

Child Welfare Values
& Principles
Put into Practice

From Ancient Egypt to the
Twenty-First Century

Developed by the
Institute for Human
Services, for the
Ohio Department of
Job and Family
Services and the
Ohio Child Welfare
Training Program

August 2004

OCWTP
Steering
Committee
Members

Evelyn Bissonnette (Co-Chair), ODJFS
Max Bucey (Co-Chair), PCSAO
LeRoy Crozier, ODJFS
Rusty Geiger, ODJFS
Jim Lacks, ODJFS
Janet Caplinger, ODJFS, Canton District Office
Ron Hughes, IHS
Darren Varnado, SWORTC
Tom Swindel, NWORTC
Mark McMillian, NCORTC
Jeanne Bennett, NEORTC
Dale Hotaling, WORTC
Mary Kay Hawkins, CORTC
Brian Wear, ECORTC
Paula Marx, SEORTC
Mary Anne Robinson, Montgomery County CSB
Susan Alberter, Greene County CSB

Content for this workbook and CD ROM is derived from:
Rycus, J.S., & Hughes, R.C. (1998). *Child Welfare Values. Field Guide to Child Welfare, Volume I, Foundations of Child Protective Services*, 2-41. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.

Introduction

Upon completion of this course you will have a sound understanding of child welfare history, values, and principles.

Welcome to the Child Welfare Values and Principles Put into Practice pre-training readiness workbook. You will need to complete this workbook prior to attending your first Core training. At the end of the workbook, there is a review assignment that you will need to complete and bring with you to your first Core training.

This workbook is broken down into the following sections:

- History of Child Welfare Values
- Introduction to Values
- Child Welfare Values
- Guiding Principles
- Course Review

Let's begin with Section I...

an overview of the History of Child Welfare Values and how these values impact services and laws.

Section I - History of Child Welfare Values

In this section we will provide you with a detailed overview on the history of child welfare values and how these values impact services and laws.

The concepts of children’s rights and social justice for children are not new. They are older than civilization. But their historical expressions have been as varied and diverse as the cultures which developed them. Examining how past cultures have valued and cared for their children can provide insight into the evolution of current child welfare values.

The timeline at the bottom of the page highlights historical documents, laws, and cultural practices throughout the age of time that have made an impact on how we currently address issues relating to children.

It begins with the *Egyptian Book of the Dead* and the Hammurabi Code, two of the earliest written documents known to address the treatment of children, and ends with the reporting mandate and call for permanency for all children that occurred in the 1970s.

NOTE:

Current mandates and public policy, such as the Indian Child Welfare Act and the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980, will be discussed during your first Core training. References for these mandates can be found on page 26 of this booklet. If you would like information prior to attending your first Core training, the resources on page 26 will be helpful.

1200 BC					AD	
<i>Egyptian Book of the Dead</i>	Hammurabi Code	Mosaic Code	Golden Age of Greece	Roman Civilization	Visigothic Code	
2						

*Egyptian Book
of the Dead*

In portions of northern Africa, from the earliest times, there existed strong cultural norms that promoted socially just and altruistic behavior toward children. The *Egyptian Book of the Dead*, inferred that children should not be harmed or exploited if a person wanted things to go well on Judgment Day.

Hammurabi Code

The Hammurabi Code is one of the earliest records of a society's standards regarding children. In the code sections that address parent-child relationships, **children owed a duty of respect** to their parents, and if children fulfilled this duty, they were entitled to receive minimum care and treatment from their parents. If the child's duty was violated, the parent owed the child nothing, and the child's status reverted to that of a slave (property) or a non-family member.

The code defined the parent-child relationship as **proprietary interest**. This concept has persisted in legal codes for more than 3,000 years. The child, in simple terms, was viewed as an economic unit and could be sold or exchanged at the discretion of the parent.

Without inherent rights and protections, children could suffer abuse without state interference. Infanticide of unwanted children or children with birth defects, and punishment of children by dismemberment were accepted practices.

Mosaic Code

The Mosaic Code, a part of Hebrew life before 1000 B.C., fully supported the concepts of the Hammurabi Code, including the parent's proprietary interest in children and children's absolute duty to respect their parents. Exodus, the second book of the *Bible*, outlines the rights and responsibilities of children and parents, as well as the consequences for failing to carry out these duties.

