

2003-2004 SANTA CLARA COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY

INQUIRY INTO THE DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Summary

The 2003-2004 Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) received a number of complaints about the Department of Family and Children's Services (DFCS), a department of the Social Services Agency (SSA). The department addresses difficult issues concerning the well-being and safety of children within the family structure. In July 2003, the Grand Jury reviewed the DFCS complaint process. During that review, unexpected issues about the Office of the Ombudsperson (Ombuds) and its functions surfaced.

The Grand Jury's findings and recommendations address deficiencies in the following areas: communication between the DFCS and family members, verification of staff cultural competency training, direction of the Best Practice Committee, mandated parent orientation classes, and the Ombuds contract.

Note: After initial interactions, one grand juror recused themselves from all subsequent interviews, investigations, and conversations due to a potential conflict of interest.

Background

In July 2003, the Grand Jury received more than a dozen complaints and follow-up letters regarding DFCS services to families. Complaints ranged from dealing with 4-year-old cases to very current matters (December 2003). Based on these complaints, the Grand Jury conducted interviews with complainants, social workers (past and present) and their supervisors, program managers, the police, ombudspersons (both prior to and after their employment was terminated), the Director of the DFCS, the Director of the SSA, members of the Board of Supervisors, the Santa Clara County Executive, the President of the San Jose/Silicon Valley NAACP Chapter, and the presiding judge of the Juvenile Dependency Court. Also, the Grand Jury toured the Children's Shelter. Finally, with court approval, the Grand Jury reviewed files of the children involved in the complaints (case plans, police reports, court decisions and social workers' notes), keeping in mind that its purpose was not to engage in any second-guessing regarding case disposition or orders issued by the court, but to evaluate the DFCS performance.

Complaints stemmed from the removal of children from the home, and/or the denial of custody to parents or family members involved in the custody/adoption process. While this review began with specific inquiries regarding DFCS, the scope broadened to include the following:

- DFCS’s administrative structure, including pertinent protocols, policies, and procedures
- the internal complaint process and the analysis of that process
- the ombudsperson’s role at DFCS

With approximately 840 employees, the DFCS is the second largest of three departments in the SSA. SSA accounts for about 16% (\$534 million) of total Santa Clara County expenditures budgeted for FY 2004, 82% of which is reimbursed by federal and/or state monies. Reimbursement is based in part on DFCS workers meeting specific timelines mandated by federal or state codes regarding the processing of a case. Although DFCS operates under the California Welfare and Institutions Code, the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, specifically the Children, Seniors and Families Committee, oversees the department, including any contracts it might award for consulting work or additional services. The SSA Director signs all contracts that the DFCS director implements, as illustrated by the Ombuds contract discussed later in the report.

According to DFCS, its mission is “to protect the children from abuse and neglect, promote their healthy development, and provide services to families which preserve and strengthen their ability to care for their children.” With these goals in mind, DFCS processed 23,344 reports of abuse and neglect in FY 2002-2003. In about 6% (1478) of those cases, children were removed from the home and referred for dependency action. The majority of those children reside in the City of San Jose. The DFCS provided the following reasons for child removal:

38.5%	caretaker absence/incapacity
25%	physical abuse
16%	general lack of care
10%	severe neglect
6%	sexual abuse
4.5%	other (emotional abuse, law violation, relinquishment, exploitation)

Discussion

Complaints

The complaints received by the Grand Jury were based on cases of child removal, child custody (with specific issues regarding family reunification), and/or family-to-family adoption. The Grand Jury was advised by the Director of DFCS and the presiding judge of the Juvenile Dependency Court, that child dependency and custody cases are the most contentious cases since they shed light on dysfunctional family dynamics and individual deficiencies. Confidentiality issues protecting children’s records were addressed with the granting of Petitions of Disclosure from the Juvenile Dependency Court, which, with some non-relevant exceptions to the contents, allowed the Grand Jury to look at a specific child’s DFCS and court records. That information verified history, family background, and established undisputed facts. Grand jurors found that

regardless of agency or personal affiliation with the case, each person interviewed professed to have only the best interests of the child in mind.

