



MARCH  
2015

# TWO-YEAR EXTENSION GRANTEE INTERVIEWS: FINAL SYNTHESIS AND SUMMARY REPORT



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....  | 1  |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....  | 2  |
| Leadership.....   | 2  |
| Collaborative Practice .....  | 3  |
| Services to Children and Families .....   | 3  |
| Impact on Broader Systems .....   | 4  |
| Evaluation and Data.....  | 4  |
| Sustainability.....   | 4  |
| Two-Year Extension.....   | 5  |
| Benefits of RPG Program Design .....  | 5  |
| INTRODUCTION .....  | 7  |
| Methodology.....  | 8  |
| Interviewed Sites.....  | 9  |
| KEY FINDINGS.....   | 10 |
| 1. Leadership.....  | 10 |
| State-led Initiatives Should Engage Local Leadership to Support Systems-Level Collaborative Change..... | 10 |
| Change in Leadership Can Impact Progress .....  | 12 |
| Use Outcome Data to Engage Leaders and Decision Makers .....  | 12 |
| State Leadership May Not be Engaged with Local Systems Change.....                                      | 13 |
| 2. Collaborative Practice .....   | 13 |
| Establish a Bi-Level, Collaborative Structure .....   | 13 |
| Ensure Trust, Relationship Development, and Communication among Key Partners .....                      | 14 |
| Develop a Common Language and Remind Each Other of Shared Goals .....                                   | 15 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Implement Ongoing Efforts to Develop, Maintain, and Strengthen the Collaborative Partnership ..... | 17 |
| Expect Collaborative Systems Change to Take Time .....   | 19 |
| Unanticipated Partners Can Strengthen a Collaborative and Lead to Important Connections.....       | 20 |
| 3. Services to Children and Families .....   | 21 |
| Trauma-Specific and Trauma-Informed Services .....   | 21 |
| Increased Services to Children, Whole Families, and Fathers.....                                   | 22 |
| Support Relative Caregivers .....  | 22 |
| Motivational Interviewing, Education, and Getting Clients to Services .....                        | 23 |
| One RPG Created a Child/Family Services Agency .....   | 23 |
| 4. Impact on Broader Systems .....   | 24 |
| Increased Awareness of Substance Use Disorders in the Child Welfare Population .....               | 24 |
| Prioritization of Child Welfare Families in Need of Substance Abuse Treatment Services .....       | 24 |
| Keeping Children with their Families .....   | 25 |
| Collaboration as a Way of Doing Business.....  | 25 |
| 5. Evaluation and Data .....   | 26 |
| Evaluate the Collaboration.....  | 26 |
| Use Data to Engage Partners.....   | 27 |
| Use Data to Inform Program and Service Modifications.....  | 27 |
| Recognize the Challenges of Data Collection and Evaluation .....                                   | 28 |
| 6. Sustainability.....   | 28 |
| RPG Partners saw the Benefit of Collaboration .....  | 29 |
| Competency and Success were Demonstrated.....  | 29 |
| A Variety of Sustainability Strategies Were Employed.....  | 30 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 7. Two-Year Extension.....  | 31 |
| Timing and Environmental Context.....                                 | 32 |
| Provision of Additional Services .....                                | 32 |
| Spreading the Message of Trauma-Informed/Trauma-Responsive Care ..... | 33 |
| Increased Data Collection.....  | 33 |
| 8. Benefits of RPG Program Design.....                                | 34 |
| A Spirit of Collaboration.....  | 34 |
| Additional Resources and Flexibility.....                             | 35 |
| Systems Change Focus .....  | 35 |
| Accountability.....   | 36 |
| Technical Assistance and Grantee Meetings.....                        | 36 |
| CONCLUSION.....   | 38 |
| APPENDIX A: Interview Questions.....                                  | 40 |
| RPG I Extension Sites Interviews.....                                 | 40 |
| Guidance to Grantees .....  | 40 |
| Extension Site-specific Questions.....                                | 42 |
| Respondent Characteristics.....                                       | 43 |

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Center for Children and Family Futures (CCFF) is especially grateful to the five grantees selected to represent the eight Regional Partnership Grant (RPG) Two-Year Extension grantees in this interview process.

The five grantees interviewed were:

- The Center for Children and Families – Billings, MT
- Judicial Branch of Iowa, Children’s Justice – Des Moines, IA
- Kentucky River Community Care, Inc. – Jackson, KY
- Massachusetts Department of Public Health Bureau of Substance Abuse Services – Boston, MA
- Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services – Nashville, TN

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 reauthorized the Promoting Safe and Stable Families program and provided funding for a five-year period through the Regional Partnership Grant (RPG) Program. In October 2007, the Children's Bureau, in the Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, awarded 53 Regional Partnership Grants to applicants across the country. The RPG Program funded regional partnerships designed to improve permanency outcomes for children and families affected by methamphetamine or other substance abuse.

On September 30, 2011, the President signed the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (Public Law 112-34 under Title IV-B of the Social Security Act) into law. This law provided funding for 17 RPG-II sites and gave the Department of Health and Human Services the authority to provide two additional years of funding to previously awarded, targeted grant programs. The funding came with a cost-sharing requirement of 30 percent in Year 6 and 35 percent in Year 7, and was meant to help sites build upon the knowledge and lessons learned from their initial 2007 RPG awards. While changes were anticipated, grantees were expected to continue to align activities and services with their original proposed efforts. Eight sites were granted this two-year extension of their RPG grants at an amount of \$500,000 per year.

With the leadership and support of the Children's Bureau, the Center for Children and Family Futures (CCFF) continued to support the RPG-I Two-Year Extension sites through their RPG Technical Assistance team. CCFF operates the National Center on Substance Abuse and Child Welfare (NCSACW), a national resource center supported by the Children's Bureau and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Programmatic technical assistance (TA) was provided through the NCSACW as well.

This report provides a summary and synthesis of interviews conducted with the program directors from five of the eight Two-Year Extension site grantees. The interviews were designed to document the accomplishments and lessons learned from the entire seven years of RPG funding, as well as to provide insight into the benefits of the additional two years of federal funding provided through the extension grants. In addition to the *Final Synthesis and Summary Report Grantee Interviews - May 2014*, which detailed interviews from the first round of RPG funding, this report provides an important contribution to the field by reflecting these program directors' experiences and key lessons in implementing services in partnerships that included child welfare, substance abuse, courts, mental health, and other human services systems. These interviews underscore the importance of working collaboratively across multiple systems to challenge business-as-usual and to facilitate and sustain policy and practice changes that improve outcomes for children and families.

### LEADERSHIP

RPG partnerships were complex, multi-system, collaborative efforts that require solid leadership skills and multi-layered strategies. Leaders of complex efforts of this nature must be able to communicate and work across multiple systems, engage and retain partners with differing values and agendas, develop consensus, and foster community interest and support.

Several important themes in regard to leadership emerged from the interviews. For state-led initiatives, state-level leaders provided consistency and established cross-agency relationships, and local leadership was essential for engaging and strengthening the relationships necessary among providers. The use of program data and sharing information on outcomes from the RPG-funded services was an effective way to engage leaders and decision makers. Data should be used by leaders to garner and sustain support at both the state and local levels.

Challenges to the RPG efforts were experienced by changes in leadership at the state, local, and programmatic levels. Changes in leadership may help or hinder a collaborative effort depending upon the knowledge, interest, and perspective of the new leader. Such changes always require time and effort to engage new individuals. One grantee faced challenges stemming from state leaders who were not interested or engaged in the RPG collaborative efforts. The state leaders did not see the importance of the collaborative partnerships needed to support systems change.

## **COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE**

All grantees' regional partnerships extended well beyond the required two-partner minimum, and included 10 or more diverse partners. Regional partnerships benefited from a bi-level, collaborative structure where a higher-level advisory group guided and supported policy changes, while frontline staff identified practice issues and worked to implement the day-to-day tasks of collaborative practice. Grantees noted the benefits derived from the engagement of unexpected partners who became integral to their collaborative efforts.

During the grant period, the partnerships changed as families' needs and the environment in which the grantees operated continued to shift and evolve. Ongoing efforts to engage, re-engage, and strengthen the collaborative partnerships were important. Establishing trust among partners, developing relationships, and ongoing communication were seen as critical elements of a strong collaboration. Focusing on a shared goal and creating a common language helped partners with diverse philosophies and frameworks to focus on their common purpose. Spending dedicated time on each aspect of developing, supporting, and sustaining the collaborative was seen as linked to successful collaboration. This concerted effort to work on strengthening and maintaining the collaborative partnership must take place simultaneously with moving forward toward service and systems change. Grantees spoke of these efforts and indicated they should include staff dedicated to building relationships among collaborative partners, providing training, and sharing information and resources.

## **SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES**

Over the course of RPG implementation, grantees worked to increase services to children, focused on wrapping services around the whole family, and developed specific initiatives to support fathers. Additionally, grantees increased their awareness of the consequences that traumatic experiences have on the lives of their clients, and worked to provide both trauma-specific and trauma-informed services. Providing support and services to relative caregivers was one way in which familial bonds could be strengthened when out-of-home placement was necessary. Motivational Interviewing was used as a strategy to engage clients and work through the denial often faced by parents with substance use disorders. In one jurisdiction, the RPG

Program helped to establish a child-services agency that will be maintained beyond the Federal grant funding.

## **IMPACT ON BROADER SYSTEMS**

Regional partnership grantees worked to extend changes beyond their specific grant-funded services and address larger, system-wide barriers to effective collaboration. Interviewees spoke to an increased awareness in partner systems concerning the issue of substance use disorders among the child welfare population, and the extent to which parental substance use disorders impact child abuse and neglect. This increased awareness led many grantees to prioritize child welfare clients in need of substance abuse treatment services. Grantees and their partners focused concerted efforts on supporting families' needs, while maintaining children safely in their homes. System-wide efforts were seen to not only decrease the frequency of removal of children from their homes, but to strengthen reunification to prevent future removals.