English
Law

Elizabethan
Poor Laws

Early
American
Law

Twentieth
Century

1950s
1960s

1970s

Golden Age of Greece

Greek law, in some respects, was unique for early civilizations. While some laws were repressive, the treatment of children was more benevolent, particularly in later Greek civilizations. For example, the law evolved to restrict the father from having the right to take his child's life. Instead, he was given the right to physically "chastise" the child. As the golden age of Greece declined, however, so did some of its more benevolent attitudes toward children.

Roman Civilization

Roman civilization supplanted Greek civilization and quickly assimilated much of that civilization. Roman law evolved over many centuries and changed, sometimes dramatically, from emperor to emperor. The doctrine of **patria potestas** established the unilateral and almost unlimited right of the father. The "father" in this society was the oldest male family member. He was the head of the family and the undisputed leader until he died. In later Roman society, the father's right to put a child to death was specifically outlawed, as was the right to sell a child. However, despite legal prohibitions, the practice of the sale, mutilation, or killing of children, and the view of children as property persisted in Roman culture. The power of the male head of the family was not controllable by law. This is an early expression of a pervasive cultural value of parents' rights superseding the rights of children.

The Visigothic Code

The Visigothic Kingdom existed in Europe between about 476 and 711 A.D. Formed with Roman, Germanic, and newly emerging Christian influences, this society was unusual in its humane treatment of children. The primary difference from earlier codes was that the Visigothic Code stressed the **duties rather than the power of the**

1200 BC				AD	
<i>Egyptian Book of the Dead</i>	Hammurabi Code	Mosaic Code	Golden Age of Greece	Roman Civilization	Visigothic Code

4

parent. Children could be punished or disinherited, but they could not be put to death or mutilated and the sale of children was forbidden. Parents were given authority to use **reasonable** physical discipline, but were not permitted to exceed what was considered reasonable.

English Law

Early English law was strongly influenced by Roman law in that it permitted infanticide and the sale of children in times of poverty, and it upheld the parent’s right to fully control his children. During this time children had some legal rights - they were emancipated at majority, and had the right to own property. The “guardian-ad-litem” or court-appointed “next friend” was established during this period, although the rights of the child to independent representation were not always assured.

English Law After the Thirteenth Century:

Later English law included the doctrine of **parens patriae**, literally the “father of his country.” This doctrine evolved from case law over a period of hundreds of years and defined the relationship between the parent and the child as a trust. It evolved to establish three important principles regarding the rights of children:

- It established that children had rights and interests separate from others, including their parents.
- It established parental rights as contingent rights (i.e., rights that were contingent upon the parent providing minimal care and nurturance and a home free of abuse).
- It established the state as the guarantor of that trust, responsible for intervening, when necessary, to protect children.

English Law	Elizabethan Poor Laws	Early American Law	Twentieth Century	1950s 1960s	1970s
-------------	-----------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------	-------

Although the concept of state responsibility for the protection of children was important, its impact would not be felt until centuries later.

Elizabethan
Poor Laws

The Sixteenth Century was a period of extreme poverty. The Elizabethan Poor Laws of 1601 were an attempt to meet the needs of children in poverty. However, they established the legal precedent of removing children from their families. Although the laws established local community responsibility for children, they also resulted in a large number of children becoming wards of the state. More children were hurt than helped by these laws, and English society lacked the resources to administer them. By the mid-1600s, the Poor Laws were repealed.

Early
American Law

Early American law grew out of English law. Initially little formal protection was offered to children. The Stubborn Child Act, enacted in Massachusetts in 1628, held that a stubborn or rebellious son, old enough to understand, and who would not obey his parents, could be put to death. Children were often seen as extensions of their families, had few separate rights, were often exploited economically, and were offered little protection from cruel treatment or economic deprivations.

In contrast, there were societies in which the community's social norms and practices assured that children were cared for, even without formal legal protections. For example, in many African and Native American groups, children were historically viewed as the responsibility of the entire community, and if children were orphaned or needed care, extended family and community members assumed responsibility for their well being. This occurred despite the fact that during this time period Native American families were regularly displaced, disrupted, and

1200 BC				AD	
<i>Egyptian Book of the Dead</i>	Hammurabi Code	Mosaic Code	Golden Age of Greece	Roman Civilization	Visigothic Code

destroyed; and, until the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863, a whole race of African children were bought and sold by slave owners, subject to physical and psychological maltreatment, and routinely separated from their families.