The SSA Director's office received 19 complaints against DFCS in 2003 which raised issues regarding social workers' conduct and responsiveness, child removal and placement, court and service plan notification, and legal representation. The complaints filed with the Grand Jury concern families in crisis and children at risk—shattering decisions that change lives. From the outset, it was made clear to the complainant families that the Grand Jury could not advocate for, nor influence the progress or determination of any case.

In 2003, the NAACP had also received complaints against DFCS. It hosted a public meeting in June 2003 with the SSA and DFCS directors and other managers in attendance to discuss these complaints. During this same period of time, the Ombuds also received complaints. To be clear, some complaints to this Grand Jury may duplicate those reported to the NAACP, SSA Director and the Ombuds. It became apparent that although the stated basis for the complaints was family members' disagreement with the disposition of the social workers' case plans and the court's decisions, the real motivation was to reverse those actions and have the children returned to them.

In eight of the twelve complaints reviewed by the Grand Jury, issues of miscommunication between social workers and family (immediate and extended) surfaced as allegations from family members: phone calls were not returned, questions went unanswered, post-meeting follow-up was inadequate, and misunderstandings developed about complying with case plans. An issue as pressing as the custody of a child demands sensitivity, clear communication, and a timely response to questions. Without these elements (given the highly charged atmosphere of child removal cases), misunderstandings of DFCS language and terminology can occur. In one specific case, the social worker admitted not returning telephone calls to an anxious family member because it would take too much time and the workload was heavy. The Grand Jury learned that the DFCS has forms available that caseworkers could use to respond in writing to complaints, questions, and information requests that would be helpful to the client. Since the question regarding custody approval had already been determined, a written notification might have been sufficient to end those calls. Moreover, a written response to those concerned provides the documentation that a decision has been made, gives reasons for that decision, and can clarify DFCS terminology. In another case, one family applying for family-to-family adoption encountered problems as they attempted to work with DFCS for five months, complying with each DFCS request. They received a letter denying custody with no explanation for the decision included. Other families, frustrated in their attempts for answers, had contacted the SSA Director and members of the Board of Supervisors, who in turn had referred them to the Ombuds. Again, timely and clear communication throughout the custody process can provide the family with the pertinent information and prevent misunderstandings.

Cultural Competency Training

In the investigation of a complaint, the Grand Jury learned from a senior social worker that there were no ongoing training requirements regarding cultural sensitivity issues (which DFCS refers

to as cultural competency). There are several factors that make cultural competency training important. Our county is comprised of a very ethnically diverse population and there is an overrepresentation of children of color in the dependency system. Given this fact, social workers need to have an understanding of the cultural differences among their clients. More specifically, social workers need to be knowledgeable about cultural norms regarding childrearing practices and family dynamics (both immediate and extended) in the county's various communities. Racial and ethnic stereotypes must be challenged. While social workers need to uphold our child protection laws, they have to do so with an understanding of wide-ranging and deeply-rooted cultural practices among their clients.

The Grand Jury obtained documentation of cultural competency training of social workers in November 2003, after interviewing the Director of DFCS. It indicated that new social workers receive 3.5 hours of cultural competency training but did not mention refresher courses for DFCS employees. The Grand Jury conducted a follow-up interview with the Director of DFCS on April 8, 2004, and requested documentation of mandatory cultural competency training for DFCS employees. At that interview, the director stated that all employees receive mandatory training in cultural competency. A memo from the SSA Director, dated July 26, 2001, stated "The Social Services Agency has a strong commitment to cultural competency and service excellence. As part of that commitment, all staff will be required to attend two trainings in cultural competency." Staff was given one year to complete this requirement. This training would have been valuable for a senior social worker who made an ethnically insensitive comment to members of the Grand Jury. In fact, this comment motivated the Grand Jury to further explore the cultural sensitivity throughout the department.

