

Join Hands for Children
Site Selection Survey Download - May 12, 2010

Affiliation	4. Each demonstration site must encompass the same urban and rural distribution as is reflective of the child welfare populations in the eastern and western parts of the state.	5. Boundaries must be drawn to fully include or fully exclude tribal land boundaries.	6. Boundaries must be drawn to fully include or fully exclude office catchment areas.	7. Boundaries must be both geographically and practically contiguous via roads.	8. Minority composition of sites must reflect the approximate minority composition of families being served within that region.	Other criteria you feel the Site Selection and Transition Issues Advisory Committee should consider when determining the demonstration site locations.
Children's Administration Employee	I believe Moses lake would be a good site source as they are big enough to have many more local resources for families.				Moses Lkae clearly reflects the approximate minority composition of families being served within this region.	
Foster Parent		Given the number of tribal areas within the state, the study would be flawed without including tribal land boundaries.	fully include			
Children's Administration Employee		Tribal work is a very specialized subset of child welfare. I would agree with an "all or nothing" sort of approach.				Selection need be made according to pure demographical representation. At no time should the fact that a designated area does or does not have a "master contractor" in the area willing to accept this challenge be considered a determining factor. This would be an ethical and moral breach of the responsibilities we shoulder on behalf of our children.

Join Hands for Children
Site Selection Survey Download - May 12, 2010

Affiliation	4. Each demonstration site must encompass the same urban and rural distribution as is reflective of the child welfare populations in the eastern and western parts of the state.	5. Boundaries must be drawn to fully include or fully exclude tribal land boundaries.	6. Boundaries must be drawn to fully include or fully exclude office catchment areas.	7. Boundaries must be both geographically and practically contiguous via roads.	8. Minority composition of sites must reflect the approximate minority composition of families being served within that region.	Other criteria you feel the Site Selection and Transition Issues Advisory Committee should consider when determining the demonstration site locations.
Other						<p>I don't understand why more consideration has not been given to the assumptions surrounding the scope of the study. To start, it appears that your sample sizes are based on the premise that two separate evaluations are required under the legislation (i.e. one evaluation on the east side of the state and one evaluation on the west side of the state). While this is a perfectly legitimate assumption. An equally legitimate assumption would be that, while two pilot sites were required to "spread the wealth" of change that will come from these pilots, only one evaluation is required. Proceeding from this assumption, one would be able to substantially reduce the size of the demonstration site. Furthermore, one would also be able to scale the demonstration sites based on the proportion of cases which exist on the East and West sides of the State. In reviewing the minutes from previous meetings, it appears that this distinction has hardly been given any consideration at all. All that is lost from a "one evaluation" model is the ability to independently ask the question: "Does privatization work on the [East or West] side of the State?". In truth, since your pilot sites are not sampling from the entire population of interest, you really don't have the ability to answer this question under the current proposal. All that is answerable under the current design is "Does privatization work in the [East or West] pilot site". Another concern I have that is related to this decision-making process is the lack of coordination between this effort and the planning surrounding "Phase 1" of the implementation of 2106. At a minimum, it appears to me, that efforts should be made to ensure that the geographic catchment of the pilot sites aligns with the geographic catchments of at least two of the "master contract geographic catchments" under Phase 1. In terms of long term strategic planning for any prospective contractor, this only makes sense. Under the current paradigm being presented for the different "master contracts" such a coordination effort would ultimately serve to make a cleaner transition between Phase 1 and Phase 2 of this process. Under current plans it would appear that Phase 1 master contractors in a geographic area that overlaps a pilot site would be required to essentially stop doing business and either expand, reduce, or significantly modify their geographic scope of responsibility under Phase 2.</p>

Join Hands for Children
Site Selection Survey Download - May 12, 2010

Affiliation	4. Each demonstration site must encompass the same urban and rural distribution as is reflective of the child welfare populations in the eastern and western parts of the state.	5. Boundaries must be drawn to fully include or fully exclude tribal land boundaries.	6. Boundaries must be drawn to fully include or fully exclude office catchment areas.	7. Boundaries must be both geographically and practically contiguous via roads.	8. Minority composition of sites must reflect the approximate minority composition of families being served within that region.	Other criteria you feel the Site Selection and Transition Issues Advisory Committee should consider when determining the demonstration site locations.
Other						<p>The prospects of such an eventuality make bidding for a Phase 1 contract that overlaps a pilot site somewhat unappealing. Related to this concern is the lack of any planning for an evaluation of Phase 1. While performance based contracting (PBC) has shown promising results in some regions (e.g. Illinois and Pennsylvania), the results have been less clear in other areas (e.g. Wayne County, Michigan). At a minimum, it would be nice to see CA utilize the extra six months of time provided by the legislature to stagger the implementation of PBC throughout the State. While this would not necessarily allow for a full causal analysis of the effects of PBC on performance outcomes. It would at least allow for some analysis of the validity of PBC by observing whether or not the prospective change in outcomes is delayed in the late implementation areas vs. the early implementation areas. Indeed, the PBC implementation in Illinois was staggered in such a manner (with a year between Cook County and "downstate" implementations) which allowed for precisely this type of analysis. Ideally, PBC would be included as an additional variable in the pilot site "experiment" such that four treatment conditions actually exist (i.e. a 2 by 2 experiment with the following conditions for any given outcome; Public Agency by PBC, Private Agency by PBC, Public Agency by non-PBC, and Private Agency by non-PBC). Of course, the later suggestion would require further legislative changes for implementation. However, the point remains that (aside from the probable retrospective analysis that will likely ensue) current plans make no effort to evaluate the effects of PBC (i.e. Phase 1) in this state.</p>