

Guiding Organizational Change

**A Casebook for the Executive Development
Program in the Human Services**

25th Edition

2019

Editors

SARAH CARNOCHAN, BASSC Research Director

ANDREA DUBROW, BASSC Training Director

MICHAEL J. AUSTIN, BASSC Staff Director

School of Social Welfare

University of California at Berkeley

Berkeley, CA 94720-7400

PREFACE

This casebook is very unusual. It represents the experiences of county human services managers. It seeks to capture the daily pressures and opportunities to promote innovations and organizational change. The cases reflect the changing economic and political environment in California over a twenty-five year period (1994-2019). It also reflects examples of practice research.

The contributors to this casebook are members of the Bay Area Social Services Consortium (BASSC) founded in 1987 with the assistance of the San Francisco Zellerbach Family Fund. The Consortium represents a policy/research/training partnership between twelve northern California counties surrounding the San Francisco Bay, five university graduate social work education programs, and one foundation. Since 1992, the Consortium has functioned as a Think Tank for its members exploring issues of common concern. The evolution of BASSC is described in Chapter 1. BASSC's current Vision Statement appears as Chapter 3. In nearly all of its meetings and retreats, members have presented case descriptions of either innovative practice or administrative challenges and responses.

This 25th anniversary edition of the casebook features a wide array of BASSC research projects and teaching cases. It marks a milestone of the BASSC EDP and the beginning of a transition as the founders, Stan Weisner and Mike Austin, make way for the next generation of educational leaders. In the process of educating over 750 county staff over 2 ½ decades, the county directors are most grateful for Stan's and Mike's leadership in designing, implementing,

sustaining, and continuously updating the EDP with the assistance of the BASSC Training Coordinator, Andrea DuBrow. Additional gratitude for the program can be found in the keynote address (attached to this Preface) by Ellen Timberlake (Director, Santa Cruz County) at the 25th graduation ceremony in May 2019.

The set of cases reflecting the experiences of top management in the public human services and related research have been compiled for use in preparing senior managers for top management positions. The Consortium members identified as one of their top priorities the development of a cadre of their most promising managers, primarily women and people of color, for a regional talent pool that could be accessed when seeking to fill top management positions in the future. The contributors dedicate this casebook to their future successors; as one county director said, "These are the professionals who will be running our agencies when we all have retired to the golf course."

In addition to thanking the contributors, we want to acknowledge the valuable assistance of all the BASSC Research Assistants. They spent many hours researching topics of interest to the members, transcribing and editing the cases, and assisting each contributor in locating the missing pieces of their stories. We also wish to express our appreciation to our BASSC Staff at the University of California, School of Social Welfare, for serving as general editors of the casebook as well as ongoing facilitators of the rich and rewarding deliberations of the Consortium members.

**Jerry Huber, BASSC Co-Chair
Director, Solano County Department
of Health and Social Services**

Celebrating 25 Years of the BASSC Executive Development Program: The Gift that Keeps on Giving

May 2019 Graduation
BASSC Executive Development Program

ELLEN TIMBERLAKE

DIRECTOR, SANTA CRUZ COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Introduction

TONIGHT – is one of my favorite evenings of the year –
An opportunity to:

- Celebrate your graduation from the program
- Honor and acknowledge the time and energy you've poured into the program – 3 weeks in the classroom, ½ day exchanges, 15-day internship and written case study – all while maintaining your day job and juggling home and family commitments.
- Thank our amazing university and extension partners and our County BASSC Liaisons– Stan Weiner (Program Director), Andrea DuBrow (Program Coordinator), Mike Austin (Lead faculty adviser), and Jonathan Gill – without you there is no Executive Development Program –if you're a BASSC liaison please stand up – round of applause.
- Acknowledge my fellow directors for their continuing commitment to EDP – year end and year out, you support your staff's participation, you host staff from other counties in completing their internships, and you take time out of your busy schedules to teach modules throughout the year; and
- Welcome you into the EDP Alumni Club – a club with over 750 members, no annual fees, and lots of free perks to look forward to. In a nutshell, the Executive Development Program is indeed *“the gift that keeps on giving.”*

As you know, tonight we celebrate, 25th Anniversary of the Executive Development Program.

- Pretty sure that I was asked to say a couple of words on this auspicious occasion of our 25th anniversary because as a proud graduate of the EDP Class of 1995 – Year Two, I may very well be the oldest active member of this esteemed Alumni Club.
- Set the stage– 25 years ago, I left a 10-year career in higher education to become an Analyst for the County of Santa Cruz Human Services Department.
- Truth be told, when I took the job I knew very little about what they did, who they served – it seemed like a world steeped in acronyms, unfamiliar, a bit overwhelming in fact – the only thing at the time that was crystal clear for me is that I wanted to work for this guy named Will Lightbourne – I had an informational interview with him and was inspired by him.
- So, I stepped off the cliff, took the job, and after a year working on a special IHSS assignment, Will asked me if I'd be interested in participating in this newly hatched, BASSC Executive Development Program.
- Eagerly, and without hesitation, I said yes.

MY BASSC CLASS

- In the second-year class, there were 25 folks representing 7 counties.
- From day one, I felt like a little kid in a candy store – a lottery winner – BASSC was this amazing opportunity to get a crash course in social services – connect the dots – decrease my anxiety, fuel my excitement. I did not know at the time that it would set the stage for 25 years of growth and development.

- I loved most everything single thing about BASSC: the modules, my internship in Contra Costa studying relative caregiver support; and getting to know my fellow classmates – not so much the paper.

In 1996, even if I had a Crystal Ball when I was sitting where you are – there’s probably no way I could have seen how the gifts I received from my participation in EDP would impact me personally throughout my career:

- Let me illustrate by sharing 2 examples of my personal favorite modules:
 - State and county budgeting
 - Creating a learning organization.
1. **State and county budgeting** – Sally Kippur, San Francisco Director of Administration, taught the budget module in 1996. She was very dynamic – starting from a place of values – emphasizing transparency, stewardship, the budget as the golden key that unlocks our ability to deliver on our mission – she broke it down, made it interesting, explained the power of leveraging – I marched myself back to the department and told Will Lightbourne that we needed to bring her down, we needed to change, be more transparent. At that time, there were 1 maybe 2 people in the department who understood the budget and made decisions – Even our Director, I think, felt at times that the budget was a mystery.

Ever since my BASSC class on budgeting, I’ve been on a mission to simplify, deepen knowledge within our department. I never would have predicted that the fire Sally Kipper lit under me would translate all these years later – how it would lead me to:

- Tackle 1991 and 2011 Realignment, self-study – reaching out to my BASSC classmate Elliot Robinson, trainings, and others across the region.
- Initiate cross department leveraging/financing study groups with our health and probation partners and creating Technical Assistance opportunities for our community partners.
- Navigate very difficult budget decisions during the great recession with the elimination of over 25% of our workforce – but be able to do it in such a way that no one involuntarily lost their jobs; and ultimately lead me full circle to:
 - Teach the budget module with my good friend Karen Fies. My love for trying to excite folks about finance; to simplify the complex and

ignite the same passion; all of that is a gift from BASSC – from Sally Kipper.

