

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Community Strategies to Reduce Child Abuse and Neglect: Lessons from the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program

Author(s): WESTAT

Document No.: 210275

Date Received: June 2005

Award Number: 97-MU-MU-0005

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Communitywide Strategies to Reduce Child Abuse and Neglect: Lessons from the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program

Child abuse and neglect can harm young people in many ways, beyond the immediate pain and suffering inflicted. Many studies point to long-term consequences, finding that victims of child abuse and neglect are at greater risk of delinquency, substance abuse, adult criminality, and other problems [5, 6, 10, 11, 13-15].

The Safe Kids/Safe Streets (SK/SS) Program is an initiative of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to help five communities reduce child abuse and neglect and their aftereffects through collaborative, community-wide efforts. Three DOJ offices—the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), the Executive Office for Weed & Seed (EOWS), and the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW)—collaborate on funding and monitoring these communities, with OJJDP providing overall coordination.¹ The program began in 1997, when DOJ selected five localities to implement SK/SS. Three of the SK/SS grantees were in mid-sized cities (Huntsville, Alabama; Kansas City, Missouri; and Toledo, Ohio), one in a rural area (Burlington, Vermont) and one in a Tribal area (Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan).

A national core team, consisting of DOJ program managers, Westat as the national evaluator, and a technical assistance (TA) team, supported the initiative. The TA team was added in the second year to promote a stronger system reform focus and help sites access a wider range of TA. The TA included direct on-site assistance and subsidies for training or consultation from other sources. DOJ also convened biennial “cluster conferences” for national team members and the sites, in an effort to create a shared vision for SK/SS and introduce best practices from other jurisdictions.

[Sidebar] Information in this bulletin is adapted from a 4-volume evaluation report on the Safe Kids/Safe Streets program, *National Evaluation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program: Final Report*, prepared by Westat. This report describes the results of Westat's national evaluation of SK/SS planning and implementation from 1997, when sites were first funded, through June 2003 [2]. Findings are based on multiple sources of information, including twice-yearly site visits, review of project documentation, three Stakeholder Surveys (in 1998, 2001, and 2003), a 2002 Survey of Agency Personnel, and two structured surveys of “key informants” (in 2000 and 2002). Westat also developed a logic model and a detailed case study of the SK/SS experience for each site.

¹ When SK/SS began and for most of its history, these three offices were part of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) within DOJ. In 1994, a reorganization removed the Office on Violence against Women (OVW) from OJP, though it continues to work closely with various components of that office.

About the Safe Kids/Safe Streets initiative

The goals of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets initiative were ambitious. It was designed to help communities make significant changes in the policies, procedures and practices of agencies that deal with children and families involved in or at risk of abuse and neglect. Communities were expected to become more comprehensive and proactive in combating child abuse and neglect, improve coordination and collaboration across agencies, and deploy resources more effectively. To engage the entire community in this child protection effort, sites were expected to develop broad-based local collaboratives, building on relationships and collaborations already in place. The SK/SS collaboratives must include justice, child welfare, family service, education, health, and mental health agencies, and also nontraditional partners, such as faith-based organizations, community groups, the media, and victims and their families.

Each site also had to develop and implement plans covering four components:

- **System reform and accountability**—reforming agency policies, practices, and procedures, and improving cross-agency training and communication.
- **Enhancing the continuum of services, from prevention to treatment**—improving existing services, filling gaps, and using current resources more effectively, including those of public, private, and informal support systems.
- **Data collection and evaluation**—improving local data and information sharing across systems and agencies, to support decisionmaking in individual cases and help the community evaluate its progress toward its objectives.
- **Prevention education**—educating the community about child abuse and neglect and how to report it, community services, and good parenting practices [12].

Sites were allowed considerable flexibility in designing their programs, but DOJ intervened if a site appeared to stray too far from the Federal vision. Federal staff provided significant input on draft plans for implementation and, over time provided more clarification about their expectations. This clarification, also stressed by the TA team, emphasized the overarching importance of system reform and the way that the other program components could support it.

