

FAMILY SERVICES IN LOS ANGELES

COUNTY GOVERNMENT VOLUME II

February 1989

FAMILY SERVICES
IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY GOVERNMENT

February 1989

MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE ON CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Arthur J. Peever, Chairperson
Louise Frankel
Dr. Alfred J. Freitag
Robert J. Lowe
Lauro J. Neri

OTHER COMMISSION MEMBERS

Joe Crail, Chairperson
George E. Bodle
Gunther W. Buerk
Jack Drown
Dr. Edward H. Erath
Manuel A. Gallegos
Chun Y. Lee
Abraham M. Lurie
Dr. Doris K. Seward
Daniel M. Shapiro
Randolph B. Stockwell
Wally Thor
Betty Trotter
Robert L. Williams
Efrem Zimbalist, III

NOTICE

This Volume contains working papers and reference material that were used by our task force during the preparation of the report, Family Services in Los Angeles County.

The task force is publishing this material for limited distribution as a courtesy to people who may have a professional interest in further pursuing the various lines of research that were undertaken by the task force in the course of the work.

The material in this Volume represents some, but does not represent all of the work that the task force did in reaching conclusions and formulating its recommendations. It is not part of the task force report, and should not be cited, quoted, or included as part of the task force report by reference or in any other way.

Working papers are used to transmit preliminary results, background information, or discussion of alternatives while a task force study is in progress. They are tentative, do not necessarily reflect the findings or conclusions of the taskforce, and contain information that may have been modified later.

Reference material refers to some of the reports, studies, and other sources of information reviewed by the task force or The staff in the course of the study.

FAMILY SERVICES IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY GOVERNMENT

VOLUME II: APPENDICES

CONTENTS

Basis for Study: Board Letter of
September 24, 1987i

List of Recommendations, Related Working
Papers and Other Economy and Efficiency
Commission Reportsii

WORKING PAPERS

A. ...Theory and Practice in Social
Service CoordinationA1 to 48

B. ...Roles and Functions of County
GovernmentB1 to 18

C. ...The County's Responsibility to
ChildrenC1 to 26

D. ...Structural Issues and AlternativesD1 to 30

E. ...General Description of the
Commission SystemE1 to 56

F. ...Roles and Responsibility of the
Children's Services CommissionF1 to 9

G. Children's Services Task ForceG1 to 32

H. Multijurisdictional Interagency Councils ICA
Children's Services Planning Council, OthersH1 to 41

OTHER REFERENCES

I. Written Comments to
Report Draft of June 1988/1 to 43

J. Selected Court Cases and Laws ReviewedJ1 to 8

K. Bibliographic References K1 to 22

TABLES

B1 Multijurisdictional System for Social
and Protective Services.....B 9

B2 Functions of Governmental Agencies
Affecting Children.....B10

B3 Los Angeles County Minors Demographic Data.....B16

B4 Child Abuse and Neglect in Los Angeles County:
Key StatisticsB17

B5 Children's Services in Los Angeles County:
Characteristics of Programs.B18

C1 County Departments and Child SubPopulations
Served.....C19

C2 County of Los Angeles, Fiscal Year 198485:
Amounts Budgeted for Children's Services and Care..... C20

C3 Children's Services and Care; Funding Sources..... C21

C4 County of Los Angeles, Fiscal Year 198485:
Detail of Budget for Protection of Children.....C22

C5 County of Los Angeles: Selected Caseload Data
(Children Aided/Served)C23

C6 Family Services Programs and Budgets, 198788.....C24

TABLES (Continued)

C7 Change in Children's Services Appropriations
From 198485 to 198788.....C25

C8 Department of Community and Senior
Citizens' Services.....C26

E1 Relevant Commissions and Boards.....E21

E2 Children's Services Commissions.....E49

F1 Budget Appropriations for Children's Services.....F 9

G1 Children's Services Preliminary Recommendations.....G 5

H1 Fiscal Year 198586: ICAN Costs (Estimated).....H28

H2 Council Membership.....H39

FIGURES

A1 State of Maine: Intergovernmental Council
organizational ChartA47

A2 State of Nebraska: Strategic Planning
for Children and Families.....A48

D1 Networking Schemata.....D30

H1 ICAN organization Chart.....H27

ATTACHMENTS

F1 Commission for Children's Services
Ordinance.....F-7

H1 Interagency Council on Child Abuse
and Neglect Policy Committee (ICAN)
Ordinance.....H-7

H2 ICAN Official Agency Roles.....H-19

H3 ICAN Fact SheetH-21

H4 Letter from James C. Hankla (past CAO) to
to Each Supervisor.....H-24

H-5 Subject: Department of Children's Services, ICAN
Commission for Children's Services Interaction
and Coordination Activities.....H-24

H5 Children's Services Planning CouncilH-36

Mission Statement.

. H36

Mr. Joe Crail, Chair

Economy and Efficiency Commission
Los Angeles County
163 Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Joe:

In 1977, the Board of Supervisors created a body called the InterAgency Council and Child Abuse Neglect (ICAN) whose responsibility was to "begin immediately to plan for close cooperation and assistance with reliable and responsible agencies dedicated to fighting child abuse. " Upon its creation, a staff position was added to the budget of the Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) to provide support of ICAN.

During the past ten years, many other bodies have been formed to address the growing needs of children. The most significant development was the creation of the Department of Children's Services. The existence of all these agencies has created duplication, fragmentation and confusion.

For example, we have the Planning Council, the Children's Budget Coordination Committee, the Commission for Children's Services and ICAN, along with their many committees.

In order to best serve children and maximize our resources, / believe it is appropriate for the Economy and Efficiency Commission to look at each of these entities and recommend to the Board of Supervisors how we can best coordinate their activities.

Considering the importance of the subject matter, your prompt attention would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL D. Antonovich

Chairman of the Board

WORKING PAPER A

THEORY AND PRACTICE
IN
SOCIAL SERVICE COORDINATION

THEORY AND PRACTICE IN SOCIAL SERVICE COORDINATION

The problems of fragmentation and coordination in social services are not unique to Los Angeles County Government. The recent California State "Little Hoover Commission" study identified 35 different state programs, 10 different state agencies and 3 different state university systems involved with services and training related to child care, runaway/homeless youth and abused and neglected children. Other governments at all level shave identified this concern. One high ranking government official interviewed described the situation as one which was systematically dysfunctional throughout the entire country.

Researchers and practitioners in the social work profession have long recognized the need for coordination of services. A significant body of literature directly addresses or indirectly supports this position. Numerous attempts have been made to coordinate state and local agencies and programs. We will describe (1) research findings and expert opinion which document the need for coordination, (2) a variety of coordination strategies recommended by experts or employed in other jurisdictions and (3) the theoretical basis for service integration. ¹,

THE NEED FOR COORDINATION

The Unified Nature of Family Violence. In a study of 2143, families (Straus, 1983), it was found that intrafamily violence was pervasive and interconnected. There was a significant correlation between the frequency and severity of violence among spouses, parental violence toward children, and child violence toward siblings. Battered women had the highest rates of child abuse. Even women subjected to minor violence from their husbands had double the rate of child abuse compared to those who were not hit at all. Physically punished children later physically punished their own children and also committed spouse and child abuse. The findings were most dramatic for the 100 most frequently abused children. The same social and psychological variables were correlated with spouse abuse, child abuse, ordinary physical punishment and minor marital violence.

In comparing samples of child abusing and non abusing families (Gelles and Cornell, 1983), it was found that abusers had serious marital friction ten times as often as non-abusers, and that half of battering husbands also were violent toward their children, often precipitating the departure of the wife.

Marital discord and disturbed family relations are related to incestuous abuse. One study reported that 88 percent of the families evidenced symptoms of "disorganization" before the incest occurred. (California Commission on Crime Control and Violence Prevention, 1983)

Other researchers have found that one third of spouse abuse cases are accompanied by child abuse and that up to 85% of child

¹ Information not accompanied by a literature citation was obtained during interview.

abuse cases are accompanied by spouse abuse (Goodwin, 1985). Sexual abuse of a child by the male figure in the family is especially correlated with wife abuse by the same male. Sex abuse victims were usually beaten or saw their mothers beaten; wife abusers are likely to be child abusers, and vice versa (Finkelhor, 1983). A random sample of middle class college students revealed that child, spouse and sibling abuse and neglect are found in the same families (Stewart et al. , 1987).

Nationwide, thirty to forty percent of reported elder abuse is committed by an adult child. In a sample of 2020 senior citizens in Massachusetts (Pillemer and Finkelhor, 1988), although only about 10% of elders live with their adult children, 24% of all including unreported elder abuse is by such children. Elder abuse is more likely when the family has other kinds of violence or dysfunction or when the adult child was previously punished physically or abused by the now aged parent.

For the most part, elder abuse occurs later in the family cycle than child abuse. The elder is most likely to reach an age at which he or she requires care after the grandchildren have left the home. However, three and four generation families are increasing in number because of the long life spans of American seniors and the delays in child bearing by many women. Some dependent elders are being cared for by adult children who are in their 40's and who are still coping with dependent teenagers or young adults. Although teen abuse sometimes continues earlier child abuse, parent child conflict often begins during the child's teen years, when the latter is becoming more difficult

to manage. When the parent is also burdened with a dependent elder, the risk of elder abuse rises. In some cases, the elder's adult child caregiver is simultaneously caring for her own grandchildren, because of the parenting failure of her teen or young adult daughter. (Pagelow, 1984).

Whether caring for a spouse, child or parent, a caregiver's episode of violence tends to follow a frustration in coping with or controlling the other person (Goodwin, 1985).

Family violence often escalates, sometimes to the extent of homicide. Twenty five percent of all homicides nationwide are committed by close family members against one another. In over half of these cases, one spouse killed the other. (California Commission on Crime Control and Violence Prevention, 1983)

Even ordinary and minor intrafamily violence teaches the recipient and others of impressionable age to regard violence as(are acceptable behavior (Straus, 1983). In violent families, there is a pattern of interpersonal aggressiveness which take diverse forms (Stewart et al. , 1987). Family violence is recurrent in 90% of the cases; it spans the life cycle of the family(Goodwin, 1985). Family dysfunction is transmitted from one generation to the next. A study in the 1950's which led to the formation of the St. Paul, Minnesota, Family Centered Project found that 90% of families which required police contact had done so for more than one generation. A major source of family violence is the structure of a family's relationships, particularly under organization; the structure is inadequate to carry out normal tasks (Aponte, 1986).

Because researchers and practitioners tend to specialize in either child/spouse or elder abuse, there is a scarcity of statistical and anecdotal information which addresses elder abuse as well as child and spouse abuse. Because of the dispersion of records and data bases among agencies which serve different age groups, respond to different problems or perform different functions, data have not yet been analyzed to clearly establish whether one type of abuse is a definite predictor of another nor whether the exact same families are being reported to public agencies for diverse types of abuse. Typically, agencies at the local and state levels do not even collect data on how many child abusing families have elders in the home or on how many elder abusing families include minors.

Other Problems Related to Family Violence. Family violence contributes to other social problems. Persons who are violent outside of the home have usually been involved in intrafamily violence (Goodwin, 1985). Most violent juvenile delinquents have seen or felt intrafamily violence during their younger years.

In one New York study of 4465 families, over 50 percent of those reported for child abuse had at least one child who was later taken to court as delinquent or ungovernable. This represented a rate five times greater than that of the general population in the study area. (California Commission on Crime Control and Violence Prevention, 1983)

A lack of self-esteem, negative or criminal self-image, and feelings of distrust and personal powerlessness are prevalent

among violent offenders and highly recidivistic criminals. These personality characteristics are often reflective of a family environment in which, as a child, the person experienced rejection, abuse, and an overall lack of love and affection. (California Commission on Crime Control and Violence Prevention, 1983)

One expert estimates that half of all runaway children have fled abusive homes. Another states that a large percent of homeless adults had been placed in substitute care when they were children, due to their parents' abuse or neglect of them or to their own delinquency.

Other social problems also contribute to family violence. Parents who were not themselves abused as children may, because of other problems, become abusing parents. Abusers have been found to come from multi problem families, to have suffered poor socialization and emotional instability. (California Commission on Crime Control and Violence Prevention, 1983) Seventy percent of abusing families in California had known problems of family interaction, including one or more of the following: inability to cope with parenting, marital discord or instability, disruption of the family structure, spouse abuse, and chronic family violence ('Placement Preventive Services' survey, 1986).

Troubled families are often a product of troubled social conditions. Violence within the family can stem from or be aggravated by external stress factors such as poverty, job insecurity, under and unemployment, racism, social isolation, lack of a support network, and inadequate access to the rewards of

mainstream institutions. (California Commission on Crime Control and Violence Prevention, 1983)

Forty three percent of the families in California which received services because of child abuse or neglect were recipients of public financial assistance. This is approximately four times the rate of receipt of assistance benefits in the general population. Thirty two percent had difficulty living within their income, 19 percent had inadequate housing for the family size, and 14 percent had job related problems. ('Placement Preventive Services' survey, 1986)

A comparison of child abusing and non-abusing AFDC families revealed that the former had experienced the greatest poverty as children, still were poorer than the others, and were also the most isolated socially (Wolock, 1979). According to the report on the National Study of the Incidence and Severity of Child Abuse and Neglect (1981), children from low income families are maltreated disproportionately to their number in the entire population. Although 17% of children lived in families with incomes below \$7,000, they were 53% of neglected and 34% of abused children.

Other researchers found that, in comparing abusing and non-abusing families, abusers had problems of finances twice as often and of housing four times as often. In examining worldwide child abuse data. They found a correlation between abuse and the absence of respite for the primary caregiver: 21 of 34 societies with little child abuse have alternate caregivers, i. e. , extended families or multiple wives. (Gelles and Cornell, 1983).

Risk factors associated with elder abuse are similar. They include lack of supportive activities by persons other than the primary caregiver, overcrowding, social isolation, and financial problems (Kosberg, 1988). Seventy percent of abused elders in California whose income was known received less than \$700 per month ("Dependent Adult and Elder Abuse" survey, 1988). The financial problems of those who abuse elders can be temporary rather than chronic or severe: elder abuse rates are similar in all economic strata (Pillemer and Finkelhor, 1988). When elder abuse occurs in the middle class, it is often because the dependent elder disrupts the family's comfortable housing arrangement and life style. A middle class family is not affluent enough to pay for out of home or in home care yet is ineligible for public financial assistance.

The social isolation correlated with all types of abuse consists of a lack of community ties in the form of friendships or memberships (Finkelhor, 1983).

SERVICE DELIVERY STRATEGIES

Family Centered Services. Removing an abused child from the parental home, especially to foster care or institutional custody, can be detrimental to the child's emotional wellbeing, with effects possibly worse than those likely to result from the abusive home environment except in the worst cases. Children remain in foster care for long periods of time. They may be abused there. Special needs often are not met because of low foster care payments. Out of home placement tends to discriminate

against the poor who lack middle class access to education, counseling and other support services. And foster or institutional care is more expensive than the cost of adequate support services. (California Commission on Crime Control and Violence Prevention, 1983)

In child protective services, the focus tends to be on relieving the child's trauma. The family largely remains unchanged, with risk of future abuse. More work is needed with families, both to protect siblings and to prevent future abuse(Pergola, 1984). A recent survey by researchers at the University of California, Berkeley, determined that 25% of children who are returned to their homes are re-abused by their parents (Sullivan, 1988). A State survey found that 29% of abused children came from a family which had previously received child abuse services one or more times ("Placement Preventive Services" survey. 1986). In addition to working directly with acting out children, clinicians must assess and treat broader family variables such as marital discord, interfering in-laws and social isolation (Dads, 1987).

In elder abuse, the documented risk factors can be utilized to prevent elder abuse by guiding decisions about the elder's place of care (Kosberg, 1988).

Where one form of abuse or neglect is found, workers should expect to find others (Stewart et al. , 1987). Workers should identify all actual and likely perpetrators and victims, should anticipate future family needs and risk situations, should provide services to meet both intangible and tangible needs which

create risk, and should prepare family contingency plans (Goodwin, 1985).

Spouse abuse shelters should provide counseling and services for children who accompany their mothers (Pagelow, 1984).

The elements of a comprehensive services program necessary to treat family violence are common to all types of such violence (Goodwin, 1985)

Coordinated training among law enforcement, medical personnel and others likely to report violence.

A coordinated reporting system.

Crisis facilities

24 hour hotlines,

 emergency shelters,

 surrogate families.

Adequate treatment systems

long-term relationships with helpers,

treatment and self-help groups,

time-intensive treatment involving

 coordinated use of many agencies,

 day and institutional care,

 trained volunteers.

Outreach to potential victims.

Outreach to potential abusers.

Use of mass media to inform the general public.

Promotion of legislative and community programs

 to provide services and decrease stresses,

 to facilitate access to treatment,

 to provide education and training,

 to encourage research.

Community Based Services. Services must affect the realities which surround the clients, in order to relieve stress and build confidence. Therapy alone may actually harm the client, because it tends to ignore external realities (Pagelow, 1984).

Neighborhood based cooperative services should be developed, utilizing local human resources (Price, 1987). This will minimize costs of service delivery as well as remove the sense of social isolation which is at the root of much family dysfunction. Such services include intergenerational services.

Intergenerational Services. Many elders need meaningful activity and additional income. Programs which utilize elders to assist others can provide both. For example, the Foster Grandparents Home Visitors program employs senior citizens at minimum wage to visit troubled families, parent the parents, model successful parenting behavior, and demonstrate parenting and home management skills. The visitors typically have an eighth grade education and live alone. They come from a variety of occupational backgrounds. The troubled families are referred by child protective services, the courts, and other social agencies. The visitors are trained and receive weekly consultations by professionals. Each visitor carries a "caseload" of four families. (Arch, 1978) A similar program utilizing unpaid volunteers was documented as having reduced recidivism in child abuse and neglect to 14% of the families served (Buckley, 1985). The usual recidivism rate was, unfortunately, not stated.

Family Dynamics, a nonprofit agency dedicated to prevention of child abuse and neglect, has sponsored for 30 months an inter generation program which serves the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, New York. Brooklyn has the highest number of reported cases of child abuse and neglect of New York's five boroughs and accounts for nearly half of the city's teenage pregnancies. The nine project volunteers homemakers, a retired teacher, a social worker, and a beautician visit homes to teach young mothers how to care for themselves and their children. (Breen, 1988)

Other intergenerational programs include:

- in school districts in Iowa and Michigan, older volunteers teach career awareness and educational excellence to youngsters in danger of dropping out of school
- in Maine and Illinois, nonprofit programs draw on the life experiences of older women to assist disadvantaged teenage mothers in raising their children;
- in Massachusetts, an alternative sentencing program for jail-bound juveniles, sponsored by a chapter of the International Union of Electrical Workers, utilizes retired union workers as mentors to the first offenders. (Breen, 1988)

In other models, teenagers serve as volunteers to visit and help older adults, or both work together. Camp Fire tested the use of elder/teen teams in conducting self-reliance programs for children from kindergarten through third grade. The programs were presented in schools, in after-school and recreation programs, in community centers, and in summer camps. (Riley, 1985)

California law encourages intergenerational day care centers for children. The Department of Education supports use of schools for programs to involve older adults in caring for latchkey children. (Tice, 1985)

Intergenerational activities are feasible in child care, education, delinquency and drug prevention, arts, home sharing, grandparenting, chore services, and informal support groups (Trice, 1985). In Pennsylvania, Generations Together developed intergenerational programs. An evaluation reported that the children benefited in behavior, socialization, and learning, while the senior citizens gained in social contact, self-confidence, self-esteem, and happiness (Lyons, 1986).

Many older adults prefer to work with their own age group. Former teachers in particular are often tired of working with

children. Less than 1% of the seniors invited to participate in intergenerational programs are likely to be recruited. (Riley, 1985) However, those who do participate feel useful and welcome in society. They experience an increase in self-esteem and in mental and physical health. (Tice, 1985)

Intergenerational programs are promoted by many national organizations, including the National Association of State Unison Aging, the National Council on the Aging, the Community Education Center on Aging, the ACTION Foster Grandparent Program, and AARP (Tice, 1985). The National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect funded, and AARP trained and evaluated, several intergenerational parent aide demonstration projects (Buckley, 1985). Public/Private Ventures, Inc. , of Philadelphia tracks intergenerational programs (Breen, 1988).

SERVICE ORGANIZATION STRATEGIES

Unification of Management Only. In several jurisdictions, all social services are administratively unified at the top management level but are delivered separately.

For example, Iowa's Department of Human Services is comprised of two divisions: Social Services and Mental Health. The Social Services Division contains branches for Medicaid, AFDC and Food Stamps, and Services. The latter has several programs, most of which focus on children and their families. Each program has a manager. Despite administrative unification, programs and services are not unified. All of the programs and their managers are age-specific, that is, they focus either on children/families or on senior citizens. The only program manager

who focuses on both manages day care for all ages. At the service delivery level, there are separate intake units for specific programs such as child abuse and adult protection, and a general intake unit for walk-ins whose problems are unknown. Cross referral between units works well; management believes that this is because they are all in the same agency. Corrections were also formerly within the same agency but have recently been separated. When corrections were in the same department as social services and mental health, the law violator and his or her family benefited from better planning and more services than they have subsequent to separation.

Indianapolis, Indiana, and the State of Georgia likewise unify top administration but separate service delivery.

In 1979, the State of Minnesota passed the Community Social Services Act, which consolidated virtually all of the personal social services into generic social service departments (Hoshino, "The Provider Driven Service Delivery System, 1988).

The St. Paul, Minnesota, Department of Human Services administers public assistance, social services and mental health. Within social services, there are separate intakes for child and adult services. Spouse abuse would come through adult intake, but mainly the department delegates spouse abuse matters to women's shelters operated by contractors and to the domestic relations court. The department has a special unit which provides case management for clients who are served through purchased services.

Minneapolis likewise has a unified administration with separate

intakes. Intake was unified until a few years ago; the breakup is still a subject of debate within the agency. Co-location is being considered as a compromise. There are seven separate social services programs and intakes. However, if an individual or family needs services from more than one program, the initial intake worker manages the entire case, consolidates the case plan for all family members, and coordinates all services until another worker assumes that role. The client is not merely referred from one program to another. The department's information system tracks all contact points and identifies the case manager. The same case management policy is utilized when the client is in contact with both social services and probation (which is in a separate agency), per a negotiated "treaty" between the two agencies. Information and referral services (contracted to United Way) are still unified, as are after hours emergency services. Although mental health and social services are in the same agency, they do not get along well. There are significant turf issues between the professions.

Where administration is unified but service delivery is not, departments do not routinely collect data on the overlap between programs. For example, in St. Paul only the mental health division reports the numbers of its clients who are also clients of the department's other programs. Even this is incomplete: it does not identify clients who are recipients of more than one other program, and it omits clients served by mental health contractors, mainly chronic mental illness and chemical dependency cases.

Unification of Management and Services Delivery. During the 1950's, St. Paul was the site of probably the earliest effort informal unification of social services. It was called the Family Centered Project. It was based on research conducted by Beulah Compton, Bradley Buell and others on multi-problem families. One study found that 90% of the families on which law enforcement had a case for one reason or another had required police contact for more than one generation. A comparison of agency caseloads found that only 6% of the families receiving services from more than 100 public and voluntary health and welfare agencies were using over half of the combined services of these agencies, yet their problems and behaviors were becoming worse instead of better. All of the families had been known to the agencies for years, and 50% had been known for more than 10 years. Eighty-percent of the most disturbed and disturbing families in the community came from families that had lived in this way for more than one generation. (Compton, 1967)

Concerned agencies, the Community Chest, and leading citizens cooperated to obtain a foundation grant. A project agency was established. It borrowed its workers from the seven participating agencies, which included schools, public and private social services, and probation. In return for loaning staff, those agencies had the right to refer cases to the project. The agreement included complete delegation of agency responsibility and authority to the project. If a particular case required a child protection worker, probation officer, and school social

worker, the project worker was all three. The referring and participating agencies did not also have workers assigned to the case. The project worker had the same access to the resources of each agency as its own workers had. Once the client family was stabilized and had learned to cooperate with the service system, it might be referred to a regular worker in one of the agencies. Nonparticipating agencies cooperated with the project, partially because of established professional relationships among the administrators, but no doubt also partially because of the high degree of prominent support for the project.

Each worker was assigned 20 families but had a case count 35 based on the manner in which the participating agencies counted all the casework functions performed.

The project only accepted the worst cases. A family had to be in court for child abuse or juvenile delinquency, had to have other significant problems. and had to be considered untreatable by the regular agencies. The average client family had been active with 9 or 10 agencies for approximately 10 years when accepted for service by the project.

The project worker made a presentation to each referred family. If the family did not want to be assigned to the project. the case was returned to the referring agency. On 16% rejected project service.

The project served approximately 400 families. The first 50 were tracked for five years to evaluate results. According to independent research, within 18 months of initial service by the project 64% of the families were functioning observably better

and had ceased to be a source of trouble in their neighborhoods. Those served indicated that they preferred having a single worker and found it less confusing than multiple workers.

In the first year of service, public expenditures for client families increased, primarily because they received public benefits to which they had been eligible but about which they had never been informed. In each subsequent year, public costs for them decreased. The families no longer required police or other intervention, they became more self-sufficient economically, and their children experienced juvenile delinquency less than children of other poor families.

A similar project in the same area unified services to single adults, largely alcoholics, whose repeated contact with numerous agencies had earned them the nickname "butterflies".

Special projects such as these created additional costs for separate administration or staff. They were discontinued when the grant funded project period ended. The State of Washington has begun three pilots for service management at the community level. In April of this year the Washington State Legislature passed the Children's Pilot Project.

The purpose of this act is to prevent child abuse and neglect and to promote the delivery of cost effective child and family services through the establishment of the pilot project in order to guide the state in establishing a comprehensive system of children and family services statewide by 1990. (Chapter 503, Laws of 1987, Washington State)

The goals of the pilot project are:

- a) To demonstrate delivery of a continuum of services for children and families that will maximize problem prevention, early problem intervention and resolution and family independence while maintaining the physical safety and emotion wellbeing of the child;
- b) To demonstrate the use of outcome measures to determine the cost effectiveness of service components and the system as a whole
- c) To demonstrate that services can be designed to be appropriate, accessible, and sensitive to the needs of all populations within the community, including minority cultures and ethnic groups;
- d) To eliminate fiscal and process barriers where possible in order to increase efficiency in providing services
- e) To encourage conceptual development of a continuum of service model to meet the needs of children and families and to maximize and coordinate available federal, state, and local resources;
- f) To involve local communities, schools, private entities and other state agencies, including the division of mental health of the department of social and health services, in the future assessment and planning of services in an open and formal way; and
- g) To enhance the provision of quality services through a system of workload management.

Washington State's Department of Social Services is responsible for implementing the pilot project outlined in the legislation. This department is the largest state department. It was developed in the early 1970's as the centralized umbrella department for almost all of the social service related programs. Within the last five years numerous divisions have been separated and made independent departments. In light of this current decentralization effort, there has been an effort to create an independent department to deal exclusively with children's issues. The pilot project is seen as one effort to prevent this,

to integrate the various resources that the department currently has, and to support community level efforts to design the service delivery mechanism most fitting for that community. Money(\$2. 4 million) was attached for the development of these pilot projects. The three locations for pilots included an urban section of the Seattle area, a relatively small rural community and the second largest city in Washington. Alternative management models were encouraged :at these different sites. The communities were required to develop implementation plans and to submit these to the department.

In order to provide services in a continuum the legislation directed that the community based implementation plans:

- a) plan so that clients entered the system at the least intrusive and most cost-effective level of service appropriate to the clients needs;
- b) assess client service needs frequently to assure that services continue at the least intrusive level appropriate; d
- c) develop written assessment guidelines and consistently apply these throughout the duration of the project.

Another focus of the legislation was the development of an information management system for monitoring both baseline and outcome data. By directing the department to set up such a system it was hoped that it would collect and analyze much needed program and client information in new and reliable ways. The department is required to report back to the legislature on the pit's results.

This Washington State pilot project has only reached its community planning phase at this time. The plans are being

reviewed by the Department of Social Services, and implementation is expected within the next few months. A Statewide Coordinator with strong community experience was hired and is facilitating the process. She has expressed confidence that this effort will produce much needed improvements in the service delivery system for children and their families.

Unification of services delivery was achieved on the neighborhood level in the early 1980's in Normanton, Great Britain, by applying a concept called the "patch" system. The community was divided geographically into patches of 8,000 or fewer inhabitants. A team of workers was assigned to each patch to deliver children and youth services, family services, services for the elderly and disabled, and services for the mentally ill and retarded. Their community involvement has led the patch teams to emphasize prevention rather than reaction and to find ways to serve the community as a whole as well as individual clients. They have made extensive use of groups, both natural and formed by patch workers, and have become heavily engaged in community activities with formal and informal support groups and networks. In these respects the patch teams are very different from the typical specialist workers who serve nearby communities from full-service centralized offices. (Hadley and McGrath, 1988)

Co-location. During the 1970's, co-location of workers from different agencies was seen as a means to improve access to and coordination of services administered by different agencies. It was not successful in Los Angeles County or in other jurisdiction

For example, in Minnesota's rural counties, the Human Service Department often shared the same building with the Agricultural Extension Service offices. Both served rural families in trouble, but neither knew what the other was doing. Refugee mental health project staff were across the hall from the regular mental health department staff, but they did not talk to one another. (Hoshino, "The Provider Driven Service Delivery System, " 1988)

Coordinating Councils. Interagency councils are being utilized to address the problem of coordination by the States of Maine and Nebraska. Marin County, California, has also formed a council to assess its social service problems and to coordinate efforts. Several other metropolitan area councils have been studied in depth.

The State of Maine, under the previous and current gubernatorial administrations, has institutionalized an Interdepartmental Council for the last nine years. This is a formal interdepartmental coordination mechanism established for the purposes of coordinating selected policy, planning and programming for Maine's at risk and/or dependent children, families and individuals. " (Interdepartmental Coordination Policy Statement, Nov. 1, 1987) The Interdepartmental Council is comprised of the Commissioners of Maine's Departments of Human Services, Mental Health and Mental Retardation, Educational and Cultural Services and Corrections. Other Commissioners join the Council on an ad hoc basis for appropriate issue areas. The Chair rotates on an annual basis. The Commissioners are responsible for policy

development and final agency actions. A Deputy/Associate Commissioners Operations Group parallels the Interdepartmental Council. The Chair rotates on an annual basis and corresponds directly to the Chair of the Interdepartmental Council. This group has responsibility for recommending action to the Interdepartmental Council and oversight of the policy committees. An Executive Director position is assigned to this group and reports directly to its chairperson. The Executive Director is responsible for:

facilitation of the overall execution and quality of interdepartmental communication and assignments;

staff support for the Interdepartmental Council and the Deputy/Associate Commissioners Operating Group;

development of interagency operation procedures;

consultation and advice to Policy Committees;

coordination of interdepartmental legislative response;

provision of information and education to outside state and national agencies;

and direction of special projects, as assigned by the Deputy/Associate Commissioners Operations Group

(State of Maine Interdepartmental Coordination

Policy Committees were established by the Interdepartmental Council to carry out the interdepartmental mandate in specific policy areas in accordance with interdepartmental operating procedures. The Policy Committee Chairpersons report directly to the chairperson of the Deputy/Associate Commissioners Operations Group. They are comprised of assigned interdepartmental representatives and may establish subcommittees as needed. Some

of the current Policy Committees are:

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Planning Committee;
Children's Policy Committee;
Adult Policy Committee;
Health Policy Committee.

Currently the Chairperson of the Interdepartmental Council is the Commissioner of the Department of Human Services. In practice the chairperson has been from this department most of the time. The funding for the Council comes from the participating departments. The staff are housed in one of the departments, usually the Department of Human Services. However, their funding may come from another participating department. The staff does not perceive their role as advocates but rather as facilitators. The current Executive Director indicated that other New England states have requested the Council to conduct model meetings in their states to see how this successful mechanism works.