After a thorough review of the documentation, implementation of this directive could not be verified. A document issued to the entire SSA dated January 18, 2002, describes mandatory training sessions entitled "Service Excellence Through Cultural Effectiveness" or "TODOS II, Taking a Look at Racism: Level II Diversity Workshop," or Family Services Certificate Program. However, there is no documentation of how many DFCS staff attended these classes. The training documentation for 2002 included a class entitled "Cultural Competency." However, only 260 SSA employees, out of approximately 2591, are documented as attending that class. In the documentation covering November 2002 through October 2003 the numbers are just as low. The training entitled "Service Excellence Through Cultural Effectiveness" was attended by 330 employees throughout the entire SSA, and 10 employees attended the TODOS Level I diversity training. As DFCS alone is comprised of approximately 840 employees, the documentation does not support the statement by the Director of DFCS that all employees had received cultural competency training.

DFCS Reorganization

A reorganization of DFCS commenced in March 2003. The reorganization is spearheaded by the Director of DFCS, assisted by a team of one consultant and three coordinators. This is the first time the department has attempted a reorganization in twenty-five years. According to the DFCS Revised Service Plan, the reorganization has two priority goals:

- to lower caseloads for case carrying social workers
- to improve the continuity of relationships by assigning one worker per family as soon as possible to see the process through to permanent placement

Presently social workers have an average caseload of 37 to 40 children. The first priority goal of the reorganization is to reduce that caseload to 17 to 19 children per worker by reassigning more social workers to direct service, which would allow the social worker to spend more time with each case. The second priority goal of having one social worker per family is advantageous in several ways. It offers more stability for the child and the family and more familiarity with the family's specific issues and concerns. More time spent with the child and family results in more informed placement decisions. It is important to note that social workers are required to interface with both immediate and extended families.

The DFCS Revised Service Plan also states the reorganization has three main drivers:

- 1) Integrate Family-to-Family philosophy into everyday business practices at DFCS. This philosophy states that children are best served when they are able to stay in their own homes, or when this is not possible, in their own neighborhoods or communities.
- 2) Meet budget reduction targets. Fiscal year 2003 budget deficits in the state and the county have resulted in an \$8 million budget reduction in the DFCS. This loss of funding means eliminating 85 positions or about 10% of the social worker staff. DFCS has had to focus its limited resources on federal and stated mandated child abuse and neglect services.
- 3) Respond to recommendations made in management audits over the past several years.

According to the director of DFCS, the expected completion date of the DFCS reorganization is December 2004.

Best Practice Committee

The Best Practice Committee (BPC), recommended by both MilesTone Solutions (former Ombuds contractor) and the NAACP in 2003, and approved by the Board of Supervisors was formed to assist the DFCS department as an advisory body and complement the reorganization, to provide a forum to air complaints, to help improve its services, to better respond to its clients, and to build stronger partnerships with stakeholders in the community. (See Appendix A) While the BPC's role is to identify best practice issues and trends, which may lead to recommendations to the Director of DFCS for changes in departmental policies and procedures, the Grand Jury was unable to determine exactly how the committee will establish what is social service 'best practice' for the county's population. The director has no obligation to act on these recommendations. Personnel issues are not addressed by the committee.

The BPC is comprised of eleven community representatives, four SSA representatives, one ombudsperson, and two Board of Supervisor or Committee representatives. These

representatives are detailed in Appendix A. As stated there, BPC members will be appointed jointly by the Director of SSA and the Director of DFCS.

The first BPC meeting was held on January 14, 2004, and was attended by members of the Grand Jury. The meeting served as a planning session for the BPC. Several community members and the Ombuds were not in attendance. The BPC plans to meet four times a year for two-hour sessions. They had their second meeting on March 30, 2004. That meeting continued to establish the groundwork for the committee. Several issues were raised concerning parental rights in the Best Practice Process. These issues were put on the agenda for the next meeting for further discussion and clarification. According to the information received, there are no procedures in place to analyze the “best practices” at DFCS, nor even to compare this department with others. There are no specific work plans or measurable goals in place at this time.