During the implementation phase, each site carried out a unique mix of activities. There were some commonalities, however. For example, all sites worked to make more effective use of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) in cases of child abuse and neglect. All invested in Children's Advocacy Centers (CACs), which combine multidisciplinary handling of child abuse cases with a child-friendly setting and resources for families. All communities also worked to improve training for mandated reporters, the school, health,

and other personnel who are required by law to report suspected child abuse and neglect. Some new services were implemented everywhere, often through subgrants from the lead agency to other partners.

By mid-2003, when most data collection for the national evaluation ended, full Federal support was winding down for three sites—Burlington, Huntsville, and Toledo. However, they were expecting a sixth award to cover one last year of effort to support the transition from Federal to non-Federal funding. Kansas City and Sault Ste. Marie still had a year or more of full funding left. Although it was too early to detect any reductions in child abuse and neglect, the SK/SS communities had made impressive progress both at establishing effective collaboratives and implementing plans to improve local systems and services. Four of the five SK/SS collaboratives were hoping to survive beyond the term of Federal funding. The Kansas City collaborative was the exception. It planned to transfer its functions to another multi-agency committee with ongoing responsibility for child protective services.

What lessons can we learn from the SK/SS experience?

The SK/SS experience offers a wealth of insights about collaboration-building, system reform, services, and other activities for jurisdictions that are contemplating similar initiatives and their sponsors.

Community context

The SK/SS approach can succeed in a wide range of communities. The SK/SS sites ranged from rural and Tribal areas to mid-size cities. The SK/SS approach adapted to environments with differing demographics and resource levels and was implemented by a variety of agency types. The lead agencies in Huntsville, Kansas City, and Sault Ste. Marie had multimillion dollar budgets prior to SK/SS, compared with just \$29,000 in Burlington and \$700,000 in Toledo. The Sault Ste. Marie project was led by an agency of the Sault Tribal government, while the other four grantees were nonprofit organizations. Two grantees—in Burlington and Kansas City—had been convening stakeholders with an interest in the child abuse and neglect system for many years, but were not direct service providers. In contrast, the other lead agencies had pivotal direct service roles in their formal child protection systems. Sault Ste. Marie targeted Tribal members in a multicounty area. The other projects all targeted a single county, although Kansas City focused direct services mostly on three high-need ZIP Code areas. Annual Federal funding levels ranged from \$125,000 (Toledo) to over \$800,000 (Huntsville). (See Table 1 for further details about the sites.)

Some community conditions will be more favorable than others. In selecting sites, DOJ favored communities with existing capacity and infrastructure, “friendly” legislation and policies, and a readiness

to undertake system reform—with good results. The SK/SS experience suggests that it is especially important to have a lead agency with leadership experience, content expertise, and credibility in the community. Ideally, the agency will be seen as a neutral party and have an existing collaborative to build on. Where those two elements are absent, the community can expect to spend more time collaboration-building and agenda-setting. Sault Ste. Marie, for example, suffered on both counts; it had no standing collaborative and its lead agency was the one responsible for investigating and intervening in child abuse and neglect. Huntsville's lead agency had a collaboration in place, but as a major service provider and one of the largest agencies in the community, it was not perceived as "neutral."

Program design

Flexible program design and oversight helps programs overcome barriers and adapt to new challenges and opportunities. DOJ established a broad vision and held to some key principles, but allowed sites considerable latitude to find the right mix of activities for their own communities. No other approach could have accommodated the wide range of community circumstances and stakeholder priorities. Some plans just didn't work out, despite good faith efforts. For example, Huntsville tried several approaches for bringing services to neighborhoods before settling on a full-service school model. Kansas City's initial MDT was abandoned and replaced by a different model, linked to the existing CAC. Burlington stopped its CAC services and restarted with different targeting criteria.

Also, sites need the freedom to be opportunistic. These days, many communities have multiple collaboratives, with new ones emerging all the time. The SK/SS sites profited from aligning themselves with other collaboratives, even though initially the payoff may have been uncertain. For example, Toledo's involvement with the OJJDP-funded Comprehensive Strategies Program brought stronger alliances between the child welfare and law enforcement/court arenas. In Burlington, the relationship between SK/SS and the Family Court Permanency Planning Project resulted in both service enhancements and joint data collection efforts.