Recently one of Maine's Commissioners on their Council has taken a position in Oregon. He has begun the necessary steps to create a similar coordinating council in that state because of his positive experiences with Maine's Interdepartmental Council. This mechanism appears to be an effective tool for addressing the integration and coordination issues in the delivery to children and their families. It is also important to note that the focus of Maine's Interdepartmental Council is not just on children but on all related areas including adult policy.

In the State of Nebraska, during the 1987 legislative session a bill (L. B. 637) was passed which focused on the creation

of an interdepartmental planning approach for children and families which would provide the judicial, executive and legislative leadership an opportunity to reach a consensus concerning the quality of life and the role of state government with regard to Nebraska's children and families. ("Nebraska's Intergovernmental and Community Planning Process For Families and Children, " July 1, 1987). Although the separation of powers outlined in Nebraska's Constitution precluded a joint decision making structure, the Nebraska Legislature found it essential that a planning process be established that provided for joint review of recommendations concerning overall direction of service improvement. Furthermore, they believed that the task should have a strong community input component.

Nebraska's Governor's Office has taken "the lead to make certain that an adaptive planning process unfold[s* which provides for (1) executive level review, (2) systemic coordination within and among all three branches, and (3) issue specific working groups from which specific recommendations are developed. " ("Nebraska's Intergovernmental and Community Planning Process For Families and Children, " July 1, 1987)

A Project Director was hired who was an expert in child welfare and juvenile justice. This person was viewed as having a strong sense of credibility by the three branches of government and the community. Foundation and grant support was sought for this and other support staff positions. The Executive Branch agencies were to provide the other necessary support. The Project Director reports to the Director of the Policy Research

Office in the Governor's Office. Project goals were developed by representatives from all branches of government using the initiating legislation as a guide. The following goals were established by July, 1987. They are not refined and it is expected that they will be further developed through the polyphasic planning process:

1. The State of Nebraska will assess, document, and monitor the impact of all policy decisions, services and programs affecting children and families.
2. When a child or family requires assistance, the State of Nebraska will:
 - a. Provide assistance in the least restrictive, least intrusive and most family and community centered method.
 - b. Assure the provision of community based services which strengthen communities and families and promote healthy development of children.
 - c. Assure the fullest participation of the community in the design and provision of a family centered continuum of care which advances compliance with permanency planning statutes.
 - d. Assure that individual case planning will integrate all services to children and families.
3. The State of Nebraska will provide coordinated planning, budgeting and delivery of services which will strengthen the capacity of communities to care for children and families.

The planning process and structure are based on a number of assumptions:

1. That certain principles of systematic change guide a process more than the specific content.
2. Systematic change occurs best with people who have the responsibility to carry out the tasks.

The planning process has been designed with a set of principles in mind. These include:

1. Mid-management and field staff will be integrated into the process as early as possible.
2. The natural results of the project for all persons involved will be education and training. The project was intended to design and operationalize a system in such a way as to change the way the services were provided.
3. The planning process should result in a better view of how actual services are delivered at the client worker level.
4. The planning process presumes that state employees are more than competent and can work in harmony. When the expectations are present, when resources are present, and when the environment is conducive to attaining excellence, pride in one's work and caring for the client emerge.
5. The planning process is designed to integrate the community representation to the fullest extent possible.
6. The presumption is that all services are delivered in the community and the local community support is critical.
7. The systemic operational goals of the planning process are very simple: help families to keep children in their homes; help communities provide the services so that more children can stay home; help state government identify and operationalize the means to make this happen.
8. The process is designed so that at each planning phase, measurable objectives in incremental fashion are provided by each branch of government and the community.
9. The planning process is designed to correct the belief system which supports the institutional approach to children.
10. The planning process is designed to trust employees. The planning process is designed to enable research and evaluation to occur.

The planning process involves three levels:

Level One: Intergovernmental Planning Team made up of representatives from the legislative* executive, judicial, and community.

Level Two: Coordination Team made up of legislative, executive, court administrator designees and statewide community leaders.

Level Three: working Groups, issue specific, made up of subcommittees from Level Two.

The Project Director's role is to facilitate and sustain the planning process and finalize the recommendations from the Coordinating Level (Level Two) to the Intergovernmental Planning Team (Level One).

The State of Nebraska has been involved with the development of this Project for the last six months. It is still too early to tell what the results of their efforts to provide service integration through this structured planning process will be. The participatory emphasis on the community in this process attempts to ensure that the community will take ownership for the final implementation of the design of the social service delivery system. Funding alternatives from the community are also strongly encouraged as one means of making sure that the community takes responsibility for its contributions.

Marin County, California, invested in long range planning for its social services in 1987. This was necessary because limitations on local taxing authority and declining state and federal revenues were seen as jeopardizing critical public health, mental health and social services. Appeals to private sources. especially the Mann County Foundation, were made to offset revenue shortfalls. It was determined that a joint

effort between the public and philanthropic sectors was needed to identify the best use of declining financial support.

The County of Marin spearheaded the planning process and formed a task force of members representing the various sectors. "The purpose of the Task Force was to share experience and knowledge, combine that experience with careful analysis and imagination and identify the most effective way to organize, restructure, or modify the public and private network so that all available funds from public and private sources are tapped and are used efficiently and effectively to address the most critical needs of the people. . . . The major work of the Task Force was to examine the system, identify fresh approaches, and recommend changes that will address short range and long range situations with solutions that are less costly and programmatically sound. " ("Draft of the Health and Human Services Task Force Report, " Dept. of Health and Human Services, County of Marin, July 16, 1987)

A series of recommendations were made by the Task Force which focused on the public sector, the nonprofit sector, and the Mann County Foundation. Much effort was devoted to what the "true" mission of the public sector was. The services were analyzed from two perspectives: 1) that of adults and older adults, and 2) that of children and families. The Task Force concluded that the public sector's main responsibility was to provide protective services to both groups. Responsibilities varied between those for adults and older adults and those for children and families. Scenarios were developed for the "ideal. "

public sector services for both of these groups.

Services for adults and older adults included:

- A. information and referral, contracted out to a private provider;
- B. gate keeping where a community based outreach network is supported for early detection and intervention for citizens at risk;
- C. a 24 hour emergency response system contracted out to a private provider and linked up with the information and referral system;
- D. the establishment of a unified adult and aging division within the Department of Health and Human Services which emphasizes co-locating and integrating of services with the private sector and focuses on assessment of the client.

Public sector services to children and families would be provided under a new collaborative model with the nonprofit and profit sectors. A Children's Division within Mann County's Health and Human Services Department would be created. A single entry system would be developed with community based centers co locating the public and private providers. This co-locating is thought to provide the natural collaboration needed to eliminate duplication, reduce interagency conflicts, increase greater agreement on treatment planning, and result in more effective delivery of services. Interdisciplinary and comprehensive Children 5 Assessment Teams would be available at the community centers. It is believed that this integrated approach would reduce overall caseloads and "provide the level of intervention and monitoring needed to resolve more family dysfunction prior to the crisis point where out-of-home care or institutionalization becomes the only alternative. " (Task Force Report)

Various specific recommendations for each sector were made around the system priority geared to client centered services. A list of characteristics which make up a "Good System" was developed. Collaborative ongoing public and private planning was also suggested.

Local interagency councils in six metropolitan areas have been studied in depth by Robert Agranoff: Dayton and Columbus, Ohio; Indianapolis, Indiana;; Pueblo, Colorado; Baltimore, Maryland; and Seattle, Washington. The composition and formal structure of each council was different, although they all involved a wide range of individuals in decisions: elected legislative officials, appointed government executives, general and special purpose government agency staff, council of government and regional planning staffs, foundation executives, executives and staff of private funding bodies, and private citizens.

The author advocates equal participation by the private sector in interagency councils and increased recognition that nonpublic entities families, neighborhoods, voluntary associations, religious institutions, and employers provide significant underpinnings to the formal public human service system. Councils should serve as forums to coordinate public and private efforts as well as intergovernmental efforts. In most councils, however, the final decision making body consists of the founders rather than the agencies they fund.

The formal structure of each council evolved as the groups learned how to operate. For example, in Dayton the leadership found that the top administrators needed to be involved more

often than the political decision makers. Thus a previous two-tier structure was supplanted by a three-tier structure: policy makers, executives, and planners. In Indianapolis, a large advisory group which had proved unable to properly screen work and make recommendations was abolished and replaced with a working committee of top administrators.

Typical successful efforts were: a countywide services decentralization strategy, a systematic block grant or general revenue sharing allocation process, a joint agency transportation program, a model plan for increasing client access to services, a change in the welfare intake process, a program for reducing waiting time in local service agencies, an interagency program for dealing with adolescent pregnancy. a multi-agency contract monitoring system, a study of deinstitutionalization of ex-mental patients that led to a group home zoning ordinance, coordinated delivery systems for target areas, a common database for planning, a multi-agency computerized information and referral service, and emergency housing for the homeless.

The obstacles to success included perceptions of resource dependence or of lack of statutory authority to adjust programs; desire for agency autonomy and turf protection; lack of high level administrative support or incentives to cooperate; lack of general understanding of the problems; and difficulties in standardizing procedures.

Success in cooperatively solving problems within a council setting required several conditions:

1. Governments and organizations had to be treated as

equals, even if their levels of financial participation were unequal. In the six councils studied, the public and private sectors evolved toward equal footing.

2. Individual participants had to recognize the political nature of their task, explicitly acknowledging and adjusting to partisan and inter organizational politics. The membership had to reflect the complexities of the political and organizational system, including the state and federal governments.
3. Politicians and executives had to be actively involved, as well as specialists in organization, planning, data management, and services delivery, in order to impact the system at all levels.
4. Participants had to maintain a consistent focus on the problem at hand and make adjustments to solve that particular problem, as distinct from focusing on generalized goals such as working together, reducing duplication, or comprehensive planning.

Success was most likely to proceed from integrative solutions, i. e. , the participants did not merely bargain to balance respective gains and losses, but found a new idea from which everyone derived some gain with little or no loss. Such solutions emerged only when the participants shared concerns and openly exchanged information. Many of the solutions either involved some program or funding adjustment which required federal or state agreement, or participants found a tolerable middle ground between strict compliance with and open defiance of higher level regulations.

The mode of operation emphasized consensus rather than voting. Staff contacts with the participants and informal sessions, such as annual retreats and information gathering sessions, were important in creating consensus. The problem solving sequence which most of the councils employed was very slow but was considered necessary if there was to be any hope of implementation. It had the following major

elements:

1. Agency and council staff researched a problem which had been proposed for consideration, in order to define it.
2. The decision makers discussed the problem in detail and decided whether to include it in the council's work program. They assigned further research tasks and development of potential solutions to the staff.
3. The decision makers reviewed the staff report(s), discussed the alternatives, and decided upon a course of action.
4. The decision makers implemented the necessary actions in their own jurisdictions or organizations. The council as an institution rarely executed a decision.
5. The staff monitored the results. (This step was more threatening and less closely followed than the others; it was often done informally and irregularly.)

Councils have developed or are developing new administrative tools to facilitate their work, for example, a unified funding application process, service classification, and audit agreement, a joint survey of service provider capabilities, and a common update of economic and social needs data.

The councils' orientation has been the resolving of specific problems rather than systemic reform. Even though the original design for Columbus, Dayton, and Pueblo called for comprehensive system planning, all the structures ended up as problem solving entities. They neither led to fundamental changes nor resolved highly complex problems within their metropolitan areas. Any member could introduce a problem or issue for consideration. However, councils tended to tackle issues which required attention, i. e. , some loss would be experienced if the issue was not resolved. They avoided issues which were so comprehensive that they could not deliver solutions within a comfortable time frame or which were so jurisdictionally sensitive that their relationships

would be torn apart. Some issues were ignored or left for two party action between the most affected jurisdictions. Others were left for a later time when relationships would presumably be more secure after the achievement of some successes and when the capabilities of the staff had been tested. As the councils gained credibility, more agencies used them to broker bilateral or multilateral issues.

When appropriate, the councils represented the local community generally or a particular jurisdiction in lobbying another jurisdiction for changes. It was less important that the council received any credit for an achievement than that the parties chose to work through the council. Political support increased as projects and data produced by the councils helped to remove political pressure from local decision makers. The councils were beginning to use their data and experience to understand the overall system better, and there was some prospect for more comprehensive planning in the future.

This study accepted as a given that the system is highly fragmented. The author did not address reform. He pointed out, however, that both politicians and academics have called for basic changes such as the sorting out of the functional roles of levels of government, consolidation of federal grants, and simplification and standardization of requirements, and that some problems will be solved only by structural reform. (Agranoff, 1986)

Case Management. Dysfunction within the services network can cause havoc for already distressed families (Compher,

1984). With or without unified agency management or interagency councils, wherever service delivery itself is not unified, the need for case management to coordinate service programs and resources is widely recognized.

The National Association of Social Workers (NASW) in 1987 published a policy statement advocating the use of trained social workers to perform case management. Case management includes but is not limited to the functions of assessing needs, and planning, linking and monitoring services. It requires a trusting and enabling relationship between worker and client to expedite the utilization of services and to promote the independent functioning of the client. NASW's 1984 standards and guidelines for case management call for continuity of responsibilities when more than one person is involved in providing services and case management to a client, and declare that without such continuity the client will be adversely affected. Some (e. g. , Comfier, 1984) believe that case management may not be shared but should be assigned to a single worker. No two workers have the same ideas about service needs, priorities, and approaches. Multiple agencies, case plans and workers confuse clients and add to their problems of coping.

Where multiple agencies and professionals are involved, case management usually requires at least one joint case conference; after a pattern of collaboration is established, letters and telephone calls may suffice. This is time consuming (one study estimates it takes up to 47% of a worker's time), but lack of coordination both consumes time and interferes with results.

Failure to include all involved agencies can lead to serious deficits in service. (Family Centered Project, 1957) As the coordinator of the client's social service network, the case manager needs to mediate the overt and covert conflicts that often exist among the professionals who are involved simultaneously with the client (Compher, 1984). Many workers object to being "coordinated" by another worker (Moshino, "The Provider Driven Service Delivery System, 1988).

Case management is a multilevel system; there are roles for administrators, supervisors, and workers. The administrator's role is to develop and coordinate the network of available services. The worker's role is to coordinate and deliver services in a particular case. The supervisor is the link between administrative and case coordination. (O'Connor, 1988)

From October 1984 to October 1985, the Mississippi Governor's Commission for Children and Youth sponsored a program to provide integrated case management services for multi problem children, ages six to fifteen, and their families. The project funded three case managers who possessed graduate degrees in social work and had at least three years of field experience. Major requirement for referral was that the family have multiple problems and be known to more than one agency. While 50% of reported problems were directly child related, 38% concerned survival issues, such as food, housing and money. The case managers took a holistic approach to client problems. They did not supplant other agencies' workers as in the St. Paul project, but worked simultaneously with the client. The findings of the

project evaluation indicated that the clients made better use of existing services and resolved more of their difficulties when assisted by a central person as assessor, planner, and coordinator of services. (Zimmerman, 1987)

Purchase of Service. This is a variation of the case management concept. After the 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act permitted public agencies to purchase services from other public agencies and, later, from private agencies, the American Public Welfare Association developed an idea called the warehouse, approach, which evolved into the purchase of service concept . The case manager would order or purchase services needed by the client; they would be delivered by specialized units of the same agency (from the "warehouse") or by contract agencies ("purchase of services"). The concept was influenced by the vocational rehabilitation model, in which the worker contracts for various services for the disabled person. The statutorily responsible agency would be the case manager and fiscal intermediary but would deliver little service. This approach did not gain favor with statutorily responsible agencies. (Hoshino, The Provider Driven Service Delivery System, 1988). Also, it does not address the fragmentation of those very agencies and the problem of coordinating their respective case managers .

Unification of administration or of services delivery can to an extent be achieved through subcontracting, if the various statutorily responsible agencies contract with the same provider. For example, in Delaware, one contract agency operates all

types of shelters: for abused children, abused spouses, runaways, etc. This is reported to be very effective.

THEORETICAL GROUNDING FOR INTEGRATION OF SERVICES

Service delivery integration models which emphasize the need for community involvement are rooted in an ecological paradigm which takes into consideration the child, family and environment. At the root of this paradigm is the relationship between person and environment. Kurt Lewin simplified the concept with the equation $B=f(P, E)$: behavior is a function of both the persons and the environment. Urie Bronfenbrenner expanded on this concept in characterizing human development as the progressive, mutual accommodation between an active, growing human being and the changing properties of the immediate settings in which the developing person lives, as this process is affected by relations between these settings, and by the larger context in which the settings are imbedded. (quoted by Whittier, 1986)

Bronfenbrenner describes his ecology of human development in the context of an environment which is a set of nested concentric structures. These are made up of different systems (micro, meso, exo, and macro). These various systems comprise the "world" of human beings. An individual moves between these various systems and is influenced by and influences each of them in turn.

A service delivery system based on an ecological paradigm focuses on environmentally oriented assessments that are designed to inform treatment methods that help the individual client from the outside, that is, by placing major attention on

the creation and maintenance of challenging, supportive and responsive environments, both proximate and distal. (Whittier, 1986). State and county models which focus on community based service provision use this theoretical orientation. They attempt to take into consideration the environmental context of the clients.

Additional research on successful service delivery has substantiated the need for environmental considerations. One researcher, Carol Meyer, has pointed out that there is a strong relationship between individual physical social psychological health and social supports and between social isolation and the breakdown in these areas of function. Social isolation has been reported as a frequent correlate of families involved in neglect and abuse. Researchers Schumaker and Brownell suggest that social support has a direct, indirect, or interactive effect on physical and mental health. (Whittaker, 1986)

In summary, there is theoretical and research evidence that services need to be community based. Basing the services in the communities builds on the accepted ecological paradigm. The service delivery systems that focus on communities will maximize their effectiveness because of this consideration.

PROFESSIONAL AND ADVOCACY OBSTACLES TO SERVICE INTEGRATION

Separate agencies keep their records separately and do not readily share them with one another. Records of different types of violence are kept by different agencies. Researchers focus on different sets of records and types of violence. (Bolton, 1983). Fragmentation of research into different specialties

obscures the problem of family dysfunction (Goodwin, 1985).

Practitioners treating child and elder abuse tend to advocate decriminalization, while practitioners dealing with spouse abuse and sexual abuse largely advocate criminalization (Goodwin, 1985).

In lieu of pursuing positive client outcomes as the primary goal, agency administrators usually focus on other goals such as resource acquisition (Patti, 1987), despite the fact that the correlation between spending levels and volume or quality of services is highly variable at best (Horton, 1987).

Although the St. Paul Family Centered Project was effective and received strong local support, it was coolly received in professional circles for several reasons: it reached out to client families and required them at least to hear the initial offer of services, it shared the content of agencies' records and of workers' diagnoses with clients, and it built competencies rather than cured pathologies. Such approaches are useful in treating poor families with observable dysfunction's. However, the schools of social work largely train professionals to treat individuals who are hurting inside, and the project's approaches were contrary to this emphasis. Some professionals also opposed the single worker's concentration of power over a family's access to services. Local agencies objected to the project's attempt to obtain changes in their methods and to train their workers.

As pointed out earlier, the management of the Human Services Department in Minneapolis is still divided over whether to reunify intake, and it has retained some unification

(I&R and emergency after hours services).

Opponents of case management argue that it does not increase the inadequate supply of services and that the case manager, who lacks the authority to manage the system, manages the client instead. Case managers are being used to control and coerce clients, especially the poor and most vulnerable, by controlling information about and access to benefits and services. (Hoshino, "Models of Case Management", 1988)

Age integrated and age segregated services are also debated. The major arguments for age integrated services are that(a) they discourage age discrimination, (b) they link people of different ages, and (c) they improve efficiency in service provision. Opponents counter that age neutral programming has not eliminated age discrimination in health centers and retraining programs, and that there is no evidence for superior efficiency of age neutral programs. Opponents also make their own arguments: that elders prefer and benefit from peer interaction, that elder problems require special expertise, and that elder needs will be neglected unless targeted. However, the evidence that elders prefer peer interaction is based on studies of housing and neighborhoods, and further studies have found no correlation with preference for elder centers and political groups. Elders do have conditions and situations biological, physiological, psychological and social which are not common to other age groups, but loss of a spouse occurs at other ages, and status and role deprivations may come from unemployment or the

growing up of children as well as from retirement or the absence of family. The extent of need for geriatric expertise is still debated within the social work profession. Some thinkers propose that both age neutral and age segregated entry points into the service system are needed, and that the system should be oriented toward multigenerational relationships. (Lowy, 1987)

Organized advocacy and public support for elder programs focuses on age targeted programs such as Social Security and Medicare. All elderly can rally around and preserve elder specific programs. However, in social services age targeting rather than need targeting is a mechanism whereby the non poor gain access to public funding, often at the expense of poor elders who have greater needs but are less influential and are squeezed out. Age targeting also reduces cooperation among advocates to work for better social policies which might reduce the need for direct services. (Lowy, 1987)

CONCLUSION

The violent family has many combinations of perpetrator and victim. of all ages, simultaneously or at different times. Violence within the family contributes to running away, delinquency, homelessness, and violence outside the family. The violent family ordinarily also suffers from other types of dysfunction and external stresses. Violent and other dysfunctional families transmit their behaviors from one generation to another. All family members both those living in the family residence and those separated from it, such as absent parents, runaway or grown children, and isolated senior citizens are

affected by the family's dysfunctions. These dysfunctions, in turn, are exacerbated by stresses in the family's environment, such as unemployment, overcrowding, financial problems, and social isolation.

The elements of a comprehensive service system are the same for all types of intrafamily violence.

To be effective, services must deal with the family's internal and external relations: and with its environment: (a) with the pattern of internal relationships within a family, not merely with one type of violence or with one perpetrator victim combination, and (b) with the family's economic and social problems which are often common to other families in its community and may require action on the community level. Intervention and prevention of all kinds of intrafamily abuse and prevention of delinquency and crime are inseparable. For poor families and communities, they are also inseparable from alleviation of poverty and its effects.

One service worker per family is more effective than multiple workers. Where service is delivered by more than one individual, case management is needed. There should be only one case manager per family. Continuity in the worker client relationship is better than passing the client from worker to worker. The mix and delivery of services should be tailored to each community and to each client family. Private providers and community members should be involved in planning the service system.

Intergenerational programs make good use of human resources

available in the community, minimize costs, expand services, and provide special benefits to young and old.

Fragmentation of services among different agencies hampers research, case planning, and service delivery. Various methods have been tried to overcome this.

- Administrative unification improves coordination of and access to services even when service delivery programs and units remain distinct. It is most effective when there is a single case manager and a single information system. Problem prevention and community network improvement are emphasized when all services are the responsibility of a community centered team. Unification should be permanent and involve standing agencies. Where administrative and service unification has been achieved only through the creation of a separate case management agency, side by side with the existing statutory agencies, the separate agency does not survive the expiration of the special funding which made it possible. Unification of mental health and social service agencies does not resolve their professional conflicts.
- Co-location without unification, where tried, has not ensured coordination or even communication.
- Numerous jurisdictions have established multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional coordinating councils. These councils incorporate a wide range of public and private service funders and providers. As councils mature, private members achieve equality with public members. Councils initiate cooperative projects of limited scope on which the members can agree; issues and problems which are systemic or on which disagreement is basic and strong are avoided. The councils' capabilities are proportionate to mutual trust and staff ability. Councils' effectiveness depends on active involvement by decision makers, managers and staff. The decision process is slow. Monitoring of results is weak.
- The social work profession promotes case management. Case management is multilevel: it requires program as well as service delivery coordination. Service delivery management must be unified in one worker. It is time consuming and requires voluntary interagency cooperation unless administration is unified or the case manager is purchasing the services. If agencies are fragmented but they purchase services from the same provider, unification of operations administration and services delivery may be achieved.

Coordination is different from cooperation. A coordinator must have formal authority and power over the individuals or agencies to be coordinated.

(Hoshino, 'The Provider Driven Service Delivery System', 1988)

'Our region's multilevel bureaucracy does not serve us well. It encourages each agency to avoid the tough problems of planning. . . and finding innovative ways of working with other agencies. It is like trying to grow a beautiful, well-manicured garden with five different gardeners planting the seeds without consulting one another. Someone has to be in charge. Someone must provide direction. ' (Alatorre, 1988)

Several existing factors among professional social workers and client advocates hamper their acceptance of service integration despite its support by research findings and theory. Most social work practice, record keeping and research are fragmented. Practitioners disagree on policy. Administrators and advocates have other agendas in addition to meeting client needs. Administrators pursue resource acquisition rather than effectiveness. Age focusing by child and elder advocates reduces the mutual cooperation. Effective service demonstration projects are coolly received if they challenge customary practices.

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

WORKING PAPER B
ROLES AND FUNCTIONS
OF
COUNTY GOVERNMENT

ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Los Angeles County is only one of some 1600 governmental units operating in the Los Angeles Region (the "60 mile Circle"). Children, like other residents and visitors to the region, consume some of the services of all of the governments. Therefore, the term, 'services to children' needs refinement.

County government has two major roles. It governs, and it provides services. Governance is the province of the elected officials of the County. Governance assumes that the public welfare depends on an exercise of the sovereign powers to regulate and control the activities and behavior of people in the region. Regarding children, we have laws requiring them to attend schools, establishing minimum age for the operation of vehicles, establishing minimum age for the voting franchise, establishing curfews, and limiting not only their use of substances like alcohol, but also their presence in businesses where it is served. We also have laws designed to protect children from the various forms of depravity some practice in our society, including pornography, substance abuse, prostitution, and other forms of abuse or neglect. Such functions are provided by government and generate activities which use the resources of government, but they are not services to children. The County Board of Supervisors and other local elected

officials generate laws affecting children, in the same sense as the State does.

The provision of services, which may be produced by another unit of government or a private firm, is often not the exclusive domain of the elected County officials. They are accountable for many services to some other level of government, such as the State, which may require the County to provide a service, may or may not decide major policies affecting service provision, and may or may not fund it. Regarding children, virtually all services are available for consumption. Children, and such organizations of children as the Scouts and the various sports association, use public facilities extensively in their programs. Some services, on the other hand, are designed and funded specifically for children. Schools, for example. The Children's Museum of the City of Los Angeles. Moreover, some professions (in and out of government) specialize in services to children. Pediatricians, for example, or Child Psychologists, or Child Development Specialists.

The organization and funding of service provision varies widely. Some services are provided by multiple jurisdictions. For example, about 35 separate police departments operate in Los Angeles County. Other services are limited to a single jurisdiction. In Los Angeles County, only the County government

provides health services. Similarly, some services provided by government are produced by someone else. For example, many mental health services provided by the County are contracted to private clinics. Other services provided by government are funded or partially funded by someone else. For example, nearly half the costs of health care are State funded; the entire cost of certain transfer payments in the welfare system are funded by the State or Federal government (the grants to recipients of AFDC).

In this fragmented system, accountability is a serious issue. If the State government mandates a service and only partial funds it, who is accountable if the service is deficient? The State may claim that the funding is adequate, while the local government is inefficient. The local agency may claim that the state funding is inadequate for the demands and requirements of the service.

Coordination is a serious issue. When multiple agencies provide the same service (e. g. , police), or a single government regulates an area wide function (e. g. , Superior Court), the impact of the fragmented political system can be adverse in the. absence of careful coordination or orchestration of the policies of each. Regarding children, this may be a particularly serious question.

The actions of government affect children in numerous ways, from every level and service of each agency. The zoning practices in a city may affect children who need County protection from abuse: they may prohibit the operation of a facility in a residential neighborhood, for example. Police practices may vary depending on the community: some departments may have a strict policy of arresting and booking children for using alcohol, while others may prefer to contact parents or guardians.

The issue of who decides is particularly critical when the government touches children in an exercise of its police power. For example, the County Probation Department supervises children who have been found guilty of a crime and ordered to probation by the court. This is a function of governance the child is more the object of an exercise of the power of the state than a consumer of some service of the County government. Nevertheless, the Probation Department still provides services to the children with whom it is charged. It houses them, feeds them, counsels them, trains them, and provides for their welfare while they are in its care. The Superintendent of Schools provides schooling to them while they reside in Probation facilities. Thus, some services causing children to consume governmental resources are for children; others are not specifically or exclusively for them, but rather are to them; still others are not

provided exclusively for children, but rather are used by them as a matter of free choice.

Government also must recognize that the child cannot be separated from the human context in which he or she lives. That is, the child has family, relatives, or guardians, lives in a community, and interacts as a person with a number of other people. Removing the child from that human context, or modifying the human context in some way is a grave act of government that affects not just the child, but also the other people parents, guardians, teachers, service providers, friends with whom the child interacts.

The central issue in untangling the complexity is who decides? Who determines the policy regarding children? Who decides what services will be provided, and how? Who decides how the services will be produced? Funded? Who decides what the policy will be governing quality? Aside what is provided in the laws of the state and those of the United States, in the case of most governance and service provision decisions, multiple decision makers will decide on what is to affect children, and what the intended effects must be.

Certain governmental services affecting children are assigned by law to the County levels of government, or are produced by County government as a matter of agreement among the

various jurisdictions in the region. When child abuse is reported and confirmed, the County is obliged to protect the child from further harm and the sources of harm. The County is obliged, through funding of the court system, to provide for adjudication of the situation and a determination of what is best for the child. Depending on the court findings and decision, the county may be obliged to house the child, to find and finance supportive and developmental services, and so forth. For children who are accused of crimes, the law obliges the county to provide certain other services.

Regardless of the provisions of state law, virtually all County departments, in all areas, provide services which are relevant, not just to the effects of government on children, but also to the system of child abuse and neglect. All of the county departments with open facilities offer programs which can be used by children and their families as forms of child care or respite care, for example. Such services may be for children, but they are not exclusive; anyone can use them. Moreover, all county departments designed to provide such functional services as health care may have major impact on the population of children, but are not exclusively for "children. "

Regardless of the provisions of state law, the intention and the effect of governance or service delivery may be to correct a pathology, or to prevent it. This is by no means a separation of mutually exclusive qualities. Many actions can have both preventive and therapeutic effects. Most government officials who accept responsibility for correcting or treating a problem initiate efforts to prevent its occurrence, because in so doing they create long range opportunities to reduce the demands on their resources. Nevertheless, in most cases, it is possible to judge a the attributes of a service delivery system as primarily preventive or treatment.

With the current departmental structure of county government, the structure of its service system consists of three primary elements:

service departments. The Children's Services Department provides primary protective services for children; Probation provides supervision and detention; Public Social Services provides financial support to children and their families.

support departments. The CAO/Facilities Management Services Department provides space for county programs and maintains that space; the Auditor Controller provides accounting services and payrolls; the CAO/Personnel Department supports recruitment and selection of employees. These directly affect children because they control the conditions under which children live as dependents or wards of the County

policy departments. The CAO provides resource allocation functions and services through recommendation of service and support department budgets; the Auditor Controller specifies the accounting practices to be used by departments; County

Counsel interprets the law for the Board of Supervisors. These affect children less directly than they affect the operations and behavior of the departments providing services. Commissions and other groups contribute to the work of the Board of Supervisors in deliberating on the policies recommended by these departments or by service departments.

Summary

Governmental activity affecting children includes both governance and service provision. Service provision is distinct from service production and service finance. Jurisdictional fragmentation of production and finance creates major issues of accountability and coordination, both interagency within a unit of government, and interjurisdictional. Some governmental functions affecting or used by children are not specifically for the children. and the resources used are not exclusively for them. In terms of intention or effect, services may be primarily preventive or primarily corrective. In the case of service provision assigned by law to the County units of government, the structure for delivering the service includes the organization providing it and managing it, organizations supporting the provider logistically, and organizations deciding or mediating policy affecting the provider. The next section contains a list of the County service departments whose activities affect children or are for them, the services they provide, and the degree to which they meet the various conditions described in this section.

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

WORKING PAPER C

THE COUNTY'S RESPONSIBILITIES
TO CHILDREN

THE COUNTY'S RESPONSIBILITIES TO CHILDREN

Introduction

Services to children have changed significantly in the past hundred years. Initially, extended families and long term neighbors provided day, respite and foster care for children, and social control of the behavior of parents. Standards were different physical discipline was accepted, even when severe, and sexual molestation was denied. Government provided a "poorhouse" for indigents. Rarely did it have to find an adoptive or foster family for a minor.