Parent Orientation

During the initial meeting of the Best Practice Committee, the Grand Jury discovered that the South County DFCS office provides mandatory parent orientation at the onset of entering the child dependency system. The Grand Jury asked the Director of SSA if this was a countywide program and was told it was not, but plans were being drawn to implement it as a requirement throughout the county. Parent orientation is a class designed to give parents an overview of the child dependency system, answer their questions, and prepare them for the experience. It also provides parents with resources in case they need additional information or guidance. The Grand Jury was told that this orientation is effective in helping parents navigate what can sometimes be a very complex system. By making parent orientation mandatory, as is the Director’s plan, DFCS can ensure that all parents entering the system are starting from an informed foundation. This, in turn, will not only benefit the parent, but can lead to a smoother, less traumatic experience for the child.

Team Decision Making

One of the key elements in the reorganization is Team Decision Making (TDM). The purpose of TDM is “to provide a strength-based and family-focused forum for reaching a consensus on placement/permanency decisions.” A variety of individuals participate in the process: a facilitator (who runs the meeting), social worker, social worker’s supervisor, family members, extended family, support people, community partners, and service providers. All TDM meetings involve placement decisions: imminent risk of placement, emergency placement, placement move, and exit from placement. A distinct advantage of TDM over a single social worker managing a case is that many voices participate in removal and placement decisions. TDM explores more options for the family and mitigates the adversarial aspects of child removal by building consensus among concerned parties. This process began July 2003, and to date, DFCS has conducted 143 TDM meetings: 94 for initial child removals, 46 for placement continuity/change of placement, and 3 for permanent placement.

At present, either a family member or a social worker can request a TDM meeting at any time. Budget constraints pose a potential obstacle for full implementation of TDM, which requires increased staff. It is projected TDM will expand to include all placement changes/transitions, and by late summer 2004, it will be in place for all removals.

Office of the Ombudsperson

In 1993, the Board of Supervisors established the Ombudsperson Program “to provide an independent review of issues and concerns raised by the families served by the DFCS due to their interactions with the Department.” Initially, the SSA had independent contractors providing Ombudsperson services. In 2001, the Board of Supervisors approved a restructuring of the Ombuds and authorized a Request for Qualification (RFQ) to be issued by SSA. That contract was awarded to MilesTone Solutions (MTS). Three subsequent amendments extended the annual contract through January 31, 2004. From October 1, 2001, through November 30, 2002, the Ombuds had 937 client contacts; 649 of these were inquiries/referrals and 288 were opened as cases by the Ombuds.

On October 22, 2003, October 28, 2003, and November 15, 2003, members of the Grand Jury interviewed two associate ombudspersons from MTS as part of a general review of Ombuds services. During these interviews, the Grand Jury heard allegations regarding irregularities in the operation of the office, specifically that the Director of MTS was spending time in Costa Rica and not performing her contractual duties. At this same time, the media reported similar allegations. The associate ombudspersons were terminated by the Director of MTS on November 5, 2003. The county terminated its contract with MTS on November 21, 2003, two months prior to the contractual termination date.

Documentation surfaced that the Ombuds annual reports had been modified by the Director of DFCS. According to the Ombudsman Protocol transmitted to the Children and Families Committee on October 19, 1999, annual Ombuds reports should be submitted to the DFCS director, who should then attach department staff reports to the Ombuds report. Both reports should then be submitted to the Board of Supervisors’ Children and Family Services Committee. The purpose of this procedure is to allow the committee to review the issues from two perspectives. Between 1999 and 2003, the annual reporting requirement to the Board of Supervisors changed. There was no longer a specific requirement for two separate reports, only that the DFCS director request that the annual report be placed on the Children and Family Services committee agenda. Eventually, the two reports morphed into one, edited by the DFCS director.

The current April 14, 2004, RFQ for the Ombuds contract reverses recent practice and reinstates the requirement for two separate reports and therefore, two perspectives. In addition, the DFCS director, without authorization from the Board of Supervisors, deleted the whistleblower clause in the 1999 Ombuds’ Protocol that allowed anonymous reporting by the Children’s Shelter staff on behalf of a child. This section has been reinstated in the current RFQ.