Planning and carrying out a system reform effort takes a long time, even if the community has the infrastructure. All the SK/SS sites were heavily involved in planning for at least 18 months, although partial implementation began everywhere within a year. DOJ was sufficiently flexible to extend the planning phase beyond 6 months and the overall initiative beyond the 5½ years originally envisioned. DOJ also released implementation funds incrementally during planning to address pressing community concerns and make the lengthy planning more tolerable. Judging from the SK/SS experience, it makes sense to:

- **Allow 9 to 12 months for project planning and initial collaboration building.** Where outside sponsors are involved, they should be prepared to release small amounts of implementation funds during planning for activities about which there is consensus.
- **Assume that the overall initiative will take 8 to 10 years.** The pace of progress will vary depending on a number of local factors—readiness to take on system reform, the initial status of collaboration, the strategies selected, barriers encountered, and the targeted outcomes. Outside sponsors should consider a period of stepped-down funding toward the end of the initiative, as DOJ did.
- **Develop detailed timelines for accomplishing key activities and achieving the specified outcomes.** The timeline should reflect a consensus from stakeholders about what is possible when and include recognizable milestones. The timeline should not be a straitjacket or prevent the program from responding to unexpected opportunities, but rather help the community make realistic plans, assess progress, and make necessary adjustments.

Collaboration-building

All the SK/SS sites developed governing councils, supplemented by committees and workgroups that also played an important role in designing and carrying out the SK/SS agenda. Most of the sites also held communitywide meetings to publicize project activities and encourage input. The collaboratives engaged a broad spectrum of stakeholders, exceeding the core membership requirements of DOJ. Further, the members shared responsibility, accountability, and to a lesser extent resources.

Many strategies that have been effective for other collaborative efforts also worked for SK/SS.

Observers of other collaboratives have identified many strategies that help build and maintain effective collaborations [3, 4, 7-9]. Many of these same approaches were applied successfully at the SK/SS sites. Thus, other communities should work to:

- Involve key players early in the process,
- Establish a shared vision,
- Set readily attainable objectives,
- Devise creative and realistic strategies,
- Emphasize what partners agree on and respect differences,
- Avoid "red herrings" that might derail the initiative, and
- Publicize success and acknowledge contributions from partners.

SK/SS demonstrates the value of additional strategies and tactics. Besides confirming previous insights, the SK/SS experience suggests several other lessons for communities that are trying to build lasting collaborations.

- **Be prepared to fine-tune the governance structure** over time. Major restructuring (which occurred in Huntsville and Sault Ste. Marie) may even be desirable to bring in additional partners, accommodate new political realities, and make the most effective use of resources.
- **Use community meetings** to broaden participation in setting the collaborative's agenda and recruit people to more active roles. Workgroups and committees can play a similar role, while ensuring that both the work and the credit for accomplishments are widely shared.
- **Redistribute some program funds** through grants. This can bring key stakeholders to the table and enhance the program's legitimacy, especially if the stakeholders (not staff) decide how to allocate the funds. Added benefits may come from a competitive funding process that heavily involves stakeholders in proposal reviews. Burlington and Kansas City found that this built capacity both to write proposals and to think critically about how specific projects can contribute to system reform. Kansas City's small grant program, specifically targeted to nontraditional and grassroots organizations, also brought brand new stakeholders to the collaborative.
- **Do not be overly concerned about turf conflict** derailing the entire initiative. Given a broad agenda, the initiative can still progress in some areas, while stakeholders who are at odds on other areas take time to find common ground. Also, some turf issues can be tackled directly and moderated through team-building training (as happened for the CACs in several SK/SS sites).
- **Rather than rush the initial planning, start a few activities** about which there is strong stakeholder consensus while planning is still underway. In every SK/SS site, this helped ease frustration and sustain stakeholder commitment. Even small efforts—like Family Fun Nights in Sault Ste. Marie—built support for planning and brought visibility to the project.
- **Operate as a "learning community."** A good collaborative should function as a learning community, valuing clear and open communication and willing to revisit initial plans and resource allocations with a critical eye. Early plans sometimes founder and community circumstances change. New information about best practices becomes available. A return to strategic planning can elicit new ideas and initiatives that re-energize stakeholders. Burlington's development of statewide mandatory reporter training was one such idea. Toledo's decision to shift funding for Building Healthy Families from direct services to training and coordination was another.

