EVIDENCE-BASED SUPERVISOR-TEAM INDEPENDENT LIVING TRAINING: KENTUCKY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

Becky F. Antle
Kent School of Social Work, University of Louisville

Anita P. Barbee
Kent School of Social Work, University of Louisville

Dana J. Sullivan
Kent School of Social Work, University of Louisville

Acknowledgement: This study was funded by a federal training grant to the second author from the U.S. DHHS, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau, 90CW1134. Comments concerning this manuscript should be directed to the first author at becky.antle@louisville.edu.

Nationwide, 20,000 adolescents each year leave the foster care system and attempt to live independently (GAO, 1999). Of the 550,000 children in foster care, 20% of them will age out of care and need to be trained in independent living skills so as to ease the transition to independent living. The Foster Care Independence Act of 1999 (Chaffee Act) emphasized the need for the government to ensure that youth aging out of the foster care system move to independent living successfully and prevent health hazards, untreated mental illness, domestic abuse, substance abuse, unemployment, homelessness, criminal behavior and subsequent incarceration.

Kentucky has a substantial problem with children lingering in the foster care system, not being adopted, and thus needing to transition to adulthood without the benefit of a loving family to launch them. This issue was a concern in Kentucky's CFSR review in March 2003 and was a major focus of the first PIP. For example, the number of Legacy Children (those in care for 4 years or longer) has not been reduced substantially even though ASFA has been in effect for eight years. A recent dissertation study at the University of Louisville (Tungate, 2005) compared 125 legacy children with 125 randomly chosen children who had moved to permanency within 2 years. The analysis of numerous child, family, worker and system variables accounted for 70% of the variance in predicting what led to children remaining in the system for too long. Tungate found that Kentucky children who remain in the system for four years or longer were more likely to have come from larger families, poorer families with less community support, had more physical, emotional and behavioral symptoms at time of entry into care, had more time between updated case plans, had more moves in the system, and had a higher rate of termination of parental rights in their families due to more social workers on the case, fewer parent/

child visitations, and higher maltreatment at entry into foster care. Thus, children who are most likely to move from foster care to independent living are more likely to have severe emotional and behavioral problems as they make the transition to adulthood, making them vulnerable to enter other systems of care such as health, mental health, welfare, and criminal justice.

Previous research has shown that the provision of training, services, supportive interventions, and other concrete assistance is associated with positive outcomes for youth (Reilly, 2003; Lozano, 1993). Youth who receive appropriate services prior to leaving the child welfare system acquire necessary skills, change negative behaviors, and achieve self-sufficiency (Stoner, 1999). Child welfare teams who work with youth need competency-based training on these issues, as well as the ongoing reinforcement and support of their supervisor for these practices. A panel of experts in independent living recommended that independent living services must be holistic, provide training, and stress the importance of relationships (Melpignano & Collins, 2003). Many independent living programs use instructional models to teach self-sufficiency skills to youth (Lemon, Hines, & Merdinger, 2005). Lozano (1993) found that the more independent living services youth receive, the better their outcomes are. These services may include training, support network development, and the provision of job experience (Reilly, 2003). The Citizen's Committee for Children of New York (2000) also asserts the importance of practical job experience and the securing of a permanent home prior to discharge from the system. Services provided to youth in a group format have been found to be helpful in reducing stigma and isolation (McMillen, Rideout, Fisher, & Tucker, 1997). Another essential component of services for youth is cultural sensitivity (Iglehart & Becerra, 2002). Child welfare teams should demonstrate respect for cultural diversity and consider the use of "rites of passage" during this transition (Gavazzi, Alford, & McKenry, 1996). Finally, there must be a gradual (not abrupt) transition to independence with the provision of aftercare (Mallon, 1998). Youth need continued family and community support after they achieve independence (Collins, 2001).

Research studies and results of the CFSR found that in order for members of the child welfare workforce to feel competent in their ability to execute their job duties, a strong training component must be built into their daily practice (Cicero-Reese & Black, 1998; Fox, Barbee, Harmon, Staples, & Spang, 2002; Anderson-Butcher, Lawson, & Barkdull, 2003; Milner, 2003), particularly in areas of engaging families, engaging children and youth through regular visits and interventions, comprehensive assessments, case planning, and fostering partnerships with other providers (Milner, 2003). Research has also demonstrated that workers who are rigorously trained with a high level of mentoring and field reinforcement by supervisors perform better on the job and have higher rates of organizational commitment than those workers without this type of professional development (Barbee, Yankeelov, Antle, Fox, Harmon, Evans, & Black, in press).

