Transforming Response to Child Sexual Abuse
Theory-Based Multi-System Team Development

Rosalyn M. Bertram Ph.D.
Principal Investigator
University of Missouri Kansas City
School of Social Work

Study supported by

Kids Safe Funds via Heart of America United Way
&
University of Missouri Kansas City
Center for the City CORPS grant

Child Sexual Abuse Response
Complex Interdependent Relationships

- Legally mandated roles, responsibilities & timelines
  Separate funding, policy, training, supervision

- Overlapping roles (law enforcement & child welfare)

- Complementary roles (child welfare & family court)
- Complementary roles (law enforcement & prosecution)

- Medical evaluations by Childrens Mercy Hospital

- All relied upon forensic evaluations conducted by
  The Child Protection Center

Child Protection Center's
Confused Decision-Making Forums

Community Council	Governance Group
Former Judges	Chief Administrators from
Doctors	Child Welfare
Former Prosecutors	Kansas City Police
Fundraisers	Family Court
Activists	Prosecutor's Office
AND	
Some members of the Governance Group	

Case Collaboratives

Primary means for negotiating overlapping or
    complementary roles & responsibilities

Case-by-case means to integrate multi-system response
    Composition varied
    Structure varied
    Relied upon trust developed between professionals

Politically hot cases, funding cuts & staff turnover eroded
    this case-by-case approach to systems integration

Theory of Team Development

NIDRR studies by five universities of effective
teamwork in developmental disabilities
(Eno-Heineman, 1997)

Applied in CMHS-SAMHSA grants
in defining theory base for wraparound
(Malysiak, Bertram, 1997-2001)
(Bertram & Bertram , 2003)

Never applied with administrators representing
multiple systems working with same population

Theory-based Constructs

Power and challenge of collaborative models of practice:
    Bring together differing perspectives of a situation

- Team composition affects assessment and outcomes
- Clear team structure
- Team structure is defined via four sets of agreements
- Greater cohesion contributes to better performance
- Shared goals & rules are basis for collaboration
- Assessment can then be fully ecological & systemic

Team Structure

Goals

Rules of Operation

Information Sharing
- Information needed
- How to share it

Decision Making
- Especially how to make decisions when not all agree

Conflict Resolution

Assessment

Ecological
- Competencies & Assets
- Constraints & Challenges

Current status
Agreement on problems-in-context
Used with goals to develop plan

Plan & Evaluation
Strengths as levers for change
Lessons guide further team efforts

Composition

- **Childrens Division Regional Director**
- **Captain KCPD Special Victims Crime Unit**
- **Jackson County Prosecutor's Office**
- **Jackson County Family Court Chief Juvenile Officer**
- **Director of Social Work Childrens Mercy Hospital**
- **Director Child Protection Center**
- **Chief Investigative Detective Independence Police**
- **Chief Investigative Detective Lees Summit Police**
- **Director of Community Development United Way**

Child Protection Network Goals

Administrators agreed they should be working together through the Child Protection Center to provide:

- Timely, efficient, co-investigation of child sexual abuse allegations

- to better inform decisions each agency must make to support children and families in a culturally competent manner.

CPN Rules of Operation

1. Agreed it was necessary to share information about practice with families, and about agency policy, resources, & projects

2. Clarified discussions by whether they were confidential, simple information sharing, exploratory, or decision-making

3. Decision-making rules: a menu of options if talking to consensus or voting seemed problematic. Dissenting perspectives recorded & if a decision wasn't productive, dissenting viewpoints would be revisited.

4. Conflict resolution procedures established

Child Protection Network Assessment
Ecological & multi-layered

- **Direct practice with families**
  Co-investigation, medical & forensic evaluation, family court, prosecution, family services (case collaboratives)

- **Administrative level guiding that practice**
  (Governance Group → Child Protection Network)

- **Community advocates for changes in policy & funding**
  (Community Council)

  Clarified composition, information needed, roles & responsibilities, assets & constraints for each level

Current Status Agreement

Helps bring assumptions onto the table
Ideally, a systemic hypothesis of problems-in-context

"We lacked clarity for different levels of our activities. This contributed to confusion on roles & responsibilities. We lacked shared means to ensure systematic, efficient information gathering as well as shared guidelines for decision making. This compromised our best intentions to enhance our assets and address constraints."

Child Protection Network: 2004-2005 Action Plan

1. Defined best practice from initial report, through investigation, forensic evaluation, & collaborative review for prosecution and services

2. Defined shared protocol for roles & responsibilities in that practice

3. Wrote shared manual for detailed protocol guidance

4. Provided joint training in new guidelines to all staff

5. Identified QA data points for a shared database administrators review together monthly to evaluate practice fidelity to inform further improvements

Fully Accomplished in One Year

Participant Interviews: Summer 2005
Prior to theory-based team development

- Little collaboration occurring
- Attempts to integrate roles & responsibilities failing
- Each agency advocated for its own perspective & goals
- No rules for information sharing or decision-making
- Assumed discussions would forge understanding
- Assumed votes would resolve differences
- Repeated failures raised suspicion
- Decisions often revisited, stalling efforts
- No multi-systems strengths-based assessment
- Conflict clouded their vision
- They lacked trust.

After Theory-based Team Development

- Trust & a sense of influence emerged from developing shared goals & working within shared rules

- Shared goals & rules also provided direction & structure for collaboration in assessment & planning

- This clarified agency concerns & identified assets overlooked in their conflicts

- Previously pessimistic administrators found hope because there was something from which to build

- Culminating assessment with status agreement helped them consider why they had been stuck in conflict

- Using this with shared goals to prioritize steps in their plan contributed to ownership & timely, successful implementation of plan

---

Results & Next Steps

Theory of team development worked exactly as designed
- Action plan successfully completed in 1 year

- Shared database evaluating CPN protocol fidelity initiated January 2006

- Further differentiation of roles & responsibilities Community Council, Child Protection Network Governance Group, Case Collaborative Reviews

Annual Revision to CPN Goals, Rules, Assessment & Plan

Systems of Care
Possible Implications

Value-based principles & legal mandates are not enough
Relationships or parlimentary procedure are not enough

This theory base supports collaboration & integration
Theory of Team Development
Ecological Systems Theory

These theories provide a basis for
developing and refining systems of care