As the old social supports crumbled, government assumed a larger portion of the burden. It provided financial aid to widows and orphans, although nonprofit agencies and religious groups usually operated the orphanages. The welfare departments which aided broken families, or the probation departments which detained juvenile delinquents, established units to remove abused and molested children from their homes and place them elsewhere. As the reports of abused and neglected children increased. government operated shelters and paid foster parents. Private nonprofit or profit making agencies increased in number or grew in size. constructing institutions to meet the demand to house children who had been removed from their

homes. The number of children in foster care increased steadily. In response to concerns that social workers were placing children unnecessarily, the Federal government in 1973 made its financial participation dependent on court order of the placement. The court caseload grew astronomically. To reduce the demand and the expense, the State of California in 1978 legislated S4, which required termination of either agency supervision or parental rights within a maximum of 24 months. Caseload has continued to increase.

Child protection agencies in the 1970's conducted campaigns to increase public awareness. Child abuse reports increased significantly. The number of children in foster care grew. but the increase in the number of working women made recruitment and retention of foster homes more difficult. professionals recognized that intervention was not enough; growth in caseload was potentially enormous. and the ability to meet it was uncertain. Meanwhile, researchers identified a wide variety of social problems, from family breakup to drug abuse, which contributed to the high incidence of child abuse and neglect. Prevention of child abuse became a new field for professional endeavor and citizen involvement. Advocates again began to lobby for expansion of government's resources and role in providing services to children and families. The public and professional consensus on this role is in transition.

Members of the public bureaucracies, and associations of citizens and professionals, are not in agreement on the components of the government's role nor on priorities. Some of the conflicts which have surfaced are the result of these fundamental

differences in perspective. Although they have not necessarily been clearly recognized, they do influence behavior and judgments on specific issues. They also inhibit rational and constructive communication because the realization, however vague and ill defined, that beliefs differ creates mistrust. As long as the underlying issues are not openly debated and rationally discussed, the danger is that the County and other levels of government will drift in directions which they do not recognize and from which they may have to recover, perhaps with political and economic pain, when unplanned results are experienced. We have identified a number of those issues which are relevant to the County's commitments in providing services to children, and we describe them in this section.

The key issues which we have identified are:

- appropriate role of government, in terms of problems which government is responsible to resolve and appropriate means;
- relationship of child abuse and governmental protective roles to social trends, technological developments, and public health agendas;
- relative emphasis on the interests of the child as an individual and on the family unit, including the parents;
- effectiveness of different protective strategies;
- role of the court system in protecting children;
- generalist vs. specialist workers, the roles of different professions, professional identity and the need for interdisciplinary approaches and program coordination;
- the role of professional unions and associations, and the tradeoffs between caseload and compensation.

Appropriate role of government.

Should government be responsible for the total wellbeing of children or simply for their protection from harm by others, including their parents? What is the government's responsibility for runaways, dropouts, and latchkey minors? And should government protect all runaway including those who don't want protection? If so, by what means, when they cannot be forcibly detained for any length of time? To what extent does prevention of abuse and neglect move into the realm of providing overall wellbeing? What ill or lack of service in society is there that does not contribute to child abuse and neglect in some way? If governmental responsibility embraces a child's wellbeing as well as protection, is government setting a precedent that it is responsible for an adult's as well as a child's wellbeing? How much wellbeing: total personal development intellectual moral, physical, emotional. sexual, artistic, cultural, etc. , etc. ? In other words, what are the boundaries of the government's responsibilities? What means are proper to its exercise? Should government provide all of the material and social services to ensure the wellbeing of those who do not or cannot adequately meet a certain standard on their own? If not provide it, should government enforce it or merely encourage it? Should government eliminate disapproved alternative behavioral choices by applying disincentives (such as criminalizing them) or by incentives alone? What is financially feasible for government to undertake? Is government the "everything" of last

resort? Will the County, by intervening to support an activity(e. g. , child care), ensure that the activity will always depend on the County for some of its funding? Is a specific government department responsible for advocacy with public and private organizations on behalf of children? If not, is anyone in government?

Relationship of child abuse and governmental protective roles to social trends, technological developments, and public health agendas.

Relative emphasis on the interests of the child as an individual and on the family unit, including the parents.

Existing legislation emphasizes family reunification in preference to long term or permanent separation of the minor from the family. Its application in specific cases is dependent on the values and perceptions of the social worker and of the judicial officer. Is the legislative emphasis appropriately applied? To the extent that it permits discretion at the local level, should policy tilt toward supporting parental authority and control or toward protecting the individual minor? What are the tradeoffs between society's interest in strong families and

its interest in child protection? What should their resolution be? How should the parent's civil liability for the damages caused by a child's behavior affect the government's policy in regulating the parent's ability to control the child, and vice versa? Historically, minors have been considered to possess fewer legal rights than adults. How should this be factored into the balance of parental and child rights? To what extent should a child's right to protection from harm by his parents differ from his right to protection from harm by others?

Effectiveness of different child protective strategies.

Would a redirection of resources from supervision to prevention be cost effective in reducing the child protection caseload? To what level of prevention society wide. targeted to high risk groups, targeted to those who have requested help in times of stress, targeted to those who have abused in the past? Or should the amounts currently spent on prevention be redirected to intervention and treatment? Under which circumstances is it more cost-effective to provide supervision and in home services to the family than to remove a child from an abusing or neglectful home? Is it feasible to redirect current resources from placement supervision to in home services? Should the abusing adult be removed rather than the child? Should policy prefer to place a child in a foster family home with counseling provided by the worker or other professionals, in a small group home which presumably combines the family home atmosphere with professional treatment, or in an institution with a highly therapeutic program? Should the helping professions focus on individual

ual counseling, on forming and guiding mutual support groups, on improving the support mechanisms within client communities, or on a combination of these strategies? If the latter, what are the criteria and the priorities? Are meaningful work and human relations important factors in mental health and socially acceptable behavior? If so, what can the County do about them?

Role of the court system in protecting children.

Should local discretion be, . exercised by the executive or judicial branch? How much discretion should management delegate to its workers? Should the judicial branch review all social work decisions or just those which are disputed by parents or minors? Should the review be limited to specific statutory requirements and procedural safeguards, or should it include the judge's assessment of the best course of action for the child and family? What is the appropriate judicial posture when the statutory time limit has been reached yet the worker has failed to arrange the treatment which the abusing parent supposedly needs to permit return of the minor?

Generalist vs. specialist workers, the roles of different professions, professional identity and the need for interdisciplinary approaches and program coordination.

Should different workers perform different functions in managing a case, e. g. , intervention, investigation, family reunification, non adoptive permanent placement and adoptive permanent placement? Or should the client interact with the same worker from beginning to end? Social workers are trained to assess and counsel: they spend their time not only making assessments.

but also writing reports and arranging for care or treatment by others. Should they be treatment workers or case managers? Should the child receive counseling and therapy from the same person who manages his/her case? If so, should the assignment of case management govern the assignment of treatment responsibility, or vice versa? What were the effects of separating eligibility and social services, and what are the implications for current practice? Should social workers, police officers, and prosecutors' investigators all be investigating the same case? Should alcohol and drug abusing parents receive therapy from mental health workers or from medical programs? Are there clear distinctions between the roles of the different professions? If each has a special contribution to make to a total effect, how can their program designs and actual practice be coordinated? How can efforts to improve neighborhoods and strengthen communities be targeted to help the individuals and families most in need? To what extent and how should government mobilize volunteer and community self help resources to supplement or substitute for hired professionals?

The role of professional unions and associations, and the tradeoffs between caseload and compensation.

Professional unions have at various times lobbied or negotiated for changes in work rules, especially in caseloads, as well as for increases in compensation for their members. Most social service programs have capped appropriations, however, so there is a tradeoff between increase in compensation and decrease in caseload. Should the County negotiate with unions on caseloads

as well as on compensation? Should workers be brought into the planning and problem solving processes? Should they be included in Board advisory or interdepartmental coordination committees? If so, should it be through management created committees, through their unions, or through professional associations?

In order to deal rationally with any of the above issues and avoid repeating the mistakes of other times and places, it is necessary to determine how other jurisdictions and societies have dealt with the same questions, and what the results have been.

These are the kinds of major policy issues which Board advisory groups should tackle.

COUNTY AGENCIES' ROLES IN PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

Services Available to and Used by Children, Non Mandatory, Locally Funded, Non Protective, Non Exclusive, Preventive

The Public Library, Museum of Art, Museum of Natural History, Music and Performing Arts Commission, Department of Parks and Recreation, and Department of Beaches and Harbors provide cultural, educational, or recreational opportunities which children use, more or less on the basis of their free choice or that of their parents or guardians. To the extent that employees interact with or at least observe children, child abuse and neglect by family members may be suspected and reported, and the children may be safe from assault by non family adults or older children. Similarly, criminal or delinquent behavior can be observed and reported for intervention by law enforcement officials.

Some County parks have a specific after school care program for children of elementary age and operate day camps during school breaks. Many parents send their children to such places in lieu of child care facilities. In addition to providing collections of resources for children to use, the Public Library promotes awareness of and offers literature on child abuse and neglect. The Library also offers special programs in reading designed for school age and preschool children. It is therefore a resource for latchkey children and for respite care for parents.

In addition to their facilities and exhibits, the Museums operate educational programs for children, including in some cases preschool children, in basic science and the arts.

In addition to subsidizing educational performances for children, the Music and Performing Arts Commission subsidizes youth orchestras and youth programs.

Directly For Children, Non Mandatory, Mixed Funding, Protective, Non Exclusive, Preventive

The Department of Community and Senior Citizens Services operates community service centers which children use for group (e. g. , Scout) meetings and other activities. These centers were established in the early 1970's, when policy makers at several levels of government recognized the need to coordinate services in order to achieve impact. Although

the Board of Supervisors created the centers, and various County, State and Federal agencies out stationed in take workers in them, the agencies retained separate systems and office locations. The attempt at a one stop service system failed. The centers now provide a place for various public and community organizations to operate, but intake and services are not unified.

The Farm Advisor (the agricultural extension of U. C. L. A.), which is logistically supported by this department, guides the 4H Clubs. The service centers and 4H clubs serve child abuse prevention and detection purposes similar to the cultural facilities observation and reporting as well as child care and respite care.

In addition, the department contracts with city government or private agencies to provide a wide variety of supportive services to individuals and families and to enrich the social environment of low income communities. The services, usually funded by the State or Federal governments, include job training, employment assistance, housing assistance, emergency food and shelter, and truancy counseling. These programs contribute to the reduction of those conditions which lead to child abuse and neglect or to juvenile delinquency.

The department administers a domestic violence program which provides shelter, counseling, arrangements for schooling, and liaison with law enforcement for children and parents who are victims of abuse or neglect. The department also operates programs for homeless people, including homeless families with children.

The department administers the Job Training and Partnership Act funds for the county and a number of cities in partnership with the County. Some of the funds are used for technical skill training and placement for children who are wards of the county, particularly those supervised by Probation. Others are used for adults who may be at risk of becoming abusive because of their economic situations.

Similarly, the Community Development Commission administers grants and loans for physical development. social services, and financial assistance to attract businesses, create jobs, rehabilitate or construct housing (e. g. , a shelter for homeless women with children), train the unemployed and generate other improvements in low income communities.

Directly Children, Mandatory, Mixed Funding, Protective, Exclusive¹ (1), Corrective

The Department of Children's Services receives reports of suspected child abuse and neglect from public and private agencies and from individuals. The department crossreports to the Sheriff or city police department. The department decides whether to remove the child from his or her home.

It requests Superior Court concurrence with a removal. It obtains medical or psychological care for the child as needed. It investigates the situation and may recommend ongoing court supervision. If the latter is recommended and is approved by the court, the department provides counseling to the children and parents or refers them to other service providers such as the Department of Mental Health, community agencies, or individual professionals. It places the child outside the home if warranted and if approved by the court. Within 24 months it must review the case and recommend that the court terminate either departmental supervision or parental rights. If the latter, the department arranges adoption or legal guardianship when possible.

The department recruits, evaluates and pays the homes in which it places children, including adoptive homes; it administers the State's licensing program for foster family homes. It operates MacLaren Children's Center, a shelter for children who cannot be placed elsewhere and for children awaiting placement. It determines the eligibility of placed children for Federal and State contributions to their foster care costs and medical expenses. The department also investigates allegations of child abuse or neglect by paid care takers such as foster parents and institutions. If the allegations are substantiated, the department removes placed children, stops further referrals, and may initiate action to revoke a facility's license.

The Office of Education (County Superintendent of Schools) provides public school districts and private schools throughout the County with information and training

¹ These services are not strictly exclusive, since the work is intended to affect the families.

on the recognition and reporting of child abuse and neglect. It also operates onsite schools at major child care institutions such as the County's shelter for abused children (MacLaren Children's Center of the Department of Children's Services), in large privately operated group homes in which that department places some of the victimized children, and in Probation facilities. In these settings its employees may report suspected child abuse by institutional staff.

Local School District employees are obliged by law to report any cases of suspected abuse or neglect to the Department of Children's Services and the local police department. The Districts must establish regulations providing for such reporting and for appropriate training for their staffs.

Affecting Children. Mandatory, Mixed Funding, Non Protective, non-exclusive, Corrective

Most individuals and agencies report suspected child abuse and neglect to local Police Departments. The law requires dual response, so the police are required to notify the Department of Children's Services. The police are generally the first to contact the child in a new case of abuse or neglect. In unincorporated areas and contract cities, the Sheriff receives such reports and is usually on the scene before the Department of Children's Services. The Sheriff decides whether to arrest the accused on the spot, investigates the case as needed, and recommends for or against prosecution. If the crime is a misdemeanor, the Sheriff recommends prosecution to the City Attorney in those cities with a prosecuting attorney; otherwise, he recommends it to the District Attorney. Police officers must testify in court if the city or county decides to prosecute.

Police agencies also work with children who are not necessarily victims of abuse or neglect at the time of police contact, but who are good candidates. They contact any child who is vagrant or runaway, violating a curfew, in poor physical or mental condition, suspected of using drugs or alcohol, suspected of a crime, or the victim of a crime. Research has shown that the population of children in these groups overlaps significantly with the population of children who are victims of abuse and neglect. Moreover, significant sectors of the population of adult criminals were the victims of abuse or neglect as children. Therefore, it is likely that the long range consequence of abuse and neglect which is not effectively corrected is increased demands on the criminal justice system. Finally, since the population of some young people is mobile, they may come in contact

with a number of different police organizations at different times.

Police agencies and the Sheriff, and their employees organize and run a variety of programs for children and youth. designed to provide healthful activities for them, to educate them about the law and law enforcement, and to provide a resource for the community. Although such programs are primarily oriented to delinquency prevention, they also assist in prevention and detection of child abuse and neglect.

Police agencies and the Sheriff finance and operate a variety of programs for children in the schools and at a community level. They may use their broadcast channels in cable systems for children directed programs, for parent education, and for programs directed at abuse and neglect. They work in the classrooms to provide education on drug abuse and instruction on methods to avoid it. These kinds of programs are preventive in their intent. since by reducing drug dependence. for example, they also reduce the rate of drug dependent births and the rate of drug related abuse cases.

The Forester and Fire Warden provides paramedic services within unincorporated areas and within cities which belong to the Consolidated Fire District. Firemen and paramedics report injuries and suspected arson which appear to be caused by child abuse and neglect or by a child's behavior. Paramedics may be the first witnesses to the harm done to a child by abuse or neglect, and may remove the child to a safe medical facility.

The department also sponsors junior firefighter training and experience for youth, which may prevent or detect abuse and neglect.

The Probation Department monitors adults who are convicted of felony or misdemeanor child abuse or neglect and are placed on probation by the Superior or Municipal Court. It also visits their children. The department has specially trained units with below average caseloads for this purpose. The department also monitors juvenile delinquents who are on probation. Many of them have previously experienced child abuse or neglect and thus are at risk of becoming abusing parents themselves. Some are placed in department operated juvenile halls and camps, others in foster family homes, group homes and institutions. The Probation Department recruits its own foster homes, which the Department of Children's Services licenses. The two departments use many of the same group homes and institutions, including those which contain a mental health component and are partially funded by the Department of Mental

Health. One of Probation's juvenile halls features a strong mental health component, staffed by the Department of Mental Health.

Directly for Children, Mandatory, Mixed Funding, Non Protective, Non Exclusive, Corrective

The Department of Health Services, through its hospitals and medical clinics, provides inpatient and outpatient medical care, including emergency care, to large numbers of individuals and families, primarily those whose low incomes and insurance, if any, are inadequate to pay for the needed care. Although the law obliges all medical practitioners to report cases of suspected abuse and neglect, the reality is that most of the reports by medical personnel of suspected child abuse and neglect originate with this department's staff. The department provides private medical professionals with information and training on the recognition and reporting of child abuse and neglect. It also provides onsite medical care to juveniles in the MacLaren Children's

Center and in the Probation Department's juvenile halls and camps. The Department professionals decide on the need for, level, and type of care which will be required by children in the care of the Children's Services and Probation Departments. The standards for such decisions are adopted and promulgated by medical professionals. In addition, through contract agencies, it provides medical and psychological treatment to abusers of drugs and alcohol; such abuse is often related to child abuse or neglect.

The Department of Health Services performs a number of community functions which are significant for all children. It enforces laws designed to protect children in the schools from communicable diseases. It operates disease prevention programs for diseases which victimize children more than others. It operates prenatal care programs designed to prevent or reduce the impact of poor nutritional practices, poor hygiene, and drug usage on fetal and infant development presently one of the primary sources of children who are harmed by their parents. It manages programs to support the issues surrounding teenage pregnancy and may assist in the births resulting from such pregnancy. It makes ethical decisions affecting the survival probability for children who are born with disabling or life threatening conditions, and for children who are the victims of accidents, disease, and abuse. It examines children who are suspected victims of abuse for the nature of the abuse, and provides court testimony where necessary. It establishes standards for the actions of public and private hospitals receiving emergencies in which children are involved.

The Department of Mental Health provides assessment and Treatment, including counseling and medication, to adults and children who suffer from emotional or mental illness, including children who are dependents or wards of the County Services are delivered by departmental staff and by contractors. Suspected child abuse and neglect are reported. If a person needs commitment to a mental hospital or conservatorship, the department seeks the necessary court order and makes the hospital placement or provides the conservatorship (through its Public Guardian function. which was recently consolidated with this department). The Department of Mental Health provides onsite mental health assessments and treatment for children admitted to the MacLaren Children's Center. It staffs an intensive mental health treatment program for juvenile delinquents at the Probation Department's Dorothy F. Kirby Center. The Department also provides consultation and training to other agencies which deal with abused and neglected children.

Affecting Children, Mandatory, Mixed Funding, NonProtective, NonExclusive, NonCorrective

The Department of Public Social Services comes in contact with many families when determining and reviewing eligibility for financial assistance and when responding to reports of elder abuse. It reports suspected child abuse and neglect. About half of the child protective service cases opened by the Department of Children's Services are among families who receive public assistance, although many are reported by agencies other than the Department of Public Social Services. In some cases, abuse impacts multiple generations, i. e. . children as well as seniors. A few disabled children receive In Home Supportive Services (i. e. , care by an attendant) which DPSS evaluates, authorizes and arranges. The department also funds INFOLINE, the area's primary central telephone information bank concerning social services and other resources of all kinds.

The Department provides social services, including in home supportive services for the disabled or elderly, protective services for adults, such employment services as sheltered workshops for those on relief, refugee instruction in English as a second language. and how to look for work, and the GAIN vocational training and counseling program for AFDC recipients. The department purchases direct services to children in the form of day care for parents in the GAIN program.

The Chief Medical Examiner Coroner investigates cases of death resulting from suspected abuse or neglect, and reports the results of his investigation to the District Attorney.

The District Attorney prosecutes a felony child abuse or neglect case, if he decides it is prosecutable. In lieu of prosecution, he may warn the accused against further such behavior and demand corrective counseling.

The District Attorney also sponsors youth programs which are primarily oriented to delinquency prevention but may assist in prevention and detection of child abuse and neglect.

The District Attorney manages the Child Support Collection System to enforce court orders requiring parents to provide child support payments to the parent with custody, and has the power to prosecute those who do not pay. Part of the payments recovered in this way are used to reduce the cost of welfare payments to the parent with custody. This program has an effect on child abuse and neglect; abuse and neglect is more prevalent in situations where the parent suffers from financial hardship.

The District Attorney prosecutes defendants whose cases are referred to Mental Health Court (Dept. 95). Such cases may affect children.

The Treasurer Tax Collector is the Court Trustee for funds recovered by the District Attorney's prosecution of child support payments. The trustee holds and invests funds while action to dispose of them is pending.

The Public Defender may represent an indigent defendant in a misdemeanor or felony criminal prosecution, including juvenile delinquents and adults charged with child abuse or neglect. The Public Defender also defends indigents in Mental Health Court.

The County Counsel represents the Department of Children's Services in Superior Court hearings of its recommendations when they are before Dependency Court. The Superior Court manages three departments with significant direct effects on children the Dependency Section of Juvenile Court, the Delinquency Section of the Juvenile Court, and the Family Court. Two other departments affect children indirectly, by adjudicating the cases of those accused of the harm to them.

The Dependency Section of the Juvenile Court rules upon recommendations by the Department of Children's Services to initiate court supervision, to place a child, to continue court supervision, and to terminate either court supervision or parental rights. In lieu of placing a child, the court occasionally orders the perpetrator to stay out of the family home.

The Child Advocates Office of the Juvenile Court provides volunteer guardians ad litem to represent the child's views during proceedings in Dependency Court.

The Delinquency Section of Juvenile Court decides on the disposition of cases where a child is accused of a crime, based on the recommendations of public officials who have been in contact with the child, including Probation officials. In some instances, the court may refer the case to the Dependency Court.

The Family Court rules upon the Department of Children's Services' recommendations to approve adoptions. This Court also adjudicates custody disputes in case of divorce or other custody suits. In custody cases involving child abuse, the Family Court may refer the case to Dependency Court for custody decisions.

The Criminal Court conducts trials of felony prosecutions for child abuse and neglect. The Mental Health Court determines whether any persons, including child abuse perpetrators and victims, shall be committed to mental institutions or subjected to conservatorship.

The Municipal Courts conduct trials of misdemeanor prosecutions for child abuse and neglect within their respective districts. The Municipal Courts also adjudicate most traffic cases of juveniles.

Support Departments

Facilities Management (directed by the CAO)

Personnel (consolidated with the CAO)

Auditor Controller

Policy Departments

Per CAO policy, the Department of Children's Services must use the Department of Mental Health to serve perpetrators and victims of child abuse and neglect who need mental health services. The two departments jointly recruit and fund group homes and institutions for abused and neglected children who need intensive therapy and supervision.

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Working Paper D

STRUCTURAL ISSUES

AND

ALTERNATIVES

STRUCTURAL ISSUES AND ALTERNATIVES

Existing Board Related Committees

The groups which are important are the:

Adoptions Commission
Children's Budget Implementation Committee
Commission for Children's Services (CSC)
Children's Roundtable
Children's Services Planning Council
Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee CCJCC
Delinquency and Crime Commission
Domestic Violence Council
Emergency Medical Care Commission
Board of Education
Hospital Commission
Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN)
Justice System Advisory Group
Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Planning Council
Local Suppression of Drug Abuse in Schools Committee
Mental Health Advisory Board
Obscenity and Pornography Commission
Public Health Commission
Task Force to Promote Self Esteem and Personal and Social
Responsibility
Welfare Advisory Commission
Commission for Women
Commission for Youth

The Board has referred children's issues of various kinds to all of these at one time or another over the past year. Some even have specific mandates that have to do with children and services to children: others have more general mandates, but have influenced county policy significantly regarding children. For example, CCJCC, not ICAN or the Children's Services Commission, assisted the Board last year in establishing a county position on legislation regarding protection of children in preschool and day care facilities. Similarly, the Board requested the Director of Health Services, District Attorney and Emergency Medical Services Commission to make recommendations for the care and treatment of child victims of sexual assault.

ALTERNATIVES

Given the social trends and the underlying social and professional issues we should address alternatives on a number of different levels:

- alternative methods of obtaining citizen input
- alternative methods of coordinating department work
- alternative methods of structuring the county system

ALTERNATIVES FOR OBTAINING CITIZEN INPUT

SCOPE OF COMMISSION

- one commission for all casework & community services
- one commission each for adult/children's services
- one commission each for casework/community services
- one commission for each department

- one commission for each: recipient constituency
- one commission for each professional constituency

- one commission for each social problem
 - child abuse and neglect
 - elder abuse
 - juvenile delinquency
 - unemployment, etc.

- one commission for each service program
 - child protective services
 - adoption services
 - adult protective services (elder abuse)
 - domestic violence (spousal abuse)
 - conservatorship, etc.

MANDATE AND AUTHORITY OF COMMISSION

- recommend to Board, department(s)
- recommend on policy, organization, operation, staffing
- oversee, monitor, evaluate
- require testimony, documents, data, special reports

COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION

- current / former service recipients
- potential service recipients (members of constituency)
- other professionals e. g. teachers, researchers
- other interested citizens
- County managers / professionals
- representatives of other governments

STAFFING OF COMMISSION

- secretarial and clerical support
- staff assistant
- analyst: generic / from a relevant profession

ALTERNATIVES FOR ORGANIZATION AND COORDINATION

CONSOLIDATION

- all social services
 - casework and community
 - adult and child
 - with or without Mental Health and Probation

- all casework services/all community services
 - adult and child
 - with or without Mental Health and Probation

- all children's services/all adult services
 - casework and community
 - with or without Mental Health and Probation

- mission
 - protection, child and adult
 - correction, child and adult
 - welfare, child and adult

PURCHASE WITH CHOICE

- case management department purchases services
 - for clients
 - residential care
 - health care
 - mental health
 - drug and alcohol abuse
 - schooling
 - for the agency
 - legal representation
 - facilities and general

COORDINATION

- County executive
- agency structure
- lead department
- coordinating committee
 - agencies: County. all governments, private
 - citizens: professionals. Nonprofessionals
- bilateral negotiation

SAMPLE #1

Consolidate all social casework and community services:

- Department of Children's Services
- Adult Protective Svcs. & In Home Supportive Svcs. (DPSS)
- Probation Department
- Department of Mental Health
- alcohol and drug abuse programs (Health Services)
- Department of Community and Senior Citizens Services

Restructure ICAN:

- director of consolidated department is permanent chair
- small executive committee
 - chair, Sheriff, Superintendent of Schools
- mandate to coordinate operations

Restructure Commission for Children's Services:

- combine with Commission for Youth
- require one professional appointee per Supervisor
- mandate to recommend Countywide children's policy
- not oversight
- hire professional researcher in sociology/social work

Restructure Adoptions Commission:

- advise on all programs of Department of Children's Services
- increase size and diversity of membership
- include private providers

Retain other existing commissions

Fund the consolidated department to purchase from the most cost effective providers

- for clients
 - health care
- for the agency
- legal representation
- facilities, data processing and general services

SAMPLE #2

No reorganization

Restructure ICAN:

- CAO is permanent chair
- executive committee of key officials,
- chair, Children's Services, Mental Health, Sheriff,
- Superintendent of Schools
- mandate to coordinate operations

Restructure Commission for Children's Services:

- advice & oversight re Department of Children's Services only
- include private providers and other professionals

Restructure Commission for Youth:

- mandate to recommend Countywide children's policy
- increase membership to include professionals
- provide professional research staff

Fund each department to purchase from the most cost effective providers

- for the clients whose cases it manages
 - any services clients now obtain from other departments
- for the agency
- legal representation
- facilities, data processing and general services

STRUCTURAL ALTERNATIVES CHILDREN' S SERVICES

February 29, 1989

I. Departmental Structure

A. (Functional)

Create a new department of protective services / social services by integrating DCS, DCSSS, DMH, Adult Protective Service programs from DPSS, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services from DCS.

B. (Programmatic)

Move all child / family directed services to DCS:the Children's Services divisions of DMH. the California Children's programs from DHS, juvenile detention programs from Probation, etc.

C. (intermediate steps with goals of A. or B. above)

D. (status quo)

II. Interdepartmental Relationship

A. (program management)

Give the DCS the funding and authority to decide from which sources (internal or external) to purchase services for the children for whom it is the partner. This assumes change of budgeting to provide for full cost recovery policies in interdepartmental transactions.

B. (performance contracting)

Use formal interdepartmental agreements to improve accountability for performance, delivery, and costs, with the DCS as the customer for services of the DHS. DMH. and DOE.

C. (status quo)

III. Coordination

A. (internal County committee / protection)

Form a new committee. designating the Director of DCS as the chairman. with DHS, DOE, and DMH as members. with the function of coordinating joint activities for *CS clients. Maybe even DPSS for

link to GAIN, and Parks, Libraries, etc for policy links to unserved populations.

B. (systems committee)

Strengthen the ICAN policy formulation, planning, and coordination functions for all children, countywide. Iv.

IV. Committees and Councils

A. (status quo)

Children's Services Commission stays mostly departmental; ICAN stays system wide, with its primary concentration on information sharing.

B. (countywide policy formulation)

Children's Services Commission broadens role to advising Board of Supervisors on policy for all children (as executed by all departments and programs); ICAN focuses on the implementation of new initiatives and policies adopted by the Board.

C. (countywide public / private partnership)

Create a new group (possibly based on the Planning Council) of private / corporate and county officials, city official and school officials to create consensus in the area of children's / family policy.

D. (unification of interagency councils)

Create a single interagency council to link all of the standing ones DVC, ICAN, CCJCC, DCC. etc

E. (unification of citizens' advisory commissions)

Merge all of the citizen's commissions affecting or advising on children / family policy into a single body with that function.

V. Committees General

1. Briefings of new commissioners and annual briefings of entire commission.
2. Review of need for a proposed new commission.
3. Periodic reports on commission costs and accomplishments

STRUCTURAL ALTERNATIVES

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

February 29, 1988

I. Service Delivery Structure

Fragmentation, duplication and overlap in the service delivery structure for children's and other social services are not merely characteristic of governmental service organization. They are inherent in the populations served, with respect to service delivery, and in the political system with respect to advisory boards, lobbies, and interagency coordination. Thus, one issue is to find ways to permit as much diversity as possible while maximizing efficiency of operation. One good analogy might be the contrast between bureaucratic efficiency, which tends toward monopoly by reducing duplication wherever it is found, and market efficiency, which tends toward multiple competing providers and increased duplication, leaving efficiency up to the effects of competition. Various alternatives are reasonable. considering our earlier (1983 / 1987) recommendations.

A. (Functional)

Create a new department of protective services/social services by integrating DCS, DCSCS, DMH, Adult Protective Service programs from DPSS. Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services from DHS.

Comment. This would consolidate the following departments and functions into a Social Welfare Agency: Children's (Protective) Services (DCS), Adult (Protective) Services (from DPSS), Community and Senior Citizens Services, Mental Health, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services (from Department of Health Services). This would reintegrate the services along professional and functional lines, but would eliminate the presumed political efficacy of the current fragmentation. In our 1983 recommendations, we referred to this kind of approach as a 'realignment strategy'. The first step would be a Board decision requiring the various department heads to form a group assigned the responsibility to create a new department / agency. The staff for that group (organizational development specialists) could be the CAO or could be a contractor such as /. Adizes, E. Jaques, or P. Hitchcock.

B. (Programmatic)

Move all child / family directed services to Department of Children's Services: the Children's Services divisions of the Department of Mental Health, the California Children's programs from Department of Health Services, juvenile detention programs from Probation, the court schools from Department of Education, etc.