Our research in Kentucky over the past 16 years has found that 1) Higher

supervisory support and co-worker support significantly predicted greater transfer of training in the field in the form of assessments, case plans, and treatment (Yankeelov & Barbee, 1996; Antle, 2002). In addition, other researchers have found that when supervisors create clear expectations and establish rules for accountability that relate to a coherent organizational mission, workers' performance is enhanced (Coleman & Clark, 2003; Davis-Sacks, Jayaratne, & Chess, 1985; Ellett, Ellett, Kelley, & Noble, 1996; Vinokur-Kaplan, Jayaratne, & Chess, 1994). 2) Supervisory support can be enhanced through training and can then, in turn, lead to better outcomes including lower recidivism rates and better child well-being outcomes (Antle, 2002; Antle, Sullivan, Barbee, & Christensen, in press; Martin, Barbee, Antle, Sar, & Hanna, 2002). 3) Furthermore, child welfare workers are more highly committed to their jobs if they feel that their supervisors are competent, instrumentally supportive, emotionally supportive, and value a team approach to child welfare practice (Yankeelov, Barbee, Sullivan, & Antle, 2009). Other research found that supervisors that articulate clear performance standards, reward superior performance, and facilitate professional development are more likely to have workers with a high degree of organizational commitment (Ellett, Ellett, & Rugut, 2003). Thus, supervisors who are well trained to be supportive to their workers, coaching and mentoring the workers as they practice intricate skills such as assessing, case planning, and coaching and mentoring their clients, produce a better practicing and stable workforce that achieves better outcomes for children than supervisors that do not exhibit those key skills.

In the area of working with youth moving to independent living, it is critical for the youth's learning for them to be attached to the workers. Thus, the workforce needs to be stable and for those workers to be highly competent in their engagement and mentoring skills.

We understand the need for a specific curriculum aimed at supervisors to build their capacity to prepare and guide staff in their work with older youth involved in the child welfare system. We developed several supervisor and team based trainings that emphasize the components of quality supervision that contribute to optimal outcomes for children and families (Antle, 2002). One of these trainings focused supervisors on the casework process such as how to work with front line employees on the parallel process of treating workers the way we want workers to treat clients, conducting thorough assessments, writing case plans that flow from those assessments, engaging in effective case management, and building collaborations with community partners as well as how to build teams and how to be supportive of front line staff. The training utilized the Solution-Based Casework practice model (Christensen, Todahl, & Barrett, 1999) and trained supervisors and their teams together. The purpose of training the supervisors and teams together was to allow all members of a team to hear the same core message about practice. This led to enhanced accountability among team members and gave the supervisor support for the kinds of monitoring activities that they are re-

quired to conduct to ensure effective practice among their team members. It also gave the supervisors a chance to play a leadership role with their team members in a training context. Subsequently, when supervisors trained and coached their workers on specific skills that needed to be enhanced, their interventions were received better by the workers because of this early exposure to their supervisors as trainers. This mode of training supervisors was very effective in enhancing worker and client outcomes (Antle, Christensen, Barbee, & Martin, 2008). When supervisors and workers were NOT trained together there was low training transfer (Antle, Christensen, Barbee, & Martin, 2008) and poorer outcomes for children. Case managers need the support (emotional and instrumental) of supervisors to make practice changes or improvements. In order for case managers to use best practices for independent living, the supervisors need to share their knowledge and skills in a supportive and effective manner.

The training developed for Kentucky supervisors built on these previous supervisor trainings and on Kentucky's structured training reinforcement model that is a component of the state's quality assurance mechanism. It was noted in the CFSR findings that Kentucky has one of the more sophisticated training and training evaluation systems in the country and one of the few that has trained managers and supervisors in high level leadership and team building skills which will enhance the supervisors ability to help their workers achieve positive outcomes for youth transitioning into independent living. (Center for the Study of Social Policy, 2003; Fox, Miller, & Barbee, 2004).

The National Child Welfare Resource Center for Youth Development (NRCYD) identifies four core principles for adolescent transitional living programs: 1) youth development; 2) collaboration; 3) cultural competence; and 4) permanent connections. For youth development, there are a range of life skills youth need to learn in order to function independently. These youth need to learn skills in areas of education, employment, housing, relationship formation, and service acquisition. They must also be trained to recognize and respond to crises that place them at risk after emancipation. Another key component of youth development is the involvement of youth in the decision-making for their case. Youth need to be empowered to make these types of decisions so that they feel equipped to do so after emancipation. There are a number of educational and supportive independent living programs that target these necessary skills. Child welfare supervisors and their teams were taught to assess the youth's readiness for learning these target skills and the appropriate timing of interventions. Supervisors were trained to guide their workers in this assessment and determination process. They also were trained in the provision of training and supportive services to foster these skills in youth. Practice skills were not limited to education, but will also included concrete support particularly in the areas of employment and securing permanent housing (Citizen's Committee for Children of New York, 2000). Teams also were encouraged to involve youth in the development and decision-making of case plans and aftercare plans. Teams

were also provided with information on the aforementioned risk factors related to the transition to independence, as well as how to recognize and intervene around these risk factors.

Collaboration is another core principle and refers to the need for child welfare teams to seek community involvement in the life of the youth. This community involvement creates linkages that can assist youth after their emancipation and may provide them with job and mentoring opportunities. Child welfare supervisors and their teams need training in techniques such as family team meetings, which bring together multiple family members, friends/acquaintances, and professional helpers. Both intra- and inter-agency partners were encouraged to attend this training to enhance their understanding and support of the program.