Including nontraditional partners in a collaborative is a particular challenge, especially if the partners have different ethnicity, culture, and experience from agency professionals. Although the SK/SS collaboratives sought a broad range of participants, they fell short of fully integrating nontraditional partners, especially residents and clients. Most sites appeared to genuinely want more nontraditional participation, but none invested heavily in the effort. Some sites also had trouble retaining nontraditional participants, once they had been recruited. Other jurisdictions should:

- **Identify nontraditional partners during the early planning stages and strategize about how to secure their involvement.** Identify obstacles and how they might be overcome. For example, the collaborative may need to sell parents and other nontraditional partners on the idea that it is in their interest to participate and give them support (e.g., through training, financial assistance, and accessible meeting times and places). Traditional partners may need convincing, too, not just about

the benefits of having nontraditional partners, but also the need to invest in bringing them to the table and developing effective working relationships.

- **Budget for the costs of involving nontraditional groups**, such as identification and recruitment, initial and ongoing orientation/training, transportation, and babysitting.

Outside sponsors can help by providing TA on these challenges, requiring sites to use it early in the planning process, and if necessary, setting budget guidelines for investments in nontraditional involvement.

System reform

The SK/SS sites affected the child protection system in many ways. Stakeholders say the SK/SS initiative provided them with new contacts, training, and an improved ability to do their job. Most stakeholders also credited SK/SS with improving both interagency and community communication and the information available for making decisions.

Several approaches can be particularly effective in increasing the personal and professional capacities of stakeholders, including:

- **A tiered approach to governance.** In SK/SS, this approach provided myriad opportunities for people to work together on governing councils, committees, and other work groups. In most sites, community meetings also allowed less active participants to expand their contacts and provide input into program development.
- **Service initiatives that promote stronger relationships among agencies.** Sometimes, SK/SS helped place agency personnel in new locations. For example, Huntsville's human service agency based a Community Liaison in a neighborhood; the liaison also made monthly trips on the bus route to the agency, so she could talk informally with clients. Other service initiatives strengthened referral relationships or created new ones. In Sault Ste. Marie, the Family Service Team/Wraparound Program expanded referrals, particularly in the underserved rural Western service area. Burlington and Kansas City held regular meetings for their grantees to promote working relationships among them. Toledo established a Contract Providers Committee for agencies providing home visitation to families.
- **Cross-agency training.** Cross-agency training delivers consistent information across the community's child protection system and, regardless of its content, helps people from different agencies get better acquainted. But some training can be explicitly designed to promote closer working relationships. For example, Burlington started Building Bridges Workshops, hosted by a different agency each month. Kansas City, recognizing that domestic violence providers did not typically work with child protective services staff and law enforcement, brought them all together for cross-disciplinary training. It inspired a broader initiative to create a coordinated and consistent response to co-occurring child abuse and domestic violence, modeled on the Green Book initiative promoted by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Closer collaboration between the domestic violence and child protection communities was a particularly noteworthy result of project efforts in several sites. Two-thirds of all stakeholders said that SK/SS had improved multiagency responses to children affected by domestic violence.

Cross-agency training can be sustained by creating concrete products like training curricula, toolkits, and videos and embedding training requirements in local systems. The SK/SS sites demonstrated some success with this approach. For example,

- Sault Ste. Marie turned its training for mandated reporters into a self-administered tutorial and required it for all new Tribal employees.
- Kansas City's training curriculum on Medical Aspects of Child Abuse and Neglect was mandated for child protective services workers and conducted by the local children's hospital.
- Huntsville's *Resources 101*, a monthly orientation on community resources, was required for new staff at CPS and Healthy Families.