Comment. This would be consistent with what we called a "constituency" strategy in 1983. and would be a logical follow up to the action of creating DCS in the first

place. This would be action based on the assumption that the County should have a single department which deals with /is in charge of / services for all children, when the child who receives the service can be isolated from the context. (That is, it would not apply to Parks and Recreation, for example, or to police, or to the pediatric wards in county hospitals.) This would unify the structure for services to children and the associated constituencies; the cost would be fragmentation of the service delivery systems. In particular, the present integration of a mental health system, for example, would be fragmented by moving children's mental health to the Children's Services Department.

On the other hand, fragmenting the service delivery system can be productive from the political perspective. Once a separate department is in operation, it is linked to a constituency that thereby has direct and ready access to elected decision makers. That is why it is done. It is not efficient. and it is effective only in the sense that it increases political efficacy for that constituency. Those interested in senior citizens had a separate department for years, and accomplished much with it. Those interested in children now believe it is their turn and they want to do the same things.

If fragmentation is the issue, it is a consequence of the political system and characteristics of the service population. Correcting it organizationally would require (what contemporary social theorists have found) a unification of the service populations in ways that would accommodate various political perspectives on what is needed. There is no such thing as a non-fragmented, non-duplicative structure which is focused on children's services as though they can be divorced from the other populations and conditions which have led to social disintegration. Buying the political agenda that is, that a separate structure is needed to ensure access and efficacy will only lead eventually to more fragmentation, as the seniors, the ethnic minorities, and other sub-populations decide to create their own thing.

In fact, a structure organized purely around constituencies could be optimally efficient in the market sense. The departments of the county would be organized around specific populations age groups, gender, ethnicity, etc. Each department would be a case manager for that group (i. e. , a program manager). All services medical, psychological. financial, social, detention, etc. (probably excepting police patrol) would be contracted out by the case managers. This model would maximize fragmentation

and maximize market efficiency. It has never been done, so the potential social effects are a bit difficult' to predict. But it could be done, and it would be theoretically efficient.

C. (Intermediate with goals of A. or B. above)

Take a few intermediate steps, with A. or B. above as the ultimate plan.

Comment. In the case of A. , for example, the "Adult Protective Services" functions could be taken out of DPSS and either a) made a separate department, or b) consolidated with the Public Guardian functions of the Department of Mental Health.

It is possible to sketch this in terms of a phased plan, with levels as follows:

Level 1: Protection: DCS, Adult Protection from DPSS, Public Guardian from Mental Health

Level 2: Social Casework: above plus In Home Social Services from DPSS, and [Probation ??]

Level 3: All social work: above plus Department of Community and Senior Citizens Services

Level 4: All social work plus therapy: above plus Department of Mental Health, and alcohol and drug programs from Health Services D. (Status quo)

D. (Status quo)

II. Interdepartmental Relationship

A. (Program Management)

Give the DCS the funding and authority to decide from which sources (internal or external) to purchase services for the children for whom it is the partner. This assumes change of budgeting to provide for full cost recovery policies in interdepartmental transactions.

Comment. Leave the structure as is. but give the Children's Services Department the funding and authority to decide from which sources (i. e. , internal or external) it will purchase services. This would assume that the full and fully burdened costs of all services supplied by one department to another are transferred in the budgets. and that alternative sources are available by contract or other means. We have consistently recommended this for particular internal services, but not explicitly for all services. The budget processes and bureaucratic policies/ assumptions are not properly set up to do this, but could be revised, given the CAO's (i. e. , Dixon's) intention to cooperate with the potential that the alternative resources may be private. as well as alternative public. providers.

B. (performance contracting)

Use formal interdepartmental agreements to improve accountability for performance. delivery, and costs, with the DCS as the customer for services of the DHS, DMH, and DOE.

Comment. Formal interdepartmental agreements have been used successfully in several California Counties and in a few other states. The idea is that the suppliers of services to children who are in the charge of the county recognize the Children's Services Department as the responsible agent for those children (i. e. , the "parenter"), and agree in writing to specifications and terms and conditions (excluding funding) for supplying those services.

The expectation is that this kind of interdepartmental agreement would work, since everyone would have agreed in advance on the terms. The reality is that they usually don't work. Without transfer of money or another incentive, each department's primary motivation is to reduce pressure on its budget (so it can stay within its own budget). Consequently, the agreements don't last long. Since the departments are in no hierarchy at all, there is no way to enforce the agreements.

In the present case, the occasion of the disagreement over the services of the Mental Health Department was precisely that the Director of Children's Services expressed a degree of uncertainty over whether or not the Department of Mental Health had kept to the agreement that various groups believed they had; and the Director

of Mental Health expressed a degree of uncertainty over the actual contents of the agreement.

The key to making a system like this work would be to create incentives for each of the parties to make it work. For example, the "pay for performance" plan could be modified so that goals and objectives explicit in the interdepartmental agreements would be incorporated in the performance agreement affecting the department heads' compensation.

C. (Status quo)

The point is the same one we stressed in the 1983 work. The Board will have to decide on the overall principle of organization it wants. Item /. B. above requires the development and maturation of a program management system in county government. There is no history of such a system. and no experience with it; the only place where anything resembling it is practiced is in the Road Department. Item /. A. above requires that the Board declare an explicit intention to consolidate, regardless of any "opportunity" window. Neither of these explicit strategies has been adopted. Items II. A. and II. B. above would do nothing about fragmentation, but would at least create a stronger impression. Symbolic, that the Director of Children's Services is in charge of the bureaucratic policy for services affecting children.

Thus, regardless of the alternative chosen, the basic requirement will be that the Board direct the CAO to accomplish these steps and adopt these strategies, with a time limit. The reason this generally does not work is that the bureaucracy assumes that it won't stick i. e. , that the Board doesn't really mean it, or will forget about it. That is why the easiest strategy is the "opportunity" strategy. It is passive one waits for opportunities, and as time goes on, the Board's interest and commitment wanes. Even now, for example. the cost accounting systems are not in place. Interdepartmental charges are still based on marginal cost pricing rather than full cost recovery or average unit cost. DCS has an interdepartmental agreement with Mental Health: the agreement. and the issue of whether or not its terms are being met, is one of the central points of contention at present; but DCS has no alternative but DMH as a provider of mental health services. The County Department Heads may believe that they have worked it out, but others do not.

III. Coordination

A. (Internal County committee / protection)

Form a new committee, designating the Director of DCS as the chairman, with DHS, DOE, and DMH as members, with the function of coordinating joint activities for DCS

clients. Maybe even DPSS for link to GAIN, and Parks, Libraries, etc. for policy links to unserved populations.

Comment. This hardly seems reasonable as a means of reducing "duplication, fragmentation, and confusion. "

B. (Systems committee)

Strengthen the ICAN¹ planning. program development. and coordination functions for all children, countywide.

Comment. This is the only reason to justify having such departments as Parks and Recreation and the Public Library as members of ICAN. However. this kind of committee almost never functions in a genuine coordination role for long. The activity reverts to program development and joint projects. In addition, this is apparently opposed by the current chairman of ICAN (although supported by earlier letters of his). and would be opposed by the Children's Services Commission in the guess of most.

IV. Committees and Councils

A. (Status quo)

Children's Services Commission stays mostly departmental; ICAN stays system wide. with its primary concentration on information sharing and training.

Comment. This kind of system provides for citizen participation linked to a department and its programs.

¹ Throughout the term ICAN refers to the committee of elected and appointed officials known by that name and designated in the County Code by that name. In particular. when reference is made to the staff of ICAN, the term used is "the staff of ICAN. "

It can work reasonably well; most departments have at least one committee or commission which acts as a source of citizen input, advocacy, and some evaluation. The only problem with it is that eventually the commission becomes or appears to become a captive of the department. Most of the energy goes into advocacy for departmental interests, rather than into policy formulation by the Board of Supervisors.

The interagency council, when performing properly, can produce significant initiatives for new interdepartmental programs. This has been the success of the council which is currently most effective(i. e. . CCJCC). It has developed integrated information systems, plans for new technology, training programs, and other criminal justice initiatives. Early on, when they are first created, these councils tend to have a large participation by the principals. Later, as the new programs get moving, the principals begin sending subordinates more and more frequently. This is now starting to happen in CCJCC. The subordinates dream up new and good ideas, but the credibility of the principals' participation is no longer behind them. If the second-tier participation stays strong enough, the group can continue to set meaningful agendas and influence priorities. This is apparently

what is happening with the Domestic Violence Council, for example. If the participation is too weak, then eventually the group becomes an information sharing network, which is what has happened with ICAN.

This is not necessarily a problem, provided only that the functions and operations are limited to that i. e. , information sharing, training, and so forth. Some coordination may even occasionally creep in. On the other hand, it must be controlled and disciplined. The proposal, to put the chairmanship in the hands of the Children's Services Department, will not be acceptable to the current chairman or anyone else in the system. In fact, the ICAN members in general would resist any attempt to reduce ICAN's level of self-governance. On such questions, the following alternatives would make sense and possibly create a vehicle for later correction:

move the funding for ICAN out of Children's Services and into a) the department of the chairman, or b) a centralized appropriation funded as a pool from assessments of all participating agencies;

encourage the elected officials on ICAN and the other representatives to elect as chairman one of the educators i. e. , the County Superintendent of Schools, or the Superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District.

Regarding the ongoing animosity between the individuals involved, it can be ignored. In fact, a whole theory of management says it should be ignored. There is little point in trying to deal with conflict by choosing sides; it will merely surface somewhere else anyway.

B. (Countywide policy formulation)

Children's Services' Commission broadens role to advising Board of Supervisors on policy for all children (as executed by all departments and programs); ICAN focuses on the [planning of] implementation of new initiatives and policies adopted by the Board. ICAN is not an implementing agency in its own right. but it is a council which was formed explicitly for the purpose of developing methods of interdepartmental coordination when several departments are involved in the same kind of program.

This is a genuine separation of function. One function is to assist the Board of Supervisors in formulating County policy as it affects children; a second function is to implement the policy when adopted by the Board. Implementation is the responsibility of public officials not of a council of public officials. However, in some instances policy can be implemented only by multiple departments. In such cases, a council composed of the constituent members of ICAN would be a reasonable way to plan. given the current county structure. Any interagency group with this function would be composed of the same member agencies.

The composition of ICAN is also close to what is necessary for coordinated implementation planning. However, the staff of ICAN is not adequate for the kinds of complex planning that would be needed. The staff would have to be augmented with different management, moved out of MacLaren Hall, and relocated organizationally (and financially) in a central staff department. That could be in the department of the CAO, subordinate to the staff of CCJCC, or in the Department of Community and Senior Citizens' Affairs, subordinate to the staff of the Domestic Violence Council. It could be in the Department of the Board of Supervisors. Since it is the ordinance responsibility of the CAO to "coordinate all departments, services, institutions or districts. . . " (2. 08. 060) and to "assist the board of supervisors in coordinating the functions and operation of the several such departments, services, institutions or departments [sic]. . . * (2. 08. 050), it seems legitimate to consider locating the staff function in the CAO. The incumbent staff, with a high level of competence in legislative work, public relations, and primary prevention programs, would fit in well in this arena.

The argument, that ICAN is composed of officials of other jurisdictions, is irrelevant here. So are CCJCC and the Domestic Violence Council.

The composition of the commission is proper for performing its role. It would be reasonable, but probably not necessary, to clarify the ordinance, particularly in the area of "review".

C. (Countywide public / private partnership)

Create a new group (possibly based on the Planning Council) of private / corporate and county officials, city officials, and school officials to create consensus in the area of children's / family policy.

Comment. This model has been employed successfully in Mann County and in other states. Inclusion of private institutions and professional in the planning process maximizes cooperation between the public and private sectors, strengthens appeals of private service providers for foundation and corporate donations, and ensures political consensus as well as managerial cooperation.

This model differs from ICAN in that private participation is significant, and from the Children's Services Commission in that the private representatives are professionals and decision makers rather than concerned citizens. Such a group would supplant a public only interagency council such as ICAN but not a citizen's advisory panel such as the Commission.

D. (Unification of interagency councils)

Create a single interagency council to link all of the standing ones Domestic Violence Council. ICAN, CCJCC. Delinquency and Crime Commission, etc.

Comment. This would effectively make a council which focuses on a particular subject area a subcommittee of the linking council. Executives who are responsible for program implementation would serve on the subordinate councils, under the direction of the elected officials and department heads who would comprise the policy group. For public relations purposes, the various councils would retain their names, and the elected officials and department heads might participate personally on ceremonial occasions or in key decisions.

E. (Unification of citizens', advisory commissions)

Merge all of the citizens' commissions affecting or advising on children's / family policy into a single body with that function.

Comment. This would provide the Board of Supervisors with a single official source of citizen policy recommendations, in which competing views could have been negotiated to the extent possible before presentation to the Board. A clear focus on policy, and a requirement to address the full range of service needs, would minimize the likelihood of the commission being an advocate for a

particular bureaucratic interest or involving itself too much in the management of policy implementation.

V Committees General

The Board of supervisors should take a few steps to make the system of committees and commissions work better. These steps should be taken regardless of any other action, and should apply to all situations in which the Board intends to work with a committee, commission, board, interdepartmental council, interagency council, or other group. They are:

1. Briefings of commissioners. Instruct the Chief Administrative Officer to prepare and deliver briefings on the overall structure and operation of county government. The briefing would be provided to each commissioner when appointed, as a matter of initiation. A second, more global briefing on the structure, operations, and current state of the County would be made available to all commissioners as a group twice a year. An alternative source for such a briefing would be the staff of the E & E Commission. The briefings would be intended to ensure that commissioners a) understand the terrain. b) comprehend the major issues the Board is confronting, and c) understand their missions within an appropriate framework.
2. Review of need. Reintroduce and implement the procedure, recommended by E & E in 1975 and adopted by the Board of Supervisors, requiring the CAO a) to review the roles and functions of any new committee or commission in terms of whether or not its intended functions could be performed by an existing group, and b) to recommend the detailed functions, composition. and method of operation of the new commission.
3. Periodic reports. Implement the recommendations of the 198687 Grand Jury regarding reporting requirements for the costs and the accomplishments of committees and commissions: a) report costs separately, and require a periodic report on activity and accomplishments.

Commentary

Any of the above alternatives would be an improvement, and could be implemented. They would increase the efficiency of the overall system, although "savings" may not be ponderable for some time. However, a few basic underlying points would have to be made explicit. They are loosely stated here.

Creating the department of Children's Services was structurally necessary. Social services do not belong in DPSS with the financial eligibility function. However, creating the new department along the lines of a constituency (clients, service providers, lobbies, professional and legislative interests, etc) fragmented the social services delivery system, which is defined functionally. That the same services, by the same kinds of professionals, are delivered to different age groups is no reason to organize them separately. In fact, all contemporary findings the research show that the unit of service delivery must be the family or the community. Not the child, not the senior citizen, and not any other age, ethnic, or special interest.

On the other hand, fragmenting the service delivery system can be productive from the political perspective. Once a separate department is in operation, it is linked to a constituency that thereby has direct and ready access to elected decision makers. That is why it is done. It is not efficient, and it is effective only in the sense that it increases political efficacy for that constituency. Those interested in senior citizens had separate department for years, and accomplished much with it. Those interested in children now believe it is their turn and They want to do the same things.

In summary, if fragmentation is the issue, it is a consequence of the political system and characteristics of the service population. Correcting it organizationally would require what contemporary social theorist have found) a unification of the service populations In ways that would accommodate various political perspectives on what is needed. There is no such thing as a non-fragmented, non-duplicative structure which is on children `s services as though they can be divorced from the other populations and conditions which have led to social disintegration. Buying the political agenda that is, that a separate structure is needed to ensure access and efficacy will only lead eventually to more fragmentation, as the

seniors, the ethnic minorities, and other subpopulations decide to create their own thing.

In fact, a structure organized purely around constituencies could be optimally efficient in the market sense. The departments of the county would be organized around specific populations age groups, gender; ethnicity, etc. Each department would be a case manager for that group. All services medical, psychological, financial, social, detention, etc (probably excepting police patrol) would be contracted out by the case managers. This model would maximize fragmentation and maximize market efficiency. It has never been done, so the potential social effects are a bit difficult to predict. But it could be done, and it would be theoretically efficient.

The point is the same one we stressed in the 1963 work. The Board will have to decide on what the overall principle of organization it wants . Item 2. above requires the development and maturation of a program management system in county government. There is no history of such a system, and no experience with it; the only place where anything resembling it is practiced is in the road department. Item 1. above requires that the Board declare an explicit intention to consolidate, regardless of any "opportunity" window. Neither of these explicit strategies has

been adopted. Items 4. and 5. above would do nothing about fragmentation, but would at least create a stronger impression, symbolic, that the Director of Children's Services is in charge of the bureaucratic policy for services affecting children.

Thus, regardless of the alternative chosen, the basic requirement will be that the Board direct the CAO to accomplish these steps and adopt these strategies, with a time limit. The reason this generally does not work is that the bureaucracy assumes that it won't stick i. e. , that the Board doesn't really mean it , or will forget about It That is why the easiest strategy is the "opportunity" strategy. It is passive one waits for opportunities, and as time goes on, the Board's interest and commitment wanes. Even now, the cost accounting systems are not in place. Interdepartmental charges are still based on marginal cost pricing rather than full cost recovery or average unit cost. DCS has an interdepartmental agreement with Mental Health: the agreement, and the issue of whether or not terms are being met, is one of the central points of contention at present; but DCS has no alternative but DMH as a provider of mental health services. The County Department Heads may believe that have worked it out, but others do not.

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

WORKING PAPER E

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

OF THE

COMMISSION SYSTEM

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF COMMISSION SYSTEM: DEFINITIONS

Introduction

In the most general sense, a commission or committee is any group organized to participate in the work of government or to influence governmental actions, comprised of people who are not elected for the governmental purpose in which the group participates. Given the complexity of today's society, people sense that voting for elected officials is not by itself sufficient to ensure that governmental actions can represent a common understanding of needs and issues. Commissions and committees provide a vehicle in which citizens can participate directly in the activities of government. Service on them is a form of voluntarism. All levels of government organize commissions and committees in a variety of different forms. In addition, it has been frequent practice in recent decades to remove particularly critical areas of operation from the direct control of the governing body of any jurisdiction. Consequently, such joint powers agencies and regional operating agencies as the Air Quality Management District, the Coastal Commission, and the Southern California Rapid Transit District have proliferated.

Alternative Forms

Commissions and committees can be formed on the initiative of a group of citizens, or on the initiative of the governing body of a jurisdiction. The composition and the structure of such groups vary widely. We recognize six general classifications:

Broadly based educational groups, organized on a voluntary membership basis (League of Women Voters, Common Cause, Heritage Foundation)

Citizens commissions appointed by the governing body (Police Commission, Economy and Efficiency Commission, Children's Services Commission)

Task forces or coordinating councils formed of representatives from numerous internal departments or interjurisdictional agencies (Countywide Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, Transportation Commission, Data Processing Task Force, Fleet Maintenance Task Force, Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect)

Groups formed as a mix of public officials, service providers, and citizens to cooperate on problem solving, a program area, or a series of tasks (Little Hoover Commission, Children's Roundtable, Judicial Procedures Commission)

Special purpose external or mixed groups formed for a single purpose (President's Task Force on Juvenile Justice, Grace Commission, Citizens' Planning Councils)

General purpose external or mixed groups formed to unify the public in a geographical area (Community Coordinating Councils).

These kinds of groups are all relevant to the governmental system in Los Angeles County and to the problems the Board of Supervisors faces in governing. They share the following characteristics

they provide a means for citizens to exercise the right to participate in government;

they generate proposals, recommendations, testimony and the like intended to influence the judgments of elected officials;

they are independent of one another, and in some cases may be structured to be independent of any single governing body;

they impose costs on government;

none has any mandate to work in an area to the exclusion of any other group.

Alternative Link to Government

A number of alternative relationships are open to the governing body of a jurisdiction and to its voluntary groups. The governing body may recognize the group formally, making it in some sense part of the public system of government. For example, the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County has established and appoints the members of at least 94 advisory committees and commissions. ¹ Such broadly based groups as Common Cause are not sanctioned in this sense: they are purely private; they are not part of government; they influence government through formal communications that originate outside

¹ Government Operations Committee, Los Angeles County Grand Jury, Los Angeles County Commissions and Committees, January, 1987.

it. Formally recognized groups vary as follows:

they may be funded or unfunded;

they may be temporary or standing;

they may be statutory or administratively authorized²

their roles may be advisory or administrative;

they may be self-governing, informal, or operate with an imposed governance; they may be comprised of appointees chosen by the elected official, appointees nominated by expert groups or professional society or appointees who volunteer or are elected to serve to represent a geographical area or a group.

Alternative Role Definitions

The law recognizes no distinctions among the various names of committees. That is, whether a formally sanctioned group is called a "commission ", a "committee ", a "council" or some thing else makes no difference in the fundamentals of its role. The fundamental is, the group is either purely advisory or administers a program within strictly defined statutory limits. Elected officials, acting in their elected capacity to exercise the

² By statutory, we mean established in the County Charter or in the laws of the State or Federal Governments. Those established by ordinance or by order of the Board of Supervisors are administrative, since they are created through the administrative authority of the Board.

public trust. make all final decisions.

Administrative Bodies. In Los Angeles County Government, administrative commissions or boards are extremely rare. They may have three roles:

the commission itself performs a function of government (Civil Service Commission, Employee Relations Commission);

the commission operates a program of governmental services, including appointment of the department head (Board of the Museum of Art);

the County government participates in a Joint Powers Agency or a regional board which operates a program of governmental services, but does not control it in the elected capacity of the Board of Supervisors (County Sanitation Districts, Transportation Commission), although it may fund it in the sense that it provides the major resources supporting it

Advisory Groups. The majority of commissions organized. sanctioned and funded by the Los Angeles County government are purely advisory. Their role is to provide information, analysis and recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. The nature of the power of such groups is the power to influence. If the Board of Supervisors acts affirmatively on their recommendations, the reason is that the majority of the Board has confidence in the judgments of the people they appoint to serve, rather than that some power to act has been delegated to the group.

This basic advisory role of commissions can be realized in a number of different ways, usually expressed by the Board in the policy statement creating or continuing the group (i. e. , the ordinance or the Board minute order). By controlling such variables

as funding, compensation. staffing, membership, and other details, the ordinance provisions can also affect the ability of the commission to carry out its mission and the level of activity the commission can realistically perform. Within that framework, County commissions vary widely with respect to the following:

Expertise. The role may be to provide the expert judgment of professionals in a field of concentration for which the commission was formed. The membership of the Productivity Commission and the Emergency Medical Care Commission includes experts in the technical fields of interest, appointed by the Board from nominations by professional societies in those fields, some of whom may include service providers in the field. (This is also true of certain administrative commissions. For example, the membership of the Employee Relations Commission consists of professionals in labor relations because the Board relies on it for judgments on matters of union security, bargaining rights, and employee organization.)

Problem Solving. The Board may establish a commission for advice from a broadly based group to assist it in solving problems or addressing issues of policy, independent of the assumptions of practitioners in the field, and independent of service providers. Such groups may have a broad mandate, such as that of the Economy and Efficiency Commission to "investigate any area of County government", or a program or department specific mandate, such as that of the Judicial Procedures Commission to "recommend. . . changes and improvements in judicial administration. . . . "or that of the Institutional Inspection Commission to ". . . visit and inspect each jail or lockup . . . and ascertain its condition as to effective and economical administration, . . . , and in any other respects. . . . ". What is common to the roles of these groups is the presumption that their recommendations, if adopted by the Board of Supervisors, will lead to change and correct a problem.

Advocacy. The Board may establish a commission for advice on how to improve conditions which are believed to be deficient by a particular group. Membership is usually limited to those who are members of the group with the problem. These commissions may act in a problem solving role, coordinate the activities of other groups influencing county activity, or develop and operate programs of their own; their

main function. however. is to advocate the interests of a particular clientele or interest group. For example. the Board charges the Commission for Women to "recommend necessary procedures. programs or legislation to promote and insure equal rights and opportunities for all women. Similarly, the Commission on Disabilities is comprised of People with disabilities and is charged to a make recommendations to the Board for improvement of policies. systems, and procedures . . . in the best interest of people with disabilities. a What is common to such groups is that they are composed exclusively of members of a clientele or constituency with a strong relationship to County government. and that they focus on problem areas peculiar to that constituency. some of which may not be under the control of the Board of Supervisors, rather than on a service production area or specific program.

Regulatory Decision Making. The Board of Supervisors may delegate certain of its decision making ("quasi-judicial") responsibilities to an advisory commission, subject to appeal to the Board or subsequent litigation by the parties. For example. the Assessment Appeals Board is charged "to hear appeals of equalization assessments". and the Engineering Geology and Soils Review and Appeals Board is charged to serve as a board of review of the adequacy of geological reports. . . .
. *. The membership of such groups is frequently limited to professional practitioners in the field of interest. and may be checked by confirmation or selection of another branch of government, or trade and professional societies. to eliminate the possibility of conflicts of interest.

Department or Program Advocacy/Liaison. The Board of Supervisors charges certain commissions with the responsibility to work with a particular department or programs of a department. For example, the Board charges the Hospital Commission to "consult with and advise the Director of Health Services and the Board of Supervisors on all matters pertaining to the patient care policies and programs of the Los Angeles County hospital system. . . . " Similarly, the Commission for Public Social Services is charged to "consult with and advise the Board of Supervisors and. the director of Public Social Services on all matters relating to the provision of Public Social Services, including but not restricted to financial assistance and social services..." What characterizes these groups is that they concentrate on a service production area or specific program of County government, rather than on a clientele or constituency.

Fund Allocation / Distribution. The Board has established several commissions to assist it in distributing certain kinds of funding among the various communities in the Country. The funds in question are usually block grants or categorical grants of a State or Federal Agency which specifies the nature of the commission which is to assist. The problem faced by the Board in these instances is to determine a need based formula for distribution of the funds while preserving equity among Supervisorial Districts and ensuring that the funds will be used for the intended purposes. Many of them are inter-jurisdictional, interagency boards whose members are public and private service providers or professional practitioners in the field or category to which the funds apply. For example, the Justice System Advisory Group is charged to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors concerning applicants to be selected to receive justice system block grant funds, assess County justice system heads, evaluate alternative programs for meeting needs. and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding needs. " The Delinquency and Crime Commission is charged with "recommendations regarding programs administered by local governmental or non-governmental organizations submitted for funding on a matching basis through the California Delinquency Prevention Commission to the Department of Youth Authority. " The Community Action Board recommends "allocation of community services block grant funds. "

Alternative Orientations.

Depending on the nature of the problems or issues to be addressed, the group whose interests are to be advocated, or the degree to which technical expertise is important in the activities of the commission, the commissions may orient themselves to the task in a variety of different ways. Any commission may change its orientation from time to time, as conditions change, or as the leadership in the group changes; the Board does not specify an orientation or a method of approach for most commissions. We classify these various kinds of approach as follows. We do not intend these to be mutually exclusive. The items in the list are more an identification of extremes on an axis of measure than mutually exclusive choices.

Measures of Focus.

Policy/Planning	<<----- >>	Implementation
Task/Problem (Temp.)	<<----->>	Role (Ongoing)
Change (Policy)	<<----->>	Management (Evaluation)
Own Initiative (External)	<<----->>	Board/Mgt. Initiative (Internal)
Service/Profession	<<----->>	Market/Constituency

Measures of Style.

Leadership	<<----->>	Reaction/Passivity
Acceptance/Support	<<----->>	Criticism/Confrontation
Media Exposure	<<----->>	Confidentiality
Research	<<----->>	Opinion/Feeling
Formal Reports	<<----->>	Informal/No Comment

Sources of Cost.

We noted above that all groups, even those organized completely externally, impose a cost on government. The minimal cost is an indirect cost: that is, the cost of information. County and other paid officials perform work to supply the commission with information or to respond to commission recommendations. In addition, commissions organized by the County impose direct and indirect costs associated with performing the work the County asks of them.

When considering the measurement of costs, one can focus on incremental costs, or on total/actual costs. Incremental costs are those amounts, usually budgeted in accounts that can be traced to the commission, which the County spends, solely as a

result of the commission's activity, in addition to its regular, ongoing expenses. For example, commissioner compensation is an incremental cost. Measures of incremental cost exclude amounts for services and supplies that would be spent regardless of the commission. For example, they would exclude the costs of the attendance of county officials at commission meetings, since the salaries of the officials would be paid regardless of whether they attend such meetings. The County can usually compute incremental costs from the budgetary records it keeps. The Grand Jury reported \$4.9 million budgeted incremental costs for fiscal year 198687. Since budgeted funds need not be spent, the amount does not measure actual incremental costs. It is, however, an accurate indicator of the magnitude of such Costs.

Measures of total cost include all amounts attributable to commission activity. They include the cost of space, the cost of work performed for the commission by staff or by county officials, and all indirect costs of maintenance, management, and administration. The county does not typically keep records of total costs attributable to a commission's activity. Employees do not generally keep detailed records of how they spend their time, and the indirect administrative costs attributable to commission activity are not recorded in separate accounts. Consequently, the total costs of a commission must be estimated. The most recent documented attempt to do so for all county

commissions was accomplished by the Grand Jury in 1967. At that time, the number of Board commissions was 88, and the estimated total cost was \$ 1. 7 million.

The paragraphs below define each source of cost attributable to the operations of a commission.

Commissioner Compensation. The County frequently compensates members of commissions for the time and expense of their service. The form of compensation is a stipend a fixed amount to be paid per meeting attended by the commissioner. Stipends range from \$25 to \$250 per meeting. The total amount is budgeted as a direct expense. based on the number of commissioners and the maximum number of meetings specified in the ordinance creating the commission.

Commissioner Expenses. In a few cases, the County provides means for commissioners to recover travel expenses associated with their work for the County. When the work of the commission requires extensive local travel, the County may supply a car and driver for commissioner use.

Staffing. The County provides staff services for commissions in a variety of forms. At a minimum some County employee prepares and distributes meeting agendas, notices, minutes, and other clerical or logistical support. Staffing ranges from this minimum to, in some instances, professional and technical workers assigned full time to the commission. In most cases, the staffing of a commission is added to the regular duties of an employee, so the costs must be estimated. When the County provides dedicated staff to a commission, the cost can be measured directly from budgetary document.

Space, Services and Supplies. All commissions use County space. They conduct meetings and other business in facilities maintained by the County. This basic, minimal cost cannot be measured directly from County records, and must be estimated. The County allocates permanent office space to a few commissions. In these cases, the costs attributable to the space can be estimated using County averages and allocation rules. All commissions also use such basic supplies as letterhead stationery and business cards supplied by the County. The County may also fund specialized technical or professional services of outside contractors for commission projects.

Meeting Attendance. Meetings are part of the nature of the participation expected of commissioners. Depending on the expectation that actions of the commission may affect them, on the need to respond to demands for information by the commission, or on the wish to supply testimony or other information to the commission, county employees and the employees of private firms paid by the County to provide a service relevant to the commission's work attend commission meetings. This is a cost. Someone else must be performing the work that would otherwise be performed by such employees, or the work is being neglected, or it is performed by the employee in overtime. Since the County keeps no detailed records of how employees spend their time, this cost cannot be measured from budgetary or accounting records. It must be estimated.

Response to Inquiries. The only reasonable source of information regarding a government's operations is the government itself. Commissions need information about the subjects relevant to their responsibilities; they cannot function without it. Therefore, someone must perform work to respond to commission inquiries. The time spent on that work is a cost. In addition, the commission may question the information supplied, wish to obtain more detail, or wish to recognize the contributions of those who did the work. In all such cases, the employees who did the work must spend additional time. These costs are typically not recorded, and must be estimated from the recollection of the people involved.

Response to / Defense from Initiatives. The output of a commission is a recommendation. It may be documented, in a report, or stated in a letter or other communication, but it is not a final action. Only the Board of Supervisors (or the governing body of some other jurisdiction) can take the final action to adopt the recommendation and order employees to implement it. In the case that affected employees disagree, they spend time in preparing replies and organizing resistance. In the case that they agree, they spend time documenting their agreement and organizing support. The costs of this time, which is generally assumed to be part of the job of a public official, are not recorded anywhere, and must be estimated from the recollection of those involved.

Summary

County government provides for extensive citizen participation through its formal commission system, in addition to its recognition of outside groups organized to interact with local government.

