

Children’s Bureau Region IV Domestic Violence Strategies Within Child Protection Agencies
January 2011

	DV partners to CPS	DV protocol/ practice guidance	DV training	DV specialization within CPS system	DV policy or QA efforts	Of cases reviewed, DV identified as primary reason for opening case		DV services <i>(In each case review process, referrals were made for DV services. This column reflects other statements and concerns about services.)</i>	Sources and comments <i>(Unless otherwise noted, absence of 2 indicates no mention of DV in the PIP. Where PIP not available for review, that is noted.)</i>
						Foster care cases	In-home cases		
Alabama			Additional training provided after 2002 CFSR			0%	8%	Gaps in some locations	1
Florida	“In partnership with other agencies, DCF increased services” after 2001 CFSR.	Northeast Region investigator protocol. Also seeking TA for inclusion of DV into assessment tools and processes (from consultant D Mandel)	PIP: Northeast Region investigator training. Also Coordinated Community-Based Response Joint Training for DV and DCF CFSR Final Report: More training needed	Northeast Region pilot in protective investigation and case management units	PIP: Chapter 39 injunction (passed in 07, expanded in 08) allows DCF, law enforcement, state attorney, and others to seek order to remove a perpetrator from the home to minimize disruption to child and remove incentive for retaliation against adult victim. CFSR Final Report: DCF issued administrative rules re: identification of DV	12%	42%	DV services in “Expand service array” identified need	1, 2 CFSR Final Report: DV related to repeat maltreatment. In Miami-Dade and Smeinoles counties, stakeholder interviews suggest that failure to address underlying DV may result in children re-entering foster care. In Seminole County, DV identified as barrier to reunification.
Georgia	Yes— “partnership with local DV programs” for services	Developed after 2001 CFSR, and added to enhanced family assessment through Community Partnerships for Protecting Children	In follow-on training to pre-service training		In QCR reports, “where difficulties were identified” includes DV cases	2.5%	12%	Service development needed in some locations	1, 2

	DV Partners	Protocol/practice guidance	Training	DV specialists	Policy and QA	FC cases	In-home	DV services	Sources and comments
Kentucky			Stakeholder interviews reference cross-training opportunities with DV and law enforcement (some think it should be mandatory)			2.5%	12%	DV service array “severely underfunded”. In Laurel County, DV evaluation services not available or adequate	1
Mississippi			Additional training provided after 2004 CFSR			2.5%	0%		1 PIP on CB website has Massachusetts’ rather than Mississippi’s PIP
North Carolina	Inter-agency collaboration to look at gaps in services. DSS co-sponsors conference with the NC Coalition Against DV. Quarterly meetings will occur between DSS, NCCDV, DV Commission, and BI treatment programs to strengthen relationship and improve communication.	Universal screening for DV required at intake. After 2001 CFSR, state developed an assessment structure to better address DV issues.	Since 2001 CFSR, “comprehensive DV training” offered regionally to all 100 counties. Annual training institute brings national and local experts to train on family-centered DV intervention.		Since 2001 CFSR, a “comprehensive DV policy was developed through a multi-disciplinary work group” PIP:DSS policy consultants, trainers, and QA staff will review DV policy, training, service provision, and quality assurance results.	2.5%	24%	Services identified as insufficient to meet needs—both shelter programs and batterer intervention programs. A Regional model to build service capacity at the local level is being led by NC Director’s of Social Services Association. County departments to conduct self-assessment of program delivery components including DV. Several stakeholders expressed concern that reorganization of mental/behavioral health services has resulted in a decline in the availability of DV services (offenders and NOPs). In Nash County, MH system restructuring and resulting decline in DV services led to local agency director developing a DV shelter for men, women, and children.	1 DV connected to repeat maltreatment PIP: Internal dialogues on DV will continue with focus on shared communication between management, policy staff, field staff, and training staff. The internal dialogue will feed an external dialogue with DV service providers on identifying areas of need regarding batterer intervention programs and DV shelters/services. Community programs providing evidence-based DV will be funded.

	DV Partners	Protocol/practice guidance	Training	DV specialists	Policy and QA	FC cases	In-home	DV services	Sources and comments
South Carolina	After 2003 CFSR, worked with SC Coalition Against DV and Sexual Assault to expand services statewide.					0%	24%	After 2003 CFSR, expanded services statewide. Statewide Assessment in 2008 indicate that DV shelters and/or offender programs exist in all counties. However state budget cuts are having an impact on contracts. In interviews, some stakeholders indicated services are insufficient to meet needs.	1 PIP not available on-line as of 1.5.10
Tennessee						2.5%	4%	Stakeholders indicated in interviews that DV services not always accessible to children and families, esp in rural areas.	

Sources of information

- 1 – Round Two CFSR report (searched by terms: domestic violence, intimate partner violence, dating violence, relationship violence)
- 2 – Round Two PIP (searched by terms: domestic violence, intimate partner violence, dating violence, relationship violence)