

ENGAGING

Effectively joining with the family to establish common goals concerning child safety, well-being and permanency

“Engaging” is the ongoing ability to establish and sustain a genuinely supportive relationship with the family while developing a partnership, establishing healthy boundaries and maintaining contact as mutually negotiated.

“Engagement is about motivating and empowering families to recognize their own needs, strengths and resources and to take an active role in changing things for the better. Engagement is what keeps families working in the long and sometimes slow process of positive change... Research suggests that engagement in a helping relationship may be related to spending time with clients, communicating clearly, providing positive reinforcement and emphasizing client strengths.”

— Steib, 2004



Ideal	Developmental	Unacceptable
<p>Calls the family to schedule the first appointment (a phone call is the preferred method of initial contact), unless a significant safety concern requires an unannounced home visit. Drop-in visits are used sparingly and only with a specific purpose that is clearly documented in the case record. If a drop-in visit is necessary because the family does not have a phone, the worker will ask family about their preference for scheduling the future assessment visits.</p>	<p>Usually calls the family to schedule the first appointment; will sometimes use drop-in visits to meet timeframe mandates.</p>	<p>Regularly conducts unannounced, drop-in home visits to initiate contact.</p>
<p>Uses language that shows respect (such as asking each family member how he/she would like to be addressed – first name, Mr./Mrs., nickname, etc.)</p>	<p>Avoids language that tends to inflame (such as “victim”, “perpetrator”, “abusive”, “neglectful”, poor parenting”, “dirty home”, “drug addict”)</p>	<p>Uses language that is judgmental, authoritative or pejorative in communication with the family.</p> <p>Uses labels or language that reflects stereotypes or belittles the family’s culture, history, situation or behaviors.</p> <p>Uses abbreviations or technical language without explaining their meanings.</p>
<p>Respects family choices when scheduling contacts; incorporates family’s preference for day, time and location for the assessment visit (unless safety concerns are present); asks family about contact preferences, such as phone, email or text.</p>	<p>Determines a time and date for the visit and asks the family if this is mutually agreeable. Arrives at the appointment on time for scheduled contact; avoids cancellation of appointments.</p> <p>Inconsistently or selectively asks the family about contact preferences.</p>	<p>Schedules visits primarily according to the worker’s convenience for time and location, regularly misses appointments with family without notifying the family; does not ask the family about contact preferences.</p>

Ideal	Developmental	Unacceptable
<p>Uses protective authority only when necessary; engages law enforcement authority only when necessary to ensure child or worker safety, or as required by DCF Policy and Procedure Manual.</p>	<p>Overuses protective authority to ensure child or worker safety.</p>	<p>Primarily uses protective authority; does not balance protective authority with engaging families in a collaborative relationship. Demeanor with families is authoritative. Regularly uses law enforcement to gain access to the child, even when child safety is not an immediate concern.</p>
<p>Recognizes and verbalizes to the family members their strengths and skills.</p>	<p>Recognizes and verbalizes to the family members their obvious strengths and skills but does not consistently recognize underlying or less obvious family strengths, skills or resources.</p>	<p>Discusses only family challenges or problems and fails to recognize family strengths or resources that could be leveraged to address areas of concern.</p>
<p>Effectively uses strategies detailed in this profile to continuously explore and address family resistance and encourage participation and collaboration.</p>	<p>Inconsistently or selectively uses strategies detailed in this profile to encourage participation and collaboration when encountering family resistance.</p>	<p>Routinely avoids using strategies detailed in this profile to address and respond to family resistance, or prematurely requests pathway change when the family demonstrates resistance.</p>
<p>Listens actively to each family member and solicits perspectives from all involved (for example, by summarizing for the family members what the worker understood them to say) and encourages the family to tell their story without</p>	<p>Listens and sometimes seeks perspectives from family members; avoids assumptions; asks open-ended follow-up questions to clarify information.</p>	<p>Communication consists mostly of worker informing the family about his/her assessment conclusions and recommendations for services, without soliciting meaningful input from the family. Interprets the family's statements from the worker's perspective and/or</p>

Ideal	Developmental	Unacceptable
interruption by allowing the family members to speak more than the worker.		summarizes inaccurately for the family. Demonstrates indifference about and/or disdain for the family members' voices in their story.
Actively involves children and parents or caregivers in all aspects of the case by using activities such as scaling, life circles, genograms, strengths and needs exercises and pointing out to the family what is going well. Uses these techniques with family members individually or together (e.g., child and parent together) as appropriate to the case situation.	Uses engagement activities or strategies inconsistently throughout the life of the case.	Avoids interactions with family; does not involve family members in assessment, case planning, decision making or service plan implementation. Does not discuss progress or point out family strengths.
Returns family calls within one business day.	Inconsistently returns family phone calls within one business day.	Takes more than two business days to return family phone calls.
Informs the family about what to expect from the agency, both verbally and in writing, including caseworker contact information and who to contact if the case worker is unavailable. Also provides team or supervisor contact information and consumer rights.	Provides written information to the family about what to expect from the agency, but inconsistently provides verbal explanation. Inconsistently provides written information to the family about what to expect from the agency but provides verbal explanation.	Does not inform the family about what to expect; does not provide family with contact information or sufficient information to make informed decisions.
Discusses with the family the agency's and stakeholders' role and responsibilities in the assessment and investigative processes.	Inconsistently or incompletely discusses with the family the roles and responsibilities of the agency and involved stakeholders.	Omits discussions with the family regarding agency and stakeholder roles and responsibilities.