In subsequent interviews with county officials, conflicting reasons were given as to why the MTS contract was terminated. One was lack of performance and another was a lack of liability insurance. The Director of SSA stated that the responsibility for monitoring the Ombuds contract performance had been removed from the Director of the DFCS due to a conflict of interest. In a separate interview, the Director of the DFCS agreed that the oversight of the Ombuds contract should not reside with the DFCS. However, despite the changes agreed to by the Director, the April 14, 2004, RFQ continues to place oversight and monitoring of the Ombuds contract with the DFCS, thereby jeopardizing the Ombuds ability to provide an *independent review* of issues.

Current State of the Ombudsperson's Office

An RFQ for the Ombuds office was released December 11, 2003, with a January 5, 2004, due date. The RFQ due date was extended twice with two addenda due to posting errors and inadequate communications to potential vendors, according to the SSA Chief Deputy Director. Four applicants applied for the contract. The Grand Jury was told during a meeting with the county executive on February 3, 2004 that an ombudsperson had been chosen and a new contract would be awarded on or about March 15, 2004. However, an appeal filed on February 13, 2004, by one of the applicants delayed the awarding of the contract.

In March 2004, the Grand Jury was notified, without explanation, that the contract would not be awarded and that SSA management and a representative from the county executive's office would be revising the RFQ. The fourth RFQ was released on April 14, 2004, with applications due May 7, 2004. The awarding of the Ombuds contract is not expected until June 22, 2004, seven months after the MTS contract was terminated.

The manager of the SSA's Community Relations Unit, a longtime SSA employee, is serving as the interim Ombuds Director. This is in direct violation of the mission of the Ombuds that requires an independent review of the issues.

Findings and Recommendations

Finding I

In the sample of complaints reviewed, there were communication problems between DFCS social workers and family members of children under the custody of DFCS.

Recommendation I

As an aid to families and social workers, the Grand Jury recommends updating and utilizing pertinent forms that are available to social workers to document and better communicate status, requirements and disposition relating to the families of children in the system.

Finding II

The Administration of DFCS could not demonstrate that all DFCS personnel had participated in Cultural Competency/Awareness training, as required by the SSA director's mandate of July 26, 2001.

Recommendation II

DFCS should enforce and verify mandatory attendance at Cultural Competency/Awareness training classes for **all** DFCS staff no later than June 30, 2005.

Finding III

The Best Practice Committee has met twice, on January 14, 2004, and March 30, 2004, for two-hour sessions. No specific work plans or goals have been established to date.

Recommendation III

DFCS should increase the number of meetings initially from quarterly to monthly, and provide workplans and measurable goals that will give the Best Practice Committee the ability to make recommendations to the Director of the DFCS.

Finding IV

Parent orientation classes are mandatory for South County DFCS clients only, even though the majority of children are removed from families residing in San Jose.

Recommendation IV

DFCS should institute mandatory parent orientation classes countywide for families entering the child dependency system.

Finding V

The current RFQ Protocol, dated April 14, 2004, for the proposed Ombuds contract includes the same oversight and monitoring by the DFCS which the director of the SSA previously described as a "conflict of interest."

Recommendation V-A

The County Executive and the Board of Supervisors should establish a policy and procedure to provide *independent* oversight of the Office of the Ombudsperson.

Recommendation V-B

The Ombuds should submit an annual report, independent of DFCS, to the Board of Supervisors.

Finding VI

The Ombuds contract was not monitored on a consistent basis.

Recommendation VI

The SSA should revise the current RFQ Protocol to establish independent, unannounced, and scheduled performance, as well as financial audits, of the Ombuds contract to provide oversight and contract compliance.

Finding VII

The Office of the Ombudsperson has been without an independent contractor since November 21, 2003.

Recommendation VII

The Ombuds contract should be awarded as soon as possible.

PASSED and **ADOPTED** by the Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury on this 8th day of June, 2004.