As a result of RPG collaboration, interviewees saw networking, communication, and information sharing as systemic changes in the way their jurisdictions were doing business. They spoke to both formal and informal efforts toward increased collaboration in their jurisdictions.

## **EVALUATION AND DATA**

Evaluation and data collection were seen as critical to RPG efforts. Data were utilized by grantees to monitor the efforts, progress, and strength of the collaborative partnership itself, as well as the services provided to families through the partnerships. Assessments of the collaborative were used to make improvements in attendance, understand partners' perception of the issues, and to recognize why systems were or were not changing. Program data was used to examine specific components of services and practices were modified, as needed. Sharing positive outcomes and cost-avoidance data was seen as a successful strategy for engaging reluctant partners, strengthening collaborative efforts with committed partners, and in garnering the support of legislatures.

While the RPG sites appreciated the benefits of data collection and evaluations, challenges persisted for some as they struggled to get requested data from their child welfare and substance abuse treatment partners. The development of detailed Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) between data-sharing partners was seen as an important strategy in avoiding or overcoming difficulties with data sharing among agencies. The importance of engaging interested evaluators when implementing an evaluation process was emphasized as a useful strategy for success.

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

The RPG Program required grantees to address the issue of sustaining their grant-funded services. Of the eight extension site grantees, four have plans in place to sustain all or most program services beyond the grant period; one has plans in place to sustain a scaled down or modified version; and two will be sustaining specific components of their RPG-I efforts with the support of an RPG-II grant.

Interviewees spoke to ways that the partnerships they had built and the relationships that were fostered during RPG implementation played an important role in creating connections among partners that would remain in place beyond Federal funding.

Sustainability strategies must be plentiful, diverse, and employed as early in the process as possible in order to ensure that these complex, multi-system efforts will be able to continue beyond the grant period. The most successful RPG projects were those that addressed sustainability early in grant implementation and did not wait until the final year or years of Federal funding. These grantees utilized a variety of strategies, including developing a sustainability grid to outline components to be sustained and outlining who will provide resources to sustain each of those components; reducing length of services; and understanding and accessing third-party billing options.

When looking to sustain their efforts, it is essential that collaborative partnerships monitor the fiscal and policy changes occurring in their states and communities. How a state is implementing the Affordable Health Care Act and other state-specific changes to funding and delivery of services to populations in need may help or hinder efforts to sustain collaborative services.

## **TWO-YEAR EXTENSION**

Interviewees were asked to reflect on the Two-Year Extension period and how it assisted them in sustaining services and institutionalizing systems change. They indicated the extension funding allowed them to provide additional services, including the development of initiatives targeting fathers and a focus on trauma-informed and trauma-responsive care. The two years also allowed for additional data and outcomes to be collected. This information was used to market grantees successes and demonstrate cost savings to key stakeholders and decision makers. The extra time and credibility of a second federal grant also helped to strengthen collaborative partnerships. For some, timing and the environmental context in their state two years later meant the difference in being able to sustain their services.

## **BENEFITS OF RPG PROGRAM DESIGN**

The design of the RPG program was different than the designs of grant programs the grantee agencies had encountered in the past. The differences were seen to have a positive impact on the outcomes of the grant-funded efforts. The benefits experienced by the grantees included fostering of a spirit of collaboration through a systems-change grant (versus a program services grant); the addition of flexible dollars for program services; being held accountable for dollars spent and program success; and the support of an engaged technical assistance team and network of grantees across the nation. One grantee noted that the design of the RPG Program changed the way the systems in their jurisdiction worked together, bringing in important new partners and ultimately benefitting clients in a way no other grant program had done before.

Meeting the needs of families requires collaborative, cross-system approaches because no one system has the resources or competencies to effectively respond to all of those needs. The agencies spotlighted in these pages and their partners were willing to work beyond individual and system boundaries to better serve and improve outcomes for children and families.

This report illustrates ways that the RPG Program has been a catalyst for changing how these grantees and their partners do business. The authors hope that the reflections documented herein will encourage and advance collaborative policy and practice beyond the scope of discretionary grant programs and become the standard for how systems work together to better serve children and families.

## INTRODUCTION

The Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 reauthorized the Promoting Safe and Stable Families program and provided funding for a five-year period through the Regional Partnership Grant (RPG) Program. In October 2007, the Children's Bureau, in the Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, awarded 53 Regional Partnership Grants to applicants across the country. The RPG program funded regional partnerships designed to improve permanency outcomes for children and families affected by methamphetamine or other substance abuse. Funding from this program was to be used to address a variety of common systemic and practice challenges that serve as barriers to optimal family outcomes, including:

- Recruitment, engagement, and retention of parents in substance abuse treatment
- Differences in professional perspectives and training
- Conflicting timeframes across the systems to achieve outcomes
- Chronic service shortages in both child welfare services and substance abuse treatment systems

In addition to direct funds being allocated to grantees, the reauthorization language called for technical assistance (TA) to be provided to the grantees. The Center for Children and Family Futures (CCFF) of Lake Forest, California and partners including Planning and Learning Technologies (Pal-Tech) and ICF International were awarded the contract to develop and implement a TA program to support the grant programs. CCFF operates the National Center on Substance Abuse and Child Welfare (NCSACW), which provided TA as well. The NCSACW is supported by the Children's Bureau and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). Under the leadership and with the support of the Children's Bureau, the TA team developed a performance measurement and reporting system, conducted site visits with all 53 grantees, and provided programmatic and evaluation-related TA to grantees.

On September 30, 2011, the President signed the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (Public Law 112-34 under Title IV-B of the Social Security Act) into law. This law provided funding for 17 RPG-II sites, and included a cross-site evaluation component. CCFF continued to provide programmatic TA and Mathematica Policy Research was contracted as the cross-site evaluator.

The law also provided the Department of Health and Human Services with the authority to provide two additional years of funding to previously awarded, targeted grant programs. This funding came with a cost-sharing requirement of 30 percent in Year 6 and 35 percent in Year 7 and was meant to help sites build upon the knowledge and lessons learned from their initial 2007 RPG awards. While changes were anticipated, grantees were expected to continue to align activities and services with their original proposed efforts. Eight sites were granted this two-year extension of their RPG grants at an amount of \$500,000 per year.

The RPG Program represents the broadest federal program ever launched to assist states, tribes, and communities across the nation to improve the well-being, permanency, and safety of children who are in, or at-risk of, out-of-home placement as a result of methamphetamine or other substance abuse by a parent or caregiver.

This report provides a summary and synthesis of interviews conducted with program directors from five of these eight Two-Year Extension sites. The interviews were designed to document the accomplishments and lessons learned from the entire seven years of RPG funding, as well as to provide insight into the benefits of the additional two years of federal funding provided through the Two-Year Extension grants.

In addition to the *Final Synthesis and Summary Report Grantee Interviews - May 2014*, which detailed interviews from the first round of RPG funding, this report provides an important contribution to the field by reflecting these program directors' experiences and key lessons in implementing services in partnerships that included child welfare, substance abuse, courts, mental health, and other human services systems. The commentary and insights noted in this document are not usually found in more formal progress or evaluation reports. These interviews underscore the importance of working collaboratively across multiple systems to challenge business-as-usual and to facilitate and sustain policy and practice changes that improve outcomes for children and families.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This report was developed using information from in-depth telephone interviews conducted during a period of two months. These structured interviews gathered personal insight from the program directors of five RPG-I Two-Year Extension sites, and in some cases, other members of the local RPG team.

Senior staff from CCFF and Children's Bureau developed a set of questions designed to enhance or elaborate on the information contained in the RPG grantees' Semi-Annual Progress Reports (SAPR). Interview questions (Appendix A) focused discussions primarily on the topics presented in the Key Findings section below.

Prior to the interview with each site, the interviewer conducted a review of each site's most recent SAPR. The interviewer made reasonable attempts to ensure that information collected during the interview was not also found in the SAPRs. Each interview was recorded and transcribed. CCFF staff organized the transcripts into the key-topic areas and summarized the feedback from all of the program directors. Direct quotes from the interviewees are included in this report to represent the voices of the people who are working hard to address challenges and barriers to services and to improve outcomes for children and families.

## **INTERVIEWED SITES**

The five RPG-I Two-Year Extension sites interviewed are listed below in alphabetical order by the grantee's lead agency name:

1. The Center for Children and Families – Billings, MT
1. Judicial Branch of Iowa, Children's Justice – Des Moines, IA
2. Kentucky River Community Care, Inc. – Jackson, KY
3. Massachusetts Department of Public Health Bureau of Substance Abuse Services – Boston, MA
4. Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services – Nashville, TN

## KEY FINDINGS

The interviews were designed to elicit feedback from several key-topics areas, including:

1. Leadership
2. Collaborative Practice
3. Services to Children and Families
4. Impact on Broader Systems
5. Evaluation and Data
6. Sustainability
7. Two-Year Extension
8. Benefits of RPG Program Design

### **1. LEADERSHIP**

RPG partnerships were complex, multi-system, collaborative efforts that required solid leadership skills and multi-layered strategies. Leaders of cross-systems initiatives of this nature must possess the ability to communicate and work across multiple systems, engage and retain partners with differing values and agendas, develop consensus, and garner community interest and support. The most common themes interviewees identified in regard to leadership were:

- State-led initiatives should engage local leadership to support systems-level collaborative change
- Change in leadership can impact progress
- Outcome data can be used to engage leaders and decision makers
- State leadership may not be engaged with local systems change

#### **STATE-LED INITIATIVES SHOULD ENGAGE LOCAL LEADERSHIP TO SUPPORT SYSTEMS-LEVEL COLLABORATIVE CHANGE**

Among the five sites interviewed for this report, both state agencies and community-based organizations were the lead agency for the RPG award. The state-led grantees realized that while being state-run was important, ensuring local leadership was an essential component as well. State-agency leaders saw themselves as instrumental in initiating the collaborative process through their positions and existing relationships; moving the collaborative agenda forward; developing standards and parameters for the RPG initiative; and, for final decision-making.