The Earliest Child Welfare: Out-of-Home Placement

During the middle years of the Nineteenth Century, large groups of children became orphaned or dependent. Immigrant children were orphaned, due to epidemics of cholera and yellow fever, and abandoned because of poverty and other hardships. Lynchings, family displacements, and disruptions that followed emancipation, Jim Crow laws in the South, and the exodus north by former slaves resulted in even more orphaned and abandoned children. This was also a time of major disruption and displacement of Native American families as whole tribes were destroyed during the Indian Wars.

Almshouses and indenture were two of the ways communities addressed the large numbers of orphaned or abandoned children. Almshouses were the forerunners to county homes for the poor, disabled, or mentally ill, and they became the dumping ground for poor children. Indenture is the provision of occupational training and room and board in exchange for a period of providing labor. Some children were indentured into “adopting” families. Others were placed in asylums and then indentured into local families under the auspices of the institution. The success of indenture, from the child’s view, depended entirely on the luck of the draw. With a good placement, indenture could greatly benefit children. For others, indenture meant slave labor, little learning, and much suffering.

English Law	Elizabethan Poor Laws	Early American Law	Twentieth Century	1950s 1960s	1970s
-------------	-----------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------	-------

Early Movements to Protect Children

The first formal organization for identifying and assessing child abuse and neglect was established in 1874 in New York City. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (SPCC) was founded as a result of concerned citizens becoming aware of the abuse of a child named Mary Ellen. Mary Ellen was beaten and cruelly mistreated by a couple who had assumed her care at infancy. Her cries were heard throughout the neighborhood but neighbors knew of no legal recourse. Her case was brought to the attention of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals who took Mary Ellen's case to court and won a protective order. By 1900, more than 250 societies for the protection of children had been formed. One initiative of the New York chapter was to move New York "street kids" to small towns and farms in the Midwest with people who were of "good repute and moral character." These children were transported on "orphan trains" to their new homes in Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and further west.

Early Twentieth Century

The beginnings of the Twentieth Century saw the emergence of a unifying theme that would shape the history of child welfare to the present day-- **the increasing recognition of the supreme importance of a stable, caring family to the life of a child.** This theme formed the basis for a number of debates that occurred in the Twentieth Century; punishment versus rehabilitation of abusing parents, the relationship between poverty and neglect, and the debate between home-based services versus placement.

During this time period, the first **child care institutions** were founded to "rescue" children from the deplorable conditions of the poor houses and mental institutions. Orphanages, later called "children's homes," remained a primary child welfare institution well into the 1940s.

1200 BC				AD	
<i>Egyptian Book of the Dead</i>	Hammurabi Code	Mosaic Code	Golden Age of Greece	Roman Civilization	Visigothic Code

Child welfare services were first addressed by public policy in the early 1900s. In 1912, the U.S. Children's Bureau was established to create a federal agency that could represent the interests of children. As a result of this legislation, many public and private child welfare agencies were established and funded.

In the early part of the Twentieth Century, the profession of social work and the casework methods of intervention began to emerge as a powerful force of social change. From the 1920s on, social work ideology and methods have shaped the field of child welfare.

1950s – 1960s

In the 1950s, professionals began to recognize that the needs of children could be better met in family settings than in institutions, and the **foster family home** began to replace the orphanage as the primary child placement resource.

In the early 1960s, Dr. Kempe and associates identified **the battered child syndrome** and published their research findings. The report shocked many professionals despite the fact that Kempe's research had seriously underestimated the incidence of child abuse in the United States.

In 1959, a landmark study described the serious developmental and emotional problems of children who had grown up in foster care. During the 1960s and early 1970s research identified a phenomenon called **foster care drift**, referring to placement of children in a series of temporary foster homes with no expedient plan for a permanent family placement. A disturbingly large percentage of foster children exhibited **serious developmental and psychological problems**, apparently as a result of changing and impermanent

English
Law

Elizabethan
Poor Laws

Early
American
Law

Twentieth
Century

1950s
1960s

1970s

placements. It was becoming evident that the “cure” was often as damaging to children as the “problem” it was designed to remedy.

