



Oregon

Kate Brown, Governor

Office of the Director
500 Summer St. NE, E-15
Salem, OR 97301-1097
Voice: 503-945-5600
Fax: 503-581-6198
TTY: 503-945-5896

ORS 418.485 and 418.580
Report to Legislative Assembly for 2018
Strengthening, Preserving and Reunifying Families Programs
Department of Human Services - Child Welfare
September 12, 2018

The Department of Human Services is submitting this report to the Oregon Legislature as required by Senate Bill 964 enacted in the 2011 Regular Legislative Session and now part of Chapter 418 of the Oregon Revised Statute. This report relates to the Strengthening, Preserving, and Reunifying Families (SPRF) programs throughout Oregon. The specific requirements of the report are as follows: The Department, in consultation with programs, shall report annually to the Governor and the appropriate interim committees of the Legislative Assembly that address child welfare issues on the progress toward and projected costs of full implementation of ORS 418.575 to 418.598. This report consists of updated information regarding SPRF contracts and service array; program funds and allocation; and program outcomes and evaluation.

History of SPRF:

2011 – SB964 Legislation passed.

2012 – Three counties chosen to pilot SPRF.

2013 – SPRF expanded into four more counties.

2014 – All 36 counties have SPRF contracts in place.

2015 – SPRF contracts have outcome based language added, baseline data collection begins.

2016-2018 – Service gaps reassessed, continued contract administration improvements, continued evaluation of providers/contracts for renewal.

SPRF Contracts and Service Array:

The Department has had SPRF contracts executed for services in all 36 counties statewide since December 2014, and those services are consistent with those outlined in ORS 418.580.

The contract administration team within each county continues to review their individualized service array through means which may include conversations with county partners and program staff. Initially, they held specific meetings to identify gaps in service provision and capacity issues in services already in place. Once the gaps were identified, contracts were written to address the gaps. In the original discussions, a variety of county partners had representatives at meetings in many of the counties, provided valuable input, and participated in planning the service array for their individual counties. Some of those partners included: Judicial Department, Tribes, law enforcement, county employees, faith-based organizations, school districts/education, drug and alcohol and mental health programs, parent programs, etc. The contract administration teams will continue to include community partners moving forward as they reassess their individualized service array.

The following list provides themes in the contracted service array across the state:

- **Navigators:** Specialists to help navigate social service agencies. Multnomah, Washington, Lane, Tillamook, Klamath, Lake, Malheur, Grant, Harney, Lincoln, Clatsop, Columbia, Douglas, Coos, Curry, Marion, Polk, Yamhill, Multnomah, Josephine, Jackson, Hood River, Wasco, Benton and Linn.
- **Parent, Educate and Coach/Mentoring:** Specialists to reinforce parenting behaviors, supportive services. Tillamook, Columbia, Clatsop, Marion, Polk, Yamhill, Clackamas, Josephine, Jackson, Multnomah, Lane, Klamath, Lake, Douglas, Umatilla, Coos, Curry, Lincoln, Linn, Benton and Washington.
- **Relief Nursery:** Childcare, parenting, support services. Umatilla, Jackson, Coos, Malheur, Douglas, Curry, Josephine and Lane.
- **Alcohol and Drug Treatment:** Inpatient/Outpatient alcohol and drug treatment or recovery focused services that focus on multi-dimensional issues such as parenting, domestic violence services, and childcare. Columbia, Washington, Marion, Douglas and Yamhill.
- **Housing:** Short-term, Long-term, Emergency, Treatment Based and Transitional Housing services. Umatilla, Jackson, Josephine, Klamath, Douglas, Linn, Benton, Lincoln, Coos,

Multnomah, Clackamas, Tillamook, Lane, Columbia, Clatsop, Polk, Yamhill, Marion, Washington, Malheur, Deschutes, Crook and Jefferson.

