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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Council</th>
<th>Governance Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Judges</td>
<td>Chief Administrators from Child Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>Kansas City Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Prosecutors</td>
<td>Family Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraisers</td>
<td>Prosecutor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activists</td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some members of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
(Malyszak, 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**
- Assessment
  - Ecological
  - Competencies & Assets
  - Constraints & Challenges

**Rules of Operation**

**Information Sharing**
- Information needed

**Decision Making**
- How to share it

**Conflict Resolution**
- Especially how to make decisions when not all agree

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.

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

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

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.”

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 parliamentary 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