Our understanding of cultural competence is constantly evolving as cultures change (Gavazzi, Alford, & McKenry, 1996). Given the overrepresentation of children of color in the child welfare system, supervisors and workers must have an adequate understanding of youth strengths and needs related to culture. Iglehart and Becerra (2002) conducted a qualitative study that found youth transitioning out of care are not a homogenous group. Therefore, there is a need for culturally sensitive and individualized interventions. Child welfare supervisors and workers must model respect for cultural diversity and encourage the development of their identity. One strategy to encourage ethnic identity in the emancipation process is the use of "rites of passage" that are common to many ethnic minority groups. In this project, supervisors and their teams were taught to assess the cultural competence/sensitivity of independent living interventions, as well as other skills to foster cultural identity.

The final core principle, permanent connections, relates to the need for youth transitioning to independence to learn skills and have the opportunity to form healthy family and professional relationships. This principle underscores the importance of involving as many family and friends as possible in the casework process and transition to independence. Youth must be given the opportunity to explore their feelings about past family relationships and consider relationships they want to form in the future. They need specific skills training in relationship formation and maintenance (Melpignano & Collins, 2003). They also need the assistance of their child welfare worker to establish any necessary helping relationships to support them following emancipation (Collins, 2001). Youth transitioning to independent living have been exposed to poor role models of relationship initiation, maintenance, and dissolution through their families or origin and often in their foster homes. They need additional training and modeling of how to identify appropriate romantic and friendship partners, how to initiate romantic relationships and friendships, how to discern compatibility with others, how to maintain close relationships, and how to dissolve close relationships properly and safely when necessary.

Curriculum Development Process

Matrix of Previous IL Training Grants

Thre were multiple stages of development for this curriculum. First, the Kentucky team worked together with other grantees to create a matrix of key topics by curricula from first set of CB grants on IL (see Barbee et al. in this same issue). This matrix of previous grant curricula provided a thorough understanding of the key concepts and skills that had been addressed to date and areas of needed development. This review also identified excellent activities/exercises/resources that could be used to engage participants around youth issues. Previous grantees were contacted to obtain permission to utilize these resources to build upon their excellent work. At this time, the Kentucky team also updated the literature on IL with articles that had been published since the original IL grantees developed their curricula in order to address gaps and ensure the most recent and accurate research and practice findings were incorporated into the curriculum.

Next, based upon the conceptual framework set forth in Kentucky's grant application, which incorporates federal policies, core principles of the NRCYS, and Kentucky's practice model, the team posed key questions to guide curriculum development. These questions were 1) What is the key role of supervisors and managers in ensuring that youth receive the services they need to lead successful lives?; and 2) What do the key constituencies that deliver and receive the services say is needed that perhaps managers and supervisors can address? The first question was answered through an evidence-based literature review on key roles of child welfare managers and supervisors. The second question regarding the thoughts of key constituencies was addressed through focus groups with youth, public child welfare workers, private child care workers, and other key collaterals involved in the life of youth.

Evidence-Based Literature Review

For the first question (What is the key role of supervisors and managers in ensuring that youth receive the services they need to lead successful lives?), an evidence-based literature review was conducted. An evidence-based literature review begins with a COPES (Client-Oriented Practical Evidence Search) question to guide the review process (Gibbs, 2003). Next, search terms and filters are identified. Articles that fit these criteria are reviewed for their scientific rigor and extent to which they answer the COPES question. This evidence-based literature reviewed the following functions child welfare supervisors and managers: 1) supervisory support for workers (Davis-Sacks, Jayaratne, & Chess, 1985; DiGiulio, 1995; Decker, Bailey, & Westergaard, 2002; Smith, 2005; Wagner, Spence, & van Reyk, 2001; Yin, 2004); 2) supervisor tasks (Bernotavicz & Bartley, 1996; Silver, Poulin, & Manning, 1997; Ward, 2004); 3) create commitment (Ezell, Casey, Pecora, Grossman, Friend, Vernon, & Godfrey, 2002; Landsman, 2001; Quinn, Rycraft, & Schoech, 2002; Regehr, Chau,

Leslie, & Howe, 2002; Sevicki, 1999); 4) managers in child welfare (Regehr, et al., 2002; Sevicki, 1999; Ware, Dobrec, Rosenthal, & Wedel, 1992; Zunz, 1995); 5) middle managers (Antle, Barbee,& Van Zyl, 2008).

From this review, three key roles were identified for child welfare supervisors/managers: 1) Collaboration; (Klagge, 1998; Currie & Proctor, 2005); 2) Communication (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003; Balogun, 2003; Floyd & Wooldridge, 1997; Klagge, 1998; Likert, 1961; Thompson, 1967); 3) Advocacy and Change (Balogun, 2003; Barbee & Cunningham, 2006; Currie & Proctor, 2005; Floyd & Wooldridge, 1992, 1994, 1997; Hertzig & Jimmieson, 2006; Huy, 2002; Rouleau, 2005; Milner, 2003; Thakur, 1998; Wai-Kwong, Priem, & Cycyota, 2001).