Richard H. Woodward
Foreperson

Appendix A
County of Santa Clara
Social Services Agency

Department of Family and Children's Services
Best Practice Protocol

Overview

The "Best Practice" initiative has been established to assist the Department of Family and Children's Services (DFCS) in developing service and process improvements which will enable DFCS to better respond to the needs of our clients and to foster stronger partnerships with stakeholders in the community. The Committee on Best Practices will provide a vehicle for effective discussion of service issues and process improvements which can be implemented to increase accountability and to provide more effective and efficient service to DFCS clients.

Purpose of the DFCS Best Practice Protocols

Inquiries, comments and complaints may be initiated by a wide array of sources--Department of Family and Children's Services (DFCS) clients and kin, the community at large, the media, other government officials and staff--and may be directed to a variety of offices for resolution -- DFCS staff and administration, Social Services Agency (SSA) Administration, the State Ombudsperson's Office or the Office of the Ombudsperson for DFCS.

Once issues are raised, it is important that they be reviewed thoroughly in a collaborative manner which involves community stakeholders so that appropriate action can be taken. Further, existing policies and practices need to be evaluated in the context of this case-based review; this will ensure that service trends can be identified and solutions reached and implemented consistently on a department-wide basis.

This will complement the DFCS service delivery redesign process now underway to strengthen and enhance working relationships with families, their communities, the court, and public and private sector service providers. Identifying and implementing "best practices" will support many of the guiding principles behind the service redesign effort. The redesign responds to recommendations made in management audits regarding staff turnover rates, caseload equalization, continuity of services to families and overrepresentation of children of color in the system. The DFCS redesign will result in lower caseloads, one worker per family, improved family finding and enhanced placement service.

Complaint Handling

While complaints may be received in numerous ways, rapid communication to all responsible parties is critical. In order to ensure that this communication occurs, three points of contact have been established within SSA.

- Received by Office of the Ombudsperson-- Complaints received by the Office of the Ombudsperson will be reviewed and handled with impartiality and confidentiality. No change is proposed in how the Office of the Ombudsperson conducts fact-finding reviews of complaints. If consideration by the Committee on Best Practices is recommended, the issues raised will be forwarded to the DFCS Administrative Support Bureau for inclusion in the Committee's work program.
- Received by DFCS staff-- Complaints received by DFCS staff which cannot be resolved at the line level will be forwarded to the Office of the Ombudsperson for handling. Complaints which raise ethical issues will be handled by the Director, DFCS.
- Received by SSA Administration-- Complaints received by SSA Administration will be referred to the Office of the Ombudsperson and, if appropriate to the Office of the Director, DFCS, for timely report back on the status of complaints.

Handling of Complaints Which Raise Ethical or Personnel Issues

Any issue which raises ethical or personnel concerns will be handled through the appropriate County personnel process. Resolution of confidential personnel matters will not be agendaized for the Committee on Best Practices discussion or information.

Committee on Best Practices

A committee on Best Practices has been established to provide practice review, development and monitoring. This Committee will provide broad representation from the community and County stakeholders. The work of the Best Practice Committee will be coordinated by the DFCS Administrative Support Bureau, under the direction of the Office of the Director, DFCS.

The role of the Committee on Best Practices is to identify practice issues and trends, which may lead to recommendations for changes in DFCS policies and procedures. Committee recommendations will be forwarded to the Director, DFCS, for appropriate action. The 18-member Committee will be comprised of:

- Community Representatives (11)
 - 1-Mayfair/Eastside Community Action Team Representative
 - 1-South County Community Action Team Representative
 - 1-African Ancestry Community Action Team Representative
 - 1-Asian Pacific Islander Community Action Team Representative
 - 1-Sunnyvale Community Action Team Representative
 - 1-NAACP Representative
 - 1-Fost/Adopt Parent Association Representative
 - 1-Educator from the College of Social Work, San Jose University
 - 1-Parent At-Large
 - 1-Former Foster Child
 - 1-Latino Social Work Network
- Social Services Agency Representatives (4)
 - 1-Representative of the Director, DFCS
 - 1-Representative of the Director, SSA
 - 1-Social Services Program Manager or Social Work Supervisor
 - 1-County Counsel
- Office of the Ombudsperson (1)
- Board or Committee Representatives (2)
 - 1-Representative of Children Senior family Committee
 - 1- Representative of Social Services Advisory Commission

Committee members will be appointed jointly by the Director, SSA, and the Director, DFCS, initially to serve two-year terms. Because this is a newly-established Committee, it is anticipated that the Committee will re-evaluate its process and make recommendations for changes in Committee composition, process and term of service after one year of activity.