1970s: Permanency Planning and Mandated Reporting

In the early 1970s, the “**permanency planning**” movement was initiated to correct the problem of foster care drift. Permanency planning referred to comprehensive case planning designed to achieve permanence for children. Initially, permanency planning was directed specifically to foster children who had been removed from their families and placed in substitute care. However, it was soon recognized that the best way to achieve permanence for any child was to prevent any separation at all. The concept of permanence was adopted as a primary child welfare goal, and permanency-planning activities were provided to all children served by the child welfare system. The permanency movement also generated changes in adoption policy and practice. Many children with special needs, who had been previously considered unadoptable, became the focus of permanency planning efforts.

Mandated reporting of suspected child maltreatment by both citizens and professionals was legislated in the 1970s. This led to dramatic increases in the number of investigations and in the number of children and families served in the child welfare system. It created an inevitable system overload that persists in the child welfare field today.

During the first Core training, you will have an opportunity to discuss the history of child welfare values and learn how they continue to influence the values, policies, and laws that govern your practice.

Remember, if you need information about current mandates and policies, check the references on page 26 of this booklet.

Section 2 - Introduction to Values

In this section we will provide you with a questionnaire and follow-up discussion about your personal feelings toward child welfare values.

Upon completion of this section, you will be able to:

Clarify your personal values about helping children and their families

Begin to identify values that are central to the profession of social work and child protective services

Honestly consider the statements on the following pages and circle your position on each, using the following rating scale:

SD = Strongly Disagree

D = Disagree

? = Don't Know

A = Agree

SA = Strongly Agree

After rating each statement, please continue by reading the adjacent discussion points.

STATEMENT

1

Parents have a basic right to guide their children's development. Sometimes the general interests of the family should supersede the interests of the child.

SD D ? A SA

Discussion Point

This statement reflects a critical values conflict in child welfare -- the apparent conflict between "parents' rights" and "children's rights" in situations of child maltreatment.

If you agreed with #1, your values are consistent with the social work value of "self determination" and "parental rights." Adherence to a value of self determination will assure that you respect and support families' rights to retain personal autonomy regarding the care of their children. However, this value may raise conflicts for you when you must use the authority vested in your position to limit a parent's rights or to assume custody of a child in order to protect the child.

If you disagreed with #1, you may be more comfortable when you must use your vested authority to protect children. However, you must be aware of two important realities. It is in a child's best interest to maintain and support a family, whenever possible, and you never have the legal or moral authority to remove a child unless there is no other viable recourse to protect him.

Regardless of your response, you should understand that skilled child welfare workers are able to intervene, in most cases, in ways that simultaneously assure the safety of the child and empower and strengthen the family, thereby preserving the rights of both. Family preservation is an essential goal of good child welfare practice. While removing a child may, on occasion, be the less harmful alternative, it is still harmful.

STATEMENT #2

For real change to occur, people must willingly become involved in the change process and understand the benefits of the change for them.

SD D ? A SA

Discussion Point

If you agreed that people must be invested in a change for change to occur, you will be more likely to commit time and energy to empowering families to join with you in a partnership for positive change. This process, called “engaging” the client, is central to social work practice. However, you may likely become very frustrated and feel thwarted in your ability to help when a client appears to be resistant to your interventions and seems unwilling to change, even after your best efforts.

If you disagreed with the statement and believe that the use of external authority and sanctions often can produce needed change, you will find that, in the realm of human services, such change is generally circumstantial and short lived. Changes will often be abandoned when the external authority is no longer present; or the family will sabotage your change efforts. As a last resort, it is sometimes your only possible intervention. But as a primary strategy for accomplishing generalized family change, it is not often successful in the field of child welfare.

STATEMENT #3

Due to their specialized knowledge, training, and experience, child welfare workers often have a better understanding than their clients about what must occur to resolve the clients' problems.

SD D ? A SA

Discussion Point

If you agreed that trained social workers generally have a better understanding of family problems and dynamics, you may often be right. This confidence in your knowledge and training can help you to facilitate productive change. But it is often easy to overestimate your capacity to make things happen, to underestimate the importance of a family's strengths and capabilities, or to discount the essential nature of client commitment to the successful achievement of positive change. Successful child welfare social workers are more often enablers and facilitators than they are instructors and monitors.

If you disagreed with the statement, you may have a tendency to leave too much to the discretion of your clients, which may prevent you from coaching, teaching, leading, and instructing clients who need direction in order to know how to go about resolving their problems. This emphasizes the critical necessity of individualized family assessment and intervention. Some families will need considerable instruction, support, and monitoring.