We distinguish commissions from one another in the following:

<u>Form</u>	Broadly based/special interest; citizen/expert; self-organized/officially created; single geographic area/Countywide.
<u>Link</u>	Funded/unfunded; temporary/standing; statutory/administrative; advisory/administering; self/directed governance; appointed/nominated/ elected
<u>Role</u>	Single task/ongoing role; administrative (function. operation. participation) / advisory (ex pert. problem solving. advocacy. regulation. departmental. funding. other).
<u>Orientation</u>	Policy/implementation. task/role. change/ management, service/market. external/internal
<u>Style</u>	Support/criticism; research/opinion; media/ confidentiality; leadership/passivity; formal/ informal input.
<u>Costs</u>	Compensated/uncompensated. incremental/total (commissioner expense, staffing. space. services and supplies. meeting attendance. response to inquiries, response to recommendations)

In subsequent sections, we apply this scheme to the commissions established to work on children's issues.

COMMISSION RELATED ISSUES

Background

The use, and particularly the proliferation, of commissions in local government has always been controversial. Purists in public administration hold one extreme view. Purists in participative democratic governance hold the other. The tension between the two stabilizes the system; at the same time, it creates administrative problems.

Public administrators neither need nor want commissions. The public elects officials to determine policy and define the activities of government. In turn, the elected officials hire administrators experts and professionals in the field to carry out the policy. The public has ample opportunity to express its displeasure at the next election. In extreme cases, recalls, petitions, lawsuits, and initiatives are available. What business would appoint 94 freestanding associations to second guess its managers? Better to replace the managers. Certainly the Constitutional right of free association and the right to petition the government permit unlimited formation of such groups, but this does not mean that they have a call on the resources of the government. Some citizens' commissions are useful if they act as lobbies for bureaucratic or professional interests, and if they are kept to a minimum.

Many County departmental professionals believe that commissions are helpful adjuncts to the political system, when they assist the technical people with political problems or the Board with problems it cannot reasonably resolve unilaterally. That is, the commission is to be a "buffer" for the Board to buy time on some issue, or is to advocate and assist a departmental (or union) point of view on an issue by supplying public relations or information on the question. Alternatively, the commission is viewed as a lobby for a special interest group or a group of service providers, when it is not a lobby for county officials. This peculiarly bureaucratic view of commissions cannot be found in the formal ordinances and Minute orders of the Board, so we can cite no examples. It does, nonetheless, represent a widely held, albeit cynical, view of those commissions which are composed primarily of representatives of a particular service, such as the Hospital Commission (doctors) or the Judicial Procedures Commission (lawyers).

Similarly, there is no need for special efforts to coordinate. The elected governing board appoints each department head for specific purposes, and appoints the Chief Administrative Officer to "coordinate the administration of all departments, services, institutions or districts under his supervision" and to "plan, coordinate, set priorities, and monitor all data

processing functions in the county. ³

At the other extreme, citizens know that they must exercise direct participation in the affairs of government to preserve basic freedoms in a vehemently individualistic society. The basic points were made by Alexis de Tocqueville in 1835:

"It is difficult to draw a man out of his own circle to interest him in the destiny of the state, because he does not clearly understand what influence the destiny of the state can have upon his own lot. But if it is proposed to make a road cross the end of his estate, he will see at a glance that there is a connection between this small public affair and his greatest private affairs: and he will discover, without its being shown to him, the close tie that unites private to general interest. Thus far more may be done by entrusting to the citizens the administration of minor affairs than by surrendering to them in the control of important ones. towards interesting them in the public welfare and convincing them that they constantly stand in need of one another in order to provide for it. . . . Local freedom, then, which leads a great number of citizens to value the affection of their neighbors and of their kindred, perpetually brings men together and forces them to help one another in spite of the propensities that sever them. "⁴

In democracies, . . . the sovereign power is not only supreme, but universally present. The American functionaries are, in fact, much more free in the sphere of action which

³ County Code, 2. 08. 060 and 2, 08. 080

⁴ Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, edited by Phillips Bradley, Vintage, New York, 1958, Volume 2, 111.

the law traces out for them than any public officer in Europe. Very frequently the object which they are to accomplish is simply pointed out to them, and the choice of the means is left to their own discretion. "⁵

According to this view, continuing, persistent and on going participation in the affairs of local government is necessary to preserve freedom in our vehemently individualistic society. Therefore, the more commissions the better. Everyone adds something to the general melee, and the election of the officers who make the final decisions prevents any single perspective from dominating for too long. Monopoly is no better in government than in private markets. The technocratic lock on the provision of public services must be checked by constant, probing challenge by citizens.

Organizations of professionals to coordinate their functions with those of other agencies and other jurisdictions are also necessary. The county Board of Supervisors has little or no influence over the actions of the 85 cities, 94 school districts, and 600 independent special districts in the County. In fact, the reverse is true. Other units of government can have significant influence over the county by effective lobbying of the State government, which controls most county policy. Internally,

⁵ *ibid.* . Volume 1, 217.

the CAO never has coordinated and does not now. The CAO has no efficacious power to discipline department heads, and cannot coordinate their activities without it.

In summary, one extreme view of local political and administrative systems would keep citizen participation in the commission form to a minimum. Elected officials set policy and hire people to carry them out. The control is in the vote. If commissions cannot be eliminated, they should be co-opted. A contrasting extreme view is that commissions provide the only effective means to keep the power of government under control and to ensure an informed and interested electorate for voting.

Issues

Since commissions can form for any purpose. and since it is essentially an act of citizens rather than of professional service providers, there are few controls on proliferation and continuation of their operations. Consequently, commissions may become duplicative or redundant, may fragment a service system, or may become a nonproductive source of cost. We define the various issues below.

Duplication We define duplication as performing the same work for the same constituency or clientele. Commissions can be duplicative for several reasons. First, such advocacy commissions as the Commission for Women may duplicate the work of such problem solving or departmental commissions as the Commission on Aids and the Hospital Commission, since some women suffer from AIDS, and others are served in county hospitals. The work may be duplicative, and the resulting recommendations to the Board of Supervisors may conflict. The same is true in any areas where advocacy for a constituency crosses several departmental or service program lines veterans who are disabled, children with AIDS, communicable

diseases in schools, and so forth. Second, Commissions may be duplicative because they address the same issues related to the same problem area that is, have identical missions. For example, the Grand Jury pointed out that the missions of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography and the Task Force to Curb Pornography seem to overlap.

Fragmentation. We define fragmentation as working on the same issues related to different groups, or working on different issues for the same group. For example, the Department of Health Services has six active commissions. In a sense, they fragment the unified approach to a single departmental mission. Similarly, the categorical financing system for many county operations' tends to create multiple groups, many with nearly identical memberships, to perform similar fund distribution functions. For example, the Justice System Advisory Group, the Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect, and the Delinquency and Crime Commission allocate funds for similar kinds of purposes, with subtle categorical differences originating with the funding agencies. This fragments the county's system of service programs, particularly since they may all use slightly different allocation formulas.

Permanence. Commissions may continue in operation long after the social or governmental purpose for which they were created has faded into oblivion. This applies especially to commissions created to address a specific problem or timely issue on which the Board of Supervisors has little information; it may apply to commissions established to create a program or to monitor the effectiveness of an existing program. The problem is severe for commissions with assigned staff, since the staff has an economic interest in continuing the work of the commission.

Efficiency. Commissions may be a necessary element of local government, and they may be a desirable means of providing information and analysis that the government could not obtain in any other way. However, they are one of the least efficient means available to perform work. Without staff, the commission must obtain information by the use of hearings, in public according to California law. Commissioners must then review, summarize and analyze the information on their own time, regardless of any business or personal responsibilities. The commission must meet in public session to develop its formulation of a position and to work towards a consensus, and must then communicate its findings to the Board of Supervisors. If there are objections by those Affected, the commission must perform further work to respond. With staff, the work of the commissioners themselves may become more efficient, since they no longer are required to spend significant amounts of time on details of data

gathering and review; the process of the group is no more efficient. since the staff must perform the work anyway. Most commissions are working in areas that require information that is not available in a suitable form from the government. Someone must perform work to obtain and report the information. Inefficiency is built into the system: the government will not produce this work itself, and will not provide the kinds of resources needed to produce it efficiently.

Cost. The issue of cost is a significant one. Just the direct budgeted costs of commissions studied by the Grand Jury amounted to \$4. 9 million in 198687. The real costs are orders of magnitude higher.

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

WORKING PAPER F

ROLES RESPONSIBILITIES

OF

CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMISSION

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMISSION

This section contains a review of the roles and responsibilities of the Children's Services Commission. First, we present a brief discussion of the commission's activities and accomplishments for each role specified in the ordinance. Second, we present a detailed description of the status of each of the 1984 recommendations of the Children's Services Task Force. The significance of the task force recommendations is that the Board assigned the commission the specific responsibility to monitor their implementation.

1. "Review all programs administered by County departments which provide children's services for all children at risk. "

Since the commission is advisory, the use of the word "review" here is to be taken as 'to study' , or 'to survey' or "to examine or inspect". That is, it is an information gathering function. In government, however, the word carries the additional connotation that links it to judicial decisions: it connotes evaluation, as in judicial review, and carries the possibility of a reversal of a subordinate's decisions (such as that of allover court). It is thus a source of confusion in the ordinance. It specifies a role which can be interpreted improperly to subordinate a public official's decisions to the commission.

The term "all programs administered by County departments" is appropriate for a commission appointed by the Board of Supervisors and created to inform and advise the Board on policy

questions. The system of services to children is delivered through numerous County, city and school district agencies. The Board, however, has jurisdiction only over those delivered by the County. Therefore, the Commission's subject area should cover all programs administered by County officials. The word administered is appropriate. The County provides services principally as defined by the State government: it does not have unilateral control over policy; rather, it administered programs whose main elements are defined elsewhere.

The term, 'for all children at risk' is, on the other hand, another source of confusion. 'Children at risk' is a term of art in social services, defined in law. It refers to children who are, or who should be, under the protection of the County, and to children whose circumstances lead public officials to believe that they soon will be under the protection of the County. That leaves out a large number of children, who may or may not be in contact with some County agency at some time. It excludes runaways, dropouts, chronic truants, and all children who are exposed to the lure of alcohol, drugs, pornography, or delinquent behavior. That is, it excludes populations of children who are not recognized explicitly in the current laws, but who are, in any reasonable nontechnical interpretation, at risk.

Throughout its history, the Commission has struggled with the issues brought up by this section of the ordinance. Many County departments believe that the commission's role is and

should be specifically focused on the programs of the Department of Children's Services that is, the County's protective services for children. Indeed, the Commission has concentrated most of its effort on the Department of Children's Services. But many of the commissioners believe the focus should be on all children. Thus, the commission has accepted the responsibility of monitoring and reporting to the Board on the County's childcare programs. Recently, the commission has turned to a focus on the Departments of Mental Health and Probation, in cooperation with the departmental commissions associated with those departments. So far, however, the commission has not concentrated efforts on the overall condition and welfare of all children, even though the commissioners told us that their area of concern includes children who are overlooked by the system.

The task force concludes that the ordinance is a source of confusion in the specification of a responsibility 'to review' and in the definition of its area of focus as 'children at risk'. We believe it would be better to identify this role, which is intended to define the scope of the commission's responsibilities, to

"recommend Board policy regarding all matters which affect children and youth"

That is, by eliminating the use of the word 'review', our proposal will eliminate confusion created by its connotation of subordination of public officials' decisions. By specifying 'children and youth'. our proposal will clarify the scope as referring to all children in the County. 'Board policy regarding

all matters' includes all programs of all departments, but also includes the broader issues that cross departmental lines, and issues that may not now be addressed by any department.

2. "receive input from appropriate community groups and individuals concerning County administered children's services programs. "

To the extent to which this refers to the responsibility of the Commission to seek out and obtain information, it is unnecessary as an ordinance provision. Any commission can receive information. Commissions must receive information in order to, do their jobs properly.

However, the presence of the word 'individuals' has also introduced the possibility of the commission actively intervening in the appeals and petitions of individuals whose cases are in the charge of the Court, of the Department of Children's Services, or of some other public official. While there is apparently no legal obstacle to the commission receiving such information, which is supplied voluntarily by those involved in the case, the practice creates distortions in the system of accountability of public officials:

it creates a presumption that the commission is competent to do something about a case that it hears, while the commission has no such authority, and cannot.

it makes certain cases those brought by parties who know of the commission's interest in and activities on individual cases a higher priority for public officials who must respond to the commission.

it creates an expectation on the part of those interested in the case that the commission's judgments will prevail, when the commission can be overruled by

numerous elected or appointed officials.

The task force concludes that this provision of the ordinance is unnecessary and a potential source of trouble. We believe that the commission should minimize its involvement in individual cases, and gradually phase it out. The Department of Children's Services has, or should have, adequate case processing procedures. If it does not, then it would be valuable for the Commission to evaluate the procedures and recommend changes to the Board of Supervisors. Therefore, we believe this provision of the ordinance should be eliminated.

3. "Review and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors concerning legislation dealing with children's services. "

Except for the use of the word `review', this is exactly what the commission can and should focus on, since it is one of the most effective means available to the Board of Supervisors to influence policy as it relates to children and their families.

4. "Make recommendations, as necessary, to various department heads to improve children's services. "

The most effective role for a citizens' commission is to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. If the Board chooses to adopt the recommendations, then the effect is that the Department heads will implement them. The Board can act to ask the commission to continue its involvement by monitoring implementation and reporting to the Board. Without the Board, however, the commission has no means to ensure the efficacy of any recommendation it makes.

5. "Make recommendations, as necessary, to the Board of Supervisors to improve children's services. "

The Board is the most appropriate client for the commission; recommendations addressed to the Board, if adopted, can be enforced and implemented. However, the commission may find that it wishes to recommend changes that have little or nothing to do with services, at least in the current service system. Therefore, we believe the focus should be 'policy' rather than 'services'. It is broader than current services, without excluding services or service delivery systems. In addition, we believe that the commission should concentrate on any issues or problem areas for which the Board wants current recommendations. That is, it should be able to take up issues on its own initiative or on the request of the Board.

6. "Provide an annual report to the Board of Supervisors concerning the status of children's services, along with recommendations for their improvement, to be utilized for broad community distribution and discussion. "

We believe that the commission should continue to provide an annual report. As we have stressed, however, the issues are not confined to 'services'. We believe that the report should be strategic in scope and content. Therefore, we propose that it cover the state of children in the county as well as an analysis of the commissions recommendations regarding services.

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

WORKING PAPER G

CHILDREN'S SERVICES TASK FORCE

CHILDREN'S SERVICES TASK FORCE

One role of the Children's Services Commission is defined by ordinance as follows:

The Commission shall have the authority to monitor and evaluate progress in the implementation of Task Force recommendations adopted by the Board of Supervisors for improving the delivery of children's services and when necessary recommend modification of procedures to ensure compliance with the adopted recommendations. Also, the Commission shall report to the Board of Supervisors no less frequently than every three months for the first eighteen months of implementation. Thereafter, the Commission shall report to the Board of Supervisors every six months until implementation is complete. " (County Code 3. 68).

This contains a review of the task force, its recommendations, and the current status of its recommendations. We have added the emphasis where shown.

Children's Services Task Force

The Board of Supervisors created the Children's Services Task Force on June 14, 1983. In its action (Minute Order 81). the Board did the following in relation to the provision of services to abused and neglected children (this is paraphrased in places):

1. Instructed the CAO to study the following with the Directors of Public Social Services, Adoptions, and the Chief Probation Officer:

creation of a separate children's services department and a children's services Commission, the department to be responsible for child abuse and neglect, runaways, foster care placement, adoptions. and any other appropriate children's services.

establishment of a stronger organizational structure for the services now provided by the Probation, Adoptions, and Public Social Services Departments

consolidation of the services provided by the Probation. Adoptions, and Public Social Services Departments into one of the three existing departments.

2. Instructed the CAO to initiate the formation of a Children's Services Task Force to study the above alternatives and make recommendations to the Board relative to feasibility, cost and legislation needed to implement task force recommendations. The task force would consist of:

- representative from each Board office
- two representatives from DPSS
- one from Adoptions
- one from Probation
- one from the CAO
- one from the Sheriff (Child Abuse Detail)
- one from the DA (Child Abuse Section)
- one from the Superintendent of Schools
- five from community based organizations

3. continued various budget issues related to implementation of SB 14 in DPSS
4. instructed County Counsel, CAO, and Director, DPSS to report on the effects of SB 14 and propose amendments to reduce county cost and allow children's services workers to spend the maximum amount of time helping child abuse victims.

The task force presented its 49 recommendations to the Board in March, 1984. The recommendations addressed financial, operational, and legislative issues. On the structural question, a minority of the task force members proposed that the Board create a new department and a children's services commission. The Board adopted that recommendation, and the recommendations of the task force as well.

The table on the next pages lists the various recommendations, current status, and suggested ongoing work for the Children's Services or other County Department, the commission, ICAN, or other group. The recommendations are paraphrased in the table.

Basically, the task force recommendations, adopted by the Board in 1984, either have been, or are in the process of being implemented. For those that are not, the reasons are likely to be profound that is, they either have been found to be wrong, or would be impossible, or would require legislative changes that have been proposed unsuccessfully.

Implementing recommendations is a task for public officials, not for citizens' advisory commissions. The role of monitoring implementation is reasonable for citizens' commissions, but there comes a point when it is no longer reasonable to monitor. The recommendations need to be reviewed, restated, or changed,

or discarded after that point is reached. That point has been reached in this case. Therefore, in the table, we assume that the following is generally true:

1. ICAN is an appropriate organization for cleaning up any remaining interdepartmental implementation that needs to be attended to
2. The Children's Services Commission is an appropriate organization for restating, revising, or otherwise studying recommendations that have not been or could not be implemented
3. The Department of Children's Services is the appropriate organization for implementation of any recommendations which would affect the population of protected children and their families.

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

**CONTINUATION OF WORK TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS
of the 1984 task Force on children's Services.**

Following is an identification of the 1984 Task Force recommendations that should be referred to the Commission for Children for continuing monitoring, or to ICAN for implementation planning. The remaining recommendations have either been implemented or represent a managerial function that belongs with the departments, we paraphrase the 1984 recommendations. The comment, when provided, states our reasons for the referral we suggest.

Refer to the Commission for Children

7. Establish ongoing in service training as a requirement.

Comment. Training tends not to be a high priority. Some vigilance in maintaining such programs is needed.

12. Expand foster home recruitment

Comment. The policy question is the balance between the use of alternative resources. The Little Hoover Commission stressed that foster homes are to be favored because they are the least costly. However, many authorities promote significant increases in the amounts paid to foster homes and state that the issue is one of the reasons for unsuccessful recruitment. This recommendation presumes a policy decision and may be wrong. Thus it belongs with the commission. Implementation of recruitment programs, of course, would be a departmental responsibility.

14. **Use professional assessment to match child's needs with foster home capability; continue supervision.**

Comment. The commission would be a good resource to establish matching criteria.

19. **Open the Children's Services system to all at risk children, including runaways, chronic truants, and other status offenders. Increase funding to cover.**

Comment. The problem with status offenders is statutory. The failure of current policy to address the problems of runaways and other status offenders is one of the most tragic in the present set up. The commission could help develop new policy and programs.

20. **Appoint an interdepartmental public and private task force to study the problem of status offenders.**

Comment. Ditto

21. **Examine the legal status of status offenders for a potential shift to dependency.**

Comment. Ditto.

34. Study regionalization of the Dependency Court.

Comment. The Superior Court has jurisdiction here however; several issues would be good material for the commission. In particular, the central question is whether all the juvenile and family divisions of the court should be merged into a Family Court; there are probably other questions. This recommendation is limiting

because of its focus on facilities. What about other forms of decentralization? Roving judges? Space for judicial officers in group home facilities? Mediation programs?

38. Amend the statutes to shift the burden of proof regarding termination of a case from the County to the parent or guardian.

Comment. This is clearly an issue of public Policy. constitutional in scope. The commission is the best place for it.

47. Establish decentralized service delivery models.

Comment. The nature and degree of decentralization are still major policy issues, ideal for the commission.

Refer to ICAN

11. Define unmet service needs for replacement and family support services, including contracted services, by strengthening collaboration between public and private agencies.

Comment. The place for this is the multijurisdictional system. where there are resources to address it. ICAN has specialized in prevention programs and in family support programs, and would be a good resource for implementation.

15. Develop foster parent training progress. Assign staff to work with foster parents to design ongoing training which must be successfully completed.

Comment. ICAN is the kind of board that can implement this kind of standard across all jurisdictions. ICAN has specialized in training programs, includes the schools. which are a resource, and has the officials who can mediate the question of whether it is feasible to make the training mandatory.

25. Establish a countywide central registry of child abuse cases (also should include neglect cases)

Comment. The data sharing operation of ICAN should be developed into an SPU for information systems; it would then implement this recommendation.

26. Establish a special interdepartmental committee to decide preliminary systems design issues for the registry.

Comment. ICAN already is such a committee.

27. Ask corporate givers to contribute technical assistance and equipment for the registry.

Comment. ICAN Associates is the kind of philanthropic association that can accomplish this, in coordination with ICAN's SPU.

28. Increase public/private collaboration, including planning, on administrative and line levels, with joint training.

Comment. This is an ICAN function, especially in its network operation.

30. **Pursue vertical case handling by attorneys and judicial officer.**

Comment. All the support departments would be involved.

35. **Strengthen collaboration between the court and others, including the organization of an annual conference.**

Comment. This is the purpose for which ICAN was formed.

36. **Codify practice of taking child's testimony in chambers in the absence of parents.**

Comment. Actually accomplishing this would require collaboration of many agencies of many jurisdictions.

42. **Amend statutes to permit child testimony in chambers.**

Comment. Ditto.

WORKING PAPER H

MULTIJURISDICTIONAL INTERAGENCY COUNCILS: ICAN

CSPS

OTHERS

INTERAGENCY COUNCIL FOR CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT (ICAN)

This contains a discussion of the roles and responsibilities. of ICAN as refined in the current ordinance. The Board of Supervisors created ICAN in February, 1977. Prior to Board action, County department and other agency heads had been meeting in a similar forum, for purposes of coordinating their functions.

Structure

The acronym, ICAN, has been used by those we interviewed to refer to three distinct components of ICAN. Although they are all part of the same organization, which is a multi-jurisdictional coalition of agencies which have compelling interest in and responsibility for child abuse and neglect; the three operate with some independence. The staff provides an integrative function. In addition, the staffs of County departments provide support in the form of information, advice, and integration. The three components are:

- ICAN: the council of agency heads

- ICAN OPERATIONS: a network of people who are employed by the member agencies to perform specific administrative functions

- ICAN STAFF: three people who are employed by the County Department of Children's Services to provide staff support to the council and the network.

ICAN is a committee. It is not a service producing agency. It performs no public function. In itself, as a committee, it, has no authority or power whatsoever. On the other hand, as a group of agency heads, ICAN represents the highest available level in the community of local and State government people with coalesced authority, power, and influence. In the models developed by the organizational development specialist, Ichak Adizes, it forms a participative organizational conduit with access to maximum authority, power, and influence to implement agency actions which put policy or problem solving initiatives into effect. ¹ Similarly, the people who participate in the operations network level of ICAN, who are the agency people who specialize in children's programs, have the authority, power and influence to carry out joint decisions at their levels, given the approval of their agencies' heads.

It is important to recognize that the three components are not distinct for any formal or formally recognized reason. They should be recognized as distinct for two reasons.

First, when people refer to ICAN, they may be referring to any one of the three. It was extremely rare in our experience to hear anyone using the term, ICAN, to refer to two or all of the three components. Most use the term to refer to the staff. Some use it to refer to the Operations network. A few use it to

¹ Ichak Adizes, Ph. D. , How to Solve the Mismanagement Crisis, Adizes Institute, 1985,

refer to the Board created council of agency heads. People perceive ICAN as three independent components. This situation is one of the major sources of confusion in the policy formulation process as it is understood by members of the Children's Services Commission, public officials, and private service providers.

Second, ICAN functions as three somewhat independent components, linked and integrated to some extent by the staff, but not necessarily linked in any formally recognized hierarchy. In fact, a hierarchy would be impossible. People in governmental agencies work for the agencies which employ and pay them to perform their professional work. Their participation in such councils as ICAN is voluntary. No action that ICAN takes can compel any of its member agencies to do anything at all. For example, for ICAN to adopt a standardized assessment or reporting instrument is not sufficient to compel the Los Angeles Unified School District, or any of its employees, to use the instrument. The District may choose, to do so, voluntarily. When it does, it is an action of the District, not of ICAN. If all police departments in the County adopt a uniform standard for recognition of and action on child neglect and abuse, they do so not because ICAN has adopted it, even with the Sheriff as the Chairman; they do so voluntarily, as independent agencies of government.

The development and promulgation of such standards for adoption by public agencies is one of the strengths of ICAN. operating as a network, but it is not a function of the council created

by the Board of Supervisors. The council, when in session as a formal coalition of agency heads, can obtain the concurrence of the member agencies. The concurrence. However, is collegial. It is not hierarchical. Each agency head must still go back to his or her agency and implement the decision to which he or she concurred in ICAN session. The person who will accomplish the implementation on behalf of the agency for which he or she works is likely to be the same one who represents the agency on the ICAN operations network. Therefore, while the three components of ICAN are linked because of identification with the same organization, the relationships among them are not in any sense hierarchical. They are voluntary and collegial.

Neither the council nor the operations network perform work. They function as committees. They hold meetings, talk, agree on actions, and so forth. The work that results from the deliberations of the various committees is performed by

ICAN staff, employed by the Department of Children's Services

the staffs of member agencies

To facilitate work, subgroups of people who participate in the operations network form a variety of subcommittees. Those staffed by the ICAN staff include the following:

Training

Information Sharing

Fund distribution

Death Review

Problem Solving

Legislation (Legal Issues)

Drug, Alcohol Abuse Neonates

Such subcommittees may be formed from time to time. conclude a task, and be disbanded; or they may be ongoing. Those listed are currently active. The staff work is done by the ICAN staff or by the staffs of the member agencies.

In addition, ICAN tends to influence the creation of "spin off" subcommittees of various departments or agencies. We believe that many of the 25 multi departmental committees that we identified (following the Children's Roundtable's initial inventory) are spin offs of the ICAN operations network. That is, while such committees may have been formed in any event committees like them are not uncommon in government the activities of the operations network guarantee that the departmental people who should be participating in each of them know one another and have already established a basis for communication and cooperation.

Formal Roles

What follows is a discussion of each of the duties identified in the ordinance as the duties of ICAN. The ordinance identifies the membership by position. as the heads of the member agencies. Thus, it does not refer explicitly to the operations network or to the staff.

1. To provide a forum for interagency communication and coordination of services for the protection of children throughout Los Angeles County.

Communications. The Council provides an effective forum for interagency communications. That is, the agencies exchange

information about their various activities as they affect children, and they do so in sessions at which all or most of the members are present. When meeting in formal session, as a council, the members may vote to adopt a standard or to ask for action on the part of the member agencies; they may vote to organize and fund a new program.

However, such sessions of the council of agency heads take place at most once or twice a year. The most significant and active information exchange function is concentrated in the activities of the operations network, which meets monthly. The reason is simple enough. The agency heads who comprise the membership of the Council are responsible, either as elected officials or as officials appointed directly by elected officials, for major local government operations with budgets of hundreds of millions of dollars. Their actions in discharging their responsibilities affect children. They also affect everyone else. For most such agencies, children are part of the responsibility, frequently a small part.

Most of those who comprise the membership of the operations network, on the other hand, are directly responsible for children, particularly neglected and abused children. At a minimum, they have been assigned by the agency head to perform the communication functions called for by membership in ICAN. In any event, they all have a much more direct, and much more compelling professional interest in the communications role of ICAN as defined in the ordinance, but are not specified in the ordinance as participants.

Services for the Protection of Children. The people in ICAN represent service producing agencies of government. Thus, the content of what they communicate about is services. However, the services of the various member agencies are not necessarily limited to protective services for children, in the sense in which protective services are defined by law. The Director of Children's Services is the only official who is responsible for services which are defined as protective; other agencies are part of the protective services system, but have no primary role of protection; some member agencies are not parts of the protective services delivery system. but protect children in the same intuitive, informal sense that anyone does. Indeed, the focus needs to be on all children, even though the title of ICAN specifies abused and neglected children. It is appropriate for such agency heads as the Public Librarian and the Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation to be members because they are potential resources for services that are not necessarily currently provided. for children who are not necessarily protected by government, but who may be served in new and better ways by government. It is also appropriate to consider them as essential resources in any comprehensive prevention program.

Those agencies which are headed by elected officials. who are members of ICAN. also formulate policy within the framework of State and Federal law and the County or City Charter. Some agencies, however, do not formulate policy. They are appointed by the County Board of Supervisors or another Board, for which they implement or may interpret policy. They do not formulate

policy or control it. Thus, the identification of the ICAN(Council level) as a 'Policy Committee' in the descriptions of ICAN and its role is inappropriate.

Coordination. Coordination of Services is also specified in the ordinance as a role of ICAN. Coordination is not a function of any committee. Coordination is a responsibility of the service producing agencies. It may be bilateral or conducted by a subgroup of the interested agencies, but it is an action role that is not suited to a committee. The communications role is important to the extent that it facilitates bilateral or other coordination among agencies. For example, the Superior Court is currently planning development of new Dependency Court facilities. To do so. it must coordinate with the Chief Administrative Office. For budgeting and capital projects planning. and with the Internal Services Agency of the CAO for technical support. ICAN is not directly involved in that coordination effort, and is not needed. Nevertheless, ICAN provides an effective forum to ensure that all those who may have a professional or agency interest in the development effort are informed of the details and the status.

In addition. the subcommittees (information sharing. etc.)are a consequence of the coordination role of ICAN. While the council would not be necessary for their creation, it facilitates the participation of member agencies. Moreover, the kinds of new programs, protocols, and resources that result from subcommittee work are the most feasible form of coordination among independent agencies. While ICAN does not and cannot perform

coordination, it does act as a forum that generates coordinated programs and projects.

Therefore, we conclude that the central role of ICAN is that it provides a multijurisdictional forum for communications to facilitate coordination among agencies providing services for children throughout Los Angeles County.

2. "To facilitate training of professionals in the identification, prevention, and treatment of child abuse and neglect. "

Interdisciplinary, multijurisdictional training has been one of the major successful efforts of ICAN. Training is work. It is not done by committee; it is done by staff. It costs money. and must be budgeted for and planned by the participating agencies. As a council, ICAN facilitates training in the same way as it facilitates any other joint activity of the various agencies, by adopting a program collegially. and by obtaining the voluntary participation of each member agency. The work on training is controlled primarily by the Training Subcommittee. it is staffed by the members of the subcommittee and the ICAN staff.

3. "To develop recommendations for new and improved services to families and victims of child abuse and neglect. "

Anyone can develop recommendations. The ordinance provision does not specify to whom the recommendations are directed, or their source. As a formal role of the Council of agency heads, it is unnecessary. They are developing recommendations to them selves. if it is a role of staff, it should be identified as such in the job description for the staff. This provision

should be excised from the ordinance and placed in the job description for the staff.

4. "To facilitate implementation of child abuse programs throughout Los Angeles County. "

Because of its nature as a college of agency heads, supported by the operations network of specialists, ICAN is in an ideal position to facilitate the implementation of programs. This is the role in which it can be most effective, since it comprises, at the council level, those with sufficient authority and power to cause implementation to occur in each of the agencies affecting children. It is also the role in which ICAN has a demonstrated record of performance. Through its collegial functioning, ICAN has obtained the concurrence of member agencies in the use of assessment standards, training programs, and prevention programs, and it has fostered heightened attention to the problems of child neglect or abuse among governmental professionals.