Acknowledgments

This document was developed through the efforts of Ohio's Differential Response Leadership Council and Statewide Implementation Team. These guiding bodies for Ohio's Differential Response system work under the leadership of the Supreme Court of Ohio's Advisory Committee on Children, Families and the Courts and its Subcommittee on Responding to Child Abuse, Neglect and Dependency.

Special thanks to the Practice Profiles Workgroup of the Statewide Implementation Team. These dedicated volunteers devoted numerous hours to the development of Ohio's Differential Response Practice Profiles.

Members of the team included:

Nan Beeler, Institute for Human Services

Carla Carpenter, Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (Co-chair of the Statewide Implementation Team)

Stacy Cox, Champaign County Department of Job and Family Services (Co-chair of the Statewide Implementation Team)

Nancy Mahoney, Clark County Job and Family Services (Ohio Quality Improvement Center-Differential Response Project Director)

Trista Piccolo, Cuyahoga County Family and Children Services

Darleen Shoppe, Trumbull County Children Services (Co-chair of the Ohio Differential Response Leadership Council)

The team was supported by the expertise of:

Allison Metz, *National Implementation Research Network*

Leah Bartley, *National Implementation Research Network*

Caren Kaplan, *Independent Consultant*

Bibliography

Barr, J.E., Tubman, J.G., Montgomery, M.J., & Sosa-Vento, R.M., (2002). Amenability and Implementation in Secondary School Antitobacco Programs. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 26, 3-15.

Center of Excellence in Child Welfare, Child Welfare League of Canada. (2003). *Community Collaboration and Differential Response: Canadian and international research and emerging models of practice.*

Child Welfare Information Gateway. (2012). *Partnering with Parents.* Retrieved from <http://www.childwelfare.gov/preventing/promoting/partnering.cfm>.

Cooke, M. (2000). The Dissemination of a Smoking Cessation Program: Predictors of Program Awareness, Adoption and Maintenance. *Health Program International*, 15, 113-124.

DePanfilis, D. (2006). *Child Neglect: A Guide for Prevention, Assessment & Intervention - Child Abuse and Neglect User Manual Series.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

DePanfilis, D. and Salus, M. K., Office on Child Abuse and Neglect, Children's Bureau. (2003).

Child Protective Services: A Guide for Caseworkers. Retrieved from Child Welfare Information Gateway: <http://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/usermanuals/cps/cpsocfm#e>.

Durlak, J. A., & DuPre, E.P. (2008). Implementation Matters: A Review on the Influence of Implementation on Program Outcomes and the Factors Affecting Implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41, 327 – 350.

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blasé, K. A., Friedman, R. M. & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature.* Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication #231).

Fixsen, D., Blasé, K., Metz, A., & Van Dyke, M. V. (2013). Statewide implementation of evidence-based programs. *Exceptional Children*.

Hall, G.E. & Hord, S.M. (2006). *Implementing Change: Patterns, Principles and Potholes* (Second Edition). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Institute for Human Services for the Ohio Child Welfare Training Program and the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services. (2012). *The Ohio Child Welfare Training Program Policy Manual*.

Institute for Human Services for the Ohio Child Welfare Training Program and the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services. (2003). *Achieving Permanence Through Interagency Collaboration*.

Kallestad, J.H. & Olweus, D. (2003). Predicting Teachers' and Schools' Implementation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program: A Multilevel Study. *Prevention & Treatment*, 6.

Metz, A., Bartley, L., Blasé, K., Fixsen, D. (2011). *A Guide to Developing Practice Profiles*. The National Implementation Research Network, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC.

Minnesota Department of Human Services. (2009). *Minnesota Child Welfare Practice Model*. Retrieved from <https://edocs.dhs.state.mn.us/lfsrserver/Legacy/DHS-5881-ENG>.

National Association of Social Workers. (2005). *NASW Standards for Social Work Practice in Child Welfare*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialworkers.org/practice/standards/NASWChildWelfareStandards0905.pdf>.

Northern California Training Academy, U.C. Davis Center for Human Resources. (2008). *Participatory Case Planning in Child Welfare Services: a Resource Guide*. Retrieved from <http://humanservices.ucdavis.edu/Academy/pdf/FINAL2PCPVersion.pdf>

Reder, Peter & Duncan, Sylvia. (2003). Understanding communication in child protection Networks. *Child Abuse Review*. Vol. 12: 82–100: DOI: 10.1002/car.787.

Ringwalt, C.L., Ennett, S., Johnson, R., Rohrback, L. A., Simons-Rudolph, A., Vincus, A., et al. (2003). Factors Associated with Fidelity of Substance Use Prevention Curriculum Guides in the nation's middle schools. *Health Education & Behavior*, 30, 375-391.

Rycus, Judith S. and Hughes, Ronald C. (1998). *Field Guide to Child Welfare, Volume II: Case Planning and Family-Centered Casework*, CWLA press.

Schene, Patricia. (2005). Comprehensive Family Assessment Guidelines for Child Welfare. National Child Welfare Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice, the Children's Bureau.

Steib, S. (2004). Engaging families in child welfare practice. Children's Voice. Retrieved from www.cwla.org/programs/r2p/cvarticlesef0409.htm.

John R. Kasich, Governor State of Ohio
Michael B. Colbert, Director
Ohio Department of Job and Family Services
Office of Communications JFS 08301 (12/2013)
Equal Opportunity Employer and Service Provider