Other types of training and support can further a system reform agenda. The SK/SS sites also sponsored some training for community members at large, often in partnership with collaborating agencies. The Community Healing Process in Sault Ste. Marie was especially ambitious, consisting of a multi-year training open to the entire Tribe and designed to infuse cultural values and practices throughout Tribal programs. Admittedly, the environment was distinctive, involving a small, well-defined community of Tribal members, and the content was tailored to a Tribal audience. However, this experience suggests that other small communities (or perhaps a limited target area within a larger city) could attempt a broad-based public training.

The Community Healing Process in Sault Ste. Marie was the most comprehensive of the efforts to promote cultural competence. However, other sites used tactics adaptable to a wide variety of communities. For example:

- Huntsville inaugurated Diversity Schoolhouse—a popular brown bag luncheon series on different cultures, ethnicities, and religions—for practitioners and others. This program has already been emulated by four other communities.
- Burlington required prospective grantees to demonstrate how they were addressing cultural competence issues in their grant applications.
- Kansas City made small Capacity Building and Prevention Grants, designed in part to engage more diverse service providers, such as neighborhood-based and grassroots organizations, in prevention programming.

Changes in agency structures and policies can be sustained. Perhaps the most impressive system reform efforts at the SK/SS sites involved creating new agency structures for case handling, improving existing structures, and changing policies and procedures to improve case processing and outcomes. Most of these changes do not depend on SK/SS funds for their continuation. Other sites might look to them for inspiration. For example:

- Two sites (Burlington and Huntsville) implemented new prosecution units.
- Four sites started Drug Courts (Huntsville, Kansas City, Sault Ste. Marie, and Toledo).
- Three sites (Huntsville, Kansas City, and Toledo) started or expanded law enforcement units to handle child maltreatment and domestic violence.
- The two sites that lacked Children's Advocacy Centers (CACs) at the outset (Burlington and Sault Ste. Marie) started them.
- The other three sites made a variety of improvements in the training, procedures, and MDT arrangements for their existing CACs.
- Burlington upgraded and expanded MDTs for at-risk or "gray area" families. It also improved resources and facilities for forensic examinations of sexual assault victims.
- Kansas City and Toledo were especially active in developing new protocols, procedures, and guidelines. For example, Kansas City established protocols for filing court cases on drug-exposed infants and adopted new structured decision-making tools for child protective services. Toledo developed permanency planning protocols for Juvenile Court and new pediatric sexual assault guidelines.

Of these efforts, only the new CACs in Burlington and Sault Ste. Marie expected to be heavily dependent on further fund-raising for their continuation.

Collaboration can become the normal way of doing business. By 2002, evaluators routinely heard from key informants, stakeholders, and agency front-line staff that collaboration had become the expected way of operating in the community. This expectation cut across a wide range of activities, from working on individual cases, to delivering training and developing new grants. Many respondents pointed out that it would be hard to reverse the process. Even if specific collaborations did not endure, SK/SS would leave this legacy.

Enhancing the continuum of services

Most SK/SS sites successfully filled service gaps and made services more accessible, at least during the term of Federal funding. Except for Kansas City, it was their highest priority during the early phases of

implementation. The services funded ran the gamut from prevention to treatment. In the service area, several sites expanded or improved home visitation, neighborhood- or community-based services, and parent education. Initiatives to help children affected by domestic violence were also common. Some sites emphasized coordinated and wraparound services. At times, however, service initiatives threatened to overwhelm the rest of the agenda, and DOJ had to be vigilant in defending the system reform side. Other comprehensive initiatives have experienced a similar tug of war for resources between system reform and direct services [1].