2. **Building a robust learning organization /workforce development.**
 - BASSC module taught I believe by Mike Austin – the take home point– constantly get better at what you do; be curious; question – why do we do things the way we do? Invest in your staff – they’re the single greatest asset you possess in fulfilling our mission.
 - When I went to BASSC in 1996 – I would couch our investments as minimal, inconsistent and decentralized. Like many social services agencies, we were in the infancy stage of implementing concepts like workforce development, performance outcomes and learning organizations. Staffing wise – our only two dedicated resources were: 1 personnel officer and 2 staff development trainers
 - Fast Forward to today, and I’m very proud to say that **we have over 40 staff working in our Organizational and Community Development arena:** each and every one of them dedicated to developing our workforce and providing them with the tools they need to do their job, be engaged and informed with opportunities to grow, learn, advance, decide, change, and challenge the way things have always be done
 - *Organizational Development Manager* – who by the way, I met through BASSC and snatched up from Sonoma
 - **Robust Staff Development unit**
 - *Planning and Evaluation Division* – Centralized Business Analytics and Reporting Team, Contracts Unit, Quality Improvement Unit
 - *Community Relations and Outreach Team*
- In this arena, the gift that BASSC gave me was the VALUE of investing in the workforce and creating a culture where we strive to improve, learn and support. I’ve been blessed to be in a position over the last 20 years to be able to advocate for, implement, oversee and support, and hire incredibly talented folks who’ve turned this value into a reality—one that’s making a real difference in our outcomes and in the workforce culture.
- In 1996, If I had a second crystal ball – a regional crystal ball, I also couldn’t have imagined how these Executive Development program gifts would

ripple out to our respective county departments, our region, our field, and ultimately to those folks in our community who need and rely on our services.

GRADUATES

- I don't think any of us imagined that our graduates would multiply from 25 to over 750

CASE STUDIES

- Or that as many internships and case studies on topics from A-Z would be conducted, published and on many occasions recommendations from graduates implemented.
- I did some quick math, and just in case studies alone, that represents over 11,250 hours of intentional growth, development, best practice exchange – double that to 22,000 hours when you factor in the time invested by host counties.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- One of the goals of this program is to help develop our next generation of leaders – Over the last 25 years, I have no doubt that on this front we have succeeded. You see this in many forms:
 - BASSC alumni promoting within their departments, moving to other counties in the Bay area, (we've stolen some folks), making lateral moves to other program areas or perhaps staying in their current roles and using the skills of BASSC to make positive impacts within their current role.
 - In Santa Cruz County alone, in last 10 years in Santa Cruz alone, approximately 70% of our Senior Managers/Directors have graduated from the EDP program. Those 750 folks would be movers and shakers within their department and across the region.

INNOVATION AND COLLABORATION – FORMAL AND INFORMAL

- 750 folks would disperse and come back together again through:

- Phone calls, trouble-shooting . . . product sharing, participation in hiring/interview panels;
- *BASSC committees work* – Children's, Welfare-to-Work, Adult and Aging, Admin and Finance amazing examples of innovation, product and practice development;
- *BASSC research projects* conducted by our talented BASSC team and university partners;
- *Regional Responses to Crises and Opportunities* – coming together to respond to the unexpected – most recently, you see this in our response to the Fire disasters of late – Mutual Aid MOU's, or in our upcoming transformation into Region 1 for our march towards CalSAWs implementation.

So tonight, I wish I could give each one of you a Crystal Ball so you could see how your graduation from the Executive Development Program will be the “Gift that Keeps on Giving” – What I can give you is my own experience and the reassurance of so many other graduates, that you are leaving with a set of skills, perspectives, values and relationships that will carry you to new places – *“Oh the places you will go” if you stay open and cultivate the opportunities*

As you move forward in your career, my best advice to you is to be intentional with these gifts:

- pick the ones that excite you the most and run with them
- give back what you've learned to others
- stay connected to your BASSC classmates
- grab opportunities – take risks.

On behalf of the Directors, congratulations to all our 2018/19 graduates and happy 25th anniversary to the Executive Development Program.

I.

BASSC—

PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

Building a Comprehensive Agency-University Partnership: A Case Study of the Bay Area Social Services Consortium¹

MICHAEL J. AUSTIN, MARIA MARTIN, SHERYL GOLDBERG,
JILL DUERR BERRICK, BARBARA WEISS,
AND JULIE KELLEY

ABSTRACT

University-community partnerships are receiving increased attention in an era of rapid change and fragmented resources. This case study of a multi-county consortium of social service agencies in collaboration with four graduate social work programs and two foundations represents an innovative approach to building a partnership through the use of a consortium as a mediating structure. With a focus on training, research, policy development, and a think tank, specific implications for developing agency-university partnership are identified. The case is embedded in the expanding literature on university-community collaboration.

KEYWORDS: Consortium, collaboration, social services, university-community partnerships, think tank

Introduction

As the pace quickens in our society, due in large part to the role of technology, it becomes even more difficult to overcome the fragmentation spawned by increased specialization. People are so busy working in their specialized “vineyards” that it is difficult to find the time to network with those in similar as well as different workplaces. There is a growing recognition that special mechanisms are needed to bridge the gaps created by the fast-paced nature and fragmentation in our society. Different forms of collaboration, partnerships, and consortia are emerging as structures to

connect the shared concerns of similar as well as disparate institutions. These bridges are known as “mediating” structures or institutions; platforms used to bring together two or more sets of collaborators to address shared concerns and interests. One such mediating institution is the Bay Area Social Services Consortium (BASSC), a collaboration established in 1987 between four universities, twelve county social service agencies, and two foundations. An analysis of the evolution and contributions of this Consortium is the focus of this case study.

Shared concerns and the mutuality of self-interests are frequently the cornerstones of partnerships. The “town-gown” distinction between community concerns and university interests is not new. However, as universities have begun to recognize their responsibilities to the society and taxpayers/donors supporting them, there has emerged in the last several decades a new interest in community involvement. This has occurred at the student level with community service projects, at the faculty level with collaborative research and training in community institutions, and at the governing board level with policy and funding decisions influenced by the need to address community issues in neighborhoods surrounding university campuses as well as in the region. Similarly, local governmental agencies, including county departments of social services, have recognized the value of collaborating with universities to recruit future employees, address critical issues through research and evaluation, and solicit faculty expertise in the formulation and implementation of public policies. Recent

1. This paper is dedicated to the memory of Dean Harry Specht, who had the courage and vision to build partnerships throughout the State of California. His encouragement and leadership, in partnership with Ed Nathan, former Executive Director of the Zellerbach Family Fund, and Richard O’Neil, former Director of the Santa Clara County Social Services Agency and BASSC chair (1992-1996), moved BASSC from an idea to a reality.

Michael J. Austin is BASSC Staff Director, **Maria Martin**, BASSC Social Policy Media Coordinator, **Sarah Carnochan**, BASSC Research Assistant, **Sheryl Goldberg**, BASSC Research Coordinator, **Jill Duerr Berrick**, Director, Center for Social Services Research, **Barbara Weiss**, BASSC Training Coordinator, **Julie Kelly**, BASSC Research Assistant.

arrivals at the table of university-community collaboration have been local foundations. While foundation resources are always valued commodities in forming and sustaining collaborations, even more important are the ideas and perspectives of foundations executives who bring the concerns of grassroots, community-based organizations to the collaborative process. An analysis of this mix of public, private, and university collaboration is a key dimension of the study of BASSC which grew from 1992 to 1998 from a \$7500 foundation seed grant to a \$1.2 million annual operation and includes the following initiatives: 1) an Executive Think Tank, 2) an Executive Development and Regional Training Program, 3) a Research Response Team, and 4) a Policy Media Program.