One RPG effort was initiated and led by the State Court Administration office, but the implementation of their Family Drug Treatment (FDC) courts was led by the individual judge in each site. This grantee explained that they created a statewide steering committee, and that each of their FDC sites established a local steering committee as well.

*I think doing a state-level collaboration, along with local levels at each of our sites was important to making this successful. We had the All-Sites Meeting where all the teams came together and could share ideas and learn and be somewhat of a larger community. I think that really helped build the collaboration in those sites.*

The interviewee spoke to the importance of judicial leadership at the site level.

*They wanted this to happen. I think that made a huge difference. We supported their leadership, but we also developed standards that helped give them parameters to begin their course with. Otherwise, what would have happened in adult and juvenile court is every single court would look incredibly different. I think the court involvement made a difference that brought lots of people to the table, but having a state court administration, as opposed to individual judges, deciding what they're going to do on their own, gave some consistency to it. All our judges, except for one, were onboard.*

Another state-led RPG interviewee reflected on the importance of engaging local leadership in their collaborative effort.

*I think one thing that we didn't do initially, and a change that we made, was more local leadership on the project. I think that helped with the collaborative process – really engaging local leadership and having them be a more integral part of the project. These leaders saw the critical role that leadership buy-in at the local level played in engaging community-level service providers. We figured out pretty early on that we needed to make it much more heavily weighted on the local leadership taking the reins. Our substance abuse regional manager was able to really start pounding the pavement, pulling in the relationships with the substance abuse providers.*

These state-led RPG program directors saw the benefit of having their state agencies lead by initiating the conversations with their peers in the other systems and leveraging the relationships that had already been established among directors/commissioners.

*For other people it may have been more difficult. For us, I think because my agency is the lead agency, because it is a state agency, we had leverage because various commissioners of the child-serving agencies work very well together. They know each other. They really like to collaborate to the extent possible.*

***“I think this would have been very difficult if there wasn't systems-level buy-in at the highest level.”***

## CHANGE IN LEADERSHIP CAN IMPACT PROGRESS

Several interviewees addressed challenges that arose from changes in leadership over the course of the RPG grant implementation. One noted:

*I think we accomplished a lot in the first grant (RPG-I). We had some leadership issues at [our agency] just within the scope of the project, and once that got settled down and [the Program Director] came on board, he got them moving in a more clear direction. He made it very easy for us to then pick-up and do the Two-Year Extension. In hindsight, it would have been nice, but probably not possible, if [we] could have been involved more from the beginning. I think a lot of great things happened, but I think with consistent leadership we could have had even more great things happen.*

Efforts can be impacted by a change in leadership at various levels.

*There have been new area directors, regional directors, commissioners, and assistant commissioners, and [Principle Investigators] for the grants (and) have changed multiple times on both of our sides. Within the context of doing a state-run grant, a lot is changing at the state level.*

One grantee spoke to how a change in leadership may be “devastating” because “you are back to ground zero.” The grantee also said that, “You have to build this relationship, you have to try again.” Additionally, though, it was noted that the grantee has “seen huge successes with changes of leadership, like ‘Wow, that’s a breath of fresh air.’”

## USE OUTCOME DATA TO ENGAGE LEADERS AND DECISION MAKERS

Grantees noted that sharing information on outcomes from the RPG-funded services was an effective way to engage leaders and decision makers. Keeping the outcomes in front of decision makers at both the state and local level was seen as beneficial in garnering and sustaining support.

*Once we were able to produce data, the legislature became incredibly interested and has remained very supportive. Because of our ability to continue to gather data and demonstrate cost avoidance and outcomes, we have been able to keep them on board. They are going to continue funding the coordinator positions after the grant runs out.*

***“The legislature wants treatment courts anywhere it is possible now because they saw the outcomes and the cost avoidance demonstrated.”***

## **STATE LEADERSHIP MAY NOT BE ENGAGED WITH LOCAL SYSTEMS CHANGE**

One grantee spoke to challenges stemming from state leaders who were not interested or engaged in the RPG-collaborative efforts. They felt that their state leaders were not as interested, or did not see the importance, of the collaborative partnerships needed to support systems change. The grantee said, “Their own numbers out of the state would say that they are not successful in these situations, with these families and kids, and yet they are not as passionate or as mobile to make those changes.” In addition to this lack of support for collaboration, this grantee experienced a reluctance from the state agencies to continue projects and services that were initiated through federal grant funds.

## **2. COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE**

The RPG Program required that child welfare agencies work in a collaborative manner with at least one other partner agency to address the service needs of their shared clientele. All grantees’ regional partnerships extended well beyond the required two-partner minimum. Over the course of the grant period, the partnerships expanded as families’ needs and the environment in which the grantees operated continued to shift and evolve. All partnerships consisted of 10 or more member agencies by the end of the RPG-I five-year grant period.

RPG sites participating in these interviews identified many strategies that support large-scale, cross-systems collaborative efforts like those implemented through their regional partnerships. These included:

- Establish a bi-level, collaborative structure
- Ensure trust, relationship development, and communication among key partners
- Develop a common language, and remind each other of shared goals
- Implement ongoing efforts to develop, maintain, and strengthen the collaborative partnership
- Expect collaborative systems change to take time
- Unanticipated partners can strengthen a collaborative and lead to important connections

### **ESTABLISH A BI-LEVEL, COLLABORATIVE STRUCTURE**

Grantees addressed the importance of having a collaborative structure that included an oversight group comprised of agency and decision makers, as well as a group of program managers and frontline workers who had direct contact with families. Having this bi-level, collaborative structure supported systemwide policy changes that met the needs of the children and families being served.

One site established a Regional Partnership that consisted of agency supervisors, along with a Learning Collaborative comprised of program directors and other frontline staff.

*They are still two separate groups-- the Regional Partnership group, which is my supervisor, the supervisor of DCBS, and other supervisors that are higher within the various agencies. Each*

*supervisor then has a representative on the Learning Collaborative who reports back to the Regional Partnership about what's going on. The people who are identifying what work needs to be done are really those on the learning collaborative because we are more frontline staff.*

The grantees emphasized that the day-to-day efforts were the role of the group comprised of the frontline workers, who “work with those families and encounter those families.” One grantee spoke to the expectation that the collaborative would operate in a top-down direction, but that in reality, it ended up working in more of a bottom-up manner.

*We thought it might be a top-down kind of thing, where our Regional Partnership would give more direction to the Learning Collaborative about what activities to be working on. But it seems to be the other way around, which I think actually works better. We determine where the issues are, and how we can better work together, and then report back to our supervisors, or the Regional Partnership, on how that's working. Sometimes we have to ask permission before we can commit to doing something in the Learning Collaborative, but it really is more driven by the Learning Collaborative than by our Regional Partnership.*

#### **ENSURE TRUST, RELATIONSHIP DEVELOPMENT, AND COMMUNICATION AMONG KEY PARTNERS**

Critical components of partnerships, like developing trust; building and maintaining relationships; and ensuring communication among partners, were common themes among the interviewees. They spoke to how this type of systemic change can only happen when there is a trusting relationship among partners, developed through gaining an understanding and respect of partner-agency goals, philosophies, and perspectives. Grantees spoke of trust in several dimensions, one being the ability to share client information to more effectively engage and intervene with families through processes like multi-disciplinary team staffing and coordinated case planning. The other dimension is being able to share outcome and quality assurance data to improve program performance and identify ways to improve client success without pointing fingers at each other's systems.

Grantees expressed that partnerships must build trust in order to effectively communicate on both a systems and frontline, practice level. As one grantee stated, “You really do have to build those relationships, and every small change is built on that trust and that relationship.”

One grantee explained how the most engaged partners were those who had relationships with others on the committee: “We worked with three child welfare offices and a couple were more engaged than the other. This was because their leadership had relationships with others who were already on the committee.”

In large-scale, multi-system efforts like the RPGs, the development and maintenance of relationships must occur at every level of the collaborative effort.

*We cannot affect change without relationship because people don't change for systems, they change for people. That means inside your agency; that means in your community; that means at the state. You have to have time and genuineness to build those relationships because those are what make a difference.*

When trust is not established among partners, the efforts are not as successful. One interviewee spoke to the lack of trust from one judge participating in their RPG, and its impact on the success of that court.

***“We certainly can’t collaborate together if we don’t have some degree of trust among each other.”***

Interviewees repeatedly spotlighted the importance of communication among partners, one saying, “It just can’t be about you and me having a conversation about what we think would be great for the whole system and then going for it. We really have to communicate that with our community partners.”

One grantee noted how communication must be ongoing: “The communication and the relationship piece are really essential. It seems like such a basic thing, but it's something that needs to be there and you need to work at it on an ongoing basis. It's not just a one-time deal.”

Communication at every level, from the committees that would be formed to when trainings were to be held, was a priority for one grantee.

*Our partners are involved in all of the decisions we make throughout the grant, even things as simple as when we are going have a training. We want to make sure that it is a time that works for them, especially with our child welfare system. We try to work around schedules with court and any trainings that they may be having. We just really want to have a continued communication with them so that we are able to make it the most that it can be with them. It is just continued communication and a willingness to work together.*

## **DEVELOP A COMMON LANGUAGE AND REMIND EACH OTHER OF SHARED GOALS**

RPGs were implemented by collaborative partnerships that cross multiple systems. This type of systemic change effort poses challenges because a variety of child-service agencies are expected to work together, often for the first time, while working from different values positions and theoretical frameworks. Grantees stressed the importance of developing a common language to

support collaborative efforts. For one grantee, NIATx<sup>1</sup> change teams were seen as extremely beneficial in this capacity.