For the role of collaboration, there is a need for both external and internal collaboration. External collaboration refers to the fact that for youth to gain all of the skills they need, child welfare agencies must collaborate with schools, mental health facilities, substance abuse treatment centers, job training centers, and the justice department. All youth need to maximize their education as much as possible to be ready to work. Most youth in foster care have some sort of mental health, substance abuse or disability issue to overcome to be able to form close, loving relationships and function in the workplace. Internal collaboration refers to the supervisor's ability to work with ongoing supervisors and workers who work with youth, supervisors and workers who work with foster parents, IL coordinators, foster parents, adoption supervisors and workers, adult protection supervisors and workers, and youth themselves.

For the role of communication, supervisors/managers must communicate internally with all of the groups that work with youth, as well as externally with all the groups that work with youth (e.g. other systems with which youth is involved). One skill to facilitate such communication is the offering of Family Team Meetings that bring all interested parties together to develop a collaborative case plan that addresses the range of needs for the youth.

Finally, for the role of advocacy and change, managers and supervisors need to identify existing barriers that may prohibit the system from functioning effectively. They must advocate for additional resources, new partnerships, legislative changes, and policy changes. They must facilitate collaboration and communication for the sake of youth aging out of care.

Focus Group Research

For the second question (What do the key constituencies that deliver and receive the services say is needed that perhaps managers and supervisors can address?), Kentucky conducted a number of focus groups between February and June of 2006. These focus groups were held in both urban and rural settings. Several of the focus groups were conducted with youth recipients of services, including those in private child care facilities as well as an innovative program to help youth ages 16-24 obtain their GED and employment. Focus groups were also conducted with

public child welfare supervisors and workers, foster parents, and other service providers such as private child care workers. Lastly, a focus group was conducted with the Advisory Board for this grant, which consisted of IL Coordinators, service providers, trainers, administrators, faculty members, and community leaders. These focus groups provided key insights into the needs of youth, gaps in the current training and service delivery systems, and significant need for collaboration between youth-serving organizations.

Pilot Testing of Curriculum

During the final stage of curriculum development, Kentucky pilot tested the curriculum and obtained feedback from participants through written evaluations and focus group methods. There were 5 supervisors and 19 workers trained in this pilot group. Data from this pilot showed that training methods were effective, as there was a significant increase in knowledge from pre- to post-training. Qualitative feedback pointed to areas of needed change or improvement, including more information on Kentucky policies and statistics, skills to engage difficult or multi-problem youth, and available resources for youth. Changes were made to the curriculum based upon these suggestions. We continued to revise the curriculum based upon feedback from trainees over the course of the grant. We also used feedback on additional training needs to develop supplemental modules available through an on-line format.

Content of Curriculum

The curriculum that Kentucky developed consists of ten modules, which are typically delivered over two and one half days of training. The core modules that are included in this training include the following: 1) "*Understanding the Context of Supervisor-Team Training*"; 2) "*Parallel Process*"; 3) "*Cultural Competency*"; 4) "*Youth Development*"; 5) "*Youth Engagement*"; 6) "*Relationships*"; 7) "*Assessment*"; 8) "*Substance Abuse and Mental Health Issues*"; 9) "*Collaboration*"; and 10) "*Case Closure*". The first module, "*Understanding the Context of the Supervisor-Team Training*", provides basic statistics on youth in care, as well as detailed information on federal policies that impact youth aging out of the system such as the Foster Care Independence Act of 1999, Kentucky's Chafee Independence Plan, and the Child and Family Services Reviews. The second module, "*Parallel Process*", presents the idea that the relationship between supervisors and child welfare workers is parallel to or mirrors the relationship between the worker and youth; similarly, the relationship between the child welfare worker and youth is parallel to or mirrors the youth's relationship with significant others in his/her life. This working relationship can be used to model and teach key skills. The third module, "*Cultural Competency*", describes cultural influences and basic skills to promote culturally competent practice. The fourth module, "*Youth Development*", includes areas and stages of adolescent development and a discussion of the unique experiences of LBGTQ youth. The fifth module, "*Youth En-*

gagement", teaches characteristics of effective engagement for youth, Prochaska's stages of change, and motivators for change. There are also elements from Kentucky's Solution-Based Casework practice model (Christensen, Todahl, & Barrett, 1999), including solution-focused questions and stages of the professional helping relationship.

The sixth module,"*Relationships*", describes key concepts and skills for many areas of youth relationships, including stages of the professional helping relationship, emerging adulthood, relationship permanency, social networks and relationships, social skills youth need to build relationships, relationships with birth parents and sibling, foster parent relationships, and mentoring relationships. The seventh module,"*Assessment*", presents the concept of strengths-based assessment and teaches key skills to utilize standardized assessment tools for youth such as the *Ansell-Casey Life Skills Assessment*. The eighth module,"*Substance Abuse and Mental Health Issues*", defines substance abuse versus dependence, as well as brief screening tools (e.g. the CRAFFT) and interventions. The ninth module,"*Collaboration*", engages partners in the room in collaboration-building exercises and a discussion of raising versus protecting youth. The tenth module,"*Case Closure*', teaches skills to move youth toward case closure, develop aftercare plans, and document/celebrate successes.

