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In 2004, the California Department of Social Services, Office of Child Abuse Prevention contracted with the Chadwick Center for Children and Families, Rady Children’s Hospital-San Diego in cooperation with the Child and Adolescent Services Research Center to create the CEBC.

The CEBC website was launched on 6/15/2006.
CEBC’s Mission

To advance the effective implementation of evidence-based practices (EBPs) for children and families involved with the child welfare system

- Program Registry
- Selecting & Implementing Programs
CEBC’s Definition of EBP for Child Welfare

Best Research Evidence  
Best Clinical Experience  
Consistent with Family & Client Values

[Institute of Medicine (IOM), 2001]
The CEBC Scientific Rating Scale

- NR (Not Able To Be Rated): Has no research, or research doesn’t fit scale criteria.
Child Welfare System Relevance Level

Determined by the target population and the study populations

**High:**
Designed or commonly used for child welfare clients.

**Medium:**
Designed or is commonly used for populations similar to child welfare clients.

**Low:**
Designed for populations with little apparent similarity to the child welfare services population.
Are there any pre-implementation materials (e.g., tools, assessments, or other resources) to be given to organizations or providers in order to measure organizational or provider readiness?

If yes, please provide a brief description and a copy, if possible.
Does your program have any **formal support for implementation** (besides training and training manuals)? For example, an organization that is focused on assisting with or overseeing implementation, or an individual who provides technical assistance on implementation issues or formal coaching or consultation.

If yes, please provide a brief description.
Are there any available fidelity measures?

If yes, please provide a brief description of the measure(s) and any required training to use it, as well as a copy, if possible.
Are there any **implementation guides or implementation manuals** for your program?

If yes, please provide a brief description and a copy, if possible.
• Data were pulled on December 1, 2017
• N=201
• Included only programs rated 1, 2 or 3 by the CEBC
• Examined verbatim developer responses to the Implementation Supports items
CEBC Rating level:
- 14.4% Well-Supported - 1
- 23.9% Supported - 2
- 61.7% Promising - 3

Child Welfare Relevance:
- 24.9% High
- 72.1% Medium
- 3.0% Low
Frequencies, per Developer Report (N=201)

43.3% - Pre-Implementation Supports
61.2% - Formal Implementation Supports
67.7% - Fidelity Measures
72.6% - Implementation Guide / Manual
Frequencies, per Developer Report

18.9% of Programs had NONE of the supports

35.8% of Programs had ALL 4 of the supports
Availability of Supports by Rating Level

Programs rated a 1 (Well-Supported) are more likely than programs rated a 2 (Supported) or a 3 (Promising) to provide:

• Pre-Implementation materials (p<0.01)
• Fidelity measures (p<0.01)
• Implementation guide or manual (p<0.01)
Caveat...

- Based on developer response to Yes/No item
- From a cursory look at the text descriptions, it's clear there is much variation in the Yeses
  - Format
  - Quality
  - Practicality
  - Empirically examined for effectiveness
Initial Coding Strategy

• Linked the Implementation Support items to the essential implementation functions identified in Paper 1

• Fit with the following:
  – Choosing the best-fit PRACTICE (needs/outcome and resources and capacity);
  – Comprehensive PLANNING to enable implementation;
  – DELIVERING the practice in accordance with the plan;
  – MONITORING the effectiveness and fidelity of delivery
Coding Process to date

• Multistage process:
  1. Initial coding based on the text descriptions from the developers
  2. Request copies of any materials mentioned by the developers
     – Not all developers willing to share...
  3. Code based on the materials themselves
Stage 1: Identified discrete items to code

1. Program has a certification/accreditation process

2. Description of fidelity measure – Yes/No for each:
   a) Direct observation
   b) Self-report
   c) Audio/video coding
   d) Supervision feedback
   e) Chart review
   f) Survey of clients

3. Implementation manual separate from training manual (standalone, or separate section)
Stage 1: Coding Process

• 4 coders worked independently to code based solely on the developer's text responses
  – If an item was not mentioned, it was coded as No

• With 201 programs to review on 8 implementation support criteria, the raters had 1608 decisions to make!
Stage 1: Coding Process

- Full agreement of the 4 raters 87.4% of the time
  - Range of full agreement: 61.2% - 98.0%

- 3 of the 4 raters agreed 2.4% of the time

- 75+% agreement on 89.8% of the responses
  - Used this standard to report following results
18.9% of Programs reported having a certification, accreditation, or similar process

• N=190, Yes n = 36
Stage 1: Results

Description of fidelity measure(s):

- 10.5% Direct Observation: (N=190), Yes n=20
- 15.2% Self-Report: (N=164), Yes n=25
- 16.0% Audio/Video Coding: (N=194), Yes n=31
- 31.5% Supervision: (N=146), Yes n=46
- 3.0% Chart Review: (N=198), Yes n=6
- 3.6% Survey of Clients: (N=194), Yes n=7
Stage 1: Results

24.6% of programs reported having an Implementation manual (standalone from training manual or separate section)

- N=167, Yes n = 41
Stage 1: Comments

• Inferences are difficult to make regarding type/depth
  – We don’t know what type of supports are actually most effective
  – Let’s understand what strategies are currently being used, help move the field forward, but keep judgment out

• Value & depth of information gained from registries such as this for decision makers
What have we learned so far...

- Gaps exist, even when just looking at the gross data:
  - Lack of fidelity tools in general, even before coded for practicality, usability, etc.
  - Limited Pre-Implementation Supports, even though this stage is critical to success
  - No dominant fidelity assessment approach currently
Next Steps

• Stage 2 – Most materials have been received

• Stage 3 – Develop coding scheme for a deeper dive into the materials
  – Use existing codes from literature when possible
  – Suggestions from attendees?
Questions? Comments?

For additional information on the CEBC:

Contact Us: info@cebc4cw.org

Sign up for Email Alerts: www.cebc4cw.org/email-alerts

Facebook
facebook.com/cacebc4cw

LinkedIn
linkedin.com/company/california-evidence-based-clearinghouse-for-child-welfare-cebc-

Twitter
@cebc4cw