Highlights from the Literature

The BASSC experience can be best understood when it is placed within the context of university-community partnerships. Over the past two decades, there has been increased interest in exploring ways for universities to connect with community issues and for community leaders to maximize the policy, research, and training expertise of universities. While the literature in this area is not large, there is a growing body of research that examines the structures and motivations underlying partnerships between universities and community institutions. Hackney argues that universities have a moral obligation to address the social problems in the communities where they are located, “to set an example of sensitive corporate citizenship” (1986, p. 136). In addition to the moral imperative, Harkavy and Puckett (1994) identify how partnerships with the community serve the following self-interests of universities: 1) advancing knowledge, teaching, and human welfare through community service, 2) generating increased public and private support for universities by giving attention to societal problems, and 3) facilitating faculty and student recruitment by promoting the health and safety of their surrounding community. Others have pointed out that initiatives to address community problems offer the potential for interdisciplinary teaching and research by dealing with real life problems which can be inherently incompatible with the university’s compartmentalized approaches to solutions (Ramaley, 1995). Similarly, research in communities can provide a “reality check” for the ideas and theories investigated by researchers (Young, 1995).

University partnerships have evolved out of a tradition in America of academic service to the community. An early example in the field of social work can be found in the work

of Hull House and the University of Chicago. Hull House residents produced detailed demographic data and descriptions of immigrant neighborhoods, information which was integrated into their advocacy efforts. They worked closely with sociologists at the University of Chicago, who viewed scholarship, teaching, and community service as compatible elements of the university’s mission (Harkavy & Puckett, 1994). Another form of university-community partnerships can be seen in the development of land grant colleges (Morrill Act of 1886) to provide research and consultation services to local agricultural communities (Hackney, 1986). However, for much of this century, universities formed their primary partnerships with business and government, turning away from local problems to focus on national and foreign policy issues (Harkavy & Puckett, 1994). Then, in the 1960’s, foundations and the federal government began to focus again on the problems confronting local communities, especially those located in urban areas, by supporting a number of initiatives to foster partnerships between universities and urban communities. Some of these efforts have been criticized on the grounds that while universities have benefited from using communities as a laboratory for research, the communities gained little, and had no voice in the work that universities were doing (Hackney, 1986).

While there are relatively few successful organizational models of university-community partnerships presented in the literature, Harkavy and Puckett (1991) note that most successful partnerships are tailored to the particular circumstances and needs of individual universities and community organizations. In addition, a few case studies in the literature make it possible to identify some principles and strategies that should be generalizable to a broad range of partnerships, such as studies of the efforts of universities to incorporate community service into their mission statements (Scott & Ludwig, 1995), understanding the challenge of bridging two different cultures represented by the university and the community (Bartelt, 1995), building partnerships between universities and state mental health agencies (Talbot et al, 1991), and partnership development between universities and local public schools (Zetlin & MacLeod, 1995)

Although these case examples and models have emerged in different environments, they all reflect the theme of mutuality as part of a process of developing a set of principles for collaboration. These principles include: 1) the importance of equity among partners, ensuring that each has an equal voice, and that the contributions of all are recognized, 2) the importance of partners identifying their

own self-interest in the collaboration as well as recognizing the goals and objectives of the other organizations involved, 3) the necessity of clarifying the rationale for working in collaboration despite different interests, 4) the importance of leadership to sustain collaborative partnerships and ensure longevity as well as institutionalization (e.g. supporting structures, mediating structures, faculty reward systems, and outside funding), and 5) the importance of full participation of faculty, staff, and community members in building a strong foundation of university community-partnerships.

While the literature includes interesting descriptions of partnerships and their developmental processes, it is in the field of public education that some of the most substantive analysis of partnerships and consortia can be found. There is also a strong parallel between university schools of education with their public school counterparts in the community and university schools of social work with their counterparts in public county social service agencies as well as non-profit community-based social service organizations.

Goodlad (Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988) has conducted extensive work on university-school partnerships over the past three decades through the National Network for Educational Renewal. From his assessment of successful school-university partnerships, Goodlad has identified the following five relationship-building processes for building and sustaining partnerships:

- **Partnerships** involve equal partners working together toward satisfying mutually beneficial self-interests, as reflected in the following essential characteristics: 1) a moderate degree of dissimilarity between or among partners, 2) the potential for mutual satisfaction of self-interests, and 3) sufficient selflessness on the part of each partner to assure the satisfaction of self-interests by all involved.
- **Communication** in a partnership involves efficient and effective sharing of information and knowledge produced by its members as well as communications coming from other sources.
- **Leadership** involves organizational leaders possessing, endorsing, and communicating a clear, coherent set of fundamental values to which all participants can be committed.
- **Renewal** involves change which requires the ongoing involvement of the significant persons responsible for developing and promoting innovative activities, along with the resources and time needed for the ongoing process of inquiry and organizational change.

- **Accountability** is best understood and acted upon as a system of shared responsibilities carried out by members of the partnership.

These characteristics of mediating structures in the field of public education will be used in the analyzing the BASSC partnership.

The BASSC Consortium as a Case Study

In its first five years of existence BASSC developed a number of regional training events and task forces on child welfare curriculum issues designed to reengage social work education with the public social services. As a result, a common mission statement on education for public social services was adopted and led to the creation of a statewide consortium—the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC)—for the development of new educational programs to meet the needs of publicly supported social services.

Building on the success of these initial collaborative efforts, BASSC members in 1992 began to think about defining their activities in a broader and more formalized way. With the assistance of a staff consultant from the University of California School of Social Welfare, the consortium developed an agenda, over time, related to the three broad areas of training, research, and policy development. The following sections include the description of initiatives in each of these areas and the think tank process used to generate and monitor the initiatives.

The BASSC Think Tank

The bi-monthly BASSC Think Tank meetings provide a rare opportunity for busy executives to step back from the day-to-day realities of administering programs and to focus not just on how things are, but how they might be. An early outcome of these discussions was the recognition of a shared desire to begin to influence future human services policies and programs in a more coordinated and proactive way.

As a first step, the group agreed to draft a vision statement that would place the county social service agencies' short-term strategic plans into a broader and long-term perspective. This statement was intended to create a picture of what the ideal human services system would look like, in order to provide a forum for county directors, staff, political leaders and citizens to work together to articulate a collective future. After fifteen months of deliberation the vision statement emerged with the core values that: a) social services should be universal and guaranteed, and b)

communities should be supported in the design and development of services that work for them (BASSC, 1994). In essence, services should:

- Be provided to all families in need.
- Provide guaranteed access to a minimal level of care and support.
- Educate consumers to utilize available resources in order to foster self-sufficiency.
- Use a prevention model whereby success is measured on the basis of community health and well-being.
- Work with existing community institutions to develop neighborhood-based services which involve minimal government regulation.
- Reflect a belief in the capacities of individuals and neighborhoods to promote change and a commitment to racial and cultural diversity.

From these core values arose the service principles and assumptions outlined in *Figure 1*. These principles and assumptions constitute the core of the BASSC vision and provide a road map that now serves as a guide for how daily actions can lead to individual and organizational success. In essence, the BASSC “Vision of Human Services—2000,” describes a human services system that is interdisciplinary, neighborhood-based, culturally sensitive, and accountable for contributing in a measurable way to the overall health and welfare of the communities it serves.