- **Front End Intervention:** Specialists (Alcohol and Drug, Mental Health, Domestic Violence, and human service generalists) responding with CPS workers. Umatilla, Linn, Benton, Lincoln, Coos, Curry, Baker, Union, Wallowa, Douglas, Multnomah, Clackamas and Lane.
- **Reconnecting Families:** Specialists used to engage families and conduct relative searches for additional familial resources/placements. Lincoln, Marion, Polk and Deschutes.
- **Trauma Services and therapeutic services:** Mental Health services and Intensive services to trauma affected families and children. Clackamas, Douglas, Coos, Hood River and Wasco.
- **Family Visitation Support and Coaching:** Tillamook, Washington, Hood River, Wasco, Jackson, Josephine, Lane, Klamath, Lake, Columbia, Deschutes, Linn, Benton, Lincoln, Crook, Jefferson and Douglas.
- **Transportation Services:** Washington, Lake and Klamath.
- **Family Strengths & Needs Assessment:** Lane, Klamath, Lake, Washington, Clackamas, Coos, Curry, Jackson, Josephine, Linn, Benton and Lincoln.
- **Enhanced Meeting Facilitation:** Clatsop, Columbia, Tillamook, Marion, Polk, Yamhill, Clackamas, Curry, Douglas, Multnomah and Washington.

Program Budget and Allocation:

For the 2017-2019 biennium, an allocation methodology of the previous biennium expenditures divided by the total available budget was used. This percentage was then applied to the total available budget for the biennium for each district's portion.

Program Outcomes and Evaluation:

Child Welfare's overarching goal is the safe and equitable reduction of children in foster care. One strategy to achieve this goal is statewide implementation of the Strengthening, Preserving and Reunifying Families (SPRF) program.

In an effort to understand outcomes associated with implementation of the SPRF services, the Department completed the implementation of Performance-Based Contracts for the SPRF program contracts statewide in 2015. A generally accepted definition of Performance-Based Contracting is a results-oriented contracting method that focuses on

the outputs, quality, or outcomes that may tie at least a portion of a contractor's payment, contract extensions, or contract renewals to the achievement of specific, measurable performance standards and requirements.

We have defined outcomes and have been reviewing data measurements and working collaboratively on continuous improvement with our contracted providers. The emphasis has been on outcome based contracting versus financial incentives or penalties. This work is foundational for our overall ability to report on outcomes associated with the SPRF program.

The following are examples of outcomes:

Navigator:

Achieved; Client accessed all necessary, available resources and services.

Partially Achieved; Client accessed one of more necessary, available resources and services.

Not Achieved; Client did not access any necessary, available resources and services.

Long Term Housing:

Achieved; Client obtained or maintained long-term housing by entering into agency approved lease or rental agreement or long-term commitment of cohabitation.

Partially Achieved; N/A.

Not Achieved; Client did not obtain or maintain long-term housing.

Parent Mentoring:

Achieved; Client met all agreed upon service goals.

Partially Achieved; Client met one or more agreed upon service goals.

Not Achieved; Client did not meet any agreed upon service goals.

Outcome Data:

See attached document from the period of April 2017-April 2018 for additional information.

There are many factors and variables as to why a client or family may not achieve outcomes, and those will be reported as partially achieved or not achieved.

Examples for partially achieved outcomes:

-The client met three out of the five agreed upon goals. In one example, the children may have reunified with a parent and the case closed. In another example, the client may have improved but the parental protective capacities were not enhanced to the point of eliminating the safety threat.

-The client met one out of three agreed upon goals. In some examples, a client may have been unable to continue engaging in the service due to stress factors such as mental health needs, a relapse on drugs or alcohol or a domestic violence situation.

Examples for not achieved outcomes:

-The client is unwilling to engage in the service when the provider makes initial contact with them.

-The client does not achieve the outcome and does not reach any agreed upon goals and diminished protective capacities do not improve during the time period the provider was working with the client.

The Office of Reporting, Research, Analytics and Implementation (ORRAI) is currently working to refine how we are capturing outcomes associated with SPRF services. SPRF funded services are widespread, come in a variety of types, and children often receive multiple services throughout their case progression. The plan from ORRAI is to use some research methods to help mitigate some of the inherent limitations in evaluating the effectiveness of SPRF as a whole. These include: 1) Matching to construct a viable comparison group. 2) Within-Service Comparison to determine whether achievement levels are critical for maintaining/promoting stability. 3) Service Effectiveness modeling to provide some indication of which combinations of SPRF funded services are associated with maintaining/promoting stability.

Please contact Deena Loughary at 503-945-6696 or deena.k.loughary@state.or.us if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you.