*The NIATx change team process was hugely beneficial, and we trained several different people from different agencies in the first grant. We hosted a leadership academy, or a change team academy. That brought the agencies together with a foundation of how to approach change. It gave us a common language and a common way to identify issues and do some rapid-cycle changes.*

Interviewees explained that developing, and revisiting, a shared goal is essential to moving through the challenges of collaborative work.

*We all have a shared goal, and sometimes we see different ways to get to that goal. In order to have an effective partnership, we really have to be flexible enough that we all come away happy with how we have decided to meet the goal, or how we have decided to work toward meeting the goal.*

***“Everyone at the table has to share the purpose. If we share the vision and the purpose, there is hardly anything we can’t get through together.”***

Focusing on the best interest of the child was a shared goal raised by some grantees. As one grantee stated:

*It is so interesting because we can have these discussions about transportation and who can get participants to treatment. Who is going to do this or that? When it gets so thick that we cannot make a decision, we always say, ‘Wait a minute. What is in the best interest of the child?’ It really does allow us to clear some of the muck and get down to a decision we can make in the interest of the child. It is powerful stuff. We cling to that daily in trying to mediate some of these relationships and to make these decisions with limited resources.*

This shared goal of improving outcomes for children helped one grantee work past values differences among partners. This interviewee noted that their providers often had preconceived notions about how cases were going to turn out due to the histories of the adults being in and out of the systems for years. They tried to work past the “jaded perspectives” towards the mothers, and get their partners to focus on the potential of the children. The grantee said, “They do not

---

<sup>1</sup> NIATx is a national initiative, supported in part by SAMHSA, which works with substance abuse and behavioral health organizations to implement process improvement strategies to reduce wait times, reduce no-shows, increase admissions, and increase continuation in treatment. Additional information is available at: <http://www.niatx.net>.

want to help an adult who has continued to make bad decisions, but they will be right there for kids. Focusing on the kids makes a difference.”

### **IMPLEMENT ONGOING EFFORTS TO DEVELOP, MAINTAIN, AND STRENGTHEN THE COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP**

The RPG sites interviewed addressed the ongoing efforts required to develop, maintain, strengthen, and sustain their collaborative partnerships. This type of systemic change effort is not a one-shot deal, where a collaborative body is created and moves forward in a linear fashion throughout the course of grant funding and beyond. Grantees discussed how during the course of the grant individuals and agency partners came and went for a variety of reasons. As new partnerships were made and old partnerships were maintained, implementing specific efforts to engage, reengage, and strengthen the relationships of the collaborative members was important.

*I don't think there is anybody who had consistently been there through the whole seven years, including our staff. In five years, I think this project has had several different project directors. I think with consistent staff members we could have accomplished more. We have added some different agencies, and then I think that one of the things that has been really important is that we have continued communication with them.*

***“I think you lose time when you lose staff, and you have to retrain, and get the focus set back.”***

Grantees spoke to engaging reluctant partners and engaging new partners. One grantee spoke to offering stipends to get substance abuse treatment providers to the table, when their fee-for-services models would not pay for the time spent collaborating. This grantee also spoke to the importance of the collaborative work being seen as “a good use of time” for their local administrators. The project needs to be of a significant enough scale to warrant administrators continued sustained participation in the partnership.

Attorneys were a group that was difficult to engage in multiple RPG sites. One interviewee spoke to finding success when using judges for reaching out to and engaging attorneys: “Each judge was key to having a meeting with the attorneys. When we had those meetings, they were key to making the invitation.”

One grantee spoke to the importance of understanding the benefits that collaboration offers to the client, provider, community, and state.

*When looking for customers or partners or community buy-in, we came to learn that we needed to understand primarily how to answer the question, ‘What is in it for them?’ When we originally wrote the application, we were thinking, ‘What's in it for our clients?’ We were thinking about what was in it for our community,*

*but we failed in some ways to think individually. ‘What is in it for those people who serve on the multidisciplinary team or the collaborative team, both internally, locally, and at the state?’ It was very interesting that we came to the point where we did have to identify, for the individual, what is in it for them to come to these meetings, also what is in it for their agencies to come to these meetings, and what is in it for the state? It really had so many layers, and it came right down to that core question of what is ultimately in it for them. By asking that question, we were able to match the needs of the individual—why they would come to a meeting, what they would expect out of that meeting, or ultimately what they would expect for their clients or their career or their organization. It became very interesting and quite powerful.*

Environmental factors can place a burden on partners’ ability to be engaged in the collaborative effort. One grantee spoke to success in keeping partners engaged despite an economic downturn in their jurisdiction.

*During this last go round, we had even better representation than we have had previously. We typically have between 20 and 25 people there, representing somewhere between 12 and 15 different entities. That is really good, particularly in the rural areas where we have had some services drop off during the economic downturn. Some services just were not able to make it. In spite of that, we have still managed to see people stay at the table.*

Grantees spoke to the importance of making a concerted effort to work on strengthening and maintaining the collaborative partnership as they move forward with service and systems change. These efforts included staff dedicated to building relationships among the collaborative partners, providing training, and sharing information and resources. One grantee explained:

*We certainly would have done more specific, collaborative relationship staffing, because what we ended up finding was, if we had more manpower, we could have put together more strategic teams that other people could have joined over time. And that is where things happen, when there is a multitude of voices. But you have to have time to show some credibility, you have to have time to show some accountability. You have to have some time to show some accomplishment in that small group that you form. Once you have some of that, then you get other people saying, ‘Hey, I want to join that group. I want to join that movement, that voice.’*

A key staff person whose role is to support the collaborative partnership serves to strengthen and maintain the relationships among partners and move progress forward. One grantee said that “Having someone who is in a coordinator position, and who understands the importance of building the relationships, and making it meaningful for the people that are around the table” is a critical component to success.

Another grantee stated:

*I would focus more on the collaborative process. When our sites said to us, 'Yes, we're collaborating. We're collaborating really well,' we took them at face value, when in fact sometimes they were not honest with each other, and they sat at the same table, but still operated in the same way.*

This interviewee went on to say, “The training that has been offered is essential to getting everybody on the same page, and to continue to provide them with the latest research and information and judicial leadership.” It was also noted that providing more training on how to collaborate as a team would have been beneficial to their sites’ efforts.

### **EXPECT COLLABORATIVE SYSTEMS CHANGE TO TAKE TIME**

The RPG program directors interviewed spoke to the critical element of time needed to implement successful systems-level collaborative change of this nature. Time is needed to contact and engage partners; develop a common vision, goals, and language; maintain, strengthen, and reengage partners; implement services to children and families; evaluate efforts; and, work toward sustainability. Time spent at each step of process determines the level of progress and sustainability.

The issue of time that should be initially spent developing relationships and engaging partners was a predominant theme among interviewees. One grantee explained how a lack of preparation and groundwork impacted their efforts:

*When we ran into reluctance, it was mostly because we had not spent enough time...helping people reach a common vision, making sure that they were all on the same page in terms of what a family treatment court is designed to do, and how it is different than regular court, and how it could be helpful.*

***“The preparation you do at the very beginning really does set the stage for the rest of the project.”***

This grantee also addressed the time needed to “bring our state agency partner along.”

*Part of it is if it is not an initiative that they have started, they really do not jump in. It is hard to get them to travel along with us, if you will. Usually they eventually come around, but it seems to require extra work. We'll pick up the phone. We'll have a steering committee. We'll send emails to them about the outcomes and the data that we're seeing. We always talk about them as partners, so I guess if there is anything we did it was to always consider them*

*our partners, to talk about it wherever we go as a partnership and to continue to bring it to their attention.*

Another grantee explained that they had underestimated the time needed to take on systems change while still dedicating the time needed for program services:

*It is so hard to change those major systems, which means you have to get into the trenches with individuals, and that takes so much time and energy. We did not devote enough staff manpower to do all the work we needed to do. If we could have doubled our liaison staff, we could have gone even further with that. We didn't realize. We are so kid-focused, and we are so service focused, we are very passionate about that. We are certainly more focused on systems, and systems change than we were before we were awarded the RPG. We did not understand the manpower and time it would ultimately take to make systems change. We were sad when those five years came to an end and we hadn't made the magnitude of change we had hoped for.*

Grantees that operated multiple sites within their state realized that the level of success within a given site was dependent on the amount of time spent focused on that site:

*I underestimated the amount of time early on that I wish I would have spent in each of the communities, really having some in-depth conversations. For those sites where we didn't necessarily do special engagement with some of the attorneys, or some of those key agencies, we had to go back and do that. I underestimated the amount of preparation that should have gone into it. I think we circled back around to do that, but I wish we would have done that early on. Then, I wish that we would have continued to have those conversations periodically.*

## **UNANTICIPATED PARTNERS CAN STRENGTHEN A COLLABORATIVE AND LEAD TO IMPORTANT CONNECTIONS**

Several grantees noted that key partners in their collaboratives were agencies that they had not worked with before. They expressed surprise at the level of interest, commitment, and involvement in the collaborative effort that came from these new partners.