Since this vision was articulated, BASSC members have used the Think Tank meetings to identify and address administrative challenges to implementing the vision. Examples of such challenges include fostering community leadership, supporting staff autonomy and creativity, transferring responsibility and authority from the county to local units, developing safeguards to assure accountability in the use of public funds, and designing inter-agency mechanisms to assist local community service centers with job training programs, economic development activities, local taxing authorities, and public education.

Much of the recent focus of BASSC Think Tank meetings has been on the implications of national and state welfare reform proposals and the block-granting of federal funds. As county directors shared their concerns and perceptions, two themes emerged. First, counties were not waiting to see what would happen at the federal and state levels, but were moving forward with their own plans for changing their welfare systems. Second, even though each county’s welfare reform planning process and subsequent actions would be unique and reflect the particular demographics,

economics and politics of that county, the county directors identified perspectives which they held in common:

- The importance of increasing communications with local “stakeholders” (elected officials, service providers, community members, business leaders and so on) about the realities of providing social services in today’s environment with counties being positioned as facilitators rather than drivers of the planning process.
- The need to abandon the traditional isolation associated with managing the enterprise and involve a wider range of community organizations in program planning as well as actively pursuing partnerships with other county departments, private nonprofit agencies and businesses, thereby helping to shift organizational thinking from inward-focused and present-oriented to outward-focused and forward-looking.
- The importance of experimenting with new ways of delivering community and neighborhood services by allocating resources that can potentially increase the efficiency and effectiveness of activities on behalf of clients and communities.

The BASSC Think Tank continues its exploration of these issues, primarily through the analysis and discussion of cross-country comparisons of welfare reform implementation (Carnochan & Austin, 1998).

The BASSC Executive Development Program

As the Think Tank evolved, agency directors began to feel more comfortable sharing some of their most pressing administrative dilemmas. Members found it helpful to address their dilemmas as case presentations. One issue that received unanimous support involved their shared frustration in recruiting experienced and trained women and minorities of color for senior management vacancies. This discussion led to a proposal for a multi-county Executive Development Training Program which would involve the selection of their most promising upper and middle-management staff to participate in the program, the involvement of the directors themselves as part of the teaching faculty, and the use of their cases as teaching tools (BASSC, 1997).

The original goal of the BASSC Executive Development Program was to develop a cadre of leaders who can play key roles in preparing and transforming public agencies into the service system of tomorrow. County agencies require leaders who understand bureaucratic barriers and can get the job done, despite obstacles. Acquiring the critical thinking skills, socialization, and leadership styles of

FIGURE 1
The Principles and Assumptions of the BASSC Vision

PRINCIPLES	ASSUMPTIONS
Resource Distribution	
1. The ideal system will redirect societal resources to those individuals, families and communities most in need of assistance, especially those who have been historically deprived of a fair share of economic and social benefits and opportunities.	1. Resource allocation can best be accomplished by offering services universally to those in need.
2. The ideal system will provide a minimal level of health and decency to individuals and families.	2. Historically, social service programs have been under-funded.
3. The ideal system will provide all service consumers with equal opportunity to access benefits.	3. Opportunities for access must include convenient locations and hours, appropriate physical facilities for the elderly and the disabled, access to all services to which one is entitled, access to relevant information, and the provision of services in a manner that is sensitive to language and cultural differences.
Decision Making and Authority	
4. Decision making should involve community-based approaches to problem solving.	4. Individual and family problems are rooted in the well-being of the community overall, and therefore solutions must address both individual and environmental problems. Communities can solve their own problems if they have the resources and assistance to do so.
5. Local needs must be defined by the community.	5. Local citizens must have decision-making authority to determine priorities, resource allocation and criteria for success.
6. The service delivery system should be decentralized and neighborhood-based.	6. People interact most effectively with systems that are near their place of residence and that reflect the particular characteristics of their living environment.
Service Design and Delivery	
7. The ideal service delivery system will take a proactive, prevention-oriented approach to problem-solving	7. Services should be linked to other major community institutions, in particular, all aspects of economic development.
8. Services should be comprehensive, and non-categorical.	8. Services should be responsive to a range of individual and community needs including those of young children, adolescents, young adults, senior citizens and families.
9. Services should be universal, based on federally-funded family investment policies.	9. A universal approach avoids stigmatizing recipients and acknowledges the potential of all individuals to contribute to society. Only the federal government possesses sufficient resources to implement investment policies of this magnitude.
10. Services and service delivery should reflect a deep commitment to racial and cultural diversity.	10. This commitment is at the core of the principles of equity, access and community participation, and it recognizes the importance of bringing the service delivery system in compliance with the demographic and social realities of the 21st century.

senior managers requires a learning environment where leadership issues and skills can be refined and applied to current organizational realities. The key skills include the ability to organize agencies for change and to assist others in overcoming fear and uncertainty generated by change. The transformational leader has the ability to overcome bureaucratic regulations to create new organizational forms. Such leaders are able to solicit input from all levels of the organization, from client populations, and from resources inside and outside of the agency.

The Executive Development Training Program consists of: 1) three week-long, thirty-hour classroom modules which take place during an academic year, 2) an interagency site visit exchange, and 3) a fifteen-day internship project in a county outside the participant's home country. The three classroom modules are organized by themes and the theme of the first module is leadership in public social services organizations. The module includes sessions on the history of social services, leadership development and self-assessment, client-centered administration, community relations, the administrator as community organizer, and working with community-based organizations.

Between the first and second modules, each participant is assisted in arranging a half-day visit to learn about an interesting or innovative program in another county. The objectives are to: a) strengthen the peer learning relationships formed during the first module, b) reflect upon their learning experience in a memo to their director that describes the observed project or program with implications for the home county, and c) to identify leadership and organizational change issues.

The theme of the second module is managing organizational change with an emphasis on change management, program development, presentation skills, budgeting, and grievance handling. The third module includes an array of management skills such as media relations, management information systems, advocacy and ethics in lobbying, conducting outcome evaluations, managing a diverse workforce, and executive-board relations. As the concluding module for the program, it also includes case presentations, evaluation sessions (participants, faculty, and mentors), and a graduation dinner.

Between modules 2 and 3 is a fifteen-day internship project which provides each participant with an opportunity to: 1) observe administrative practices in other agencies while acquiring new skills under the guidance of a senior manager, 2) build networks and contacts in another county, and 3) develop a case study which describes the learning

experience, identifies implications for their own agencies, and suggests action steps for future implementation.

A unique feature of the program is the involvement, at every level, of the county social service directors. They select the participants from their agencies, provide classroom instruction, assist their participants in selecting internship projects that would be beneficial to the agency as well as the participant, and recruit mentors in their own agencies to oversee internships for participants from other counties. While a detailed evaluation of the program is available (Murtaza, 1998), some of the program successes include peer learning and networking, learning from agency directors as instructors, and learning from the experiences of other counties.

Based on the success of the Executive Development Program, a comprehensive BASSC Bay Area Academy has been developed with Title IV-E funding from the state. This million dollar Academy is designed to support the child welfare and human service training needs of the counties in such areas as supervision, team-based interdisciplinary practice, change management, ethnic-sensitive risk assessment, domestic violence, substance abuse, concurrent planning, and related topics.

The BASSC Research Response Team

With the successful launching of the Executive Development, the BASSC members turned their attention to another important issue, namely the need for timely and relevant agency-based research, which resulted in the development of the BASSC Research Response Team. In 1994, members of BASSC identified the importance of building a research bridge between universities and Bay Area county social and human service agencies. In response, a BASSC Research Response Team (RRT) was launched in 1995 to respond rapidly to the agencies' needs for information about their changing environments. The RRT, financed with \$25,000 per year from each of four large Bay Area counties and a start-up grant from the Zellerbach Family Fund, is staffed by a research coordinator, several graduate research assistants, and two faculty members.