To achieve an appropriate balance between investments in direct services and system reform, communities should develop an explicit rationale for service initiatives, indicating how they will contribute to the system reform agenda. The rationale should answer the following questions:

1. How will each service investment help improve community or systemic policies and practices?
2. What will it take to sustain this service when grant funds are no longer available?
3. If a particular service initiative is unlikely to have systemic impact, what other objectives will it serve (e.g., strengthening community capacity, bringing missing voices to the table, addressing community concerns)?
4. How can direct service initiatives help promote best practices, such as cultural competence, family-centered practice, and service coordination/integration?

Outside sponsors can assist by providing guidelines for balancing expenditures for system reform activities and expenditures for new or expanded services, initially and over time. Applicants should be required to document and justify departures from guidelines.

Sustaining services is a continuing challenge. Most SK/SS participants concede that they should have started working on sustainability sooner. They also were unprepared for changes in economic conditions that reduced both public and private sources of support. Overall, however, the prospects for sustaining SK/SS-supported services look promising. Several programs have already transitioned to other sources of funding—among them, most of the service programs in Burlington, Toledo's home visitation program, and Huntsville's First Responders and Parents as Teachers programs. To build the capacity of service providers to continue valued services, several sites also sponsored training in sustainability planning and resource development.

Data collection and evaluation

Most sites made data collection and local evaluation a relatively low priority, in part a function of limited local capacity and interest in these activities. There were also significant barriers to improving electronic case tracking and information sharing across agencies—in the form of technology, cost, organizational structure, and confidentiality concerns. Nonetheless, local capacity to collect and use data did increase and there was greater recognition of the need for data to inform decisions and track progress. In part, this was a response to the challenge of sustainability, as sites became more aware that they would need to document their achievements and challenges for new sponsors.

Although no site implemented a comprehensive interagency management information system, Toledo was in the early stages of two such efforts—one to track victims seen in the emergency room and the other for home visitation clients—and Kansas City and Huntsville were taking a second look at the possibilities. All sites did make more modest changes. For example, Kansas City and Huntsville improved the technology for interagency e-mail and cross-agency access to data. Burlington backed a new database for serious sexual and physical abuse cases at the CAC location, accessible to law enforcement, SRS investigators, and prosecutors. Sault Ste. Marie was working on an interagency plan to share information about substance abuse clients.

To fully integrate data collection and evaluation into system reform efforts, jurisdictions should seek expert advice and on-site technical assistance early. In particular, evaluators recommend that communities:

- **Bring local evaluators on board to assist in planning.** Admittedly, trained evaluators may be scarce in small and relatively rural communities, so the search should start early. If such assistance is not available locally (the ideal), outside sponsors may be able to help sites find appropriate help elsewhere or fund a national evaluator to fill in.
- **Connect local evaluators with collaboration members, ideally through committees.** SK/SS sites that formed committees to help develop their evaluations or other research efforts built both demand for data and the capacity for understanding and using it in decisionmaking.
- **Focus on building capacity for "results-based accountability."** Training, TA, and evaluation support for this approach can move communities toward data-driven decisionmaking, by helping stakeholders to identify clear, measurable outcomes. Grappling with how to measure the outcomes may also expose the limitations of local data systems and ultimately, stimulate some improvements.
- **Obtain outside TA about approaches to integrating data systems.** TA can help jurisdictions understand the full range of cross-agency MIS options, from simple low-tech to cutting-edge improvements. It can also elucidate a range of approaches for addressing confidentiality issues.

In fact, SK/SS sites received TA in the latter areas, but too late to strongly affect their agendas. Early TA will help a jurisdiction do a better job of planning its overall agenda and allocating sufficient resources to data collection and data integration efforts.

Prevention education

At most SK/SS sites, modest prevention education efforts matured into more comprehensive strategies as the programs developed, though funding allocations typically remained small. The overarching lesson for other communities is to link prevention education efforts to the overall objectives of the initiative. Many of the specific activities undertaken by SK/SS may appeal to other communities. For example:

- The sites developed a wide array of resource materials, from sophisticated on-line information systems in Sault Ste. Marie and Huntsville to service directories, brochures, newsletters, community calendars, and other printed materials at all sites.
- All sites participated in many neighborhood and community events.
- All sites produced or supported multimedia campaigns about child abuse and family violence. The campaign in Sault Ste. Marie earned national recognition.
- Kansas City provided grants to community-based organizations to build grassroots capacity and develop targeted awareness efforts.