In response to the identified need to promote collaboration among the various entities that serve youth aging out of care, we modified this curriculum for three distinct audiences: state child welfare supervisor-worker teams, private child care facility staff, and foster parents. Although core concepts from the curriculum are maintained, each version targets the specific needs and interests of these different groups. For example, the private child care version of the curriculum places more emphasis on inter-agency collaboration, while the foster parent version of the curriculum presents the critical role foster parents play in modeling healthy relationships and teaching other key life skills.

There were also key content areas that could not be addressed in depth through the core curriculum due to time constraints on training for public child welfare workers. Therefore, this key content was put into a web-based format and offered through on-line training modules. These are available at: *http://cwte.louisville.edu/IL/home/ilmodules.htm* and include:

1. Dating Violence
2. Motivational Interviewing
3. Developing Mentoring Relationships for Youth Aging Out of Care
4. Reconnecting to Birth Parents

Barriers and Facilitators in the Implementation Process

The team encountered a number of barriers in the implementation of this training grant. Despite a number of facilitating factors, including strong leadership for IL issues at the state level, this federally funded grant, and a large population of

children over the age of 12 in the child welfare system, the state was not focused on IL issues during the implementation of this project. Another barrier was the high level of training burnout demonstrated by several regions that were targeted for recruitment for this project. These regions had participated in a number of training initiatives, and teams were resistant to becoming involved in yet another project. A final barrier was the conflict between the time required for this project and other priorities at the state level, including CFSR reviews and a change in the Governor and Cabinet positions. These barriers made scheduling the training difficult, and the team had to devise creative strategies to reach target numbers for the grant.

The first strategy was to market the training to multiple levels of the public child welfare agency, including the Commissioner, Service Region Administrators, representatives of the Training Branch and Regional Training Coordinators, and members of the University Training Consortium. By presenting information on the training grant at multiple levels of the state bureaucracy, we garnered greater support and influence in the recruitment of teams. The second strategy that this team utilized was to market the training to specific regions and facilitate internal collaboration within those regions. For regions that we reached, we involved the IL coordinators, supervisors, and child welfare workers who serve foster parents, ongoing cases, and adoption cases. This strategy helped us increase our numbers within regions and promote the overall goals of collaboration identified in the curriculum development process.

A third strategy we utilized to maximize our impact through this training grant was to modify the curriculum and offer it to different audiences with an interest in or commitment to working with youth. As previously mentioned, we developed a version of the curriculum for private child care providers and foster parents, as well as the core curriculum targeted to child welfare agency supervisors. We also provided IL coordinators with a training of trainers in a healthy relationships curriculum for youth entitled *Love U2* (Pearson, 2006). These IL coordinators are now able to offer this relationship program to youth transitioning to independence. There were very high levels of interest on the part of foster parents, IL coordinators, and private child care providers throughout the grant period. In addition to these curriculum modifications, we experimented with diverse training methods, including offering the training through an on-line format and at a statewide youth summit hosted by this grant team during the last month of the grant period.

Other facilitating factors included the strong working relationship between this project team and members of the public child welfare agency and service community. There has been an increase in agency focus on youth issues since the second round of the CFSR results which showed poor results for youth aging out of care. Due to their greater focus on these issues, they have been supportive of the youth summit being hosted by this site. A final facilitating factor has been the Community Advisory Board formed by this grant, which is comprised of state administrators, trainers, faculty, child welfare supervisors/workers, and other service providers from

youth-based organizations. This Advisory Board has met two to three times per year for the three years of the grant, providing feedback on the curriculum, training implementation, and strategic planning at the state level to improve collaboration and quality of care for youth services. Similarly, our team has gotten involved with other youth coalitions at the local and state level in order to promote the grant and engage in inter-agency collaboration.

Evaluation of Training

The full evaluation of this training project will be based upon the Louisville Child Welfare Training Evaluation Model (Antle, Barbee, & van Zyl, 2008). This project will utilize three primary methods of evaluation: training evaluation surveys, intervention (training) fidelity check, and client assessment data. The Training Evaluation Surveys involve a pre-post design. All teams have been given the opportunity to participate in the training. Pre-training data has been collected on predictor variables, trainee knowledge, and skill. Post-training data has been collected on trainee reactions, knowledge and skill. Workers and supervisors have been notified of the need to complete web-based surveys via e-mail. All participants in the research (supervisors and workers) completed full informed consent forms prior to the completion of these surveys. This research was approved by the Human Studies Committee of the state child welfare agency and by the University of Louisville.

Satisfaction with training was measured along two dimensions: utility and affective reactions. Utility reactions refer to the degree to which trainees find the training material useful. Affective reactions refer to the degree to which trainees like the training. Both of these reactions will be measured using a scale adapted for this study–the Level One Training Evaluation Scale. This scale contains 12 items. For each item, respondents will indicate their degree of agreement on five-point Likert scales. A similar scale was previously used for the evaluation of substance abuse training in child welfare (Barbee & Barber, 1995). Satisfaction was measured immediately post-training. Learning was measured using a test of the training curriculum. This knowledge-based test was developed specifically for this curriculum and consists of multiple-choice questions on material from each of the key content areas of the training. Supervisors and workers in the training and control groups complete this test pre-training and immediately post-training. The change between pre- and immediate post-training test scores reflects the immediate learning of trainees.

