Individual therapy Family therapy Parent aide/lay therapist counseling Alcohol/drug/weight counseling 24-hour hotline counseling Group therapy Crisis intervention Parents Anonymous Parent education classes Day care Crisis nursery Child development program Play therapy Shelter care/respite care Medical services
D. Support Services:	Homemaking (including in-home support services) Childcare (during meetings, classes, etc.) Transportation Advocacy and advocacy follow-up (e.g., with legal problems, income/employment problems, and housing problems) Referral and referral follow-up