STATEMENT
#4

Most children fare better in foster homes than they do in abusive or neglectful families.

SD D ? A SA

Discussion Point

This statement reflects another area of basic values conflict in child welfare practice. If you agreed that most children fare better in foster homes than in abusive or neglectful families, you recognize the significant value that foster care can have in providing stability and developmental services to children who have been maltreated and who cannot be protected at home. You may, however, be more likely to recommend removal and placement of a child when you find the child to be at risk of harm or developmental delay in their homes. This forced separation often has a serious detrimental effect on both the child and the family which may, in the long run, be more harmful than the maltreatment for which the child was removed.

By contrast, if you disagreed with the statement, you may be more willing to adopt a strong, family-centered approach to in-home services. However, you may be less willing to remove children from their homes when there is clear evidence of risk and the child cannot be assured protection at home. The child welfare profession stresses the importance of strengthening and preserving the family, but such efforts should never place a child at risk of serious harm.

STATEMENT

#5

I chose this job because I have always wanted to help children, and I like working with people.

SD D ? A SA

Discussion Point

If you hoped to help children, this job will indeed give you an opportunity to make a significant difference in the lives of many children. However, you will find that most of the work in child welfare is with adults - the parents of the children you are serving - not necessarily with the children, themselves. In a system that stresses family preservation, your job is to assist families to become self sufficient and to be able to care for their own children. While you will certainly have contact with the children, you will need to develop skills to work with the entire family.

If you enjoy working with people, you will certainly have an opportunity to meet many kinds of people on this job and to grow from this experience. You will be more likely to derive satisfaction from your work, as your clients truly need you. However, you may become more easily discouraged when you find you are not able to help, or when your clients don't seem to appreciate your efforts. It may also be disconcerting when you discover that you find some of your clients unlikable.

If you chose this job for other reasons, you may find it difficult to achieve job satisfaction. By contrast, you may also find yourself obtaining considerable job satisfaction from interests of which you were not aware.

Great Job on
Completing
the Values
Questionnaire!

Hopefully, completing the values questionnaire has increased your interest in how your personal values impact your work and how value ideals may conflict in the real world. This is especially true in the field of child welfare.

Parents' rights, family integrity, individual liberty and self-determination, cultural integrity, children's rights to safety and sustenance, and children's best interests, are all essential values of the child welfare field. However, they may be in conflict in some situations.

Section 3 -
Child
Welfare
Values

In this section we will provide you with a detailed overview of child welfare values.

Upon completion of this section, you will have an understanding of the following values:

Overarching Value
Human Dignity and Worth
Freedom
Justice
Social Responsibility

Child welfare values are derived from the values of the larger social work profession.

The overarching value is:

All children have an absolute right to a safe, permanent, stable home, which provides basic levels of nurturance and care, and is free from abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

The following is a discussion of the values that are central to the profession of social work.

***Value:
Human
Dignity and
Worth***

Social work respects the inherent dignity and uniqueness of each individual, and supports a client's right to live within values, standards, and beliefs that are consistent with his cultural background and heritage. Social workers may not approve of a client's behavior, but still must value the client and show basic respect.

Only in more recent times have children been seen as worthy of unconditional respect, as having human rights, and as deserving societal protection of those rights.

Case Example:

Early, in my career, I was doing intensive home-based services with a family charged with the neglect of their two boys. The home was filled with what appeared to me to be junk. Every room was crammed with broken toys, piles of clothing, and all types of knickknacks. Cleaning was virtually impossible because of all the stuff, and the house was infested with roaches. The mother was cognitively delayed and simply unable to organize or manage her home.

One time, I arranged for her to attend a parenting class with her two boys. She was hesitant about leaving her home and was incredibly shy about being with strangers. The class had a number of other families and the room was chaotic with uncontrolled children running everywhere. In this storm of chaos, my mom reached into a backpack she brought and proceeded to quietly entertain her boys. She had drinks, snacks, toys, and even a change of clothing for her two boys. I can remember being blown away by her quiet ability.

That experience has always reminded me to look for the strength in each person I work with. I am ashamed to admit that, until that moment, I had not given this mom the respect and dignity she deserved. I had made premature assumptions about her that if unchecked, would have changed the outcome of this case.

***Value:
Freedom***

Social Workers support and preserve their clients' right to self-determination to make choices and decisions about their own lives.