5. "To increase public awareness of the problems of child abuse and neglect and resources available for intervention and treatment. "

Although ICAN is not alone in this effort, it has been effective in increasing the exposure of child neglect and abuse problems in the media. For example, ICAN's Death Review Subcommittee was recently the primary subject of a television news series. Similarly, ICAN was instrumental in obtaining support for the development of new instructional media for parents regarding the problems of substance abuse among children, sponsored by the Attorney General. The problems are serious enough to justify as many active players as possible in increasing public awareness and resources. Thus, although this represents a duplication of efforts and functions that are also performed independently by the member agencies of ICAN, and by the Children's Services Commission and other

commissions and committees, it is a function for which duplication is desirable, despite the cost.

6. "To encourage and facilitate community support for child abuse/neglect programs. "

Everyone in our society should be encouraging and facilitating community support for child abuse/neglect programs, and for programs designed for all children, whether or not they are already victims or technically recognized in the laws as "at risk". In this area, duplication is again desirable, provided it is not divisive in its effects.

Unrecognized Roles

ICAN, the council, the operations network, the subcommittees, and the staff perform functions which are not recognized as ICAN roles in the ordinance. Those performed by the council should be recognized in the ordinance, and those performed by the staff should be explicitly authorized in the staff job description.

AB 1733/2994 Allocation. The Board of Supervisors designates ICAN as the statutorily required multidisciplinary body which recommends criteria for allocating State funds received under AB 1733, and the Board of Supervisors designates it as the committee which establishes criteria for the use of AB 2994 funding. Both programs help finance community based child abuse prevention and intervention programs. The funds are administered by the Department of Children's Services, according to allocation rules adopted by the Board of Supervisors which are

based, in part, on ICAN recommendations.

These sources made more than \$5 million available to the County last year. As is usually true, the distribution of the funds is controversial. The Board of Supervisors tends to prefer a 'divide by five' method of distributing such funds among supervisorial districts; it is always a major task of the committees assisting the Board to introduce some form of needs based criteria. A formal provision in the ordinance would help. It should provide that ICAN, as a multijurisdictional council,

"recommend to the Board of Supervisors criteria, formulas, processes, policies, and priorities for the distribution of funding authorized by AB 1733 (Chapter, Statutes of 1982), AB 2994 (Chapter, Statutes of 1982), and other funds received in the Children's Trust Fund. "

Legislation. As the leaders of large public agencies, the members of ICAN have compelling interest in legislation. Most of the system of services for and to children, at all levels and in all units of government, are controlled by State law, and most of the funding is provided by the State government.

In the multijurisdictional system, counties, cities, and schools are more often in a position of competition with one another for limited State resources and recognition of priorities than of cooperation. Therefore, when ICAN can produce, at its council level, a consensus on legislation among the member agencies, it performs one of its potentially most significant constructive functions.

On the other hand, it is only at its council level that ICAN can and should be active in pursuing legislative agendas. The members of the operations network, or the legislative subcommittee,

may wish to recommend legislative programs, but they cannot pursue them unilaterally. To do so would violate the disciplines that each member government, including the County, have to make sure that their own governmental programs for legislation are cohesive and integrated. In the County, for example, the Board of Supervisors reserves for itself the authority to adopt a legislative program and to take positions on specific bills when they are presented in legislative committees. The courts, as a separate branch, sometimes pursue agendas that are distinct, The system also relies on the consistent cooperation of other County elected officials Assessor. District Attorney. and Sheriff. since they have the same authority as the Board. Since everyone recognizes that it is in the best interests of the County as a whole to present a unified program in the Legislature, the typical situation is that everyone respects the Board's policy regarding County positions.

Similarly, the staff of ICAN has and should have no authority to pursue legislative programs unilaterally, as a representative of ICAN. To do so would be a significant departure from County discipline. and the county employs the staff.

Clearly, it would infringe on any person's rights, including members of ICAN. of the operations network, or of the staff to restrict them from proposing or taking positions on legislation when acting as individuals, or when acting as a representative of some other group. Many Los Angeles County officials are also among the leadership of Statewide professional or other associations; their associations may take positions on legislation

which are contrary to the official Los Angeles County position. When Los Angeles County officials present such positions, they make it clear that they are representing the association, and act at no cost to the County. Some prefer to choose the option of absenting themselves from their association's position, or finding someone else to testify in the Legislature. Otherwise, there would be an improper implication that the Board of Supervisors concurred with whatever position was being offered, or there would be an improper public cost associated with the activities of an individual or a private association.

Therefore. we believe that the ordinance on ICAN should specify that it recommend legislation to the governing bodies of its member agencies, to be proposed in the Legislature within the frameworks of the disciplines of those governments. The bylaws of the operations committee, and the job description of the staff, should make it clear that their authority extends only to making recommendations for legislation to the ICAN council. They should also specify rules or procedures which are to be observed by individuals when representing themselves or associations to which they belong.

Outreach. The incumbent staff executive of ICAN is an active participant in Statewide and national private and public organizations. They include the California Consortium of child Abuse Councils, ICAN Associates, the California Attorney General's Commission on the Enforcement of Child Abuse Laws, and the United States Attorney General's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. Such participation accrues to the benefit of Los

Angeles County and the children and families it serves; the staff represents County expertise on issues, problems and their resolution, and social conditions that is rare.

Nevertheless, if such participation is a function of ICAN, it should be formally specified as such in the ICAN ordinance and in the job description of the staff. Such formal specification will clarify the role within which the staff, as a County employee, accepts appointment to such groups. That is, the participation must be within the framework of the disciplines that apply to ICAN and to County employees. If, on the other hand, the staff is not appointed because of the position with ICAN, but rather because of personal expertise, then the outreach that is the effect is not in fact an outcome that is attributable to ICAN, but rather to the expertise of the individual. If that is the case, there is no need for the role to be specified in the ordinance, and no need to apply the disciplines of County employment.

In any event, the role specification for outreach should be formally included in the ordinance, and the rules and procedures governing the actions of staff or the operations network should be adopted by ICAN at the Council level and incorporated in the bylaws of the operations network and the job descriptions of the staff.

Conclusion

ICAN is perceived as and functions as, three distinct components which operate in no direct hierarchical relationship to one another: the council of governments, elected officials, and

agencies; the network of children's services professionals; and the staff employed by the County Department of Children's Services. The current ordinance should be modified to clarify the roles which it currently specifies, and to include roles which ICAN performs that are not now specified in the ordinance.

Page Can be Viewed at LA- EEC Office

Page Can Be Viewed at LA-EEC Office

ATTACHMENT H2

OFFICIAL AGENCY ROLES

ICAN Inter Agency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect Roles

ICAN's official roles were taken from their publication entitled, UICAN Council Description and Guidelines for Identification and Reporting of Child Abuse and Neglect. " ICAN's official responsibilities are as follows:

- To provide a forum for interagency communication and coordination of services for the protection of children throughout Los Angeles County.
- To facilitate training of professionals in the identification, prevention, and treatment of child abuse and neglect.
- To develop recommendations for new and improved services to families and victims of child abuse and neglect.
- To facilitate implementation of child abuse program throughout the County.
- To increase public awareness of the problem of child abuse and neglect and resources available for intervention and treatment.
- To encourage and facilitate community support for child abuse/neglect programs.

Children's Services Commission Roles

The official roles of the Children's Services Commission were taken from the Commission's ordinance. The official responsibilities of the Children's Services Commission are as follows:

- Review all programs administered by County departments which provide children's services for children at risk.
- Receive input from appropriate community groups and individuals concerning County administered children's services programs.
- Review and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors concerning legislation dealing with children's services.
- Make recommendations as necessary to various department heads to improve children's services.

ATTACHMENT H2 CON'T

- Make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on action to be taken to improve children's services.
- Provide an annual report to the Board of Supervisors concerning the status of children's services, along with recommendations for their improvement, to be utilized for broad community distribution and discussion.

Department of Children's Services Roles

The Department of Children's Services' official roles were taken from the Board letter, Implementation of the Department of Children's Services* adopted by your Board on November 27, 1984. The Department's official responsibilities are as follows:

- Provide protective services to children in their own homes, to assist the parent or caretaker to stabilize and maintain a safe home for children who have or may be subject to abandonment, neglect or exploitation.
- Provide protective short term out of home services to children and their surrogate families when the children cannot safely remain in their own homes.
- Provide adoptive guardianship and long term foster care services to children and their caretakers to establish and maintain permanent homes for children when the natural parents are unwilling or unable to provide a safe and nurturing home for their children.
- Provide recruitment, licensing services when appropriate, and support to adoptive, day care, and foster parents, and to group homes to develop and maintain a cadre of care given in the community who can provide temporary or long term out of home care services.
- Establish and maintain relationships with other children's services providers, private and public, to assist their providers and the community as a whole, in maintaining and developing an effective network of services to children at risk.

ATTACHMENT H3 Fact Sheet

Coordination Among Inter Agency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect, the Department of Children's Services, and the Children's Services Commission

The chairpersons of the Inter Agency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN), the Children's Services Commission, and the Director of the Department of Children's Services have agreed that the roles of the above County agencies are as follows:

Children's Services Department Serves to provide protection and care for children and their families who are at risk due to actual or potential abuse, neglect, or exploitation. Develops permanent plans for children who cannot safely return to their families; for example, adoption, legal guardianship, long term foster care.

Commission for Children's Services Serves to review departmental programs and legislation that involves children's services and recommend appropriate action to the board of Supervisors and to department heads providing children's services.

ICAN Serves to provide overall countywide coordination for programs to prevent, identify, and treat child abuse and neglect.

The agencies have also agreed to work cooperatively and agreed that:

- Periodic meetings will be held between the Director of Children's Services and the chairpersons of ICAN and the Commission for Children's Services. ICAN's policy meetings will be attended by the chair person of the Commission for Children's Services.
- ICAN operations committee meetings will be attended by the staff person of the Commission for Children's Services.
- The ICAN Director will attend the meetings of the Commission for Children's Services on a quarterly basis unless a specific issues arises that requires attendance.
- The Director of the Department of Children's Services will continue to be a member of ICAN.
- The Department of Children's Services will work with ICAN regarding any assignment or concern that the

ATTACHMENT H3 CON'T

Department has that may require coordination with departments which serves on ICAN.

- Requests for assistance from ICAN on coordination items will go directly from the Director of the Department of Children's Services to the Director of ICAN.
- Major assignments of the Department of Children's Services which require a substantial commitment from ICAN staff and ICAN members will be sent to ICAN's Executive Committee for consideration.

The official roles of each agency are delineated as follows:

ICAN Inter Agency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect Roles

- To provide a forum for interagency communication and coordination of services for the protection of children throughout Los Angeles County.
- To facilitate training of professionals in the identification, prevention, and treatment of child abuse and neglect.
- To develop recommendations for new and improved services to families and victims of child abuse and neglect.
- To facilitate implementation of child abuse programs throughout the County.
- To increase public awareness of the problems of child abuse and neglect and resources available for intervention and treatment.
- To encourage and facilitate community support for child abuse/neglect programs.

Children's Services Commission Roles

- Review all programs administered by County departments which provide children's services for children at risk.
- Receive input from appropriate community groups and individuals concerning County administered children's services programs.
- Review and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors concerning legislation dealing with children's services.

- Make recommendations as necessary to various department heads to improve children's services.
- Make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on action to be taken to improve children's services.
- Provide an annual report to the Board of Supervisors concerning the status of children's services, along with recommendations for their improvement, to be utilized for broad community distribution and discussion.

Department of Children's Services Roles

- Provide protective services to children in their own homes, to assist the parent or caretaker to stabilize and maintain a safe home for children who have or may be subject to abandonment, neglect or exploitation.
- Provide protective short term out of home services to children and their surrogate families when the children cannot safely remain in their own homes.
- provide adoptive guardianship and long term foster care services to children and their caretakers to establish and maintain permanent homes for children when the natural parents are unwilling or unable to provide a safe and nurturing home for their children.
- provide recruitment, licensing services when appropriate, and support to adoptive, day care, and foster parents, and to group homes to develop and maintain a cadre of care given in the community who can provide temporary or long term out of home care services.
- Establish and maintain relationships with other children's services providers, private and public, to assist their providers and the community as a whole, in maintaining and developing an effective network of services to children at risk.

ATTACHMENT H4

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

March 20, 1985

TO: Each Supervisor

FROM: James C. Hankla

SUBJECT: Department of Children's Service, Inter Agency Council
On Child Abuse and Neglect (ICMI). Commission for
Children's Services
Interaction and coordination of Activities

On December 18, 1984, your Board instructed this office to work with the chairperson of ICAN, the Children's Services Commission, and the Director of the Department of Children's Services, and report on how these County agencies will interact to coordinate activities and concerns needed to be addressed by each agency.

Our memorandum dated February 11, 1985 advised your Board that the chairpersons of ICAN, the Commission, and the Director of the Department of Children's Services had communicated concerning the needs of children, the necessity of functioning harmoniously and the roles of their agencies. Additionally, your Board was advised that the Commission's chairperson would be submitting their agreements to the full Commission, and that subsequent to this action, we would report to your Board the details of the agreements reached.

By memorandum dated February 25, 1985, your Board was advised that the coordination issue was listed on the Commission February 19, 1985 agenda. Because several Commissioners were unfamiliar with ICAN, the Commission voted to invite ICAN's Director to the next meeting. On March 4th, Deanne Stilton attended the meeting and answered questions. The Commission discussed the agreement and approved it by unanimous vote. The roles of the Commission, ICAN, and the Department of Children's Services are detailed in the attachment and are summarized as follows:

Children's Services Department Serves to provide protection and care for children and their families who are at risk due to actual or potential abuse, neglect, or exploitation. Develops permanent plans for children who cannot safely return to their families; for example, adoption, legal guardianship long term foster care.

ATTACHMENT H4 CON'T

March 20, 1985

Commission for Children's Services Serves to review departmental programs and legislation that involves children's Services and recommend appropriate action to the Board of Supervisors and to department heads providing children's services.

ICAN Serves to provide overall countywide coordination for programs to prevent, identify, and treat child abuse and neglect.

Agreement

The discussions resulted in the development of a workable plan to bring about coordination of efforts for the mutual benefit of the agencies and the children of Los Angeles County. Specifically, they pledged to work cooperatively and agreed that:

- Periodic meetings will be held between the Director of Children's Services and the chairpersons of ICAN and the Commission for Children's Services.
- ICAN's policy meetings will be attended by the chairperson of the Commission for Children's Services.
- ICAN operations committee meetings will be attended by the staff person of the Commission for Children's Services.
- The ICAN Director will attend the meetings of the Commission for Children's Services on a quarterly basis unless a specific issue arises that requires attendance.
- The Director of the Department of Children's Services will continue to be a member of ICAII.
- The Department of Children's Services will work with ICAN regarding any assignment or concern that the Department has that may require coordination with departments which serve on ICAN. ○ Requests for assistance from ICAN on coordination items will go directly from the Director of the Department of Children's Services to the Director of ICAN.
- Major assignments of the Department of Children's Services which require a substantial commitment from ICAN staff and ICAN members will be sent to ZCAII's Executive Committee for consideration.

In consideration of the agreements reached, coordination and communication among the agencies should ensure maximum cooperation in the delivery of child protective and related children's services.

JCH:DRD

WLM:rs

Attachment

31. 1 6

Page may viewed in file at LA EED Office

TABLE H1

FY 198586 ICAN COSTS (estimate)

SALARIES:

1. 0 Assistant Program Deputy	\$42, 151
1. 0 Program Specialist (unfunded)	38, 900
2. 0 Secretary IV	<u>41, 361</u>
Total Salaries	122, 412
Less Salary Savings	(7, 511)
Employee Benefits	<u>31, 086</u>
Total Salaries and Employee Benefits	145, 987
Travel, (estimate)	<u>4, 000</u>
GRAND TOTAL	<u>149, 987</u>

CHILDREN'S SERVICES PLANNING COUNCIL (CSPC)

The Department of Children's Services (DCS) formally established the CSPC in January 1986, when the Commission for Children's Services was encouraging the Department to involve private agencies in planning for services to children. This section contains a description of the background, mission, structure and accomplishments of the CSPC.

Background: the CSPC's Predecessors

The CSPC was an expansion of an existing group, called the Public Private Consortium, which had been convened for several years as a means of coordination between DPSS, and subsequently DC and the more influential private providers in whose group homes DPSS/DCS placed children. The public Private Consortium had been created in response to United way's attempt to improvise on between the placing agencies and those providers.

The initial issue which generated United was activity and the formation of the consortium was DPSS's attempt to persuade group homes to accept troublesome and destructive minors who were at the County's MacLaren Hall because no facility would accept them for placement.

Prior to this, in the mid 1970's, the Federal government promulgated legislation and regulations which required public social services departments to create a planning process which involved private service providers, in order to minimize duplication, overlap, gaps and mismatches between public and private programs, thus hopefully increasing the cost effectiveness of public expenditures for such services. The Bureau of Social Services of DPSS at the time convened conferences at which public and private agency representatives discussed numerous issues of common interest. An attempt was made to generate an ongoing process of multilateral planning. It did not last long.

Mission and Objectives of the CSPC The CSPC is advisory to the Director of Children's Services. Re has defined its mission and objectives largely in terms of task rather than in terms of result.

Its mission is to participate in the Department's advance planning and to review the Department's program policies and plans.

Its objectives include:

- identification and study of problems, and development and monitoring of recommendations for the use of resources.
- inclusion of multiple public jurisdictions as well as private agencies in its activities,

- review of the Department's policy and priorities,
- annual selection of critical issues and formation of task committees to study them,
- annual study of its own method of operation, accomplishments, priorities and direction.

The first objective specifies that special attention is to be given to unmet service delivery needs. This is the one explicit criterion for the CSPC's establishment of its priorities. It implies that the use of resources to fulfill such unmet needs is a goal. The only other stated goal is the formation of the public private partnership itself.

Structure

The CSPC consists of a Steering Committee and a General Body.

The Steering Committee meets monthly. It is co-chaired by the Director of Children's Services and a private agency director. It is composed of one representative from each member agency (public and private). the task committee chairpersons, and two members elected by the General Body, for a total of more than 30. The Foster Parent Associations were invited to participate effective January, 1987; city and state agencies were added effective February. 1987. Elected and appointed department heads send subordinates. The Director of Children's Services has attended less than half of the meetings. The private co-chair has attended consistently since her selection.

The General Body, which meets quarterly, is chaired by the Steering Committee co-chairs. The Director of DCS has attended 4 of the meetings, and the private co-chair has attended all since her selection. The General Body is composed of 124 "representatives from agencies which are involved in planning for and/or delivery of services to DCS families and children. " (emphasis added) Some agencies have named more than one representative. In practice, attendance by representatives of agencies other than DCS has ranged between 15 and 35.

The public agencies include not only those which are involved in the protective system (e. g. , schools, LAPD, D. A. and Probation) but also those which provide other services to families (e. g. , Community Services, DPSS).

The private agencies include both DCS subcontractors and other community agencies which serve families.

The UCLA and USC schools of social work, and two advisory committees (the County's Commission for Children's Services and the Mayor's Child Care Committee) are also represented.

Task committees are created to tackle specific issues or tasks; they meet as often as needed.

The CSPC in January 1988 piloted a three person Public/Private Interface Group consisting of the private agency CSPC co-chair, the DCS Assistant Director for Program Development

and United Way's Director of Community Issues. Its purpose is to screen policy level issues suggested by CSPC members and others, referring them either to the CSPC or to the appropriate individual, committee or department for resolution. Policy level issues raised by the residential child care committee are also referred to this group to be routed appropriately.

Accomplishments

The CSPC Steering committee initially identified several high priority issues:

- SB 14 ancillary services,
- drug addicted infants,
- child day care
- comprehensive health care for foster children,
- inefficient systems,
- Service Funded Activities,
- expansion of the quality and capabilities of foster care, and
- funding needs of the entire service system.

The Committee selected ancillary services as its top priority, one in which all member agencies can be involved. Ancillary services are those, such as training in parenting or in homemaking, which reduce the need to place children out of their homes. Such services are mandated by SB 14, but no funds have been appropriated specifically for them, and they are scarce.

However, the Committee almost immediately expanded its agenda to include child day care, runaways, health care, and expansion of foster care resources. It also expanded its role to include networking (i. e. , sharing information about other activities).

Subsequent meetings of the Steering Committee have consisted primarily of informational presentations on subjects such as AIDS. DCS' homeless and runaway youth program, the probable impact of the Gramm Rudman Act, United Way's study of healthcare for foster children, the Roundtable's report on the children's budget of Los Angeles County, the DCS organizational development process guided by Dr. Ichak Adizes, the program to prepare older foster children for independent living, and new developments in funding for unmet needs (e. g. , mental health counseling, and placement resources for emotionally disturbed children). The Committee has continued to reassess its role, priorities, membership and operations.

The Steering Committee has established task committees on residential child care, child day care, homeless and runaway youth, facilities for emotionally disturbed youth and contracting. While reports on these subjects are usually made at Committee meetings, they often reflect departmental activities rather than task committee recommendations. Recommendations have been

reported by the committees on child day care. facilities for emotionally disturbed youth, runaway youth, and contracting. 'The minutes contain no reports of recommendations having been implemented.

The CSPC General Body meetings consist of informational reports on activities of the department, new developments in legislation or funding, recommendations of the task committees, and deliberations or decisions of the Steering Committee regarding the CSPC itself. Much of the information shared at the Steering Committee is repeated for the General Body. Between one half and one third of those who attend Steering Committee meetings also participate in the General Body.

ATTACHMENT H5

CHILDREN'S SERVICES PLANNING COUNCIL

The formation of the Children's Services Planning Council demonstrates the Department of Children's Services' (DCS) commitment to aggressive community outreach. In the past, concerted community involvement in the design of children's services programs was not consistently sought. With the creation of DCS, the spirit of the Children's Services Task Force, and the assistance of the Commission for Children's Services, the new Department has incorporated a philosophy of community outreach. The Children's Services Planning Council will serve as a model of how a strong public/private partnership can benefit Departmental program development.

MISSION STATEMENT

The Children's Services Planning Council, acting in an advisory capacity, will influence and participate in the review of policy, program planning and development, and advanced planning for abused and neglected children and their families served by the Department of Children's Services.

Objective.

1. The Council's major objective is to establish a dynamic public/private partnership in the area of children's services through the identification and study of problems and the development of recommendations for the use of resources, especially where unmet service delivery needs are identified. This group will then monitor the implementation of these recommendations.
2. The Council will include public agencies (city, county, states as well as private agencies in its planning for abused and neglected children. This interdepartmental approach is essential because the needs of these children extend beyond the scope of any one department.
3. The Council will review Department policy and priorities and provide consultation and advice in a manner encompassing all public/private participants.
4. At least annually, the group will review critical issues affecting families served by DCS and select those issues with highest priority for active study during the year. Subcommittees will be established to work on specific areas of concern.
5. In order to measure the extent to which these objectives are achieved, the Council will engage in an annual study of its method of operation* accomplishments, priorities and direction.

ATTACHMENT H5 CON'T

Organization

The Children's Services Planning Council will consist of both a General Body and a Steering Committee. In order to ensure representation which adequately reflects the needs of the entire community, member agencies shall consider ethnic composition when choosing their subcommittee participant(s) and when selecting the two elected steering Committee members.

In addition to the desire for ethnic balance, it is the intent of the Children's Services Planning Council that a ratio be achieved between public and private representatives, both in terms of the types of projects undertaken as well as in the constituency of each subcommittee. This balance will be expressed in all aspects of the Council's operation and may extend to the designation of co-chairpersons to represent public and private perspectives. The General Body will meet quarterly and will be composed of representatives from agencies and organizations which are involved in planning for and/or delivery of services to DCS families and children. Agencies and organizations meeting these criteria may request membership on the General Body by designating, to the Director of DCS, an individual who can speak for the organization (an administrator or elected leader) who will commit to attend scheduled meetings. The proposed membership roster is attached (Attachment A).

A Steering Committee will be established and will meet at least monthly. Membership will include two representatives elected by the General Body, the chairpersons of the subcommittees, and public and private organization permanent members. The proposed membership roster is attached (Attachment B). The Steering Committee may invite participation by others as appropriate.

The Director of the Department of Children's Services and a Co-Chair from the private sector will chair both committees. Different types of Subcommittees are to be utilized in terms of projects and tasks undertaken. Such as topic study groups, task forces on specific short term issues and subcommittees dealing with ongoing planning and policy projects. Examples of operational subcommittees, reflecting public/private members, are the Child Care Task Force and the Runaway Youth Services Committee.

Agendas for the Council and Steering Committee will reflect a dual focus long range planning issues and short term activities.

ATTACHMENT H5 CON'T

Through a strong commitment to collaborative planning, the relationship between service agencies will be strengthened, a variety of viewpoints and alternatives will be considered, a resource network will be forged, and the children we serve will be the beneficiaries of united planning efforts.

BT:slq

11387

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed in file at LA EEC Office

SECTION

COMMENTORS AND COMMENTS

TO

REPORT DRAFT

(July 1988)

CHILDREN SERVICES STUDY

List of Commentors

Robert W. Agee Deputy Superintendent, Field Services, California State Department of Education

Thomas Becket, Chair, L. A. County Commission for Children Services

Sherman Block L. A. County Sheriff and Chair, ICAN

Mrs. Emily Burns, Member Los Angeles County Community Action Board

Richard P. Byrne, Presiding Judge, The Superior Court, Los Angeles, CA

Brian F. Cahill, President, Hawthorne Children's Services

Ross Clayton Dean, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California

Nancy Daly Chair, Los Angeles County, Commission for Children's Services

David D. Dotson Assistant Chief, Acting Chief of Police, Los Angeles Police Department

Robert G. Gates Director, Los Angeles County Department of Health Services

Edgar H. Hayes Director, Los Angeles County Data Processing Department

Celeste Kaplan President, The Los Angeles Roundtable for Children

Gurubanda Singh Khalsa Finance Specialist, Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health

Vernell V. King Secretary, Los Angeles County Public Health Commission

Howard N. Mantel Director a Government Programs a Institute of Public Administration, New York

Barry J. Nidorf Chief Probation Officer, Los Angeles County Probation Department; Member, Children's Budget Implementation Committee

John Rossi Executive Director, John Rossi Youth Foundation

Nathan Shapell Chairman of the Board, Shapell Industries, Inc. ; Member of California State Little Hoover Commission

Cheryl J. Ward Smith Chair, Los Angeles County Domestic Violence Council

Loren D. Suter Deputy Director, Adult and Family Services, State of California, Health & Welfare Agency, Department of Social Services

Richard R. Terzian Member of California Little Hoover Commission

Deanne Tilton Director, Los Angeles County ICAN (2 letters)

Frank S. Zolin Los Angeles County Clerk and Executive Officer of the Superior Court; Member of CCJCC & ICAN

September 27, 1988

John Campbell
Los Angeles County
Economy and Efficiency Commission
Room 163, Hall of Administration
500 West Temple
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Campbell:

I am responding to your letter of August 17, 1988, which enclosed a copy of the Report on Children's Services in Los Angeles County and asked for our review and comments. One of the frequently appearing issues in the organization of children's services is whether the disparate services required by a target population are more effectively rendered by a single agency established exclusively for that population, or by various agencies with each specializing in a narrowly focused service discipline such as medicine. This issue is identified in the report as the tension between the constituency and functional principles of government. The proposal for a single county department of protective services for all ages, in which appropriate professional specialties are preserved, uniquely combines both principles. I hope that you will keep me apprised of the report's acceptance and the implementation of its recommendations.

If there is any need for further contact with this Department, you may call Mr. Stan Finn in our Child Development Division. His telephone number is (916) 3238524.

Best regards,

BILL HONIG

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

COMMISSION FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES

October 2, 1988

Arthur J. Peever, Chair:
Task Force on Children's Services
Economy and Efficiency Commission
Hall of Administration, Room 163
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Peever:

On behalf of the Commission for Children's Services, thank you for taking the time from your busy schedule to address the Commission at its General Meeting on September 6, 1988. Your presentation on the Task Force's "Report on Children's Social Services in the County of Los Angeles" was most informative and of valued assistance to the Commission. We look forward to working with the Economy and Efficiency Commission, as well as the Task Force on Children's Services, to help bring about changes which are critically needed and also serve the best interest of children.

Together we can reach many mutual goals. Please keep us informed of your progress in this area.

Sincerely,

Thomas Becket, Chair

Commission for Children's Services

TB/REMD/dlrcc:

Peter Schabarum, Supervisor, First District

Kenneth Hahn, Supervisor, Second District

Edmund Edelman, Supervisor Third District

Joe Crail, Chairperson
Economy & Efficiency Commission
163 Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles , CA 90012

Dear Mr. Crail:

The purpose of this letter is to express my serious concerns regarding certain recommendations included in your Commission's Report on Children's Social Services in Los Angeles County.

As Chairperson of ICAN, and as a member of three of the five multijurisdictional councils you have proposed to coalesce at the staffing and policy I am well aware of both the shared and separate goals of these bodies. I see no benefit in any action to change their current structure, staffing or functions. To the contrary, your recommendation, if enacted, would seriously mitigate effectiveness of each council. There are sound and important reasons for establishing multiinterdepartmental bodies for children, for criminal justice issues, for emerging drug related issues, and for battered women. Obviously, these issues all interrelate at one or more levels. The various councils now have very positive working relationships with each other and we actively share information and resources at the subcommittee level when appropriate.

I also question your Recommendation #3, J & K. Recommendation 3K, for example, would require o commissions and ICAN to cross refer issues children and families to the Commission for Children. In effect, this would involve every activity ICAN undertakes, since it is a council

Joe Crail, Chairperson

Page 2

July 14, 1988

in focusing on children and families. It is also questionable to recommend directing department heads to supply the Commission with all such information they may request without a clear parallel responsibility for justification of the need for such information and a consideration of the expense and staff time required to supply such information. I strongly recommend that you reconsider your plan to submit the above recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

Very truly yours,

Sherman Block, Sheriff

ICAN Chairperson

cc: ICAN Policy Committee

Page may be viewed ion file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed ion file at LA EEC Office

Page may be viewed ion file at LA EEC Office

The Superior Court

Los Angeles California 90012

Chamber of Richard P. Byrne Telephone

(213) 9745554

Presiding Judge

September 1, 1988

John Campbell

Los Angeles County Economy and Efficiency Commission

Room 163, Hall of Administration

500 West Temple Street

Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Campbell:

Thank you for your letter of July 8, 1988, enclosing a copy of the Report on Children's Services of the Economy and Efficiency Commission. / assume that copies of the report have been sent to Judge Kathryn Doi Todd, Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Court and Judge John Henning, Supervising Judge of the Dependency Courts. / would also suggest that a copy be sent to Judge Paul Boland, who presides in Department 201, Eastlake Juvenile Court, 1601 Eastlake Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90033, if you have not already done so. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Richard P. Byrne

Presiding Judge RPB:em

INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

August 23, 1988

Mr. John Campbell
Los Angeles County
Economy and Efficiency Commission
Room 163, Hall of Administration
500 West Temple
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Campbell

Many thanks for your letter of August 17, 1988 and the Report on Children's Social Services in Los Angeles County. / am taking the liberty of circulating it to members of our senior staff who currently are engaged in a project on social services to children for New York City's Human Resources Administration.

Would it be possible to get a copy of the 1983 report, Decision Making and Organization in Los Angeles County Government?

Many thanks and regards,

Sincerely,

Howard N. Mantel
Director, Government Programs

John Rossi Youth Foundation
1515 Lincoln Boulevard, 2nd Floor
Santa Monica, California 90401
(213) 3930644

August 23, 1988

Robert J. Lowe
Vice Chairperson
Economy and Efficiency Commission
Room 163, Hall of Administration
500 West Temple
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mr. Lowe:

/ am in receipt of the review draft of your commission containing the report and recommendations relevant to Children's Services of the County of Los Angeles.

After serving for the past two decades on various county and state boards and commissions, including the Children' Services Task Force and Commission, / am fully cognizant of the magnitude of the task placed upon your group. Based on your reputation as a committed and reasonable gentleman, / have decided to address my response directly to you.