The following RRT with guidelines developed by the BASSC members was designed to be: 1) practical and oriented toward improvement and/or expansion of services at the provider level; 2) sensitive and relevant to the community's needs and values; 3) committed to involve agency staff in the design and implementation of studies; 4) carried out in the context of continuous consultation between agency administrators and researchers who would assume ultimate

responsibility for the independent presentation of findings and recommendations; 5) available to build agency capacity by providing technical assistance to agency staff; and 6) timely and completed within six to eight months of an agreed-upon scope of work reflected in a signed contract.

At the beginning of each research study, the BASSC Research Coordinator and one or more faculty members meet with county staff to define the scope of work. Agency administrators and staff persons are central to framing the study design, facilitating the data collection process, and providing feedback to be incorporated into the final report. Graduate student research assistants conduct a literature review on the topic, help create the research instrument, gather and enter data, and transcribe the research findings. The Research Coordinator oversees all phases of the project and prepares and presents the completed study in report form for discussion with the county. The faculty serve as consultants throughout the research project.

In the first three years of operations, a total of ten research projects were completed on the following topics:

- Homeless Needs Assessment – San Mateo County
- General Assistance Client Demographics Study – Contra Costa County
- An Assessment of the Quality of Care in Kin and Non-Kin Foster Homes – Santa Clara County
- A Study of Gay and Lesbian Foster and Adoptive Parenting – Santa Clara County
- Factors Associated With Successful and Unsuccessful Reunification from Foster Care – Alameda County
- Service Use and Service Needs Among Long-Term AFDC Recipients – San Mateo County
- Foster Parent Recruitment, Retention, and Rate Setting – Santa Clara County
- Developing a Public Information and Community Relations Strategy – Contra Costa County
- Managed Care and Child Welfare Reform – Alameda County
- Child Welfare Outcome Evaluation – Contra Costa County

A comprehensive evaluation of the first three years of the BASSC Research Response Team is also available (Dal Santo, 1998). With the successful launching of the Research Response Team, the BASSC members turned their attention to the changing political environment of welfare reform and the need for social policy responses.

The BASSC Social Policy Media Program

BASSC members were laying the groundwork in their counties for implementing their shared vision for human services, a national welfare reform debate escalated following the 1994 congressional elections. As a result, BASSC members felt an urgent need to inform and educate local and regional constituencies about the realities of welfare reform given all the rhetoric of the time. While the politics of each county varied, the BASSC members sought to “speak with one voice” in educating the public. Members struggled with the competing goals of getting information about welfare out to the public and opinion leaders in a timely way as well as develop the infrastructure to effectively address broader policy issues over the long term.

In 1995, with a small foundation grant, the BASSC Policy Media Project was launched to gather relevant information on poverty and welfare in order to publish a briefing packet targeted to local media representatives, elected officials, and the business community. The contents of the briefing monograph entitled *Social Welfare at a Crossroads: A National, Statewide, and Local Look at Poverty and Public Assistance* (Martin & Austin, 1997) included:

- I. ENDING WELFARE AS WE KNOW IT: The Impact of “Welfare Reform” on the Bay Area
- II. SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAMS IN THE U.S.
- III. MEDICAID: Health Care Program for the Medically Needy
- IV. SSI: Supplementary Security Income for the Elderly, Blind, and Disabled
- V. FOOD STAMPS: Program to alleviate Hunger and Malnutrition for Low Income Families and Individuals
- VI. JOBS: the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program
- VII. AFDC: Aid to Families With Dependent Children
- VIII. FACES OF POVERTY: Personal Stories of Women and Children on Public Assistance
- IX. OUR CHANGING SOCIETY: American Trends and the Social Welfare System
- X. SOCIAL WELFARE BY THE NUMBERS: National, State, and County Data

This educational tool is now being supplemented by a foundation-supported media campaign planning process to educate the public about the implementation of welfare reform. Identifying critical media messages, especially for employers of former welfare recipients and those providing family support services, is the core of such a regional media

campaign. In the context of implementing welfare reform, additional BASSC policy initiatives are under development in the areas of child care, adult services, and the elements of a living wage.

Conclusion

The agency-university partnership established through the mediating structure of BASSC provides an opportunity for continuing dialogue on issues related to education and training, research, and policy development. Some examples of the outcome of such dialogue can be found in BASSC training monographs (BASSC Academy, 1998) and policy research (Baum & Martin, 1997).

As noted in the introduction, community-university partnerships require commitment to collaboration and on-going nurturing. Using Goodlad's five criteria for effective relationship building (partnership, communication, leadership, renewal, and accountability), it is possible to assess the BASSC efforts to date. With respect to partnership, BASSC members representing universities, agencies, and foundations have demonstrated a unique capacity to work together toward satisfying mutually beneficial self-interests in the three areas of research, training, and policy development. However, it is also important to note that partnerships can reflect precarious relationships, especially when the membership is changing. For example, during the past five years, the deanship has changed in all four participating schools and in the case of one school and one foundation the leadership has changed three times. Fortunately these changes have not significantly disrupted the on-going momentum of the consortium. However, these changes call for increased attention to the process of orienting new members.

Regarding communications, there has been effective and efficient sharing of information and knowledge, usually facilitated by BASSC staff. Since the social service agency directors out-number the deans and foundation directors, the majority of information sharing relates to agency issues. Nevertheless, there is an on-going interest in addressing university curriculum issues along with increased sentiment among the agency directors to see more than one profession participating in the consortium.

On the issue of leadership, the BASSC Chair and members have articulated a clear and coherent set of values to guide and strengthen the Think Tank and related BASSC activities. In addition to shared values, there is a consensus that the elected chair of the consortium should be an agency director based in part, on the fact that they are the largest

group of dues-paying members. There is also agreement that the consortium bylaws should be simple and brief.

With respect to the criteria of renewal, the ongoing involvement of agency directors, deans, and foundation directors has demonstrated BASSC's capacity to engage colleagues in continuous inquiry and a "recharging of personal batteries" needed to manage constant organizational change. It is apparent that the members are finding the think tank approach to be both intellectually stimulating as well as emotionally supportive. The beginnings of an on-going support group can be seen in the informal exchanges between members on topics of a personal as well as professional nature. Again it appears that the group of agency directors are benefiting most from the support group environment given the recent arrivals of the new deans and foundation directors.

And the fifth criteria of accountability can be seen in the mutual support of BASSC members toward one another, in the form of contributed financial and staff resources, clearly demonstrates shared responsibility for the success of BASSC. The levels of accountability vary between those who pay dues (agencies and foundations) and those who do not (universities). One of the deans demonstrates considerable commitment and accountability since the consortium is administratively located in his school. In the final analysis, the consortium works because its members constantly search for ways to make it work.