Transfer of skill is being measured through a behavioral anchor rating scale. This type of scale has been used by the University of Louisville in other child welfare research, such as the evaluation of the Public Child Welfare Certification Program and Field Training Specialist Program (Barbee et al., in press; Fox et al. 2002). Behavioral anchors were developed based upon the IL training curriculum. These anchors specified the skills that supervisors and their workers should acquire or master through training.

The training outcomes component of this model has been based upon the

theoretical and empirical work of Kirkpatrick (1959) and Alliger and Tannenbaum (1997). The quality of the worker-youth relationship was measured through the Trusting Relationships Scale. (Mustillo, Dorsey, & Farmer, 2005). The Trusting Relationships Questionnaire is a brief measure of the quality of relationships between youth and their service providers with high reliability and multiple forms of validity (Mustillo, Dorsey, & Farmer, 2005). The Team Collaboration Survey measures the quality of collaboration between the state child welfare agency and other youth-serving agencies with which they work. This survey was developed by members of this project team to evaluate inter-agency collaboration among social service providers. Both scales have demonstrated strong reliability and validity in this and other studies.

Future Directions

In order to promote the sustainability of this training program beyond the federal funding, we will create a Credit for Learning course to be included in the Child Welfare Agency training system for supervisors and veteran workers. The Credit for Learning program is a university-state agency partnership that provides graduate level credit for completion of required and certain elective child welfare training courses. The Credit for Learning program operates at several state universities throughout Kentucky, which will expand the potential training sites beyond the grant as well. The on-line version of the course and advanced training modules will remain available beyond funding to provide another opportunity for exposure to the curriculum.

As previously mentioned, our team executed a statewide youth summit in September of 2008. The keynote addresses included Jamie Lee Evans and youth from her team in the San Francisco IL Project, who brought their museums of Lost Childhoods and Empowered Youth. Peter Correia and Dorothy Ansell from the National Child Welfare Resource Center spoke about the national initiative "Building a Shared Youth Vision." Larry Michalczyk and Lisa Johnson, a doctoral student who has worked on this project since its inception spoke about how disproportionality affects youth aging out of care. Youth panels from both California and Kentucky presented their stories during panel discussions on both days. Also at this conference, the training modules were offered and targeted to supervisors and workers as well as other private child care staff and foster parents that have not yet been reached by the grant. Additional workshops targeted those from the state child welfare agency and PCC providers who have already gone through the training to give them additional training on IL issues. These participants were provided with refresher modules. The second day was devoted to educating community partners, some from the state, but most from Jefferson County and the surrounding counties about how to build a network to support youth in care and those aging out of care in our most urban regions of the state.

Other future directions include the completion of the above evaluation research

and other research studies connected to the grant, as well as the continued dissemination of practice and research findings through peer-reviewed journals, conferences, and federally-sponsored events. There are tremendous lessons learned from this training grant that can inform the field regarding key issues for youth transitioning to independence, training development and methodologies, as well as organizational engagement and change.

References

Alliger, G.M., & Tannenbaum, S I. (1997). A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria. *Personnel Psychology, 50*(2), 341-359.

Anderson-Butcher, D., Lawson, H.A., & Barkdull, C. (2003). An evaluation of child welfare design teams in four states. J*ournal of Health and Social Policy. 15*(3/4), 131-161.

Antle, B. F. (2002). Training evaluation for supervisor best-practice in child welfare. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Science and Engineering, 24,* 4601.

Antle, B. F., Barbee, A. P., & van Zyl, M. A. (2008). A comprehensive model for child welfare training evaluation. *Children and Youth Services Review. 9,* 1063-1080.

Antle, B.F., Christensen, D., Barbee, A. P., & Martin, M.H. (2008). Solution-based casework: A paradigm shift to effective, strengths-based practice for child protection. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*.

Antle, B.F., Barbee, A.P., & van Zyl, M.A. (2009). Supervision in child welfare practice. In C. Potter & C. Brittain (Eds.), *Supervision In Child Welfare*, Oxford Press.

Antle, B. F., Sullivan, D. J., Barbee, A. P., & Christensen, D. N. (in press). The effects of training methodology on training transfer. *Child Welfare*.

Antle, B.F., Barbee, A.P., Sullivan, D.J., & Christensen, D. (in press). The prevention of child maltreatment recidivism through the solution-based casework model of child welfare practice. *Children and Youth Services Review*.

Balogun, M.J. (2003). Causative and enabling factors in public integrity: A focus on leadership, institutions and character formation. *Public Integrity, 5*(2).

Barbee, A.P., & Barber, G.M. (1995). *A multidisciplinary training approach to substance abuse as it relates to child abuse and neglect.* Kentucky: University of Louisville, Kent School of Social Work.

Barbee, A. P., & Cunningham, M.R. (2006). *Update on Evaluation of Children's Bureau Training and Technical Assistance Network*. Grantees Meeting. Washington, DC.

