

School Vision: Building upon a foundation of social justice and an ethic of care, we are a community of learners actively engaged in the development of critical, transformative knowledge for social work practice.

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Year/Term | 2015-2016 Term 2 |
| Course Title | Advanced Family Practice in Child Welfare |
| Course Schedule | Thursday 2:00 - 5:00 |
| Course Location | PONE 117 (Ponderosa Annex E room 117) |

| Instructor | Office Location | Office Phone | e-mail address |
|---|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Richard Sullivan Course designers: Kathleen Blackmore, Kristin Kraft, Jennifer Stewart, Richard Sullivan | Rm 343 | 822-4278 | Richard.Sullivan@ubc.ca |
| Office Hours | By appointment via email | | |

COURSE DESCRIPTION: This course examines the evidence for best practices in assessment, service planning, case management and outcome measurement in mandated family service. Application of evidence based approaches to family preservation, addiction recovery and parenting in the context of mental illness, domestic violence, and family reunification are reviewed. Intersections of race, gender and culture inform the application of approaches. Designed by experienced social workers in family services, the course is intended for social workers in family practice and child welfare who seek to advance their knowledge of the evidence for best practices in the areas most commonly encountered in child welfare and family service.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

1. Improved knowledge of research criteria for the selection of intervention methods.
2. To advance student knowledge of contemporary social work methods as they pertain to challenging circumstances in child welfare practice.
3. To enhance students' knowledge of instrumentation for the assessment of family circumstances and the evaluation of service outcomes.

REQUIRED COURSE TEXTS: There are no required texts for this course. Readings will be available via library e-journals.

SUPPLEMENTARY READINGS: Supplementary readings will be provided by the instructor.

EVALUATION: Evaluation will be based on three assignments.

- (1) Apply the readings in any area of the course to a family or a program with which you are familiar and where evidence of progress indicators or outcomes is sought. In this 5 to 8 page essay, explain the relevance of the readings to the situation for which progress measurement is sought. Explain why you would draw optimism or pessimism from the literature in relation to the family or program you are describing and what implications you draw for practice from these readings. (25%)
- (2) Provide an in-class presentation on best practices in any of the areas covered by the syllabus. Select a problem area covered by the course and present a summary of the evidence for best practice in this area based on the syllabus and other readings. Ideally, this will be a problem with which the student has practice experience. Include a critique of practices or programs with which you are familiar in relation to your readings. (25%)
- (3) Outline a proposed program of service and a plan of evaluation for that program. This should address an identified need and should be based on best practices supported by credible research. Evaluation should be built into the design of the program. Identify the changes the program seeks to achieve, the program elements and practices intended to achieve those changes and when and how those changes will be assessed. (50%) [*You may be taking this course in conjunction with SOWK 554C Program Evaluation and this assignment may inform some of what you will do in that course though the assignments must be separate and distinct. The work for this assignment may nonetheless inform the methods you deploy in program evaluation and achieve some of the literature review necessary for your program evaluation.*]

OUTLINE AND READINGS:

Weeks 1 & 2: Intake and Engagement in Mandated Services

January 7, 2016

Gladstone, J., Dumbrill, G., Leslie, B., Koster, A., Young, M., Ismaila, A. (2012) **Looking at engagement and outcome from the perspectives of child protection workers and parents** in Children and Youth Services Review, Vol. 34, pp. 112-118

Yatchmenoff, D. (2005) **Measuring Client Engagement From the Client's Perspective in Nonvoluntary Child Protective Services** in Research on Social Work

Practice, Vol. 15 No. 2, March 2005 84-96

Forrester, D. Westlake, D. and Glynn, G. (2012) **Parental resistance and social worker skills: towards a theory of motivational social work** in *Child & Family Social Work*, Vol. 17, pp. 118-129.

Snyder, E. H., Lawrence, C. N., Weatherbolt, T. N., & Nagy, P. (2012). **The Benefits of Motivational Interviewing and Coaching for Improving the Practice of Comprehensive Family Assessments in Child Welfare.** *Child Welfare* , 91 (5), 9-36.

Week 2

January 14

De Boer, C., & Coady, N. (2007). **Good helping relationships in child welfare: Learning from stories of success.** *Child & Family Social Work*, 12(1), 32-42.

Platt, D. (2008). **Care or control? The effects of investigations and initial assessments on the social worker–parent relationship.** *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 22(3), 301-315.

Lyons, P., & Doueck, H. J. (2009). **Child Well-Being Scales as a Predictor of Casework Activity and Services in Child Protection.** *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 3(2), 139-158.