Resources

The SK/SS communities were fortunate in receiving substantial Federal resources to carry out their efforts. Over the course of the demonstration, sites have received anywhere from \$750,000 (Toledo) to about \$4 million dollars (Huntsville). However, evaluators noted significant accomplishments in all sites, regardless of the funding level and wide variations in the level of project staffing. Although some resources are necessary to convene and manage a collaborative effort, other jurisdictions should not be discouraged if they lack comparable levels of funding. Many efforts of the SK/SS relied on donated staff time and sometimes, other sponsors. And many changes—particularly in the system reform area—have been institutionalized and require relatively little in the way of ongoing support.

Outside sponsors, for their part, should be encouraged by the accomplishments of the SK/SS sites. Investments in collaboration can stimulate impressive changes in a community. Besides funding project activities directly, sponsors can also play an important role in providing training and TA and helping communities adhere to a vision of system reform.

Summary

While collaborative approaches have been successfully used in other arenas, the SK/SS initiative represents the most comprehensive application in the child maltreatment field. It succeeded in building broad-based collaboratives around child abuse and neglect issues in five very different communities. The five collaboratives enabled their communities to forge stronger relationships among agencies and focus on system reform issues. They also engaged a broad range of stakeholders in developing and implementing a complex and ambitious agenda and made collaboration a normal way of doing business. Other communities can learn many valuable lessons from the experience of these sites.

For Further Information

On the national evaluation

Frances Gragg, Project Director
Westat
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850

301-738-3610 (work)
301-315-5934 (fax)
FrancesGragg@Westat.com

On site activities

Burlington, VT

Sally Borden, Director
KidSafe Collaborative of Chittenden County
308 Pine Street
Burlington, VT 05401
802-863-9626
802-865-4857(fax)
kidsafe@kidsafevt.org

Huntsville, AL

Jo Ann Plucker
Kevin Brown
National Children's Advocacy Center
210 Pratt Ave
Huntsville, AL 35801
256-533-0531
256-533-6883 (fax)
jplucker@nationalcac.org
kbrown@nationalcac.org

Kansas City, MO

Alinda Dennis, KIDSAFE Project Manager
Donna Snead, KIDSAFE Project Director
Heart of America United Way
1080 Washington Street
Kansas City, MO 64105
816-559-4670 (Dennis) or 816-559-4679
(Snead)
816-472-5818 or 816-474-4382 (fax)
AlindaDennis@HAUW.org
DonnaSnead@HAUW.org

Sault Ste. Marie, MI

Rick O'Kane, Behavioral Health Program
Manager
Anishnabek Community and Family Services
Sault Ste Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians
2864 Ashmun Street
Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783
906-632-5250
906-632-5266 (fax)
ssrick@saulttribe.net

Toledo, OH

Cindy Pisano, SK/SS Project Director
Family & Child Abuse Prevention Center
One Stranahan Square, Ste. 532
Toledo, OH 43604
419-244-3053
419-244-1100 (fax)
cpisano@fcapc.org