Relationship Between Best Practice and Other Agency Protocols

It is not intended that this Best Practice protocol replace or supercede any SSA or DFCS procedure relating to handling of personnel matters or any response to legal action.

References

Documents

Final Reports: Civil Grand Jury, Santa Clara County 199 –1993, 1995–1996, 2000–2001.

Santa Clara County Memorandum from County Counsel re: Ombudsperson Protocol–October 19, 1999.

NAACP Letter to Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, December 2003.

“December Focus: Team Decision-Making” Family to Family Times, Santa Clara County SSA, December, 2003.

DFCS Revised Service Plan.

Request For Qualifications (RFQ) Ombudsperson Office, October 22, 2000.

Second and Third Amendments to the Contract between County of Santa Clara and MilesTone Solutions, August 7, 2002 and July 25, 2003.

Request for Qualifications (RFQ) Ombudsperson Office, April, 14, 2004.

Memorandum to SSA staff from Will Lightbourne, SSA Director, re: Cultural Competency and Service Excellence, July 26, 2001.

Protocol and Procedures for Team Decision–Making Meetings, April 8, 2004.

DFCS Staff Demographics Data.

Orientation for New Supervisors, SSA, August 8, 2001.

Various Staff Development Training Documents, SSA.

Best Practice Protocol, Social Services Agency, January 9, 2004.

Interviews

Social Workers, Department of Family and Children’s Services, Santa Clara County Social Services Agency, November 17, 2003, December 6, 2003, December 15, 2003 and January 30, 2004.

Child Welfare Program Managers, Department of Family and Children’s Services, Santa Clara County Social Services Agency, January 12, 2004 and March 30, 2004.

Social Worker Supervisor, Department of Family and Children’s Services, Santa Clara County Social Services Agencies, November 20, 2003 and January 12, 2004.

DFCS Complainants, September 17, 2003, September 19, 2003, September 22, 2003, September 25, 2003, October 16, 2003, November 23, 2003 and March 23, 2004.

Interviews - continued

Associates from Ombudsperson Office, October 22, 2003, October 28, 2003 and November 15, 2003.

Director of SSA, December 15, 2003.

Board of Supervisor's Chair of the Children, Seniors and Families Committee, December 17, 2003.

County Executive, Chief Deputy County Executive and Deputy County Executive, Santa Clara County, February 3, 2004.

Deputy Director, DFCS, February 6, 2004.

South County DFCS Program Director, March 30, 2004.

Director, DFCS, April 8, 2004.

Contracts Manager, SSA, Santa Clara County, April 30, 2004.

Special Services Supervisor, DFCS, May 4, 2004 (telephone).

Confidential Files Reviewed

Department of Family and Children's Services, County of Santa Clara Social Services Agency, November 5, 2003, November 7, 2003, January 16, 2004, and April 13, 2004.

Addressed the Grand Jury

Director, Santa Clara County Social Services Agency, October 2, 2003.

County Executive, Santa Clara County, October 30, 2003.

Director, Department of Family and Children's Services, Santa Clara County, July 31, 2003, November 4, 2003.

Member of the Board of Supervisors, Chair of Children, Seniors and Families Committee, September 30, 2003.

Supervising Deputy District Attorney and Deputy District Attorney, Juvenile Dependency Unit, November 4, 2003.

President San Jose/Silicon Valley NAACP Chapter, December 11, 2003.

Presiding Judge--Juvenile Dependency Court, January 22, 2004.