In addition to meeting Goodlad's (1988) five criteria for effective relationship building, it is useful to identify several lessons learned while building the Bay Area Social Services Consortium:

1. For busy agency, university, and foundation administrators to maintain a clear focus on and commitment to a regional consortium, intensive staff work is needed to assist in meeting agenda framing and follow-up as well as managing projects which evolve out of consortium decision-making.
2. For university faculty and student involvement, there needs to be commitment and freedom to explore new avenues of inquiry with minimal organizational barriers to creativity.
3. For deans and foundation representatives to invest in a social services consortium, they must bring a deep commitment to strengthening public social services.
4. For county social service directors to invest personally and financially in a consortium amidst many other competing priorities, the dialogue must focus

- on the realities of current administrative practice and the needs of public social service personnel.
5. For a consortium to maintain its fiscal viability, counties must be willing to pay annual dues to support the consortium staff of faculty and students.
 6. For a community of local leaders to engage in an ongoing Think Tank, the benefits must exceed the costs in time and money and skillful leadership is needed on the part of the elected consortium chairperson.
 7. For other regions of the country with county administered social service agencies interested in replicating aspects of the BASSC, at least three key people need to surface: 1) a county social service director who is futuristic and effectively networked with other counties; 2) a social work dean with substantial commitment to the public social services; and 3) a faculty member or consultant willing and interested in staffing a consortium (these three also need to be able to secure a small start-up grant from a local foundation to cover expenses until the county participants recognize the value of sharing and commit agency funds as annual dues to maintain the consortium).
 8. A critical ingredient in providing staff for a consortium is the recruitment and deployment of doctoral and master's level students to create research teams, prepare training materials, assist in event planning, and coordinate information exchange. Similarly, experienced clerical and administrative support are needed to facilitate mailings, fiscal arrangements, and managing university policies.
 9. A flexible governance structure is useful in fostering participation through the use of a rotating chairperson and the involvement of county directors in leading ad hoc task forces on various BASSC initiatives. Similarly, the involvement of committed foundation representatives is useful in gaining additional perspectives on policy and practice issues as well as information about sources of financial support.

In conclusion, the regional training, research, and policy programs of BASSC provide a unique forum for the "cross-pollination" of ideas to promote creative solutions to the challenges which confront public social service agencies. BASSC provides a vehicle for county directors, university deans, and foundation representatives to communicate

shared values and advocate for realistic and humane social welfare policies.

References

- Bartlet, D. (1995). The university and community development: A common cause. *Metropolitan Universities*, 6(3), 15-28.
- BASSC, *Vision of Human Services* — 2000. (1994). Berkeley, CA: University of California School of Social Welfare, Bay Area Social Services Consortium.
- BASSC, *Guiding Organizational Change: A Casebook*. (1997). Berkeley, CA: University of California School of Social Welfare, BASSC Bay Area Academy.
- BASSC Academy. (1998). *Supervision in Public Social Services Agency, Understanding Management Information Systems, Ethnic-Sensitive Risk Assessment, Team-Based Interdisciplinary Practice, Permanency Planning in Child Welfare, Organizational Change: The Public Sector Challenge, Substance Abuse and Child Welfare, Mapping the Link Between Health and Welfare*, Berkeley, CA: University of California, School of Social Welfare. California Social Work Education Center.
- Baum, R. Martin, M., & Austin, M.J. (1997). *Getting Beyond General Assistance: Welfare Reform and Local Self-Sufficiency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California. Center for Social Services Research.
- Carnochan, S. & Austin, M. J. (1998). *An Analysis of County Welfare Reform Implementation Plans*. Berkeley, CA: University of California. Center for Social Services Research.
- Dal Santo, T. (1998). *Research Utilization and Dissemination: The BASSC Research Response Team*. Berkeley, CA: University of California. Center for Social Services Research.
- Hackney, S. (1986). The university and its community: Past and present. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 488, 135-147.
- Harkavy, I. & Puckett, J. L. (1991). The role of mediating structures in university and community revitalization: The University of Pennsylvania and West Philadelphia As a Case Study. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 26(1), 10-25.
- Harkavy, I. & Puckett, J. L. (1994). Lessons from Hull House for the contemporary urban university. *Social Service Review*, 68(3), 299-321.

- Martin, M. & Austin, M. J. (1997). *Social Welfare at a Crossroad: A National, Statewide, and Local Look at Poverty and Public Assistance*. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Study Center (1-800-484-4173).
- Murtaza, N. (1998). *Evaluating the BASSC Executive Development Program*. Berkeley, CA: University of California School of Social Welfare, BASSC Academy.
- Ramaley, J. A. (1995). Preparing the way for reform in higher education: Drawing upon the resources of the community-at-large. *Metropolitan Universities*, 6(3), 29-44.
- Scott, J. A. & Ludwig, M. (1995). Community service at urban public institutions: A report on conditions and activities. *Metropolitan Universities*, 6(3), 29-44.
- Sirotnik, K. A. & Goodlad, J. I. (Eds.) (1988). *School-university partnership in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Talbot, J. A., Bray, J. D., Flaherty, L., Robinowitz, C., & Tainter, Z. (1991). State-university collaboration in psychiatry: The Pew Memorial Trust Program. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 27(6), 425-439.
- Young, W. B. (1995). University-community partnerships—Why bother? *Metropolitan Universities*, 6(3), 71-77.
- Zetlin, A. G. & MacLeod, E. (1995). A school-university partnership working toward the restructure of an urban school and community. *Education and Urban Society*, 27(4), 411-420.

CHAPTER 2

BASSC@30

Bay Area Social Services Consortium

COUNTIES

Alameda
Contra Costa
Marin
Monterey
Napa
San Benito
San Francisco
San Mateo
Santa Clara
Santa Cruz
Solano
Sonoma

UNIVERSITIES

California State University, East Bay
California State University, Monterey Bay
San Francisco State
San Jose State
University of California, Berkeley

FOUNDATIONS

The Zellerbach Family Foundation

Michael J. Austin, PhD
BASSC Staff Director
Sarah Carnochan, PhD
BASSC Research Director

Bay Area Social Services Consortium
School of Social Welfare
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720

<http://mackcenter.berkeley.edu>

BASSC Mission

An Agency–University–Foundation Partnership

The Bay Area Social Services Consortium (BASSC) operates as an agency-university-foundation partnership that promotes social service research, training, and policy development. Founded in 1987 in response to interests in public social services shared by county social service agency directors, university deans and directors of social work programs, and local foundations in the San Francisco Bay Area, BASSC has developed the following core purposes and programs:

Core Purposes

- Fostering regional communications and understanding about the changing nature of social services in the public and nonprofit sectors
- Serving as a catalyst for new ideas that have legislative, administrative, public education, and training implications
- Providing a structure for innovative regional programs related to research, training and policy development
- Collaborating to address shared workforce development issues related to pre-service and in-service education

Core Programs

- Bi-monthly meetings and an annual retreat to share ideas, assess legislation, and promote regional collaboration between county agencies, universities, and foundations
- A multi-county program of policy and program research on topics selected by the BASSC members
- A multi-county training program related to Executive Development for middle and senior managers and a Bay Area Academy serving the training needs of line and supervisory staff in child welfare and related fields
- A multi-county policy development program that develops and publishes policy reports for opinion leaders and case studies on promising practices for agency staff.

The leadership that guides and sustains BASSC emerges from the active participation of 12 county social service directors, five university deans and directors of social work programs, two foundation representatives, and the BASSC Staff Director along with BASSC staff located at UC Berkeley in the School of Social Welfare (Mack Center on Nonprofit and Public Sector Management in the Human Services) and UC Berkeley Extension.

MESSAGE FROM THE BASSC CO-CHAIRS

Kathy Gallagher

Director, Contra Costa County Employment & Human Services Department

The formation of the Bay Area Social Services Consortium (BASSC) 30 years ago has proven to be nothing less than visionary. Given the monumental changes we have seen in the field of Human Services over the last three decades, the BASSC partnership has played a significant role in promoting social service research, training, and policy development in Northern California and beyond.