With regard to RECOMMENDATION 1: DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION /REALIGNMENT, with regard to the name change from Department of Children's Services to Department of Children's Protective Services, / have concern for the methodology to be employed with regard to the massive population of the balance of the children in Los Angeles County. Realizing the transitory status of many children not inclusive in the population of protective services, while yet on the verge of entering into or phasing out of this category, while the County does not have a legal obligation to these children, as a compassionate and caring society, / feel we do have a moral obligation to them as well. Long being an advocate of early intervention and prevention, it is most important that the County support and protect all children.

With regard to Phase Two: Functional Realignment, as / reflect back on the inadequacies of a single department which existed prior to the formation of the Department of Children's Services, / recall the public concern and outrage that existed over many of the conditions of such a massive department which resulted in injustices, institutional neglect, and weaknesses of that system with regard to children.

While a consolidation of this nature may be effective in a city such as Oxnard, Fresno, etc. , the large and constantly growing population of Los Angeles County would be, once again, a massive bureaucracy reducing the quality of service to all components. Were it to be combined, Children's Services would remain unique on the very basic premise that children have no income, no vote, are governed by a separate set of statutes and laws, and the groups who lobby for them are notably lacking in the economic and political support necessary to further their cause of fair and just treatment. The political climate may change from time to time and the financial state of the county may fluctuate based on State and Federal Revenues. / have no doubt, based on past history, that many children's services would bear the brunt of these budget cuts.

Regarding RECOMMENDATION 2: MULTIJURISDICTIONAL COUNCILS, / find myself in accord with your consolidation and standardized role of these councils. My opinion is based on the commonalty of the core membership of all members being elected or employed officials of the County of Los Angeles.

With reference to RECOMMENDATION 3: CHILDREN'S ADVISORY COMMISSION, / feel that an ordinance defining the scope and role of the Commission to have merit with reference to the children, the citizen participation, and agree that the Commission is not indeed a supervisory, managerial, or appeal body. / do feel, however, that the inclusion of families detracts from the initial purposes and direction for which this commission was formed and places additional burden outside the goals and interests of the Commission.

If the commissions' roles are to be limited to recommendation of Board policy, legislation and review, and implementation status monitoring and reporting of a general nature, this leaves a void which the Commission has so admirably addressed since its inception. / refer to the many actions of a questionable nature ongoing within the institutions where these children reside.

To be more specific, / would remind you of a few of the following deficiencies which resulted in a positive correction solely due to the concerns, observations, and subsequent actions on the part of the Commission. Some of these are: a physician commissioner discovered an ill-equipped medical station with an excessive supply of behavioral modification drugs. A commissioner observed in a nursery fish nets in place on the top of the cribs of

infants as a behavioral measure and lack of adequate staffing. The overpopulation beyond the legal statute has been observed on more than one occasion. There are probably another fifty instances which / could go on describing for you, however, / think that would be superfluous. My concern is that if the Commission is no longer free in its policy of oversight of specific incidents, where will the checks and balances system come into play for the protection of the children?

I have long been aware of a department's desire to collectively be concerned with the task of protecting their in-house reputations. / do not feel that any body of government should be responsible only to itself. The Commission, an apolitical group of dedicated citizens, whose concern is not monetary, employment security, or political gain, serves only at a great personal sacrifice to assure us these children will be treated humanely and without them, we remove the only independent body whose only concern is the welfare of children.

Those of us who are in the forefront of children's services on a non governmental level in the community feel that, rather than a consolidation of departments, the answer may well be in a major expansion of the Children's Services Department with an adequate support system that would enable them to provide their own auxiliary services, such as medical and mental health, etc. , and not be dependent upon contractual agreements with other departments to provide these services.

We are by and large in accord with your theory and justification for many of your reasons for consolidation, however, it is our belief that children present a unique and separate major part of our population and their needs could best be addressed by the complete separation currently existing to provide these functions. There is much that can be done to expand upon and improve the relatively young life of the Department and / do not feel that it has had adequate time or unified support to move as quickly as some would have liked to have seen. As you have been made aware, / am sure, the Department has not yet had the opportunity to fulfill its initial mission of independence from other County departments. / feel this is an opportunity that should be explored.

A personal thought and one which has caused me concern is that the Department and Commission should not be adversaries, but rather a unified team for the betterment of children.

Having been involved since the early hearings preceding the Task Force which led to the creation of the Department and formation of the Commission, / believe, as you did then, and continue to believe that the creation of this department has provided major benefits for the children of Los Angeles County and will continue to do so given the opportunity to proceed independently and solely for the benefit of children.

In closing, / would like to compliment the Economy and Efficiency Commission for the many hours and good intentions which have gone into the preparation of this review draft and further note appreciation for the fine work and research provided by John Campbell and his staff in its preparation. Like many other documents / have read in the past, in theory it is admirable, but for implementation it is flawed.

Sincerely,

John Rossi

Executive Director

JR:el

Shapell Industries, Inc.

Wilshire San Vicente Plaza
Suite 700
8383 Wilshire Boulevard
Beverly Hills, Ca 90211
213 655 7330

Nathan Shapell
Chairman of the Board

August 10, 1988

Mr. John Campbell
Los Angeles County
Economy and Efficiency Commission
Room 163, Hall of Administration
500 West Temple
Los Angeles, Ca. 90012

Dear Mr. Campbell:

Thank you for forwarding me a copy of your draft report on children's services. As you know, the Little Hoover Commission has a tremendous interest in this issue as evidenced by the release of our report last spring. During the next legislative session, our Commission will be actively advocating the passage of several pieces of legislation that will implement recommendations we presented in our report.

/ am directing our acting Executive Director, Ms. Jeannine English, to coordinate our follow-up activities with you. On behalf of the Commission, let me again thank you for sending me a copy of this fine report.

Sincerely,

Nathan Shapell

Chairman of the Board

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Joe Crail Chairperson
Economy & Efficiency Commission
163 Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Recommendations of the Economy & Efficiency
Commission for Domestic Violence Council

Dear Mr. Crail:

/ am writing On behalf of the Los Angeles County Domestic Violence Council to give feedback and express our deep concern about Recommendation. Two in the Economy & Efficiency Commission Report issued June, 1988. This recommendation calls for the consolidation of five separate councils and committees into one multijurisdictional Council. The report concludes, without any supporting evidence, that the focus of each Council and Committee directly impacts the welfare of children.

From the discussion and analysis supporting Recommendation Two, little more was done than find some degree of commonalty among the Councils (i. e. , children are involved, children live in families, and representatives from the same agency sit on more than one Council). No attempt is made to analyze the work of the Council in question, nor balance other work, not involving children, in which the Council might be engaged.

The discussion justifying he recommendation emphasizes the goal of "efficiency over advocacy" and "similar functions for different constituencies". The discussion centers on the rationale: [t]he functional form of organization performs best for ongoing production of well defined products or services. " It is unclear to us how this has been demonstrated. There is, however, a very clear bias in the report that services, based upon "the constituency principle", are not looked upon with favor; that they are inherently fragmentary and duplicative.

The report suggests that because the Department of Children Services, may deal with a child victim in a violent home, DPSS may deal with elder abuse in the violent home, and Department of Community and Senior Services may give services to spouses in a violent home, that these departments have similar functions all related to violence in the home and should be under one umbrella

council. The Department of Community and Senior Citizens does not provide services directly to victims of spouse abuse. The only services provided by DCSC are those which are funded, (through assessments on marriage license fees) through private shelters to provide safety to battered women.

This rather strained attempt to lump together victims of child abuse, elder abuse, and spouse abuse does not work for three reasons. First, while the legal framework exists for reporting and protecting victims of child abuse and elder abuse, there is no similar legal construct designed to provide protective services to adult victims of family violence. Thus, under the proposal to create a county department of child, adult and family social services, adult victims of family violence will receive few, if any, services because there is no legislative authority to protect them beyond what the police can do when a crime occurs.

Secondly, no governmental agency has assumed the responsibility to provide protective services to adult victims of family violence. The report is silent on how these victims would be accommodated under the consolidation plan. Further the consolidation and functional realignment plan mixes goals and laws applicable to children with elder abuse and spouse abuse. The reunification of the family may be a stated goal when speaking of abused children, but it is not necessarily a goal when speaking of elder abuse nor, spouse abuse. Moreover, in spouse abuse cases the focus is not reunification but protecting the victim and treatment for the batterer. In our view not all families should be reunified. / believe that the conflicting interests and points of view between spouse abuse and child abuse were never considered by your Commission.

This rather simplistic reasoning and approach to family violence if followed, actually does more harm than good for domestic violence victims. It set us back years in advancements we have made in victim services. It totally ignores the research done in the area of family violence.

Thirdly, the idea of putting domestic violence in a consolidated Council will not work for an obvious reason: the departments which sit on several Councils, do not generally have the same staff person sitting on all of the Councils. One person in each office simply can't know all there is to know about child abuse, spouse abuse, CCJCC, the Crisis Center and drug abuse. Each time a new agenda area is covered a different person from the agency would have to attend the meeting. (One can see the obvious absurdity to logically extending this point to a situation where an agenda would cover areas from each of the five consolidate

Councils.) On paper consolidation may appear very efficient to make all the departments come under one Council, however, this apparent efficiency may actually only be the lovely package on the outside, but empty of real means to serve people on the inside.

It is not without good reason that specialists have evolved in each department to develop the expertise necessary to deal with the special nature of these issues. A good example of this is the expertise in LAPD's Juvenile Division on child abuse or gang activity. The same juvenile office narcotic officer of gang expert would not attend a Domestic Violence Council meeting, rather LAPD would be represented the Council by a member of their Crisis Intervention Unit.

I would urge the Commission to reconsider the Consolidation realignment plan and wait until the affected agency can voice their opinion about the usefulness of a consolidation plan.

I hope this is of some assistance to the Commission. If more information, is needed please contact me at my office.

Very truly yours,

Cheryl J. Ward Smith

Chairperson

CJWS: jb

Mr. John Campbell
Los Angeles County
Economy and Efficiency Commission
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Dear Mr. Campbell:

Thank you for sending Governor Deukmejian a draft of the June 1988 Report on Children's Social Services in Los Angeles County prepared by the Economy and Efficiency Commission Task Force on Children's Services. The Governor has requested that the State Department of Social Services (SDSS) provide you with our comments on the recommendations presented and discussed in the Report.

The SDSS fully supports County efforts to coordinate local and County services in order to ensure that optimum services be provided to children and their families. Considering the unique structure of Los Angeles County government, the Commission's concentration on strengthening the communication and collaboration between all entities involved in providing child welfare services is recognized as a most valid and practical approach. Recommendations designated in the Report as Phase II, which will require further study and planning prior to implementation, offer particular potential in unifying government functions affecting families.

We appreciate your continued commitment to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of government services necessary to respond to the varying needs of children. Please keep us informed of the results of the Commission's presentation of this report to the Board of Supervisors, and any subsequent development efforts related to the recommendations.

Sincerely,

LOREN D. SUTER
Deputy Director
Adult and Family Services cc: Governor's Office

September 6, 1988

John Campbell

Los Angeles Economy and Efficiency Commission

Room 163

Hall of Administration

500 W. Temple Street

Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Mr. Campbell: / recently returned from vacation to find a copy of the study made by your commission on the problem of children services. As you know, the Little Hoover Commission, on which / serve, has conducted hearings and issued a report on the same problem. Your report does an excellent job on this difficult issue and / greatly appreciate your having forwarded this to me.

Sincerely,

RICHARD R. TERZIAN

RRT:bb

July 12, 1988

Arthur J. Peever
Chairperson
TaskForce on Children's Services
Economy and Efficiency Commission
163 Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles CA 90012

Dear Mr. Peever:

I appreciated the opportunity to address your Commission on July 6th regarding some of the findings and recommendations of your Task Force on Children's Services.

As emphasized in my comments, I believe your recommendations merging the staffing and Policy level of five existing interdepartmental bodies presents serious practical and philosophical problems. I would be pleased to further discuss these concerns with your Task Force Members.

Please extend my regards to your fellow Commissioners for their kind and courteous attention.

Very truly yours,

Deanne Tilton

ICAN Director

SECTION J

SELECTED COURT CASES

No

LAWS REVIEWED

SELECTED COURT CASES AND LAWS REVIEWED

COURT CASES

City of Cleburne, Texas V. Cleburne Living Center, 821565. Case involving a city zoning ordinance dating from the 1920's that requires a special permit in order to set up a home for the feeble minded, the insane, alcoholics and drug addicts. No such permit required for convalescent and nursing homes or for hospitals and sanitariums in that particular neighborhood.

Coy V. Iowa 88 Daily Journal D. A. R. 8440 (July 1, 1988). Appellant (Coy) was charged with sexually assaulting two 13 year old girls. At appellant's jury trial, the court granted the State's motion to place a screen between girls and the appellant during their testimony, rejecting appellant's claim that this procedure violated the Confrontation Clause of the Sixth Amendment, which gives a defendant the right to be confronted with the witnesses against him. 5

Contra Costa County Social Service Department v. Glenn C. 88 Daily Journal D. A. R. 6651. (May 27, 1988) Glenn C. (appellant and defendant) appeals jurisdictional findings and

disposition orders of the Contra Costa County Juvenile court relating to his three children pursuant to dependency, proceedings brought under Welfare and Institutions Code section 00, subdivision (a). Glenn C. contended that (1) the evidenced in support of the jurisdiction finding was insufficient; (2) the trial correct erroneously failed to articulate the standard of proof applied at the disposition hearing; and (3) the trial court erroneously refused: to order a reunification plan. The court held that there was sufficient evidence to sustain the jurisdictional findings but not for the later two contentions.

County of San Mateo V. Dell J. , Sr. et al. 88 Daily Journal D. A. R. 13736 (October 31, 1988). The appellate court held that the county was entitled to reimbursement for support and maintenance expenses from the parents (Dell J.) while their minor child (ward of the court) was in a foster care facility. Costs attributable to confinement, rehabilitation, treatment or supervision were excluded. The support and maintenance expenses were not found to be in violation of equal protection.

Herman Patrick Ebarb V. County of Stanislaus et. al. 88Daily Journal D. A. R. 6189 (May 19, 1988). Herman Ebarb(plaintiff appellant) contacted the Stanislaus County Child Protective Services and advised them that extreme violence would be inflicted on Melissa (his daughter) by her mother's boyfriend. No action was taken and the child died. The mother's boyfriend was alleged to be the perpetrator. The court

could not tell whether the County in fact consciously exercised discretion. The judgement was reversed and the cause remanded for further proceedings.

In the Matter of Matthew Keith S. , A Minor. Kathleen S. (mother)1
V. Los Angeles County Department of Children Services. 88 Daily Journal D.
A. R. 6270 (May 20, 1988). The Los Angeles County Department of Children's Services filed a petition pursuant to Welfare and Institution Code section 300. subdivision (a) after two year old Matthew fell from a secondary story window while living with Kathleen S. (appellant). Juvenile court took dependency jurisdiction over Matthew although he remained in appellant's custody. A supplemental petition was filed. Custody of the child was taken from the mother. The child was given to his maternal grandparents. The mother appealed the judgement terminating her parental rights. The child's father was not locatable. He was then not a party to the appeal. The court found that the mother's untreated, serious personality flaws and emotional instability, coupled with her past conduct, her lack of concern for the child's wellbeing and her lack of preparation to deal with the responsibilities of parenthood, adequately supported the court's findings that Matthew had been neglected or cruelly treated (Civ. Cod 5 232, subd. (a)(2)).

In re Brian P. , a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law. Los Angeles County Department of Children's Services, v. Colleen P. 88 Daily Journal D. A. R. 728 (January 21, 1988). Brian P. was declared a dependent child of the juvenile court pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 300, subdivision (a), on the grounds he suffered from malnutrition due to being fed an inadequate diet while in the custody and control of his mother, Colleen P. He was removed from the custody of the mother and placed in foster care. Permanency planning hearings were held and suitable placement was ordered to remain in effect and was referred to the Dept. of Adoptions for adoptive planning. The mother appealed this decision. The appeal was dismissed.

In re Micah S. , a Mino Director of Social Services v. Gloria S. , et. al. 88 Daily Journal D. A. R. 1841 (February 18, 1988). Micah was placed in protective custody at seven weeks because his mother (Gloria) and father had no place to live. The child was placed with foster parents shortly thereafter. A combined jurisdictional and disposition hearing was held where the child was judged to be a dependent child. A reunification plan calling for regular visits by the parents, completion of a parenting program. maintaining of suitable housing for six months and participation in counseling and completion of psychiatric evaluations. A combined six month review and permanency planning was held. At this hearing the county counsel was directed to file a termination of parental rights petition because of the parents' chronic mental illness.

Jean Balistreri V. Pacifica Police Dept; Al Olson, Police Chief,
individually and as a police agent. 88 Daily Journal D. A. R. 10901.
Balistreri was beaten and harassed by her husband before and after their
divorce. She alleged that the police refused to act against her husband.
She filed a complaint alleging that these acts violated her constitutional
rights: due process, equal protection under the law, freedom from excessive
force and unreasonable searches and seizure by police. The district court
dismissed the complaint with prejudice. The U. S. Court of Appeals for the
Ninth Circuit dismissed the plaintiff's complaint regarding search, seizure
and excessive use of forces: but reversed the dismissal with prejudice of the
plaintiff's due process and equal protection claims.

The People v. Kathleen Kevin and Richard Allen Hawkins. 88 Daily
Journal D. A. R. 6630 (May 27, 1988). The court held that Richard Hawkins
committed adult abuse for not properly taking care of his ill mother under
Penal Code section 368, subdivision (a). Kathleen Kevin's conviction was
reversed. Legal procedural issues were discussed but dismissed.

The People V. Robert Emmitt Anthony Mc Girr. , 88 DailyJournal D. A.
R. 1747 (February 17, 1988). Appellant cohabited with Cheryl Duvall. They
had a daughter, Sebreena, during this time. After separation the mother
informally let the appellant

have visitations with the child. On one occasion the appellant took the child for an extended period of time and made the mother go get the child in another town. The appellant claimed he did it because he was concerned for the child's welfare. The appellant sought counsel who informed him that he did not have to return the child to her mother under the circumstances. The appellant was charged with concealment under Section 227 of the California Penal Code. During testimony the appellant provided information that the child was living in an unsafe atmosphere. Both the trial and appellant court determined that the appellant acted without good cause and with the requisite specific intent required under Section 227.

LAWS

Federal

Social Security Act, Child Welfare Services, sec. 420(a), 42 U. S. C. 620, sec. 421 (a). 42 U. S. C. 621, sec. 422 (a), 42 U. S. C. 622.

Social Security Act, Federal Payments for Foster Care and Adoption Assistance, sec. 470, U. S. C. 670, sec. 471 (a), 42U. S. C. 671.

State

AB 1642. Nestande. Social services: planning. (repeal 1983).
Enacted the California Social Services Planning Act to be

administered by the State Department of Social Services. Required the department and the Governor to prepare annual state social service plans based on county social services plans and various state and federal requirements.

AB 2994, Imbrecht. Child Abuse and Neglect Programs: Vital Statistics: Fees: Birth Certificates. Law requiring a portion of payment for certified copies of birth certificates be put into a county children's trust fund or to the State Children's Trust Fund; directed county board of supervisors to create a voluntary local commission, board, or council for child abuse and neglect prevention and intervention programs; allowed county trust funds to include private sources; directed trust funds from birth certificates and private sources be used for child abuse and neglect prevention and intervention programs.

AB 3501, Bradley. Sentence enhancement legislation proposing sending murderers of children under 14 to the gas chamber. The Los Angeles Daily Journal, 16 May 1988, p. 2.

AB 4245, Green Hughes School Building Lease Purchase Bond Law of 1986. Provided for bond issue of \$800, 000, 000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools to be sold at a rate not to exceed \$400, 000, 000.

SB 125 (Proposition 26), State School Building Lease Purchase Bond Law of 1984. Provided for a bond issue of \$450, 000, 000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

SB 1760, Torres. Children's Services. Established an Interagency Board comprised of representatives of various state government entities. The board shall address issues of coordination, duplication, gaps in service, and unclear service mandates in children's services.

COLLECTION OF LAWS

Orange County Juvenile Court. Juvenile Justice Commission. Probation Dept. Laws For Youth 1982.

SECTION K

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Abrahamse. Allan F. ; Morrison, Peter A. ; and Wait Linda J. Beyond Stereotypes: Who Becomes a single Teenage Mother? Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation January 1988.
- Adizes, Ichak. "Organizational Passages Diagnosing and Treating Lifecycle Problems of Organizations. " *Organizational Dynamics* (Summer 1979)
- Agranoff. Robert J. *intergovernmental Management: "Human Services Problem Solving in Six Metropolitan Areas. "* Albany, NY: State University of New York. 1986.
- Albert, Raymond. "Addressing Socio-Legal Problems: A Unifying Perspective for Social Workers. " *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 12 (December 1985): 691711.
- Albert, Raymond. "Social Work Advocacy In the Regulatory Process. " *Social Casework* (October 1983): 473477.
- Allen Meares, P. and Lane, B. A. "Grounding Social Work in Theory: Ecosystems. " *Social Casework* 68 (Nov. 1987): 51521.
- Alatorre, Richard. "We Can Make a Modest Start on Gangs. " *Los Angeles Times* 13 October 1988.
- Alter, C. F. "The Changing Structure of Elderly Service Delivery Systems. " *Gerontologist*. 28 (Fall 1988): 9198.
- The American Humane Association. *Child Protective Services Entering the 1980's: A Nationwide Survey.* Denver, CO: 1979.
- 'The American Scene: The Plight of Children. ' *The Washington Spectator* 13 (15 October 1987): 13.
- Anderson, George M. 'Dying Young: Infant Mortality in the. United States. *America* (26 December 1987): 498500.
- Angel, Carol. 'Appeal Court Gives Gay Parent Right to Full Visitation. ' *Daily Journal* 25 January 1988.
- Angel. Carol. 'La Flamme Focuses His Efforts on Helping Abused Children. ' *Daily Journal* 15 January 1988. sec. 2.
- Ansberry. Clare. "Desperate Straits: Burgeoning Caseloads, Cuts in Funding Beset Public Social Workers. Other Problems Include Loss of Status, Low Salaries; More Leave the Profession. Society Just Doesn't Care. " *Wall Street Journal*. 5 January 1987.
- Aponte, H. J. 'If / Don't Get Simple. / Cry. ' *Family Process* 25 December 1986): 53148.

Arch, Shirley D. `Older Adults as Home Visitors Modeling Parenting for Troubled Families. ' Child Welfare 57 (November 1978): 601605.

Associated Press. `Abused N. Y. Teen Given 6 Months in Jail For Hiring Classmate to Slay Her Father. ' Daily Journal 6 October 1987, p. 6.

Associated Press. `Conservator System Needs Overhaul, State Senator Says. ' Daily Journal 8 February 1988.

Associated Press. `Child Care Bill to Include Religious Groups. ' Daily Journal, Date Unknown.

Associated Press. `Lack of Child Care Found to Deter Aid Recipients. tm Los Angeles Times 12 January 1986.

Associated Press. `Masked Police Investigators Capture Allegiance of Children. ' Daily Journal 15 July 1988.

Associated Press. `Officials Vow Custody Battle With Addict Mother. ' Daily Journal 28 October 1987.

Associated Press. `State Senator Says Children Services Bill Most Important. ' Daily Journal 19 January 1988.

Bancroft, Ann. `California Families Turn Into a High Profile Issue. ' The CAEYC Newsletter 16 (Fall 1987).

Bayles, Fred and Mc Cartney, Scott. `Gloomy Outlook, But There Are Alternatives to Guardianships. In Many Cases, the Needs of Those in Need Are Handled Without Laws. ' Daily Journal.

Bennett, William J. `Bennett's Lesson for Lawyers. The First Purpose of Education Law is to Enhance Education. ' Daily Journal 10 February 1988.

Besharov, Douglas J. `Contending with Overblown Expectation: CPS Cannot Be All Things To All People. ' Public Welfare (Winter 1987): 711.

Beyette. Beverly. `Staying Alive: For Hollywood's Castoff Teens, Selling Themselves Is More and More a Matter of Survival. ' Los Angeles Times 15 January 1988, Section 5, pp. 14.

`Black Infant Mortality Risks Studied. ' Science News 132: 128.

Block, Norman M. `Towards Reducing Recidivism in Foster Care. ' Child Welfare 60 (1981): 597610.

Bolton, Frank G. , Jr. When Bonding Fails: Clinical Assessment of High Risk Families. Beverly Hill CA: Sage Publication 1983.

Bower, B. 'Quality Daycare and Social Growth. ' Science News 132: 5455.

Brandl, John. 'Book Reviews: Family and Nation by Daniel Moynihan. ' Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 6 (1086): 110112.

Brawley, Edward A. 'The Expanding Array of Human Service Personnel. ' journal of Sociology and Social Welfare 9 (December 1982): 587606.

Breen, Bill. 'The 'Aunt' You Wish You Had Around. Intergenerational Program: Adults Give Young People Words of Wisdom. ' The Christian Science Monitor 24 October 1988.

Bronf Enbrenner, Urie. 'The Split Level American Family. ' SR (. 7 October 1987): 6066.

Brooks, Clarke. 'Day Care Funds Bogged Down In Red Tape. State Workers Say. ' Daily Journal 25 October 1985.

Brown, Larry. 'The Future of Child Protective Services. ' Public Welfare (Winter 1987): 1321.

Brudne Jeffery L. 'Coproduction Issues of Implementation. ' Administration and Society 17 (November 1985): 243256.

Buckley, Susan. 'Parent Aides Provide Support to High Risk Families. ' Children Today 14 (Sept/Oct 1985): 1619.

Bush, G. M. 'L. A. 's Child Support Payment Program Touted as Successful. ' Daily Journal 1 July 1988.

Bus G. M. 'New L. A. Panel to Take on Problems of the Homeless. ' Daily Journal 1 July 1988.

Byre. Harry. 'Church, State and Foster Care Children. ' America (25 July 1987): 3841.

California Consortium of Child Abuse Councils. Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment Programs: 198788. Sacramento, CA: 1988.

California District Attorneys Association. Child Sexual Assault Prosecution Seminar Manual. Sacramento, CA: February 1987.

Carmondy, Dianne Cyr, and Williams, Kirk K. 'Wife Assault and Perceptions of Sanctions. ' Violence and Victims 2 (1987): 2538.

Cash, T. and Valentine, D. "A Decade of Adult Protective Services: Case Characteristics. " Journal of Gerontological Social Work 10 (1987): 4760.

'Child Care Time is Now. " L. A. Times 27 July 1988. sec. 2, p. 6.

Children's Defense Fund. A Children's Defense Budget FY 1989: An Analysis of Our Nation's Investment in Children. Washington, DC: 1988.

City and County of San Francisco. Children, Youth and Family Service System Feasibility Study, Laural Grandin, et. al. San Francisco, CA: 15 December 1987.

City of Chicago Dept. of Human Services. A Chicago Youth Agenda: Meeting the Needs of the Generation At Risk. Final Report of the Major's Youth Development Coordinating Committee. July 1987.

Clark, Hattie. 'Haven for Troubled Children: 'Salem' Provides Rules and Rewards. ' The Christian Science Monitor 27 March 1986.

Coleman, Jill. 'Is No Fault Divorce Leaving Women Out in the Cold?' Daily Journal 19 November 1987.

Compher, John Victor. "Parent School Child Systems: Triadic Assessment and Intervention. " Social Casework (September 1982):415423.

Compton. Beulah. "The Family Centered Project Revisited. " St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota, Date Unknown.

Compton, Beulah. 'A Participant Observer's Brief Summary of the Family Centered Project. " St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota, May 1979.

Compton, Beulah. "Serving Problem Families. " Paper Presented at the Midwest Regional Child Welfare League of America Conference. April 1967.

Compton. Beulah. "Treatment of the Multi-problem Family. " Report to the National Conference of Social Work. Atlantic City, NJ. 9 June 1960.

Dadds, M. R. 'Families and the Origins of Child Behavior Problems. ' Family Process 26 (September 1987): 34157.

De Hoog. Ruth Hoogland. Contracting Out for Human Services: Economic, Political and Organizational Perspectives. Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 1984.

De Hoo Ruth Hoogland. 'Theoretical Perspectives on Contracting Out for Services: Implementation Problems and Possibilities on Privatizing Public Services. ' Source Unknown.

Dillon, John. 'Study Says Business is Slow Responding to' Daycare Needs. ' The Christian Science Monitor 8 April 1986. 'Divorcing Parents Must Have Child Plan. ' Source Unknown.

Dluhy, Milan J. 'Moving From Professionalism to Political Advocacy in the Human Services. How to Organize a Successful Statewide Political Effort in Youth Services. ' Source Unknown.

Donohue, William. 'Are Advocates for the Homeless Advocating Homelessness. ' Daily Journal 12 December 1987.

Duncan, Greg. 'Blame Joblessness, Not the Families, for Black Poverty. ' Los Angeles Times 10 February 1986.

Dutton, Donald G. 'The Outcome of Court Mandated Treatment for Wife Assault: A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation. ' Violence and Victims 1 (1986): 163175.

Edna Mc Connell Clark Foundation. Keeping Families Together: The Case for Family Preservation. New York: Edna Mc Connell Clark Foundation. 1985.

Eldridge, William D. 'Coping with Accountability: Guidelines for Supervisors. ' Social Casework (October 1982): 489496.

Elliot. Ward. 'Citizenship. Immigration, and Selective Exclusion. ' Paper Presented for The Claremont Institute's Fourth Annual Bicentennial Conference: NOVUS ORDO SAECULORUM: A New Order for the Ages. 'What Constitution Have /? Freedmen and Immigrants Under the New Order. ' Claremont, CA: February 1987.

Eldridge, William D. 'Practitioners and Self-Evaluation. ' Social Casework (September 1983): 426430.

England, Robert. 'Foster Care System Under Siege. ' Insight 22 February 1988, pp. 2223.

Enriquez, Sam. 'Glendale Joins Firms in Child Care Effort. ' Los Angeles Times 23 February 1986, p. 21.

Executive Service Corps of Southern California. Report On In depth Interviews with Opinion Leaders Concerning the Most Pressing Social Service Needs in Los Angeles County Now and in the Future. Los Angeles, CA: March 1986.

Family Centered Project. Casework Notebook. St. Paul, MN: Greater St. Paul Community Chest and Councils, Inc. , July 1957.

Finger, Jay `Unhealthy Benefits. Hold On To Your Wallets, Senator Kennedy Has A New National Health Insurance Plan That Won't Cost The Taxpayers A Dime. ' Inc. , July 1987, pp. 2930.

Finkeihor, David, et. al. , eds. The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983.

Fitch, Lisa. `Childcare: Why Not A Coop?' Downtown News 21 October 1985, pp. 1011.

Fox, Jerry. `Social Work Ethics and Children; Protection Versus Empowerment. ' Children and Youth Services Review 6 (1984):319328.

Franklin, Dan. `The Times, Yes They Certainly Are Changing: Companies Are Giving More Thought To Providing Day Care. ' Price Club Journal (December 1987): 19.

Friedenberg, Edgar Z. `Introduction. Children and Youth Services Review 6 (1984): 245265.

Gaitney, Liz. `The Child Abuse Crisis: Mothers on the Run. ' U. S. News and World Report, 13 October 1988, pp. 2232+.

Gardner, Marilyn. Mothers's Hours Custom Tailoring the Workweek. The Christian Science Monitor 12 September 1985, p. 29.

Garner, Joel and Clemmer, Elizabeth. `Danger to Police in Domestic Disturbances A New Look. ' National Institute of Justice Research Brief (November 1986): 18.

Garrison, William T. `Inpatient Psychiatric Treatment of the Difficult Child: Common Practices and their Ethical Implications. ' Children and Youth Services Review 6 (1984): 353365.

Gelles, Richard J. and Cornell, Claire Pedrick. International Perspectives on Family Violence. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1983.

Gelles, R. J. and Maynard, P. E. `A Structural Family Systems Approach to Intervention in Cases of Family Violence. ' Family Relations 36 (July 1987): 270275.

Getlin, Josh. `39% of Incarcerated Juveniles Found Jailed for Violence. ' Los Angeles Times 19 September 1988.