In one jurisdiction, it was the state-level Office of Drug Control Policy that became an unexpected partner:

*We just included them. We really didn't know who they were, what they did. Drug Control Policy sounded like an important group to have. We found out that they were the home of Drug Endangered Children. They have come to the table every time we asked them to. They ask good questions. They share the information. They*

*are behind-the-scenes folks. They have encouraged us on different grants. They have met with us on how things are going. I felt like they were a good silent partner.*

The Department of Corrections became a beneficial partner in another jurisdiction:

*It was quite surprising, their interest in the projects. What we found was that those probation officers and the Department of Correction system officers are out of the loop. They were starved for interaction and information and ways to help their clients. They became a huge unexpected partner for us, and they were playing a primary role in a lot of our moms' lives. They became an integral partner and are to this day. They really are client-focused.*

### **3. SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND FAMILIES**

RPG grantees all worked to improve services and outcomes for children and families involved in the child welfare system and affected by parental substance use disorders. How programs and services were implemented varied widely across sites. Even among the five grantees interviewed, implementation of services was diverse. Key topics from the interviewees' discussion of services to children and families include:

- Trauma-specific and trauma-informed services
- Increased services to children, fathers, and whole families
- Support for relative caregivers
- Motivational Interviewing, education, and getting clients to services
- One RPG's creation of a child/family services agency

#### **TRAUMA-SPECIFIC AND TRAUMA-INFORMED SERVICES**

Across the nation, agencies serving children and families recognize the impact of trauma on the lives of families involved in child welfare and/or substance abuse treatment systems. During the grant period, RPG-I Two-Year Extension grantees increased their awareness of the consequences of traumatic experiences in the lives of their clients and worked to provide both trauma-specific and trauma-informed services.

One interviewee explained:

*We have learned about trauma-informed agencies and evaluating and implementing trauma-informed assessments and whole-agency transformation from The Sanctuary Model. We are beginning to do that now for our agency. Although we have had the luxury of focusing on trauma-informed care for a while, we haven't had a formalized way to assess and then roll out a plan for a trauma-informed agency. So we're doing that now. Because of*

*that pursuit, we were able to stand out in our community and talk about trauma-informed services and trauma-informed agencies.*

## **INCREASED SERVICES TO CHILDREN, WHOLE FAMILIES, AND FATHERS**

Grantees spoke to how their RPG awards allowed them to increase services to children, develop initiatives focused on supporting fathers, and to focus on wrapping services around the whole family.

One grantee explained that when they wrote their initial RPG proposal they were focused primarily on the parents and “helping them restore their capacity to meet the needs of their kids.” Throughout implementation, they found that there was a missing piece in regard to the well-being of children:

*We saw that we really needed to look at the whole family and look at family well-being and restoring those relationships. That is what led into our additional grant applications for the second round of the RPG.*

To reduce the fragmentation of services among parents and children, this grantee created a systemic-care coordination component in the Two-Year Extension and RPG-II grant periods to address the needs of the entire family.

Two grantees interviewed noted that the extension grant allowed them to focus on developing and implementing services for fathers. In one instance, the grantee was approached by an agency supervisor on their Learning Collaborative who wanted to provide men’s groups similar to what they had available for women. “We worked with him and another treatment agency to focus on men's treatment, and now they have a men's group modeled similarly to our intensive services for women,” said the grantee.

## **SUPPORT RELATIVE CAREGIVERS**

One way of supporting and maintaining bonds among RPG families was to provide support and services to extended-family members who with this support were placed in a position to care for the children.

*One of the things that came from our Learning Collaborative is that we decided if we could keep a child in a relative placement, rather than having that child to go through a foster care placement, that would be a success for the family. That is one of the things that we have worked out, a systems change in persisting to take those families on as clients, and provide the services—the same services to those relative placements as we would a biological family. It is recognizing that putting them in homes with relative caregivers—whether it's grandparents, aunts, uncles, or cousins—that we should work together just as hard to try and preserve that placement. If we wrap services and supports around those relative caregivers, we have done the best that we can do to*

*ensure child well-being that is one step removed from it being able to be the actual biological parent.*

***“We've kept them out of foster care. We've kept them connected to their primary family. And while it's still traumatic to not be living with mom or dad, it's still less traumatic than going to live with strangers.”***

## **MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING, EDUCATION, AND GETTING CLIENTS TO SERVICES**

Denial plays an enormous role in substance use disorders, especially for parents who are using drugs while maintaining the belief that they are able to care for their children. Another deterrent to treatment services for parents can be access to services, particularly in rural communities. One grantee spoke to their program doing “a really great job using Motivational Interviewing techniques to encourage and really work with families.” This grantee also highlighted their work to both inform and educate clients, as well as to get those clients to needed services within their rural community.

*We provide as much information and education as possible. If there is nothing else we do, we encourage the few that we get that stay on the fringes. They are still in denial, ‘I want my children. I don't really have a problem.’ We work hard to get them to services, even if those services are in another region. We will go out of our way to at least try to get people to an intake appointment.*

## **ONE RPG CREATED A CHILD/FAMILY SERVICES AGENCY**

Prior to the RPG-I, one jurisdiction had a task force working to address the issues of housing, child welfare, and substance abuse in their community. Until the RPG award, there had been no one agency that had the lead responsibility for doing the work necessary to support families and no solutions implemented by the task force. The RPG-I award allowed them to create and sustain an agency designed to meet the needs of families at the intersection of the child welfare and substance abuse treatment systems.

*For us, RPG-I built and sustained an agency. We did not exist before RPG-I. We run about a two million dollar budget now. We went from nothing to a two million dollar budget in our community that is focused on child welfare and substance abuse. We used to send our clients out for therapies and other services, but we found they were not child-focused or trauma-focused, and we were really losing momentum when we sent clients out. Now we have a viable community agency that focuses on child welfare, trauma-focused, evidence-based practices.*

*“I think RPG can be credited with changing the landscape of this community for trauma-focused services for kids and families.”*

#### **4. IMPACT ON BROADER SYSTEMS**

Interviewees were asked to reflect on the ways in which their RPG efforts were able to impact other systems in their communities. They identified successful strategies for impacting system reform that can provide suggestions for other jurisdictions working with children and families affected by substance abuse. The impacts that RPGs made on broader systems were:

- Increased partner awareness of substance use disorders in the child welfare population
- Prioritization of child welfare families in need of substance abuse treatment services
- Recognition of the importance of keeping children with their families
- Collaboration as a way of doing business

#### **INCREASED AWARENESS OF SUBSTANCE USE DISORDERS IN THE CHILD WELFARE POPULATION**

Grantees spoke to a shift in awareness about the issue of substance use disorders among the child welfare population, and the extent to which parental substance use disorders impact abuse and neglect. Grantees said that prior to the RPG, many partners were “in denial,” about the issue or simply “did not even think about it.”

One grantee stated that prior to RPG collaboration, their partners had an attitude that was simply, “They abuse or neglected their kid. We have to get them to be a better parent or we are taking the kid away.” Through the collaborative work of the RPG, these partners now recognize that “substance abuse is a huge issue.”

Another interviewee spoke to a similar shift in awareness, with partners moving from a position of not believing that there are problems with substance use disorders among families in the child welfare population, to a place where “now everybody recognizes that substance abuse is key in a lot of Child Protective Services contact.”

#### **PRIORITIZATION OF CHILD WELFARE FAMILIES IN NEED OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES**

RPG collaborative efforts, and the subsequent increased awareness of the contribution of substance use disorders on abuse and neglect, led many grantees to prioritize child welfare clients in need of substance abuse treatment services.

One grantee noted that while they do not believe there is an official policy of prioritizing child welfare families, the substance abuse treatment agencies they work with are getting those families into referral much more quickly. The grantee said there is an understanding that “the earlier it is identified, the earlier they get into treatment, the more likely it is that the kids will go home or get to stay home and the parents to get into recovery.”

## **KEEPING CHILDREN WITH THEIR FAMILIES**

Two grantees spoke to increased efforts to not only decrease the frequency of removal of children from their homes, but to strengthen reunification to prevent future removals. These grantees focused concerted efforts on supporting families' needs while maintaining children safely in their homes:

*Our focus is to divert these kids from custody. Let us see what we can do for these parents and children and families, and try to keep them together and safe and have them all become a stronger and a more effective unit.*

Another grantee noted that one of the biggest changes in their jurisdiction was that instead of automatically removing kids, they are referring families to an intensive treatment program and to Incredible Families to provide in-home support that could allow children to remain in their homes.

*This is a huge change that did not happen seven years ago. They were removed first, and then we tried in a disjointed manner to get the kids back in the home with some degree of success.*

One RPG collaborative had success addressing the issue of repeat entries into foster care. The interviewee explained that because one of their RPG counties had a history of children with multiple re-entries into foster care, the site created a NIATx Change Team to focus on this issue. Through this effort this county was able to drop its re-entry rate to 0 percent. The interviewee said that RPG partners “changed the way they meet together, identified service needs, and made sure if the child was removed, before the child was returned home, some things happened in the home, not just a period of time goes by, and then the kids are returned.”

## **COLLABORATION AS A WAY OF DOING BUSINESS**

Networking, communication, and information sharing were seen by interviewees as a systemic change in the way their jurisdictions were doing business as a result of RPG collaboration.

One interviewee said:

*Something I saw change systemically is that the Behavior Health person regularly communicates with the Department of Human Services and with us. Prior to RPG, I don't think there was any communication whatsoever, systemically. We see a difference now.*

This grantee spoke to increased communication from the “highest level” of the state agency and department administrators, down to community providers communicating and coordinating in a way that had not taken place prior to RPG.

*“Workers, different professionals, communicate with each other more now on other cases too, because they trust them and they know their philosophy and their thinking. There is much more collaboration on an ongoing basis.”*

Other grantees spoke to how people and agencies are now “reaching out” for information and collaboration with other agencies, whereas before working together “just was not a typical thing.” Social workers and judges were seen as valuing and utilizing the information and training that has been provided to them by their RPG partners.

Three grantees described more formal implementation of collaborative service and information sharing among their systems. For one grantee, implementing treatment team meetings for their intensive treatment services for women was a big change.

Another interviewee felt that “the most powerful” thing they did was to conduct weekly multi-disciplinary team staff meetings. As a result of these team meetings, providers from the different systems and family-serving agencies have a “better understanding collectively of where the client is and what the client needs.” This change in how the systems do business has allowed them to respond immediately and holistically to the needs of the families being served.