References

1. Annie E. Casey Foundation, *The Path of Most Resistance: Reflections on Lessons Learned From New Futures, 1995*, Baltimore, MD: Author, 1999.
2. Gragg, F., Cronin, R., Schultz, D., & Eisen, K., *National Evaluation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program: Final Report, Volumes I - IV*, Rockville, MD: Westat, 2004. Volumes include *Volume I: Cross-Site Findings, Volume II: Case Studies of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Demonstration Sites, Volume III: Findings from the 2003 Stakeholder Survey*, and *Volume IV: Survey of Agency Personnel*.
3. CSR, Inc., *Lessons Learned: The Experience of Nine Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Programs*, Washington, DC: Author, 1996.
4. Farrow, F., *Building Community Partnerships for Child Protection*, Paper prepared for the Executive Session on Child Protection, Malcolm Wiener Center for Social Policy, Kennedy School of Government, 1997.
5. Kelley, B.T., Thornberry, T.P., & Smith, C.A., *In the Wake of Child Maltreatment*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1997.
6. Lemmon, J.H., "How Child Maltreatment Affects Dimensions of Juvenile Delinquency in a Cohort of Low-income Urban Youths," *Justice Quarterly*, 16(2), 1999: 357-76.
7. Melaville, A.I., & Blank, M.J., *What It Takes: Structuring Interagency Partnerships to Connect Children and Families with Comprehensive Services*, Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium, 1991.
8. Mizrahi, T., & Rosenthal, B.B., "Complexities of Coalition Building: Leaders, Successes, Strategies, and Solutions," *Social Work*, 46(1), 2001: 63-78.
9. Mizrahi, T., "Strategies for Effective Collaboration in Human Services," *Social Policy*, 29(4), 1999: 5-20.
10. National Institute of Justice, *Childhood Victimization and Risk for Alcohol and Drug Arrests*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, 1995.
11. National Institute of Justice, *The Cycle of Violence Revisited*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, 1996.
12. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Safe Kids/Safe Streets-Community Approaches to Reducing Abuse and Neglect and Preventing Delinquency*, FY 1996 Discretionary Competitive Program Announcements and Application Kit, Washington, DC: Author, 1996.
13. Weeks, R., & Widom, C.S., *Early Childhood Victimization Among Incarcerated Adult Male Felons*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, 1998.
14. Widom, C.S., *Victims of Childhood Sexual Abuse—Later Criminal Consequences*, Research in Brief, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, 1995.

15. Wiebush, R., Freitag, R., & Baird, C., *Preventing Delinquency Through Improved Child Protection Services*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, 2001.

Table 1. Characteristics of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Sites

	Burlington, VT	Huntsville, AL	Kansas City, MO	Sault Ste. Marie, MI	Toledo, OH
Project Name	KidSafe	One by One	KIDSAFE	Building Strong Native American Families	Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program
Lead agency	Community Network for Children, Youth, & Families ¹	National Children's Advocacy Center (NCAC)	Heart of America United Way (HAUW)	Anishnabek Community and Family Services (ACFS)	Family and Child Abuse Prevention Center (FCAPC)
Type of agency	Private, nonprofit organization; a partnership of agencies, community groups, and individuals working to improve the community's response to child abuse and neglect	Private, nonprofit organization; coordinates agency responses to child abuse and neglect, to reduce trauma to victims and improve results for prosecution	A nonprofit agency serving 6 counties in the bi-state Kansas City metro area; administers funds for nonprofit health and human service agencies	A Tribal government agency; provider of social, mental health, and substance abuse services to the Sault Sainte Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians	A nonprofit, community-based education, public awareness, and direct services agency
Agency budget the year before SK/SS	\$ 29,120	\$2,426,225	\$3,580,370	\$3,860,695	\$397,216 (6 months)
Initial SK/SS award ²	\$ 424,494	\$ 800,000	\$923,645	\$425,000	\$125,000
Total SK/SS awards	\$2,250,000	\$4,125,000	\$3,472,290	\$2,250,000	\$750,000
Primary target area for SK/SS	Chittenden County	Madison County	Jackson County, with special focus on 3 ZIP code areas	Mackinac, Chippewa, & Schoolcraft Counties	Lucas County
Target area population in 2000 ³	146,571	276,700	654,880	50,486 ⁴ (8243)	455,054
Agencies/groups on the governing council for SK/SS, 2002-3	26	30	33	18	29

¹In 2003, the Community Network began doing business as the KidSafe Collaborative of Chittenden County.

²Funding for the 1st grant period was expected to cover 18 months. Subsequent awards were for 1 year, but projects were allowed to carry over unexpended funds.

³U.S. Census Bureau: *State and County QuickFacts*, 2000 Census of Population and Housing.

⁴ Mackinac and Chippewa Counties only. Figures in parentheses represent the Sault Tribal population.