Barbee, A. P., Sullivan, D.J., Antle, B.F., Moran, E.B., Hall, J.C., & Fox, S. (2009). The public child welfare certification program: Worker retention and impact on practice. *Journal of Social Work Education. 45,* 427-445.

Barbee, A. P., Yankeelov, P. A., Antle, B. F., Fox, S., Harmon, D., Evans, S., & Black, P. (in press). The importance of training reinforcement in child welfare: Kentucky's field training specialist model. *Child Welfare*.

Bernotavicz, F. B., & Bartley, D. (1996). *A competency model for child welfare supervisors*. University of Southern Maine, Muskie Institute of Public Affairs, and Maine Department of Human Services.

Center for the Study of Social Policy, Center for Community Partnerships in Child Welfare (2003). Child Welfare Summit: Looking to the Future: An Examination of the State of Child Welfare and Recommendations for Action.

Christensen, D.N., Todahl, J., & Barrett, W.C. (1999). *Solution-based casework: An introduction to clinical and case management skills in casework practice*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Cicero-Reese, B. & Black, P. (February, 1998). Research findings suggest why child welfare workers stay on job. *Partnerships for Child Welfare Newsletter, 5*(5).

Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, NY (2000). *Can they make it on their own? Aging out of foster care-A report on New York City's independent living program*. New York: Citizens' Committee for Children of New York.

Coleman, D., & Clark, S.J. (2003). Preparing for child welfare practice: Themes, a cognitive-affective model, and implications from a qualitative study. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 7*(1), 83-96.

Collins, M.E. (2001). Transition to adulthood for vulnerable youth: A review of research and implications for policy. *Social Service Review, 75*(2), 271-291.

Currie, G. & Procter, S. (2005). The antecedents of middle managers' strategic contribution: The case of a professional bureaucracy. *Journal of Management Studies, 42*(7), 1325-1356.

Davis-Sacks, M.L., Jayaratne, S., & Chess, W.A. (1985). A comparison of the effects of social support on the incidence of burnout. *Social Work, 30*, 240-244.

Decker, J.T., Bailey, T.L., & Westergaard, N. (2002). Burnout among childcare workers. *Residential Treatment for Children & Youth, 19*(4), 61-77.

DiGiulio, J. (1995). A more humane workplace: Responding to child welfare workers' personal losses. *Child Welfare, 74*(4), 877-888.

Ellett, C.D., Ellett, A.J., Kelley, B.L. & Noble, D.N. (1996). *A statewide study of child welfare personnel needs: Who stays? who leaves? who cares?* Paper presented at the 42nd Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, Washington, DC.

Ellett, A.J., Ellett, C.D., & Rugutt, J.K. (2003). *A study of personal and organizational factors contributing to employee retention and turnover in child welfare in Georgia: Executive summary and final project report*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia School of Social Work.

Ezell, M., Casey, E., Pecora, P.J., Grossman, C., Friend, R., Vernon, L., & Godfrey, D. (2002). The results of a management redesign: A case study. *Administration in Social Work, 26*(4), 61-80.

Floyd, S.W., & Wooldridge, B. (1992). Managing strategic consensus: The foundation of effective implementation, *The Academy of Management Executive, 6*, 27- 39.

Floyd, S.W., & Wooldridge, B. (1994). Dinosaurs or dynamos? Recognizing middle management's strategic role. *The Academy of Management Executive, 8*, 47-57.

Floyd, S.W., & Wooldridge, B. (1997). Middle management's strategic influence and organizational performance. *Journal of Management Studies, 34*, 465-485.

Foster Care Independence Act of 1999. PL. 106-169.

Fox, S., Barbee, A.P., Harmon, D., Staples, K., & Spang, G. (2002). Leadership: Can it really be developed through training? *Training and Development in Human Services, 2*, 8-16.

Fox, S., Miller, V., & Barbee, A.P. (2004). Finding and keeping child welfare workers: Effective use of Title IV-E training funds. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 7*, 67-82.

General Accounting Office. (1999). *Foster care: Effectiveness of idependent living services unknown*. GAO/HEHS-00-13. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Gavazzi, S. M., Alford, K. A., & McKenry, P.C. (1996). Culturally specific programs for foster care youth: The sample case of an African American rites of passage program. *Family Relations, 45*, 166-175.

Gibbs, L.E. (2003). *Evidence-based practice for the helping professions: A practical guide with integrated multimedia*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/ Cole–Thomson Learning.

Herzig, S.E., & Jimmieson, N.L. (2006). Middle managers' uncertainty management during organizational change. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 27*(8), 628-645.

Huy, Q. (2002). Emotional balancing of organizational continuity and radical change: The contribution of middle managers. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47*, 31-69.

Iglehart, A.P., & Becerra, R.M. (2002). Hispanic and African American youth: Life after foster care emancipation. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 11*(1/ 2). 99-107.

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1959). Techniques for evaluating programs. *Journal of the American Society of Training Directions, 13*(11), 3-9.

Klagge, J. (1998). Self-perceived development needs of today's middle managers. *Journal of Management Development, 17*(7), 481 - 491.

Landsman, M. (2001). Commitment in public child welfare. *Social Service Review*, September, 387-419.