## **5. EVALUATION AND DATA**

Data collection and evaluation were a critical component of the RPG implementation. Sites were required to submit data pertaining to 23 performance indicators two times per year, as well as to submit Semi-Annual Progress Reports and Final Reports. Interviewees spoke to both the benefits and challenges of implementing the evaluation component of their RPG efforts. Themes that emerged from the discussion on evaluation included:

- Evaluate the collaboration
- Use data to engage partners
- Use data to inform program and service modifications
- Recognize the challenges of data collection and evaluation

### **EVALUATE THE COLLABORATION**

One grantee spoke to the important role that evaluation played in monitoring the efforts, progress, and strength of the collaborative partnership and to the “two sides of the coin” in their evaluation strategy.

*We are not going to do another project in this agency that we do not do that type of evaluation. We surveyed partners; we checked on attendance, we watched outcomes for kids. We really did monitor two sides of the coin. We monitored the relationship, the collaboration, the system, those kinds of things, and we monitored,*

*of course, the outcomes to the families. Monitoring each of these components holds absolute importance.*

The grantee utilized the assessments of the collaborative to make improvements in attendance, understand partners' perception of the issues, and to recognize why systems were or were not changing.

#### **USE DATA TO ENGAGE PARTNERS**

RPG grantees explained how the evaluation allowed them to demonstrate success to key stakeholders and partners. Sharing positive outcomes and cost avoidance data was seen as successful in engaging reluctant partners, strengthening collaborative efforts with committed partners, and in garnering the support of legislatures.

One interviewee noted that during the early stages of the program, the ability to demonstrate increased functioning for kids and other positive outcomes allowed them to influence collaboration.

*While we used the data to change internally, to continuously quality improve the system, we also used it to influence the collaborations. A lot of the collaborative partners were skeptical. 'Oh yeah, here's another big project. What are we going to do with it?' When you start showing that data on kids and family, and you start to pair that with some of the positive comments out of other collaborations, now you've got the momentum.*

#### **USE DATA TO INFORM PROGRAM AND SERVICE MODIFICATIONS**

For RPG grantees and their partners, being able to look at and analyze data allowed them to examine specific components and outcomes of their services and to make modifications as needed.

In one jurisdiction, the grantee was able to provide each site with detailed information about unsuccessful discharges and successful graduations. The grantee was able to look at the reasons for discharge and see if there were common themes. They brought the information back to each site and asked, "What can we do differently? What is [the data] telling us?" In one of the sites, the data allowed them to say, "Ok, the family outreach staff needs to step up to the plate. During the fourth through the sixth months, we need to really intensify the efforts to keep them engaged."

Another grantee learned through the evaluation process that families who were doing well at discharge had experienced "a good bit of decay" by the time they were evaluated at a six-month follow-up assessment. Realizing this, the evaluation and program staff for the RPG jointly decided to institute "booster calls" to check in with families to see how they were doing post-discharge, and intervene on a short-term basis, if needed.

## RECOGNIZE THE CHALLENGES OF DATA COLLECTION AND EVALUATION

Grantees spoke of ongoing challenges with data sharing and collection needed for evaluation purposes. One site experienced an “ongoing battle” trying to get the data needed from the child welfare agency. “Sometimes you got what you needed, then the next time you may not get anything,” said the interviewee, who believed this was more of a bureaucratic issue than a trust or relationship issue. This grantee also spoke to the value of determining what vital information should be requested at the beginning of the process. “If we had figured out the language of how to ask for what we wanted, and getting what we wanted, I think we would not be seeing some of the data pieces that would be beneficial.”

Another grantee spoke to the importance of engaging evaluators that “really have the interest, motivation, and engagement in the entire set of what you are looking at.” This grantee struggled with their evaluator to such an extent that it became necessary to change evaluators midway through the grant. The interviewee explained that in the beginning of RPG implementation, their program team did not understand the important role that the evaluation team should have played in planning and development, feeling that some of their challenges could have been avoided had they understood this sooner.

One way to overcome or avoid some evaluation challenges is to develop detailed Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) agreements between data sharing partners. One grantee spoke to the role this played in their site’s success with data collection:

*We submitted our grant with MOUs that were signed by all the people from whom we needed to have data. Everybody had already bought in and signed off on their responsibility prior to us actually making application for the grant. I think that was a tremendous benefit for us.*

## 6. SUSTAINABILITY

The federal announcement of funding for the RPG-I Two-Year Extension grants required that applicants address the sustainability of their efforts in their proposals. The two additional years of funding were expected to strengthen efforts begun in the first five years of RPG implementation and to increase the likelihood of sustainability after the conclusion of federal funding. Some sites were more successful than others in their ability to sustain all or most of their RPG efforts. Of the eight extension site grantees, four have plans in place to sustain all or most program services beyond the grant period; one has plans in place to sustain a scaled down or modified version; and two will be sustaining specific components of their RPG-I efforts with the support of an RPG-II grant.

The grantees interviewed spoke to key components that played a role in their ability to sustain efforts begun through RPG funding:

- RPG partners saw the benefits of collaboration
- Competency and success were demonstrated
- A variety of sustainability strategies were employed

#### **RPG PARTNERS SAW THE BENEFIT OF COLLABORATION**

Grantees found that the partnerships they had built and the relationships that were fostered during RPG implementation played an important role in securing a connection among partners that would go beyond federal funding of their efforts.

One interviewee stated that while specific components of the program may require modification, “there seems to be a commitment on the part of all our partners. They are willing to meet and talk about how we find a way to sustain our efforts. It is a little uncertain at this point, but we have people committed to being at the table.”

*“Everyone has decided that working together has been more effective, so they are going to find a way to make it work.”*

Collaborative partners saw the benefits of working together in ways they had not seen before the RPG implementation. For some, the work established with RPG funding has become “the way we do business.”

#### **COMPETENCY AND SUCCESS WERE DEMONSTRATED**

Grantees spoke to demonstration of success as a critical component to sustainability efforts. Using program outcomes and cost analyses to illustrate the benefits of RPG services and collaboration was seen as a key to promoting sustainability efforts among partners and key stakeholders.

*Being able to deliver the services, demonstrate the competencies, and continue the mantra of evidence-based practices and child-focused services has lent credibility to the organization itself, which allows us to then develop additional services.*

As noted above in the section on leadership, the use of data to “demonstrate cost avoidance and outcomes” engaged the legislature in one jurisdiction. As a result of this demonstrated success, the legislature has agreed to continue funding the FDC coordinator positions following the completion of Federal funding.

## **A VARIETY OF SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGIES WERE EMPLOYED**

Interviewees spoke to the various strategies employed as part of the sustainability efforts in their jurisdictions. This variety points to the importance of diversifying efforts and not relying upon one source of funds or an additional grant award to continue such large scale systemic change efforts. These strategies, which can offer guidance to others, include: engaging policy makers; addressing sustainability as a collaborative; looking toward 3<sup>rd</sup> party billing sources; modifying program services; and, monitoring the contextual environment.

### **Engaging policy makers**

Sustainability planning and strategies for ongoing funding of multi-systems change efforts require involvement at the highest decision-making levels within a jurisdiction. Program and policy changes and cost shifting are most often required to ensure sustainability. One interviewee noted that the program was “going to depend on the Advisory Group to help with funding streams, the sustainability piece, and systems change.”

### **Addressing sustainability as a collaborative**

Efforts the size and nature of those implemented by RPG grantees require a collaboration to implement and a collaboration to sustain. Discussions about sustainability are an important step and need to be addressed by the collaborative as a whole, looking at which components each partner wants to see sustained. From there, partners can look to see who can bring resources to the table to fund those components and work together to locate outside sources of funding. One grantee explained how their Learning Collaborative had begun working on a sustainability grid to help clarify which components will be sustained and how to make sustainability possible.

Another grantee emphasized the importance of having the collaborative examine the issue of sustainability early in program implementation. “Most people wait until almost the last year, and that is a little late,” said the grantee.

### **Looking toward third-party billing sources**

Sustainability efforts by RPG grantees have included learning more about third-party billing sources, including TANF, Medicaid, managed health organizations, and private insurance companies. In many jurisdictions, grantees have found ways to get reimbursed for services they had not previously been able to bill. In other jurisdictions, accessing reimbursement has meant changing service locations to facilities that met certain requirements or that staff complete needed certifications.

One interviewee believed that as the program continues to “branch out into [third-party billing sources]; we will be able to sustain interventions for individual families that were not even on the original radar of RPG.”

### **Reducing length of program services**

One interviewee spoke to how services may have to change in type and/or duration in order to support sustainability. The ways in which services were planned and implemented when there

was an outside funding source is not always the way they can be sustained. This grantee found that families often wanted to stay in services longer than the program had anticipated and that changes had to be made to service duration to support sustainability.

*As time went on, we had conversations that this was difficult to sustain, and thinking that we were probably going to shorten it, and how to keep it at a reasonable length. For the Two-Year Extension we went down to a much shorter length of time for the families to be participating in the project. The sustained version is going to be even a shorter time.*

### **Monitoring the contextual environment**

With the implementation of the Affordable Health Care Act, and other state-specific changes to the funding and delivery of services to populations in need, it is important that collaborative partnerships monitor the fiscal and policy changes taking place in their states and communities when looking to sustain their efforts.

One grantee noted, “Things have changed in our state with managed health care organizations coming in and a new contract with the Department for Behavioral Health. There is going to be something called a community health associate that will be a billable, reimbursable service.”

Such changes can bring both opportunities and challenges to implementation and sustainability of RPG efforts and should be closely monitored by collaborative partners.