For children, freedom includes the possibility to grow and develop, free from harm and exploitation.

Case Example:

For me, self-determination is often the value I struggle with most. Balancing a child's right to grow up free from abuse often conflicts with the self-determination right of the parent. But, despite the conflict, my job is to assure the safety of the child. This came up recently in a case involving domestic violence and child abuse. The child was being abused by the mom's boyfriend, who was also beating up the mom. Although, at the outset, there appeared to be a lot of resources available to her, the system failed in being able to keep her safe and she decided remaining with the boyfriend was her only way to survive. I didn't have the right to demand that she leave the boyfriend, but I did have the responsibility to protect the child. The good news is, I was able to place the child with her aunt, and the mom is still a part of the child's life. Hopefully, the future for this family will eventually be one free of abuse.

***Value:
Justice***

All individuals have a right to social justice. This includes equal opportunity. Social workers pursue social change, particularly with and on behalf of vulnerable and oppressed individuals and groups of people.

When considering justice for children, caseworkers must recognize that, due to children's great developmental needs and vulnerability, children are not equal to adults. They have relatively little capacity to obtain developmental resources, or to assure their own safety. They do not choose their circumstances and are not empowered to change them. Justice for children,

therefore, requires that certain rights be universally applied to children, such as the right to a safe and stable family, and the right to basic care and nurturance.

Case Example 1:

Sometimes it's hard to recognize that what we do as caseworkers could be labeled "social justice." It often feels like "just doing your job." I remember working with a single mom struggling to keep her family together. She was raising six children and had been reported for hitting her oldest son. The abuse issue was easy to resolve but, in the course of the initial intake process, her life quickly began to dissolve around her. She lost her job, was behind in her rent, was denied social security benefits, and was evicted from her apartment. I spent a lot of hours helping her navigate through a maze of social services. It took a good bit of advocacy to get her the services she deserved, but in the end she received the benefits she was entitled to and was able to provide for her children again, in a stable and loving home.

Case Example 2:

Social justice – well, I guess this will really age me, but I can remember back to the time before emotional abuse was in the law. The issue was so important to my work, that I can remember taking time away from a busy caseload to attend coalition meetings to discuss getting a bill introduced in the State House. I went on to give testimony at the bill's hearing. I was terrified about talking in front of all those people, but can remember how proud I was when the bill was passed into law. We still have a long way to go in fully addressing the impact of emotional abuse, but I like knowing I helped move us one step further toward justice.

***Value:
Social
Responsibility***

A basic value of social work is the responsibility of social workers to help others achieve a satisfying and rewarding social existence. Social workers elevate service to others above self-interest. Social workers draw on their knowledge, values, and skills to help people in need and to address social problems.

Caseworkers have a moral and professional responsibility to support the well being of others. Social responsibilities to children are perhaps the most obvious of all. Children are dependant upon the good will of others.

Case Example:

I think the responsibility I feel toward making a difference in the lives of the children and families I work with is what keeps me in this field. It certainly isn't the money or luxurious office space. The work is hard and not glamorous, but, for the most part, I can end my work week knowing I have made a difference. Not only have I helped to make sure a child's home is one where he or she can grow up to become a contributing member of society, but I have helped improve the life of that family to care for their children so we don't have to! Sometimes the difference is only a dent, but I know that dent means something to the children and families with whom I work.

Section 4 - Guiding Principles

In this section we will provide you with a detailed overview of five guiding principles.

Upon completion of this section, you will have an understanding of the following principles:

1. The child welfare system must protect children.
2. The child welfare system must provide family-centered services.
3. The child welfare system must promote permanence for all children.
4. The child welfare system must be culturally competent.
5. Children who need out-of-home placement should always be placed in the least restrictive, most home-like environment, as close to their own as possible.

Guiding Principle #1

The child welfare system must protect children.

The only justification for the child welfare field's nonvoluntary involvement with a child and family is that the child is at risk of abuse or neglect. All child welfare protective activities and interventions must be toward the goal of protecting the child from harm.

Guiding Principle #2

The child welfare system must provide family-centered services.

The family unit is the central focus of child welfare practice. It is always in a child's best interests to remain with his or her own family, if the family can be helped to provide an environment that offers basic care and nurturance, and is safe from abuse and neglect. Child welfare services should enhance and promote the healthy development of families, and empower them to provide safe and nurturing care to their children. Out-of-home placement should be avoided, unless it is the only way to protect the child. When a child must be placed out of the home temporarily, planning and services to promote reunification should begin as soon as the child is removed.