Lemon, K., Hines, A.M., & Merdinger, J. (2005). From foster care to young adulthood: The role of independent living programs in supporting successful transitions. *Children and Youth Services Review, 27*(3), 251-270.

Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lozano, B. (1993). Independent living: Relation among training, skills, and success. *American Journal of Mental Retardation, 98*, 249-62.

Mallon, G. (1998). After care, then where? Outcomes of an independent living program. *Child Welfare, 77*(1), 61-78.

Martin, M., Barbee, A.P., Antle, B., Sar, B., & Hanna, S. (2002). Expedited permanency planning: Evaluation of the Kentucky Adoptions Opportunities Project (KAOP). *Child Welfare: Special Issue on Permanency Planning, 81*, 203-224.

McMillen, J.C., Rideout, G.B., Fisher, R.H., & Tucker, J. (1997). Independent-living services: The views of former foster youth. *Families in Society, 78*(5), 471-479.

Melpignano, M., & Collins, M. (2003). Infusing youth development principles in child welfare practice: Use of a Delphi survey to inform training. *Child and Youth Care Forum, 32*(3), 159–173.

Milner, J.S. (2003). Social information processing in high risk and physically abusive parents. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 27*, 7–20.

Mustillo, S., Dorsey, S., & Farmer, E., (2005). Quality of relationships between youth and community service providers: reliability and validity of the trusting relationship questionnaire. *Journal of Child & Family Services, 14*, 577-590.

Pearson, M. (2006). *Love U2 Communication Smarts: The Prevention and Relationship Enhancement Program*. PREP Educational Products, Inc.

Quinn, A., Rycraft, J., Schoech, D. (2002). Building a model to predict caseworker and supervisor turnover using a neural network and logistic regression. *Journal of Technology in Human Services, 19*(4), 65-85.

Regehr, C., Chau, S., Leslie, B., & Howe, P. (2002). Inquiries into deaths of children in care: The impact on child welfare workers and their organization. *Children and Youth Services Review, 24*(12), 885-902.

Reilly, T. (2003). Transition from care: Status and outcomes of youth who age out of foster care. *Child Welfare, 82*(6), 727-46.

Rouleau, L. (2005). Micro-practices of strategic sensemaking and sensegiving: How middle managers interpret and sell change every day. *Journal of Management Studies, 42*, 1413-1441.

San Diego State University (2002). *Successful transitions for adult readiness curriculum*. San Diego, CA: SDSU, School of Social Work, Public Child Welfare Training Academy.

Sevicki, V. (1999). Cultural work values for supervisors and managers: A cross-cultural look at child and youth care agencies. *Child and Youth Care Forum, 28*, 239-255.

Silver, P., Poulin, J., & Manning, R. (1997). Surviving the bureaucracy: The predictors of job satisfaction for the public agency supervisor. *The Clinical Supervisor. 15*(1), 1-20.

Smith, B. (2005). Job retention in child welfare: Effects of perceived organizational support, supervisor support and intrinsic job value. *Children and Youth Services Review, 27*(2), 153-169.

Stoner, M. (1999). Life after foster care: Services and policies for former foster youth. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 26*(4), 159-175.

Sveningsson, S., & Alvesson, M. (2003). Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations 56*(10), 1163-93.

Thakur, M. (1998). Involving middle managers in strategy making. *Long Range Planning, 31*, 732-741.

Thompson, J.D. (1967). *Organizations in action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tungate, P.N. (2005). *Legacy children: Whose legacy are they?* Unpublished dissertation. University of Louisville.

Vinokur-Kaplan, D., Jayaratne, S., & Chess, W.A. (1994). Job satisfaction and retention of social workers in public agencies, non-profit agencies and private practice: The impact of workplace conditions and motivators. *Administration in Social Work, 18*(3), 93-121.

Wagner, R., Spence, N., & van Reyk, P. (2001). Improving the working conditions of child welfare workers. *Child & Family Social Work, 6*(2), 161-178.

Wai-Kwong, F.Y., Priem, R.L., & Cycyota, C.S. (2001). The performance effects of human resource managers' and other middle managers' involvement in strategy making under different business-level strategies: The case in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 12*(8), 1325-1346.

Ward, H. (2004). Working with manager to improve service: Changes in the role of research in social care. *Child and Family Social Work, 9*, 13-25.

Ware, D., Dobrec, A., Rosenthal, J.A., & Wedel, K.R. (1992). Job satisfaction, practice skills, and supervisory skills of administrators of Indian child welfare programs. *Child Welfare, 71*, 405-418.

Yankeelov, P.A., & Barbee, A.P. (1996). *Predictors of training effectiveness*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Louisville.

Yankeelov, P., Barbee, A.P., Sullivan, D.J., & Antle, B.F. (2009). Individual and organizational factors in job retention in Kentucky's child welfare agency. *Children and Youth Services Review. 31*, 547-554.

Yin, R.T. (2004). Innovations in the management of child protection workers: Building worker resilience. *Social Work, 49*, 605-608.

Zunz, S. (1995). The view from behind the desk: Child welfare managers and their roles. *Administration in Social Work, 19*(2), 63-80.