## **7. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION**

For the above sections of this document, interviewees were asked to reflect on the entirety of their RPG implementation periods—both the five years of RPG-I and the Two-Year Extension period. For this section, they were asked to reflect specifically on the Two-Year Extension award and how the extension assisted them in sustaining services and institutionalizing systems change. Their reflections on the benefits of the additional two years included references to:

- Timing and environmental context
- Provision of additional services
- Spreading the message of trauma-informed/trauma-responsive care
- Increased data collection

## TIMING AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

Several grantees explained how the Two-Year Extension was critical in sustaining efforts begun under the RPG Program. One interviewee explained that without the Two-Year Extension, they would not have been able to sustain the clinical services established under RPG-I:

*We would not have been able to sustain these services. Because it is two years later, budget-wise, we were able to. Not necessarily because people did not like the service, but because we are different right now. Child welfare is in a crisis. Substance abuse is a huge crisis in the state. Timing makes everything different. It gave us the time for all of the stars to align in the state, but they are unrelated to anything we had control over.*

When asked if the extra two years made a difference in sustainability, another grantee exclaimed:

*Absolutely it did! It was huge. We needed more time. We felt like we were on the cusp, with the current administration, with sustaining the housing innovation. We had gotten verbal commitments from people at the state and the regional level that they were going to do everything in their power to sustain. We had used some of the guidance from our technical assistance provider on different funding streams and what they could fund. We had done so much work, and we felt like at the end of our five years we were so close. The extension was huge. We felt encouragement to continue that fight, so we did. It was purely the extension of time that allowed us to have those conversations, and the fact that we had five years of data. I think because we were awarded the extension, it then gave credibility to the project. I do not know if it was intended in any way, but it certainly did lend credibility to the project. We also were able to bring on some more very valuable partners.*

Despite these efforts, this grantee was not able to garner support to keep their housing component operating.

***“I think [the Two-Year Extension] was just pivotal to the changes we have been able to make. Because of that additional data, the additional credibility, we were really able to spin off some other projects from other sources that will continue the heart of the work.”***

## PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL SERVICES

Several grantees spoke to the second grant award as giving them the opportunity to provide additional services. Many of the services addressed in the Services to Children and Families section above, were services that were implemented during the Two-Year Extension period.

Both grantees who were able to add initiatives to work with fathers did so with their extension funding. Interviewees spoke to their ability to focus more on wrapping services around the entire family during the Two-Year Extension, whereas the focus in the first five years was targeted more specifically to the parents.

One grantee detailed the impact of the additional two years of funding on the services being sustained in their jurisdiction.

*In the first project, we were only able to serve four counties in our eight-county region. In the Two-Year Extension, we were able to add the other four counties, so that's made a big difference. We would not have had integrated healthcare services without the two years. We would have had Incredible Families, but not as big as it is now. The Learning Collaborative would not have continued to meet or been as strong as it is now. We would not have done the grandparent support groups. I think the first five years was really about building the relationships, and figuring out how we can work together, and how we can identify as different systems coming together working with the same families; understanding that we each have a task to do, and figuring out how we can still do that and work together for a better outcome.*

#### **SPREADING THE MESSAGE OF TRAUMA-INFORMED/TRAUMA-RESPONSIVE CARE**

One grantee spoke to how the Two-Year Extension allowed them to “formalize, assess, and roll out a plan for a trauma-informed agency.” The interviewee explained how in working on another grant-funded task force they were able to say, “It is very important to us to be child-focused and trauma-informed.” Their partners then asked, “OK, how can you help us with that?” The partners are now working together on a trauma-informed committee to assess, plan, and implement trauma-informed agencies.

This grantee was also asked to be a subcontractor on another federal grant awarded to local hospitals, delivering trauma-informed agency assessments and implementations for nonprofits in the community.

The Two-Year Extension provided one grantee with the opportunity to bring in an expert in child welfare trauma training. This training was very well received by partners, and the grantee will be hosting it again in hopes of reaching the agency staffs of even more partners and community stakeholders.

#### **INCREASED DATA COLLECTION**

The additional two years of data collection were an asset to sustainability planning for grantees. One interviewee explained that the additional data being gathered for their cost analysis will allow them to show a larger cost savings. Another grantee echoed the sentiment that the increased amount of data will support their cost study and subsequent promotion of program sustainability.

One interviewee explained that data collection became stronger during the Two-Year Extension because they were able to refine the information gathered from program partners. During the first grant period, the grantee did not have an understanding of the child well-being and protective factors that would be helpful. The ability to “know what to ask for” in the final two years led to richer, more revealing information.

The implementation of additional assessments during the extension period has enhanced services for some grantees. “Workers have better tools to actually know what the needs are and then be able to refer clients to services more appropriately,” said one grantee.

One interviewee detailed how they used RPG data, and the relationship built through the RPG collaborative, to encourage the state to apply for a Second Chance grant to focus on families of incarcerated women. The interviewee saw this as a direct outcome of the Two-Year Extension grant and an important step in their collaborative partnership working toward family-focused, child-focused services for incarcerated women in their state.

## **8. BENEFITS OF RPG PROGRAM DESIGN**

Interviewees were asked to discuss ways in which the RPG Program was different from other grant programs their agencies had been involved with in the past. They were asked to explain any differences in the design of this federal initiative that had impacted the outcomes of their efforts. Grantees believed the following unique aspects of the RPG Program impacted their efforts:

- A spirit of collaboration
- Additional resources and flexibility of spending
- Systems change focus
- Accountability
- Technical assistance and grantee meetings

### **A SPIRIT OF COLLABORATION**

One grantee spoke to the “spirit of collaboration” that stemmed from the design of the RPG Program:

*While it posed challenges, it brought a lot more color and insight and excitement and expansion of contacts for our internal collaboration. I think that with the spirit of collaboration being emphasized in RPG, we had the opportunity to really take a look and expand upon what we had originally envisioned as internal and external collaboration.*

Interviewees explained that the federal requirement of collaboration is one that they had never, or rarely seen, with other grant requirements. “Typically it is a silo thing” said one grantee, who went on to share that this move toward collaboration has led to systemic changes where the different child-serving agencies in their jurisdiction now look to ways in which they can collaborate.

*“If you have this issue and another department has this issue, why can’t we work on it together? I think now that’s part of our lifestyle. It’s part of who we are.”*

#### **ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AND FLEXIBILITY**

Two grantees noted that RPG funding afforded them the flexibility of resources to implement services and meet needs in a way that other federal funding had not. One said, “We knew the services we wanted to do and we were able to do that. There was not a lot of ‘You can’t do this’ in the grant proposal.”

One interviewee explained that the flexibility of spending was a “difference maker,” but that it has been hard to translate into similar funding at the state level:

*I think RPG funding is ideal. I really cannot begin to say how beneficial that structure was for us. The flexibility was tremendous. I cannot say the same for our state funding system. We all sit at the same table and talk about how you can raise your funding. Let's look at how we could combine those forces into a greater funding system to sustain this project, and each of you would only pay a small portion to share the weight of this project. They could not come around to it. They still, even after we have been talking about it for five and a half years, cannot do it. There is a lot of very intense, very clear funding in silos at the state that makes this type of thing nearly impossible to sustain [in our state]. There is a gap between what the federal level wants to achieve and what the state is willing to do.*

#### **SYSTEMS CHANGE FOCUS**

The large-scale, systems change focus of the RPG Program was lauded by one grantee, who explained that the impact of this focus changed the way the systems in their jurisdiction worked together, brought in new, important partners, and ultimately benefited clients in a way no other grant program had done in the past.

*I can only think of one other grant, at least that I have been involved in, that did systems change in such a big way. To work for seven years on systems change, that is a big deal. It is not like you are developing a new treatment service. Those can come out of a systems-change grant, but systems-change grants are messy, and chaotic, but can be so much better in the long run because you have actually changed the system that the people who you are trying to work with have to encounter every day. I think one of the biggest differences is that it has really changed the way that treatment and child welfare come together to talk and work with families. This systems change grant has really allowed us the*

*flexibility to pilot some programs that have been turned into direct services for our clients. Even though this grant is not a direct services grant—it is a system change grant, it has come down to better services for our clients. The other thing is that it affected more agencies across the system, so it has touched a wider net of partners than any other system change project I have ever been involved with.”*

## ACCOUNTABILITY

One interviewee spoke to the benefit of being held accountable through the RPG Program. Rather than simply being given “some dollars to do great work,” grantees were expected to show evidence of the work being done:

*I do not think that every other granting agency requires that. I think it speaks very well to [Administration for Children and Families] that they have held us to the fire on that. It has been very positive for us. The work that we are doing here, with these grants, translates into how we do business, so that we are doing some of the same kinds of things. Now in our department we make sure that we are monitoring the providers, the program people, the evaluation people, and we have the pieces in place for measuring services in a more objective way.*

## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND GRANTEE MEETINGS

Grantees spoke to the benefit of individualized technical assistance through the National Center on Substance Abuse and Child Welfare, the responsiveness of their Federal Project Officer, and the special topic presentations given at grantee meetings. Grantees noted that Children’s Bureau and the Technical Assistance team were partners with them in the grant implementation, and that they felt supported and “heard” throughout the seven years.

Another interviewee stated:

*The difference maker for us really was our Technical Assistance group. When we ran up on things that were technical questions or programmatic questions, they were so responsive and helpful. It moved us forward much faster than had we been doing our own research or trying to figure that out on our own. I think that was key to the quality improvement and resources that we needed to make big decisions and changes.*

***“The fact that we had such a knowledgeable, helpful, passionate technical assistance group made the difference for us.”***

Grantees saw great benefit in joining other grantees and making connections with other states. However, one grantee felt that the diversity in implementation among the RPG grantees made learning from each other a challenge. This interviewee felt that clustering grantees with similarly designed efforts may have been more beneficial.

The information grantees garnered from the grantee meetings proved valuable when taken back to their individual sites. One interviewee noted that they were able to bring presenters from the grantee meetings back to speak to their sites during their all-sites meetings, further supporting their local efforts.