Goodwin, J. `Family Violence's: Principles of Intervention and Prevention. U Hospital and Community Psychiatry 36 (October 1985): 107479.

`Government on wheels. ' Daily News 22 August 1988.

Greene, Roberta R. `Case Management: Helping the Homeless Mentally Ill and Persons with Aids and Their Families. ' Silver Spring MD: National Association of Social Worker Date' Unknown.

Guccione, Jean. `Bowman Wants Change of Consciousness on Domestic Violence. ' Daily Journal 4 December 1987, sec. 2.

Guccione, Jean. `Home Electronic Detention of Juveniles Sought. ' Daily Journal 1 December 1987.

Hadley, Roger and Mc Grath, Morag. When Social Services are Local: The Normanton Experience. London: Allen and Unwin, 1984.

Hager, Philip. `Truant May Be Jailed on Contempt, Court Rules. ' Los Angeles Times 26 January 1988.

Hampso Rick. `A Pattern of Violence, and Its Frightening, Deadly Effects. ' Daily Journal 30 November 1987.

Hanson, Chris. `American Families in Crisis: Helping Keep Children and Their Parents Together. ' Civil Liberties, Winter 1988, p. 9.

Harvey M. Rose Accountancy Corp. Preliminary Management Audit Review of the Department of Children's Services Adoptions Division. Los Angeles, CA: 19 October 1988

Hoadley, Walter E. `Economic Prospects and American Youth. ' Town Hall Journal (23 February 1988): 33.

Hill-Scott, Karen, et. al. Child Care Inventory: Los Angeles County. Los Angeles, CA: Systole Stairs, Inc. , 6 March 1978.

Hoekstra, Kathleen O'C. `Ecologically Defining the Mistreatment of Adolescents. ' Children and Youth Services Review 46 (1984):285298.

Holbrook, Terry L. `Going Among Them: The Evolution of the Home Visit. ' Source Unknown.

Holbrook, Terry L. `Social Casework Practice: Who Controls the Worker's Time?' Social Casework (June 1983): 323330.

Horton. R. D. `Expenditures, Services, and Public Management. ' Public Administration Review 47 (Sept/Oct 1987): 37884.

Hoshino, George. `Case Management: `Money and Morality' Revisited; From The Benign to the Malign (A Quickie Think Piece, for Discussion and Comment). ' Unpublished paper. 27 July 1988.

Hoshino, George. `Provider Driven Service Delivery System: Implications for Case Management. ' Unpublished paper. 24 June 1988.

Hotalin Gerald T. and Sugarman, David B. `An Analysis of Risk Markers in Husband to Wife Violence: The Current State of Knowledge. ' Source Unknown.

Howe, Ken. `The Adizes Method: One of the Ways B of A is Solving Intractable Problems. ' The Adizes Institute Inc.

Howe, Ken. `The Man Behind B of A's Recent Reorganization Plan. ' San Francisco Business Journal 18 March 1985.

Johnston, William B. , et. al. Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the twenty-first Century. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute, June 1987.

`Jonas Isn't Kidding When It Comes to Kids, He Resigns Rail Post to Bring Day Care Downtown. ' The Los Angeles Business Journal, 21 September 1987, p. 4.

Jones, Robert J. ; Gruber, Kenneth J. ; and Timber, Gary D. `Incidence and Situational Factors Surrounding Sexual Assault Against Delinquent Youths. ' Child Abuse and Neglect 4 (1981): 431440.

Jordan. Hallye. `Family Law Bills Get `Lukewarm' Reception in `87. New State Task Force Authorized To Review ` Changing Families. ' Bill Package Planned. ' Daily Journal 22 October 1987.

Kearns, David T. `An Education Recovery Plan for America. ' Town Hall Journal (23 February 1988): 3132.

Kelly, Ben J. `County Rescues Teenage Parents. tm California's (January/February 1986): 12, 13, 32, 34. Kendall, Katherine A. `A Sixty Year Perspective of Social Work. ' Social Casework (September 1982): 424428.

Kitten, Peter M. and Martin, Lawrence L. `Purchase of Service Contracting and Declining Influence of Social Work. ' The Urban and Social Change Review 18 (Summer 1985): 811.

Comic, Madeleine H. ; Gutowski, Michael; and Salamon, Lester M. Child Serving Nonprofit Organizations in an Era of Government Retrenchment. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, The Nonprofit Sector Project, 1985.

Kinney. Jill; Haapala, David; and Booth, Charlotte. Homebuilders: Keeping Families Together. Federal Way, WA: Behavioral Sciences Institute, (no date).

Kohn Alfie. 'No Contest: Contrary to What You May Thin Your Company Will Be Alot More Productive If You Refuse to Tolerate Among Your Employees. " Inc. , November 1987, pp. 45148.

Kosberg. J. /. 'Preventing Elder Abuse: Identification of High Risk Factors Prior to Placement Decisions. " The Gerontologist 28 (February 1988): 4350.

Kosterlit Julie. 'Concern About Children: Despite Tight Budgets. Bills to Expand Medicaid to Increase Access to Maternal and Child Health Care Are Gaining Bipartisan Support at the State and Federal Levels. " National Journal (9 September 1986):22552258.

Krell, Helen L. 1 et. al Child Abuse And Worker Training. Social Casework (November 1983): 532538. Kitten, Robert. 'SingleParent Family Needn't Mean Disaster. " Los Angeles Times 26 January 1988.

Kurzman Paul A. "Ethical Issues In Industrial Social Work Practice. tm Social Casework (February 1983): 105111.

Lau Judith A. ; Picus, Joy; and Smith, John P. "The Family Revolution. " Town Hall Journal (14 July 1987): 103105.

League of Women Voters of Los Angeles County. Child Care in Los Angeles County. Northridge, CA: 1986.

League of Women Voters of Los Angeles County. Foster Care in Los Angeles County. Northridge, CA: 1987.

League of Women Voters of Los Angeles County. Mental Health Services in Los Angeles County. Northridge. CA: 1988.

Lee. Robert E. 'Involving the Client's Attorney in the Child Welfare Casework. " Social Casework (September 1982): 435436.

Los Angeles County. Area Agency on Aging. Area Plan 19851989: Annual Report and Operational Plan Update. Los Angeles. CA: 1 July 1986.

Los Angeles County. The Children's Budget Implementation Coordination Committee. Investing In Our Children: A Priority for Los Angeles County. Volumes / and II. Los Angeles. CA:January 1988.

Los Angeles County. Children's Services Task Force. Report to the Board of Supervisors Concerning Recommendations to Improve the Delivery of Services to Abused and Neglected Children in Los Angeles County. Los Angeles. CA: 30 March 1984.

Los Angeles County. Commission for Children Services. Annual Report 1985.
Los Angeles CA: 24 February 1986.

Los Angeles County. Commission for Children Services. 1986 Annual Report.
Los Angeles, CA: 1 June 1987.

Los Angeles County. Commission for Children Services. Progress Report on
the Commission for Children's Services. Los Angeles, CA: 9 January 1985.

Los Angeles County. Community and Senior Citizens Services. County
Justice System Subvention Program: Program Year 1986/1987. Monitoring
Report: Second Quarter, by Larry D. Rosen,

Los Angeles, CA: 3 March 1987. Los Angeles County. Community and Senior
Citizens Services. Homeless in Los Angeles County: Report to the Countywide
Taskforce on the Homeless. Los Angeles, CA: 16 August 1985.

Los Angeles County. Community and Senior Citizens Services. Report of the
Los Angeles County Commission on Obscenity and Pornography Regarding the
Attorney General's Commission on Pornography: Final Report.

Los Angeles, CA: December 1986. Los Angeles County. Department of
Auditor/Controller. Preliminary Audit Review of the Department of Children's
Services Adoptions Division, by Harvey Rose Accountancy Corporation.

Los Angeles, CA: 19 October 1988. Los Angeles County. Department of
Children's Services. Commission for Children's Services Annual Report 1985.
Los Angeles CA: 1 April 1986.

Los Angeles County. Department of Children's Services. Assessment Training
Program: A Final Report. Los Angeles, CA: December 1987.

Los Angeles County. Department of Children's Services. Child Abuse and
Neglect Treatment: Resource Directory. Los Angeles, CA: 1985.

Los Angeles County. Department of Children's Services. Detailed Analysis
Los Angeles County Department of Children's Services. Phase 1 Synag. The
Adizes Method September 2324. 1986.

Los Angeles County, CA: 1986. Los Angeles County. Department of Children's
Services. Information Systems Concept: Final Report. by Herbert H.
Isaacs. Los Angeles County, CA: 27 July 1987.

Los Angeles County. Department of Children's Services. Information Systems
Planning: Outline of Technical Issues Regarding DCS Future Systems, by
Herbert H. Isaacs. Los Angeles County CA: 26 June 1987.

Los Angeles County. Department of Children's Services. Emergency Response in the Community (ERIC) Project by the Institute for Communication and Professional Studies, California State University, Northridge. Los Angeles, CA: October 1986.

Los Angeles County. Department of Children's Services. Fulfillment Plan 1987. Los Angeles, CA: January 1987.

Los Angeles County. Department of Children's Services. Data Processing Department. Children Information System Conceptual System Design Document. Los Angeles, CA: revised July 1985.

Los Angeles County. Department of Health Services. Office of the Coordinator. Suspected Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Program. Guidelines For The Management And Reporting of Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect. Los Angeles CA: December 1980.

Los Angeles County. Department of Health Services. Child Abuse Directory of Health Workers. Los Angeles, CA: July 1987.

Los Angeles County. Department of Mental Health. A Study of the Homeless and Mental Illness in the Skid Row Area of Los Angeles. Los Angeles, CA: March 1986.

Los Angeles County. Department of Mental Health. A Study of Homelessness and Mental Illness in the Skid Row Area of Los Angeles: Executive Summary. Los Angeles, CA: March 1986.

Los Angeles County. Grand Jury: 197576. Final Report. Los Angeles, CA: 1976.

Los Angeles County. Grand Jury: 198485. Review of the MacLaren Children's Center, by Deloitte Haskins and Sells. Los Angeles, CA: June 1985

Los Angeles County. Grand Jury: 198687. Operations Committee. Los Angeles County Commissions and Committees. Los Angeles, CA: January 1987.

Los Angeles County. Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect. AB 1733/AB 2994 Planning Committee Schedule.

Los Angeles CA: 1 July 1987. Los Angeles County. Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect. Child Abuse Handbook for Professionals. Los Angeles, CA: April 1986 (with update April 1988).

Los Angeles County. Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect. Child Sexual Abuse Training for Key County Departments. Los Angeles, CA: 1987.

Los Angeles County. Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect. Council Description and Guidelines for the Identification and Reporting of Child Abuse and Neglect. Los Angeles CA: January 1987.

Los Angeles County. Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect. Data Information Sharing Committee. An Analysis of the ICAN Data/Information Sharing System Report 9 1987. Los Angeles CA: 4 November 1987.

Los Angeles County. Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect. Data/Information Sharing System Report to the Policy Committee. Los Angeles, CA: 1987.

Los Angeles County. Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect. Protocols Developed by the ICAN Child Death Review Committee. Los Angeles, CA: 1985.

Los Angeles County. Justice Action Coordinating Standing Committee on Juvenile Justice Services. Regionalization of the Juvenile Justice System in Los Angeles County. Report No. 1. Los Angeles, CA: 1975.

Los Angeles County. Los Angeles Public Library. Strategic Plan 1987-2000. Los Angeles, CA: 1987.

Los Angeles County. Office of Education. High School Seniors: Who's Graduating, and How Many? * Trends 1 (December 1987): 12.

Los Angeles County. Office of Education. Los Angeles County Office of Education Final Budget: 1987-88. Los Angeles, CA: 4 August 1988.

Los Angeles County. Probation Department. Audits and Standards Office. Second Year End Technical Report; Compton Area Juvenile Diversion Project. Los Angeles, CA: June 1976.

Los Angeles County. Task Force on Drug Abuse. Final Report. Los Angeles, CA: November 1987.

The Los Angeles Roundtable for Children. The Children's Budget of Los Angeles County Government. Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California, School of Social Work, May 1986.

The Los Angeles Roundtable for Children. Profile of the Children of Los Angeles County. Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California, School of Social Work, 1984.

The Los Angeles' Roundtable for Children. Services for Children with Disabilities in Los Angeles County: Working Draft. Los Angeles. CA: University of Southern California, School of Social Work, 8 December 1987.

Lovens, Herbert D. and Rako, Jules. "A Community Approach to Prevention of Child Abuse." *Child Welfare* 54 (February 1985): 8387.

Lowy, L. *Major Issue of Age Integrated Versus Age Segregated' Approaches to Serving the Elderly. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work* 10 (1987): 3746.

Lyons C. W. *Interagency Alliances Link Young and Old. *Children Today* 15 (1986): 2125.

Magura Stephen. "Clients View Outcomes of Child Protective Services." *Social Casework* (November 1982): 522-531.

Mahony, Roger M. *Democracy's Obligation to the Poor. Give Individuals the Tools to Tackle Cause of Poverty. *Los Angeles Times* 23 October 1985, part II, p. 5.

Maiuro, Roland; Cahn Timothy S. ; and Vitaliano, Peter P. `Assertiveness Deficits and Hostility in Domestically Violent Men. *Violence and Victims* 1 (1986): 278-289.

Mathews Audrey. `Government Role In Child Care Sparks Debate. *Public Administration Times* 2 September 1988, PP 1, 32.

May. Lee. `Ousting Abusive Parent, Not Child, Urged. *Los Angeles Times* 19 October 1987.

Meddin, Barbara J. `Third Party Vendorship: An Imperative for the 1980s. *Social Casework* (September 1982): 402-406.

Mental Health Contractors' Association of Los Angeles County. *The Mental Health Needs of Volunteers at MacLaren Children's Center.* Los Angeles, CA: December 1987.

Meredith, Nikki. `The Gravest Injustice: The Number of Reported Child Abuse Cases is up 2,000 Percent, yet Few Cases Ever Reach the Courts, and Fewer Still Result in Convictions.

Why is our Legal System Failing Us? *Parenting Magazine*, August 1988, pp. 59-63.

Mintz, Steven and Kellogg, Susan. *Domestic Revolutions: A Social History of American Family Life.* New York: Free Press, 1987.

Mishel Judith Marks. `The Missing System in Social Work's Application of Systems Theory. *Social Casework* (November 1982): 547-553.

Mitchell, Douglas E. and Iannaccone, Lawrence. *The Impact of California's Legislative Policy on Public School Performance.* Berkeley, CA: University of California, Institute of Government Studies, 1980.

Morell1 C. "Cause is Function: Toward a Feminist Model of Integration for Social Work. 'Social Service Review 61 (March 1987): 14455.

Mccormack1 Patricia. *Scofflaws Are Feeling the Bite of Child Support Reforms. 'The Los Angeles Daily Journal 1 April 1986.

McCroskey, Jacquelyn. `Policy Research: The Los Angeles Roundtable for Children Example. 1 Child Welfare 67 (May/June 1988): 195204.

McGoldrick1 Monica. `Ethnicity and Family Therapy: An Overview. ` Source Unknown.

Mclsaac. Hugh. `Media Misperception. The Real Story About Joint Custody Is That It Works. ' Daily Journal 5 July 1988.

McKain1 J. L. 1Family Violence: A Treatment Program for Couples. ' Journal of Independent Social Work 1 (Spring 1987): 7183.

McNeil, John and Litno9 John H. *Community Service Clinic: A Fieldwork Model at the University of Texas at Arlington. ' Journal of Education for Social Work 17 (Winter 1981): 111118.

McQueen, Michael. `States Set Pace on Innovative Laws for Child Care, Parental Leaves, Women's Pay Equity Standards. 'The Wall Street Journal 1 October 1987, , p. 62.

Mueller, Gunter. Networking in Open Systems. NY: Springer Verlag, 1987.

Nathan1 Winifred. `Whose Rights Are They Anyway? The Supreme Court and the Rights of Juveniles. ' Children and Youth Services Review 6 (1984): 329344.

National Association for Social Work. `Policy Statements: Social Services and Case Management in Health, Education and Human Services. ' Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers, Inc. , 1975, 1987.

National Association for Social Work. `NASW Standards and Guidelines for Social Work Case Management for the Functionally Impaired: Professional Standards No. 12. ' Silver Spring, MD:

National Association of Social Workers, Inc. 1984.
`New Data Change Image of Poverty. '175 Science News (17 March 1984): 169

Newhouse News Service. `City Approves First Ever Parental Leave Law. ' Daily Journal 29 September 1988.

New York Times. Study Finds Major Correlation Between Drug Use, Crime.
Daily Journal 25 January 1988.

O'Connor, Gerald A. *Case Management: Systems and Practice. * Social
Casework 69 (February 1988): 97106.

Orange County. Human Services Agency. Human Services Agency
Implementation Plan. Santa Ana, CA; 15 November 1976.

Oryl Marcia G. and Earpl Jo Anne L. *Child Maltreatment: An Analysis of
Familial and Institutional Predictors. *Journal of Family Issues 1
(September 1980): 339356.

Otten, Alan L. *The New Old: Grandparents Today Are Sprier. Sharper.
Richer and Plentiful. They Spend More Time Being Friends
to Grandchildren; But Major Problems Arise. Are Relations Really Better?"
Source Unknown.

Overton, Alice and Tinker, Katherine. Casework Notebook. St. Paul, MN.
: Family Centered Project, Greater St. Paul, Community Chest and Council,
Inc. 1959.

Pagelow, Mildred Daley. Family Violence. New York, NY: Praeger, 1984.

"Patterns of Change in Problem Families. " Source Unknown. Patti, R. J.
"Managing for Service Effectiveness in Social Welfare Organizations.
Social Welfare 32 (Sept/Oct 1987): 37781.

Peck, Theodore P. The Troubled Family: Sources of Information. Jefferson,
NC: McFarland Publishers. 1982.

Perlman, Lisa. "Open Adoption Movement Works to Change Accepted Rules.
"Daily Journal 21 April 1988, p. 22.

Popple, Philip R. "The Social Work Profession: A Reconceptualization.
" Social Service Review (December 1985): 560649.

"The President, The Public And The Schools. " America (24 October
1987): p. 259.

Price, L. D. "Global Neighborhoods. " Social Development Issues 11
(Spring 1987): 4955.

Prochaska, Janice M. and Prochaska, James O. "Dual Career Families Are a
New Challenge for Spouses and Agencies. " Social Casework (1982): 118120.

Prokop, Donna. "Pilot Mediation Program Made Permanent:Orange County SeesReductionin Needfor Juvenile Court Hearings. " Daily Journal, sec. 2.

Prokop, Donna. "Students to Study Children's Representation. " Daily Journal 21 March 1988.

Ramsey County Community Human Services. The Challenge:To Meet Needs With Compassion and Dignity, in Partnership with Clients, other Social Agenciesand the Community: 1986 Annual Report. Saint Paul, MN: 1987.

Resnick, Herman and Benson, Jaffee. "The Physical Environment and Social Welfare. " Social Casework (1982): 354361.

Roberts, Albert R. "Psychosocial Characteristics of Batterers: A Study of 234 Men Charged with Domestic Violence Offenses. " Journal of Family Violence 2 (1987): 8193.

Ross. W. D. "What Makes Right Acts Right?from The Right and the Good. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1930.

Rothbone, E. "Elderly Victims of Family Violence and Neglect. " Social Casework 61 (May 1980):296304.

Sackett, Kacy. "Drive On to Boost Workers' Parental Aid. " Daily Journal 8 February 1988.

Sackett, Kacy. "SuitFiled Challenging Rental Policyon Children. " Daily Journal 25 January 1988.

San BernardinoCounty. Design Subcommittee. Children's Network. San Bernardino, CA:9 December 1985.

Saunders, Daniel G. ; Lynch, Ann B. ; Grayson, Marcia; and Linz, Daniel. "The Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating: The Construction andInitial Validation of a Measure of Beliefs and Attitudes. " Violence and Victims 2 (1087):3957.

Saunders, Daniel G. "WhenBattered Women UseViolence: HusbandAbuse and SelfDefense. " Victims and Violence 1 (1086): 4760.

Scharg, Peter. "Changing the Divorce Laws to Help Children. " Daily Journal 16 December 1987.

Schneider, Carol Starr. "The Management Guru. `Never Resolve Conflict. Harness it. " Century City News reprint.

Schneider, Stanley and Rimmer, Esti. "Adoptive Parent's HostilityToward Their Adopted Children. " Children and Youth Services Review 6 (1984):345352.

Shaughnessy, Michael F. "Institutional Child Abuse. " Children and Youth Services Review 6 (1984): 311318.

Sheleff, Leon S. "Paternalism and the Young. " Children and Youth Services Review 6 (1984): 267283.

Shelter Partnership, Inc. and United Way, Inc. Shortterm Housing Directory of Los Angeles County. Los Angeles, CA: May 1987.

Silbert, Mimi H. and Pines, Ayala M. "Sexual Child Abuse As An Antecedent To Prostitution. " Child Abuse and Neglect 5(1981): 407411.

Skaff, Laura F. "Child Maltreatment Coordinating Committees For Effective Service Delivery. " Child Welfare 67 (May/June 1988): 217230.

Sonkin, Daniel Jay. "Clairvoyance vs. Common Sense: Therapist's Duty to Warn and Protect. " Victims and Violence 1 (1986): 722.

Sonnenburg, Maxine. et. al. "Winner of Miller Award Urges Children's Advocacy Fund. " Daily Journal 27 September 1988.

Sonkin, Daniey Jay and Ellison, Jean E. "The Therapist's Duty to Protect Victims of Domestic Violence: Where We Have Been and Where We Are Going. " Victims and Violence 1 (1986): 205214.

Stabiner, Karen. "The Baby Brokers. In the Emotional World of Private Adoptions, the Lawyers Make the Deals Between Childless Couples and Women Who Give Up Their Babies. " The Los Angeles Times Magazine 14 August 1988.

State of Arizona. The Arizona Consortium on Education in Partnership with the Arizona Department of Education. An Alliance To Reduce The Number Of High School Dropouts in Arizona. Scottsdale, AZ: no date.

State of California. Assembly Office of Research. California 2000: A People in Transition. Major Issues Affecting Human Resources. Sacramento 1 CA: June 1986.

State of California. Assembly Office of Research. Caring for Tomorrow: A Local Government Guide to Childcare. Sacramento, CA: December 1985.

State of California. Assembly Office of Research. Growing Up in the 70's. A Policy Statement for a System of State and County Departments of Children and Parents' Service, by Norris E. Class. Sacramento, CA: August 1957.

State of California. Assembly Office of Research. Sexual Abuse: A Lifelong Legacy. Sacramento, CA: December 1986.

State of California. Commission on Crime Control and Violence Prevention. "Ounces of Prevention: Toward An understanding of the Causes of Violence: 1982 Final Report to the People of California. Sacramento, CA: 1983

State of California. Commission on California State Government organization and Efficiency. The Children's Services Delivery System in California. A Preliminary Report. Phase /. Sacramento, CA: March 1987.

State of California. Commission on California State Government Organization and Efficiency. The Children's Services Delivery System in California. Final Report. Sacramento, CA: October 1987.

State of California. Department of Education. Agenda for the Twenty First Century: Blueprint For K12 Education Draft. Sacramento, CA: 1987.

State of California. Health and Welfare Agency. Department of Social Services. Preplacement Preventive Services: Emergency Response and Family Maintenance Programs. Survey of Selected Characteristics for Care Closed During April 1985. Sacramento, CA: April 1986.

State of California. Health and Welfare Agency. Department of Social Services. Adult and Family Services Division. Dependent Adult and Elder Abuse. Characteristics Survey. Sacramento, CA: 13 April 1988.

State of California. Health and Welfare Agency. Department of Social Services. Adult and Family Services Division. Dependent Adult and Elder Abuse. Impact of Minimum Guidelines for Dependent Adult and Elder Abuse Investigations on County Adult Protective Services Agencies. Characteristics Survey of Dependent Adult/Elder Abuse Victims. Study Period of February 15, 1987 Through March 16, 1987. Sacramento, CA: April 1988.

State of California. Health and Welfare Agency. Department of Social Services. Adult and Family Services Division. Family and Children's Services Branch. Child Welfare Services Report. Sacramento, CA: 1987.

State of California. Health and Welfare Agency. Department of Social Services. Data Processing and Statistical Services Bureau. Preplacement Preventive Services: Emergency Response and Family Maintenance Programs. Survey of Selected Characteristics for Cases Closed During April 1985. Sacramento, CA: April 1986.

State of California. Health and Welfare Agency. Department of Social Services. Office of Child Abuse Prevention. Report to the Legislature. Sacramento, CA: January 1988.

State of California. Health and Welfare Agency. Department of Social Services. Populations working Committee. Out of Home Care Task Force. Report On Population Issues. Sacramento, CA: February 1988.

State of California. Legislative Analyst. Child Welfare Services. A Review of the Effect of the 1982 Reforms on Abused and Neglected Children and Their Families. Sacramento, CA: May 1985.

State of California. Office of the Auditor General. Joint Legislative Audit Committee. Improvements Are Needed In Coordination Of Services For Children and Youth in California. Sacramento, CA: 3 October 1978.

State of California. Registry of Charitable Trusts. Periodic Report Information on: ICAN. Associates; The Big Sister League (L. A.); Children's Bureau; United Friends of the Children; The Richstone Center; Cedar House Foundation; San Fernando Valley Child Guidance Clinic. Sacramento, CA.

State of California. Senate Select Committee on Children and Youth. SB 1295 Task Force. Child Abuse Reporting Laws, Juvenile Court Dependency Statutes, and Child Welfare Services. Sacramento, CA: January 1988.

State of California. Senate Task Force On Family Equity. Final Report. Sacramento, CA: June 1987.

State of California. The Youth Authority. Child Abuse and Delinquency. What are the Correlations? A Report of the Transfer of Knowledge Workshop Held at Cenacle Retreat House, Carmichael, California June 46, 1984. Sacramento, CA: August 1984.

Steinkamp, M. W. and Kelly, J. R. "Social Integration, Leisure Activity, and Life Satisfaction in Older Adults: Activity Theory Revisited." International Journal of Aging and Human Development 25 (1987): 293-307.

Stewart, C. ; Senger, M. ; Kallen, D. ; and Scheurer S. "Family Violence in Stable Middle Class Homes." Social Work 32 (Nov/Dec 1987): 529-31.

Stibelman, Arleen. "Local Bar Calls for Change in Child Placement Law." Daily Journal 15 April 1988, p. 1.

Stibelman, Arleen. "Winning OrdersHalf the Battle in Family Violence. Activists Complain Police Won't Arrest Enforcement Poor. But Advances Cited. "Daily Journal. Date Unknown.

Straus, Murray A. "Ordinary Violence, Child Abuse, and Wife Beating. What Do They Have inCommon?" Interuniversity Consortiumfor Political and Social Research, University of Michigan. Date Unknown.

Sugarman, David B. "OriginandSolution Attributionsof Responsibilityfor WifeAbuse: Effects of Outcome Seyerity9 Prior History, and Sex of Subject. " Violence and Victims 1. (1986):291303.

Sullivan, Cheryl. "America's Troubled Children: Wards of the State. " The Christian Science MonitQr. 2730, September 1988, sec. B, pp. 18 (all issues).

Talan, Jamie. "Spanking New Study on Discipline. Leniency with ChildrenMay Backfire, Researcher Finds. "Los Angeles Times. Date Unknown.

Thomas, Leslie. "Day Care for Downtown Parents. " Downtown News 6 August 1985. p. 6, 20.

Tice, Carol H. "Perspectives on Intergenerational Initiatives: Past Present and Future. " Children Today14 (Sept/Oct 1985): 611.

"TowardsANew Youth Agenda. Assessing the Conditions of Children in California. " 9 July 1987:1215. Source Unknown.

Trebilcock, Bob. "Hiding Hilary. " Glamour November 1988, pp. 246, 247, 299, 300, 301, 303, 304, 305, 306.

TulareCounty. Child ProtectiveServices. A Report to the TulareCounty's Child Protection Services, by Maurice Bishoff and Ruta Skirius. Tulare, CA: 31 August 1983.

Trzcinski, Jon. J. "Beyond Contracting: Linking the Public and Private Sectors. " Social Casework (February 1982): 114117.

"Two Officials Will Speak at Child Care Center Rite. "Los Angeles Times 9 September 1985.

UnitedWay. School Age ChildCare Project. School's Out In L. A. County: An Inventory Report. Los Angeles, CA: May 1986.

United Way, Inc. HealthServices for Foster Children Technical Committee. Health Servicesfor FosterChildren: A Report and Recommendations on the Foster Care System in Los Angeles County. Los Angeles, CA: January 1987.

University of California, Berkeley. Institute of Government Studies. The Impact of California's Legislative Policy on Public School Performance. Berkeley, CA: 1980.

University of California, Los Angeles. Department of Pediatrics. "Child Abuse and Neglect Interdisciplinary Training Program Curriculum." Los Angeles. CA: Date Unknown.

University of California, Los Angeles. School of Social Welfare in Collaboration with Los Angeles County's Department of Children's Services. Status Offenders in Los Angeles County: Focus on Runaway and Homeless Youth. A Study and Policy Recommendations. Los Angeles, CA: 9 September 1985.

U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare. Child Abuse and Neglect: Issues on Innovation and Implementation. 2 Vols. , 1978.

U. S. Dept. of Health and Human Services. Study Findings: National Study of the Incidence and Severity of Child Abuse and Neglect. September 1981.

U. S. Dept. of Health and Human Services. Office of Human Development Services. The Division of Child Protection, Children's Hospital National Medical Center and The National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, Administration for Children, Youth and Families. The National Symposium on Child Victimization: Abstract Guide To Paper and Poster Presentations. Washington. DC: Government Printing Office, April 1988.

U. S. Dept. of Justice. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency. Organization of Youth Services. Report of Technical Assistance For the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors and the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, by Arthur D. Little. Inc. , Date Unknown.

U. S. Dept. of Justice. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The Out of State Placements of Children: A National Survey, by John Hall, et. al. , Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1982.

University of Southern Maine. Professional Social Work Practice in Public Child Welfare: An Agenda for Action. Recommendations from an Invitational Conference, March 24-26, 1986. Portland, ME, 1987.

Urban Institute. Child Serving Nonprofit Organizations in an Era of Government Retrenchment. Washington, DC: 1985

Ventura County. Interagency Collaboration Demonstration Project. Ventura, CA: November 1987.

Ventura County. Mental Health Services. A Report and Commentary on the Ventura Model for Children's Mental Health Services. Ventura, CA: 19 August 1987.

Wagner, Rob L. "McMahon Stands Up for Falsely Accused Child Abusers." Daily Journal 26 February 1988.

Weinstein, Vivian. Report on SB 14 Ancillary Services. Los Angeles, CA: 31 October 1986.

West, John G. Jr. "A Question of Custody. Batey Case Illustrates the Problems in Deciding 'Who Gets the Kids.'" Daily Journal 25 November 1987.

Whittaker, James K. ; Schinke, Steven P. ; and Gilchrist, Lewayne D. "The Ecological Paradigm in Child, Youth, and Family Services: Implications for Policy and Practice." Social Service Review (December 1986): 483-503.

"Whose Rights?" (editorial) Daily Journal 26 January 1988.

Wilgosh, L. and Paitich, D. "Delinquency and Learning Disabilities: More Evidence." Journal of Learning Disabilities 15 (May 1982): 278-279.

Wolock, Isabel and Horowitz, Bernard. "Child Maltreatment and Material Deprivation Among AFDC Recipient Families." Social Service Review (June 1979): 175-194.

Wyers, Norman L. "Income Maintenance and Social Work: A Broken Tie." Social Work (July-August 1983): 261-268.

Zasada, Marc Porter. "Childcare Update: ABCD Turns to New Tactics After Frustrated Efforts in the Boardroom." Downtown News, 16 November 1987, pp. 6+.

Zimmerman, Jerome H. "Negotiating the System: Clients Make a Case for Case Management." Public Welfare 45 (Spring 1987): 23-27.