Root, E.A., Madsen, W.C. (2013) **The Corner: Imagine: Bringing Vision into Child Protective Services** in *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, Vol. 32, No.3. 2013, pp. 74-88.

Week 3 & 4: Assessment & Decision Making

January 21

Harris, N. (2012) **Assessment: when does it help and when does it hinder? Parents' experiences of the assessment process** (*Child & Family Social Work*, Vol. 17, pp. 180-191)

Curtis, C. (2009) **Limits of Parenting Capacity Assessments in Child Protection Cases** *Canadian Family Law Quarterly*. Vol 28(1) pp. 1-23

Harnett, P. (2007) **A procedure for assessing parents' capacity for change in child protection cases** *Children and Youth Services Review*, Vol, 29, pp. 1179-1188.

Michelle A. Johnson, Susan Stone, Christine Lou, Cathy Vu, Jennifer Ling, Paola Mizrahi, Michael J. Austin (2006) **Family assessment in child welfare services: Instrument Comparison.** Available at

Week 4

January 28

Dumbrill, G.C. (2010) **Power and Child Protection: The Need for a Child Welfare Service Users' Union or Association**, *Australian Social Work*, Vol. 63, No. 2, pp. 194-206.

Crea, T.M., & Berzin, S.C. (2009) **Family Involvement in Child Welfare Decision-Making: Strategies and Research on Inclusive Practices** in *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, Vol. 3: 305-327.

Hawkins, R.M.F. (2014) **Family Inclusive Child Protection Practice: The Need for Rigorous Evaluation** *Children Australia*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 81-86.

Johnson, M. A., Stone, S., Lou, C., Vu, C. M., Ling, J., Mizrahi, P., et al. (2008). **Family Assessment in Child Welfare Services**. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work* , 57-90.

Kirk, R. S., Kim, M. M., & Griffith, D. P. (2005). **Advances in the Reliability and Validity of the North Carolina Assessment Scale**. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* , 157-176.

Week 5 & 6: Breaking the Intergenerational Cycle of Child Abuse & Neglect

February 4

Pecora, P.J. et al (2014) **Addressing common forms of child maltreatment: evidence-informed interventions and gaps in current knowledge**, *Child & Family Social Work*, Vol. 19, pp. 321-332

Marshall, J. M., Huang, H., & Ryan, J. P. (2011). **Intergenerational families in child welfare: Assessing needs and estimating permanency**. *Children and Youth Services Review* , 33, 1024-1030.

Kolko, D. J., Iselin, A.-M. R., & Gully, K. J. (2011). **Evaluation of the sustainability and clinical outcome of Alternatives for Families: A Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy (AC-CBT) in a child protection center**. *Child Abuse & Neglect* , 35 (2), 105-116.

Emery, C. R., Trung, H. N., & Wu, S. (2015). **Neighborhood informal social control and child maltreatment: A comparison of protective and punitive approaches**. *Child Abuse & Neglect* . Vol 41 March pp. 158-169

Week 6

February 11

Cicchetti, D., Rogosch, F. A., & Toth, S. L. (2006). **Fostering secure attachment in infants in maltreating families through preventive interventions.** *Development and psychopathology*, 18(03), 623-649.

DePanfilis, D., & Dubowitz, H. (2005). **Family connections: A program for preventing child neglect.** *Child Maltreatment*, 10(2), 108-123.

Gaudin, J. M., Polansky, N. A., Kilpatrick, A. C., & Shilton, P. (1996). **Family functioning in neglectful families.** *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 20(4), 363-377.

Loman, L. A., & Siegel, G. L. (2012). **Effects of anti-poverty services under the differential response approach to child welfare.** *Child and Youth Services Review*, 34, 1659-1666.

Collins, K.S., Strieder, F.H., DePanfilis, D., Tabor, M., Clarkson Freeman, P.A., Linde, L., Greenberg, P. (2011) **Trauma Adapted Family Connections: Reducing Developmental and Complex Symptomatology to Prevent Child Abuse and Neglect,** *Child Welfare*, Vol. 90, No. 6 pp 29-47

Ko, Susan et al., (2008) **Creating trauma-informed systems: Child welfare, education, first responders, health care, juvenile justice.** *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*. Vol 39, No. 4, pp 396-404

Week 7 & 8: Domestic Violence

February 25

Melchoirre, R. & Vis, J. (2013) **Engagement strategies and change: an intentional practice response for the child welfare worker in cases of domestic violence** in *Child & Family Social Work*, Vo. 18, pp. 487-495

Babcock, J. C., Green, C. E., & Robie, C. (2004). **Does batterers' treatment work? A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment.** *Clinical Psychology Review*, 23(8), 1023-1053.