## CONCLUSION

This report summarizes interviews conducted with five Regional Partnership Grant Two-Year Extension site program directors. Along with the *Final Synthesis and Summary Report Grantee Interviews - May 2014*, this report yields valuable insights into what it takes to effectively implement collaborative partnerships to meet the diverse and complex needs of children and families in the child welfare, courts, and substance abuse treatment systems. These two documents focused on the program leaders' reflections about the successes and challenges they faced in implementing their Regional Partnership Grants. These valuable qualitative insights are not always reflected among the performance and outcome data presented in more formal reports.

It is widely recognized that individual systems that serve families, whether they be from child welfare, substance abuse, mental health, or domestic violence, must not work in silos. They must partner with each other to connect the families they serve with other community services and supports so the programs can successfully engage and retain clients, and improve outcomes for children and families. These agencies and their partners have been willing to work beyond their own individual agency and system boundaries to better serve and improve outcomes for children and families. Meeting the needs of children and families requires collaborative, cross-system approaches, as no one system has the resources or competencies to effectively respond to all needs.

The characteristics of effective cross-system approaches identified by this set of RPG grantees include:

1. **Engaged and effective leadership** is critical at the management level and local implementation level to advance cross-system work and the likelihood of sustaining initiatives.
2. **Cross-system partnerships** must be established to meet the diverse and comprehensive needs of children and families. These partnerships take time to develop, requiring trust and open communication and the commitment of staff resources to effectively engage partners.
3. **Trauma-informed agencies and trauma-specific services** are an essential component when providing services to children and families participating in substance abuse treatment and child welfare services. These services should be extended to relative caregivers as well.
4. **Successful collaborative initiatives have an impact in the broader systems** in which they are being implemented, moving beyond the boundaries of a specific project. Examples of these broader systems changes include:
  - Increased partner awareness of substance use disorders in the child welfare population
  - Prioritization of child welfare families in need of substance abuse treatment services
  - Recognition of the importance of keeping children with their families
  - Collaboration as a way of doing business
5. **Collaborative initiatives include sound evaluation plans** that measure the cross-system outcomes for children and families. Sharing positive outcomes and cost avoidance data are successful strategies for engaging reluctant partners, strengthening collaborative efforts with committed partners, and in garnering the support of policy makers.

6. **Strong collaborative partnerships** impact the degree to which partnership activities and services to children and families will be sustained. Key components to sustaining collaborative partnerships include:

- Partners who experience benefits when engaging in the partnership
- Demonstrating the competency and success of the partnership and in the services delivered
- Employing a variety of strategies to sustain the partnership and services

These grantees' experiences, both challenging and successful, reflect the level of effort and commitment necessary to work across systems. It is certainly easier to implement a program within the confines of one's own agency, with "partners" as referral sources only. However, that would not have met the federal expectation for the RPG Program to create partnerships to more effectively serve families. As these grantees have reflected, the RPG Program has been a catalyst for changing how they do business.

The authors hope that the reflections documented in this report will encourage and advance collaborative policy and practice beyond the scope of discretionary grant programs; that they will raise the question whether these types of partnerships should be incentivized in core child welfare (Title IV-B and IV-E funding) and substance abuse treatment (Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant) funding; and that they will support the movement toward these types of systems-level collaborative efforts becoming the standard for how jurisdictions work together to better serve children and families.

## APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

### RPG I EXTENSION SITES INTERVIEWS GUIDANCE TO GRANTEES

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the Regional Partnership Grants (RPG) In-Depth Guided Interview for RPG I and the RPG 1 extension sites. Your participation in these interviews offers a unique perspective as your site is one out of only eight original RPG sites to have been granted the Two-Year Extension. The interviews will focus on gleaned information from your site on a level that is not likely to be included in your written reports.

We want to provide you with the opportunity to reflect on your overall experience with implementing your RPG program, including the Two-Year Extension period. A select number of sites were invited to participate in the interviews based on several factors including the leadership shown by the program staff, a site's implementation of innovative program strategies, the use of data to drive decisions and improve services, exceptional efforts to develop and maintain the cross-system collaborative, sustainability of services, services to children, and sites granted the extension. Utilizing the information provided by a select number of RPG I and RPG I extension sites, Children and Family Futures (CFF) will develop a summary document featuring the most salient lessons learned from the original round of Regional Partnership Grants.

You will be contacted by one of our Performance Management Liaisons, Theresa Lemus, to schedule and complete the interview. The interview questions are being provided to you in advance of your scheduled interview so that you have sufficient time to think about your preferred response. We anticipate that each interview will take up to 90 minutes. With your permission, CFF will record the interview so that we are sure to capture the important lessons you have agreed to share with the field.

The information gathered from the interviews will be used to augment the development of a Final Synthesis and Summary Report that is to be submitted to the Children's Bureau during fiscal year 2015. We also hope to disseminate a summary of the interviews to a broader audience through ACYF, SAMHSA, and CFF web sites. While we plan to list the participating grantees in the report, references to specific grantees will not be made in the body of the report.

The following interview questions were developed in an effort to engage grantees in a robust discussion about the significance of cross-system collaborative efforts, linkages with partners (or lack thereof), the impact of program strategies, the sharing of and use of data, program outcomes, and how your project changed the lives of children and families in the community you serve. Extension sites will be asked to elaborate on the challenges and achievements of the Two-Year Extension period.

1. What were the most important decisions you made in implementing an effective collaborative throughout the course of your project?
2. If you encountered reluctant partners (identify which ones they were), how did you respond? Did that work?

3. Who were the most important participants in the project beyond the core agencies of child welfare, treatment, and the courts? How would you explain their buy-in to the project?
4. In hindsight, which decisions or choices would you want to “do over” if you had the chance?
5. What would you say proved to be the most effective strategies for engaging leadership (e.g. SA, CW, Courts, Community leadership, legislative bodies, etc.)?
6. What is the child welfare and treatment system in which your project operated doing differently now as a result—direct or indirect—of the RPG project?
7. Were there any system-wide changes or did your project have an impact on the broader child welfare and treatment systems?
8. In addition to your RPG work, what other ways has either the child welfare system or substance abuse treatment system prioritized serving families in the child welfare system with substance use disorders?
9. What other ways besides funding has either of these systems prioritized serving these families?
10. How did providing services to children change over the course of your grant?
11. What critical program adaptations were made and continued through the end of the grant period?
12. How helpful was the local evaluation in guiding the operations and direction of the project? Did the evaluation lead you to make any significant changes in the project?
13. What parts of your program will be sustained? Will not be sustained?
14. What sustainability strategies were the most successful in sustaining your program?
15. What additional flexibility and discretion from current regulations, administrative rules, funding, etc. would have enabled you to better serve children and families either during your project, or in sustaining/institutionalizing your project? Why would you have made those changes?
16. From your experience, what are the 3 most critical components that make an effective partnership to better serve children and families?
17. How was this grant program different than others your agency has been involved with and did the design of the RPG impact the outcomes for your project?

## EXTENSION SITE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

In what ways did the Two-Year RPG I Extension award assist your site to sustain services and institutionalize systems change?

1. Can you provide concrete examples of how the extra two years of support made a difference in the overall sustainability of RPG I services? In other words, are there services presently being sustained that would not have been sustained without the extra time afforded through the extension?
2. Did the Two-Year Extension provide opportunities for your team to refine or develop focus areas that would have otherwise not been a major focus of your services? (i.e. trauma informed care, child well-being)
3. Did the extension period have any impact on your local evaluation, such as being able to collect longitudinal or follow up data regarding child welfare and substance abuse treatment outcomes?
4. In what ways did the RPG I extension contribute to the institutionalization of systems change for your community?

Five of the eight RPG Two-Year Extension sites participated in the interviews for this report. Two grantees participated in the first round of RPG Program interviews and were subsequently not interviewed for this report. Scheduling difficulties prohibited a third site from participating in time for the completion of this report. Sites' program directors were contacted via electronic mail and asked to participate in a 60-90 minute telephone interview using the RPG I Extension Sites Interviews Guidance to Grantees. The interviews were conducted by an experienced senior staff member from CCFF. The interviewer had a solid understanding of the RPG Program and was skilled at conducting key informant interviews.

Program directors were informed that the interview would be recorded using the web-based HiDef Corporate audio conferencing service and that their responses would be transcribed word-for-word by an outside entity and reported anonymously in the *Final Synthesis and Summary Report Two-Year Extension Grantee Interviews* report. Each interviewee was given a copy of the RPG I Extension Sites Interviews Guidance to Grantees in advance of their interview with the CCFF interviewer.

In preparation for the interviews, the CCFF interviewer conducted a review of available data gathered from RPG Final Reports, Semi-Annual Progress Reports, and local evaluations reports. The preparation informed the interviewer about the site and informed the discussions. In particular, the pre-interview review of available resources provided a more comprehensive view for what information was missing.

Once completed by the contract transcriptionist, the transcripts resulting from the interviews were returned to CCFF. A CCFF Program Associate then arranged the responses from each site according to the major topics being addressed. From there, themes and quotes were identified and extracted for the purpose of developing this report.

## RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

| RPG SITE   | LOCATION       | LEAD AGENCY                             | FIELD                             |
|--|----------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| The Center for Children and Families   | Billings, MT   | Non-Profit Community-Based Organization | Behavioral Health                 |
| Judicial Branch of Iowa, Children's Justice                                  | Des Moines, IA | State Court Administration              | Judicial                          |
| Kentucky River Community Care, Inc.  | Jackson, KY    | Non-Profit Community-Based Organization | Mental Health and Substance Abuse |
| Massachusetts Department of Public Health Bureau of Substance Abuse Services | Boston, MA     | State Agency                            | Substance Abuse                   |
| Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services           | Nashville, TN  | State Agency                            | Mental Health and Substance Abuse |