In 1987, the BASSC collaboration brought together human services directors from several Bay Area counties as part of an agency-university-foundation partnership to strengthen public sector social services in the region. BASSC emerged out of the history of increased government involvement in the delivery of social services to address the needs of local communities. Evolving from the War on Poverty and amendments to the Social Security Act in the 1960s, human service practitioners assumed an increasingly prominent role in ensuring that service programs were administered in ways that were more integrated, comprehensive, and accessible.

The BASSC partners built a solid foundation in 1987, and set the course for the counties in the San Francisco Bay Area to effectively deliver human service programs. Societal, cultural, economic and political changes have greatly affected how we provide support for our communities. These changes continue to impact our work as we take steps to influence public policy and set strategy for the future. The era of technological advancement has opened new doors, and our Bay Area human services departments are finding new ways to interface with customers. BASSC offers a collaborative means for human services directors

and staff to react to new mandates, changing needs and novel ways to serve our customers.

BASSC began with 12 member counties, our five Bay Area university programs featuring undergraduate and graduate social work education, and the Zellerbach Family Foundation as founding partner. Over the decades, BASSC has created seven policy groups (described elsewhere in this publication) that bring together expert staff from each Bay Area county to further regional goals through a planning and policy framework. BASSC has become a regional entity with an influential voice in the state and around the country.

Given the current political climate and federal and state budget constraints, it is reassuring to know that the founding of BASSC 30 years ago set the stage for county human services to be able to address the extraordinary challenges we face today. The group came together based on principles (as noted in our Mission Statement) that, in my view, have proven to be timeless in keeping our think tank and support group strong and connected human service issues.

We may encounter obstacles along the road before us, but we also see great opportunities to overcome them. The early vision of those who partnered to create BASSC enables us to move steadily along that road in a unified manner. I am certain BASSC will leverage its robust agency-university-foundation partnership to continue engaging in dialogue, educating each other on the basis of sound research and practice experience, and continue to influence public policy in the field of human services.

Brian Simmons

Dean Emeritus, California State University – Monterey Bay

I attended my first BASSC meeting in fall 2001. In the ensuing sixteen years, I have seen many agency directors and many academicians come and go. One of the many remarkable things about BASSC is that despite the relatively frequent turnover, the high level of commitment to thoughtful and innovative policies and practices, informed by both the universities and the counties, has remained absolutely constant. The commitment can be seen in the deliberate and respectful inquiry and debate; the desire for data-driven decision-making; the prioritization of client, community,

and system well-being; and the importance of the stewardship of the taxpayer resources. All long-standing BASSC characteristics kept my interest and engagement at a high level for all these years. The recently re-energized focus on common interests in workforce development shared by universities and counties speaks well for BASSC going forward. Our founders, Ed Nathan, Harry Specht, and Dick O’Neil, would be very pleased to see the results of their efforts thirty years later.

REFLECTIONS OF A BASSC FOUNDER

Jim Rydingsword

San Benito County Health and Human Services Agency

The Bay Area Welfare Directors were meeting quarterly for lunch during the 1980s and I participated as Director of Contra Costa County Social Services Agency. It was the era of Governor George Deukmejian and President Ronald Reagan. We held ongoing discussions about issues facing social services in California and explored the impact of these issues on our Bay Area counties. Beginning in 1987, there was much discussion about welfare reform that ultimately resulted in the 1988 Welfare Reform legislation developed under the leadership of Senator Patrick Moynihan of New York. Its provisions included new directions for Child Support, Job Opportunities, Family Support Services and the AFDC amendments, and Demonstration Projects.

It was also in 1987 that I met with others at the UC Berkeley Faculty Club for lunch to discuss the needs of counties for more graduate level social workers and the need for a commitment of schools of social work to address this challenge. The conversation was guided by UC Berkeley Dean Harry Specht who called for the public university system in California to make a commitment to educate more social workers for California county human service agencies as well as publicly-supported nonprofits. The conversation

also included Ed Nathan, director of the Zellerbach Family Fund and Dick O’Neill, the director of Santa Clara County Social Services Agency. The vision and passion of Dean Specht was very powerful and helped to promote out-of-the-box thinking. Such thinking took the form of a proposal to seek a Ford Foundation planning grant to develop a statewide strategy to increase the supply of trained social workers in public-supported social service programs. These efforts led to the establishment of the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC) in 1990.

The UC Berkeley Faculty Club luncheon planted the seeds for converting the informal quarterly lunch meeting of the Bay Area welfare directors into the formal consortium comprised of county directors, university deans and directors, and foundation representatives. It is the vision that emerged out of this 1987 meeting that we celebrate today with the 30th anniversary of the founding of the Bay Area Social Services Consortium (BASSC).

A Brief BASSC History (1987-2017)

Michael J. Austin

BASSC Staff Director

The roots of the Bay Area Social Services Consortium (BASSC) can be traced to people with ideas. For decades, those who have served as directors of county social service agencies throughout the state of California have sought each other out to exchange ideas and find support. In the San Francisco Bay Area, a group of “county welfare directors” met quarterly during the 1970s and 1980s to share ideas over lunch. In 1987, this group formed the Bay Area Social Services Consortium (BASSC) and included Ernie Hiroshi (San Mateo) as the convenor, Helen Knutson (Alameda), Dick O’Neil (Santa Clara), Jim Rydingsword (Contra Costa), Ed Sarsfield (San Francisco), and Yolanda Rinaldo (Marin/Sonoma/Santa Clara) who joined in 1989. Among the many topics they explored was the perceived insufficient curriculum attention to public mental health and child welfare issues in local schools of social work. They welcomed the opportunity to talk with the deans of social work programs. Dean Harry Specht of the UC Berkeley School of Social Welfare with the encouragement of Ed Nathan (Executive Director, Zellerbach Family Fund) seized the moment to begin a dialogue between agency administrators and university educators.

Dean Specht had been instrumental in reshaping the mission of the School of Social Welfare in the early 1980s to reflect a commitment to the public social services. In the mid-1980s, he sought out the “county welfare directors” to assist the School in implementing the new mission and began to participate in the quarterly meetings by hosting them on the UC Berkeley campus. By 1987, he had encouraged Ed Nathan, his long-time colleague with extensive contacts among Bay Area agency directors, to join the discussions. Ed had long sought to promote the improvement of social services through increased attention to service integration between public and nonprofit social service organizations. As a result of the foundation’s involvement, the first BASSC grant of \$7500 from the Zellerbach Family Fund was provided to promote regional training activities and Bart Grossman (Director of Fieldwork at the UC Berkeley School of Social Welfare) became the first part-time staff director of BASSC (1987-1990).

Based on these training activities (child welfare risk assessment, homelessness, HIV infants, etc.), BASSC members became interested in the potential for securing federal

training funds to attract MSW students to the field of child welfare. As a result, the idea for a statewide consortium of schools of social work and county social service agencies took hold. With the help of a social worker (John Lanihan) on the staff of the Ford Foundation (where there was interest in training social workers for implementing the federal 1988 Family Support Act), a Ford Foundation grant provided the seed money sought by the BASSC directors to launch CalSWEC, the California Social Work Education Center at UC Berkeley in 1990. Bart Grossman became its first director. While BASSC continued to provide regional training programs with staff assistance from Susan Laughlin at UC Berkeley Extension.