Sartin, R. M., Hansen, D. J., & Huss, M. T. (2006). **Domestic violence treatment response and recidivism: A review and implications for the study of family violence.** *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11(5), 425-440.

Week 8

March 3

Charlene Avalos, Lillian Baibomcowai-Dell et al. (2012) **Working with First Nations,**

Inuit and Metis families who have experienced family violence: A practice guide for child welfare professionals. Available at <http://www.oacas.org/> or from the instructor 168 pages inclusive of graphics, illustrations, tables, bibliography and appendices

Craig, C. D., & Sprang, G. (2007). **Trauma Exposure and Child Abuse Potential: Investigating the Cycle of Violence.** *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* , 77 (2), 296-305.

Griffin, G., McClelland, G., Holzberg, M., Stolbach, B., Maj, N., Kisiel, C. (2011) **Addressing the Impact of Trauma Before Diagnosing Mental Illness in Child Welfare,** *Child Welfare*, Vol. 90 (6). 69-89

Gonzalez, A., MacMillan, H., Tanaka, M., Jack, S. M., & Tonmyr, L. (2014). **Subtypes of exposure to intimate partner violence within a Canadian child welfare sample: Associated risks and child maladjustment.** *Child Abuse & Neglect* , 38 (12), 1934-1944.

Weeks 9 & 10: Addictions

March 10

Grella, C.E. et al. (2009) **Do drug treatment services predict reunification outcomes of mothers and their children in child welfare?** In *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* 36 pp. 278–293

Green, B. L., Rockhill, A., & Furrer, C. (2007). **Does substance abuse treatment make a difference for child welfare case outcomes? A statewide longitudinal analysis.** *Children and Youth Services Review* , 29, 460-473.

Nathoo, T. et al (2013) **Voices from the community: developing effective community programs to support pregnant and early parenting women who use alcohol and other substances,** *First Peoples Child & Family Review*, Vol. 8, No. 1 pp 93-106

Week 10

March 17

Catalano, R. F., Gainey, R. R., Fleming, C. B., Haggerty, K. P., & Johnson, N. O. (1999). **An experimental intervention with families of substance abusers: one-year follow-up of the focus on families project.** *Addiction*, 94(2), 241-254.

Niccols, A. et al. (2010) **Treatment Issues for Aboriginal Mothers with Substance Use Problems and Their Children.** *International Journal of Mental Health & Addictions* 8:320–335

Wright, T.E. et al. (2012) **Implementation and evaluation of a harm reduction model for clinical care of substance using pregnant women.** *Harm Reduction Journal* Vol. 9:5

<http://www.harmreductionjournal.com/content/9/1/5>

Weeks 11 & 12: Mental Illness

March 24

Park, J.M., Solomon, P., Mandell, D.S. (2006) **Involvement in the Child Welfare System Among Mothers with Serious Mental Illness** *Psychiatric Services* Vol. 57. No. 4. pp 493-497

Newman, L., Stevenson, C. (2008) **Issues in Infant-Parent Psychotherapy for Mothers with Borderline Personality Disorder,** *Clinical Child Psychology & Psychiatry*, Vol.13, No. 4. 505-514

Berg-Nielsen, T. S., & Wichström, L. (2012). **The mental health of preschoolers in a Norwegian population-based study when their parents have symptoms of borderline, antisocial, and narcissistic personality disorders: At the mercy of unpredictability.** *Child & Adolescent Psychiatry & Mental Health*, 6(1), 1-13.

Week 12

March 31

Budd, K. S. (2001). **Assessing parenting competence in child protection cases: A clinical practice model.** *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 4(1), 1-18.

Conroy, S., Marks, M. N., Schacht, R., Davies, H. A., & Moran, P. (2010). **The impact of maternal depression and personality disorder on early infant care.** *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*, 45(3), 285-292.

Kohl, P. L., Jonson-Reid, M., & Drake, B. (2011). **Maternal mental illness and the safety and stability of maltreated children.** *Child abuse & neglect*, 35(5), 309-318.