Guiding Principle #3

Child welfare system must promote permanence for all children.

Permanency planning is a comprehensive and ongoing case planning process directed toward achieving the goal of permanence for children. Adherence to principles of permanency planning reflects a fundamental child welfare value -- the right of children to grow and develop in permanent, stable family environments. Case planning is the step-by-step planning and problem-solving technology used by social workers to bring about desired ends. The term “permanency planning” reminds us that case-planning activities should always be directed toward assuring the children we serve have permanent families who can provide them with nurturance and protection.

Guiding Principle #4

Child welfare system must be culturally competent.

Cultural competence is the capacity to relate with persons from diverse cultures in a sensitive, respectful, and productive way. Cultural competence incorporates a complex and interrelated array of cognitive and psychological traits and behaviors. Since it is virtually impossible for anyone to fully understand all the characteristics, nuances, and traits of all the world’s cultures, achieving cultural competence requires a lifelong process of learning and change. While child welfare workers will never learn all aspects of the cultures of the families they serve, they must become sensitive, respectful, and adaptive in their cross-cultural communications and interactions.

Guiding Principle #5

Children who need out-of-home placement should always be placed in the least restrictive, most home-like environment, as close to their own home as possible.

A properly chosen placement will:

- meet children’s physical, emotional, and social needs
- strengthen and preserve children’s relationships with their families
- minimize separation trauma

To the degree possible, children should be placed with members of their own extended families, or in their home communities to maintain continuity, preserve important relationships, and support their cultural identities.

Section 5 –
Course
Review

Congratulations, you have successfully completed *Casework Values and Principles Put into Practice*.

The information you have learned from this course will be further developed in the first module of your Core training.

In order to participate in the first Core training, you will need to complete the assignment on page 27 and bring it with you to your first class.

References for Current Laws that Influence Child Welfare Practice

Indian Child Welfare Act (Public Law 95-608):

This act strengthened the role of tribal governments in determining the custody of Native American children and specified that preference should be given first to placements with extended family, then to Native American foster homes.

For more information go to:

<http://www.cwresource.org/hotTopics/asfa/app4.htm>

<http://www.abanet.org/genpractice/lawyer/complete/f95child.html>

Adoption Assistance & Child Welfare Act (Public Law 96-272):

Hailed as the most important piece of child welfare legislation enacted in three decades, the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act required states to establish programs and make procedural reforms to serve children in their own homes, prevent out-of-home placement, and facilitate family reunification following placement.

For more information go to:

<http://www.cwresource.org/hotTopics/asfa/app4.htm>

For information on Family-Centered, Neighborhood-Based Practice go to:

<http://www.pcsao.org/Family%20to%20Family/familytofamily.htm>

Multiethnic Placement Act & Interethnic Adoption Provisions (Public Law 103-382):

The Multiethnic Placement Act (later amended and strengthened by the Interethnic Adoption Provision) prohibited delaying or denying the placement of any child on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

For more information go to:

<http://www.cwresource.org/hotTopics/asfa/app4.htm>

<http://www.cwla.org/childwelfare/fglaws.pdf>

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/publications/mepa94/mepachpl.htm#standard>

Adoption & Safe Families Act (ASFA), and Ohio House Bill 484 (ORC Section 2151.419):

This Act established the goals of safety, permanency, and well-being for children in contact with the child welfare system. ASFA includes provisions that shorten the timeframe for instituting proceedings to terminate parental rights.

For more information go to:

<http://www.cwresource.org/hotTopics/asfa/app4.htm>

<http://www.cwla.org/childwelfare/fglaws.pdf>

<http://www.rom.ku.edu>

Ohio Child
Welfare
Training
Program
Mission

The Ohio Child Welfare Training Program promotes the delivery of high quality, culturally responsive, family-centered services to children who have experienced or are at risk of abuse, neglect, or dependency, and their families.

We provide competency-based training primarily to the public agency professionals, caregivers, and adoptive parents who serve them.

We collaborate with other service providers to promote the delivery of competency-based training.

We advocate for public policy and practice standards that reflect best child welfare practice.



Institute for Human Services

1706 East Broad Street
Columbus OH 43203
614/251-6000
www.ihs-trainet.com
www.ocwtp.com