Newman, L., Stevenson, C. (2008) **Issues in Infant-Parent Psychotherapy for Mothers with Borderline Personality Disorder,** *Clinical Child Psychology & Psychiatry*, Vol.13, No. 4. 505-514

Broadley, K. (2012) **Sex Offender Risk Assessments in the Child Protection Context. Helpful or Not?** *Children Australia*, Vol. 37, No. 1. 40-45

Week 13: Case Management and Worker Self Care

April 7

Juby, C., Scannapieco, M. (2007) **Characteristics of Workload Management in Public Child Welfare Agencies**, *Administration in Social Work*, Vol. 31, No. 3

Daro, D. & Dodge, K.A. (2009) **Creating Community Responsibility for Child Protection: Possibilities and Challenges**, *Future Child*, Vol. 19 (2), pp. 67-93.

Barak, M. E., Travis, D. J., Pyun, H., & Xie, B. (2009). **The Impact of Supervision on Worker Outcomes: A Meta-analysis**. *Social Service Review*, Vol 83, No. 1 pp 3-32.

Morazes, J. L., Benton, A. D., Clark, S. J., & Jacquet, S. E. (2010). **Views of Specially-trained Child Welfare Social Workers: A Qualitative Study of their Motivations, Perceptions, and Retention**. *Qualitative Social Work*, 9(2), 227-247.

Savicki, V., & Cooley, E. J. (1994). **Burnout in child protective service workers: A longitudinal study**. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(7), 655-666.

Anderson, D. G. (2000). **Coping strategies and burnout among veteran child protection workers**. *Child abuse & neglect*, 24(6), 839-848.

COURSE POLICIES [attendance, participation, academic dishonesty]:

Excerpt from the UBC calendar:

Regular attendance is expected of students in all their classes (including lectures, laboratories, tutorials, seminars, etc.). Students who neglect their academic work and assignments may be excluded from the final examinations. Students who are unavoidably absent because of illness or disability should report to their instructors on return to classes.

The University accommodates students with disabilities who have registered with the Disability Resource Centre. The University accommodates students whose religious obligations conflict with attendance, submitting assignments, or completing scheduled tests and examinations. Please let your instructor know in advance, preferably in the first week of class, if you will require any accommodation on these grounds. Students who plan to be absent for varsity athletics, family obligations, or other similar commitments, cannot assume they will be accommodated, and should discuss their commitments with the instructor before the drop date.

It is recommended that students retain a copy of all submitted assignments (in case of loss) and should also retain all their marked assignments in case they wish to apply for a Review of Assigned Standing. Students have the right to view their marked examinations with their instructor, providing they apply to do so within a month of receiving their final grades. This review is for pedagogic purposes. The examination remains the property of the university.

Academic Dishonesty:

Please review the UBC Calendar "Academic regulations" for the university policy on cheating, plagiarism, and other forms of academic dishonesty. Also visit www.arts.ubc.ca and go to the students' section for useful information on avoiding plagiarism and on correct documentation.

COURSE SCHEDULE

ASSIGNMENTS

Submitting Assignments-

All written articles will be submitted electronically.

Return of marked student assignments -

If the paper has been submitted electronically, the instructor will mark it on-line (with track changes) and return to the student on-line.

Late assignments

Unexcused late assignments will be penalized at 10% grade value per day up to 40%. Assignments submitted more than one week late will not be accepted unless with medical documentation and arrangement with the instructor.

GRADING CRITERIA:

| Letter Grade | Percent Range | Mid-Point | |
|--------------|---------------|-----------|---|
| A+ | 90-100 | 95 | Represents work of exceptional quality. Content, organization and style are all at a high level. Student demonstrates excellent research and reference to literature where appropriate. Also, student uses sound critical thinking, has innovative ideas on the subject and shows personal engagement with the topic. |
| A | 85-89 | 87 | |
| A- | 80-84 | 82 | |
| B+ | 76-79 | 77.5 | Represents work of good quality with no major weaknesses. Writing is clear and explicit and topic coverage and comprehension is more than adequate. Shows some degree of critical thinking and personal involvement in the work. Good use of existing knowledge on the subject. |
| B | 72-75 | 83.5 | |
| B- | 68-71 | 69.5 | |
| C+ | 64-67 | 65.5 | Adequate and average work. Shows fair comprehension of the subject, but has some weaknesses in content, style and/or organization of the paper. Minimal critical awareness or personal involvement in the work. Adequate use of literature. |
| C | 60-63 | 62.5 | |
| C- | 55-59 | 57 | |
| D | 50-54 | 52 | Minimally adequate work, barely at a passing level. Serious flaws in content, organization and/or style. Poor comprehension of the subject, and minimal involvement in the paper. Poor use of research and existing literature. |
| F | 0-49 | | Failing work. Inadequate for successful completion of the course or submitted beyond final date of acceptance for paper. |