By 1992, BASSC was searching for a new focus, following its success with regional training events. Harry Specht and Ed Nathan had been successful in convincing Dick O’Neil (Santa Clara) to become the Chair of BASSC. At the same time, Mike Austin had just joined the UC Berkeley faculty as Professor and Chair of the Management and Planning track in the MSW program. He joined Ed, Dick, and Harry in developing a new approach to BASSC, away from quarterly lunch meeting and towards bi-monthly day-long sessions in the form of an Executive Think Tank. BASSC membership grew from the primarily large counties to include the smaller North Bay and South Bay counties along with the deans of other schools of social work that included San Jose State, San Francisco State, California State University–Monterey Bay, and California State University–East Bay.

Many different ideas began to emerge as part of the Think Tank, including the need to recruit more women and minorities into senior management positions. Based on a decision to “grow their own talent,” the BASSC Executive Development Program was launched in 1994 under the leadership and support of Stan Weisner and Barbara Weiss at UC Berkeley Extension. This innovative training program is now twenty four years old with over 600 graduates.

As the Think Tank format continued, other new ideas emerged. Based on a shared concern about the lack of in-house research capabilities in county social service agencies, the BASSC Research Response Team was launched in 1995 within the UC Berkeley Center for Social Services Research under the leadership of Dr. Sheryl Goldberg and Dr. Pamela

Choice. A series of exploratory short-term studies, primarily in the field of child welfare, were staffed by MSW students. This innovative research program is now over twenty years old and currently operates under the leadership of Sarah Carnochan as BASSC Research Director.

By 1996, Will Lightbourne (San Francisco) as BASSC Chair and Maureen Borland (San Mateo) as Vice Chair helped to focus the BASSC Think Tank on the profusion of policy issues leading up to and including the passage of federal welfare reform legislation. The multiple challenges facing the county directors led to a continuous stream of BASSC policy reports. One of the most comprehensive BASSC reports, *Social Welfare at a Crossroads*, was the first BASSC attempt to educate opinion leaders and elected officials involved in the development of California's CalWORKs welfare reform legislation. The flood of staff training challenges associated with implementing welfare reform led to the formation of a BASSC policy group of senior human resources and training managers under the leadership of Maureen Borland and Madelyn Martin (San Mateo County). This group continues to engage in ongoing efforts to transform public social service agencies into learning organizations, including recent efforts to build regional systems to share online training content across counties.

Preceding the BASSC Human Resources Committee was the Bay Area Children's Committee which had been formed in the previous decade as a regional component of the statewide Children's Committee that operated under the auspices of the California Welfare Directors Association (CWDA). By 1998, the leadership of BASSC had expanded its attention to child welfare by launching the new Bay Area Academy with substantial Title IVE funding. After nearly thirty years, the Bay Area Academy training programs have grown substantially under the guidance of BASSC through its Training Advisory Board and the administrative guidance of Fresno State University School of Social Work (Dave Foster, Director and Chris Mathias, Assistant Director). One of the early efforts of the Bay Area Children's Committee, under the leadership of Stuart Oppenheim and Dana Fabella was the preparation of the 2002 report for the Governor's Commission on Child Welfare entitled *Promising Bay Area Practices for the Redesign of Child Welfare Services*.

Based on the 1997 successful launch of the BASSC policy group related to Staff Development and Human

Resources, another BASSC policy group was formed in 1999 under the leadership of Rodger Lum and Linda Kretz (Alameda County) to focus on adult and aging services. The first result of this collaborative effort was the BASSC publication, *Riding the Wave: Charting the Course of Adult and Aging Services into the Next Decade* (2000). The BASSC policy group development continued during the first five years of implementing CalWORKs (1998-2003), with the establishment of the BASSC Welfare-to-Work policy group under the leadership of John Cullen and Wendy Therrian (Contra Costa County).

The arrival of the new millennium in 2000 provided BASSC with an opportunity to look beyond regional, state, and national boundaries in order to explore a more global perspective on public social services. Following the commissioning of reports on the implementation of welfare reform in Great Britain, BASSC began a series of video-conferences with local authority social service directors in England that focused on welfare reform implementation, child welfare services and adult/aging services. While the initial focus was on foster care, the future agenda includes adult/aging services. The national and international reach of BASSC was further enhanced by the launching of its first website which is now supported by the Mack Center on Nonprofit and Public Sector Management in the Human Services established in 2006. Sarah Carnochan joined the Mack Center staff in 2010 and helped develop a parallel consortium of nonprofit agencies that partnered with the counties to deliver social services called the Bay Area Network of Nonprofit Human Service Agencies (BANNHSA).

Given this brief 30 year history, it is clear that BASSC represents a unique partnership of county human service agencies, universities, and local foundations. Over the past three decades, a wide array of county agency directors, university deans and directors and foundation representatives have played a key role in the success of the Bay Area Social Services Consortium. As we celebrate the 30th Anniversary of BASSC, we salute the founding members of this pioneering intermediary organization that brings together the three important sectors of county social service agencies, universities, and foundations. As both a think tank and support group, BASSC has become a dynamic regional partnership that explores and supports collaboration and provides a venue where organizational leaders can share ideas and create innovative programs and practices.

BASSC @ 30 HALL OF FAME (1987-2017)

Counties

- Alameda:** Lori Cox, Yolanda Baldovinos, Chet Hewitt, Rodger Lum, Helen Knudson
Contra Costa: Kathy Gallagher, Joe Valentine, John Cullen, Perfecto Villareal, Jim Rydingsword
Marin: Kari Beuerman, Heather Ravani, Larry Meredith, Nancy Rubin, Thomas Peters
Monterey: Elliott Robinson, Marie Glavin, Dardell McFarlin
Napa: Howard Himes, Randy Snowden, Bruce Hyde, Terry Longoria, Dan Corsello,
San Benito: James Rydingsword, Kathy Flores, Marilyn Coppola, Lee Collins
San Francisco: Trent Rhorer, Will Lightbourne, Brian Cahill, Julia Lopez, Ed Sarsfield
San Mateo: Iliana Rodriguez, Beverly Beasley Johnson, Glen Brooks, Maureen Borland, Ernie Hirosi
Santa Clara: Robert Menicocci, Bruce Wagstaff, Will Lightbourne, Yolanda Lenier Rinaldo, Dick O'Neil
Santa Cruz: Ellen Timberlake, Cecilia Espinola, Will Lightbourne, Susan Mauriello
Solano: Gerald Huber, Ann Edwards, Patrick Duterte, Donald Rowe, Donald Currey
Sonoma: Karen Fies, Jerry Dunn, Jo Weber, Dianne Edwards, Yolanda Lenier Rinaldo, Paul Allen

Universities

- California State University–Monterey Bay:** Brian Simmons
California State University–East Bay: Rose Wong, Holly Vugia, Evaon Wong Kim, Diane Rush Woods, Terry Jones
San Francisco State: Susanna Jones, Eileen Levy, Rita Takahashi, Marv Feit, Michael Reisch, David Shipp, Phyllis Rochelle
San Jose State: Peter Lee, Jack Wall, Alice Hines, Lela Noble, Sylvia Andrews, Simon Dominguez, Ismael (Andy) Dieppa
University of California, Berkeley: Jeffrey Edleson, Lorraine Midanik, James Midgley, Neil Gilbert, Harry Specht

Foundations

- Zellerbach Family Foundation:** Amy Price, Allison Magee, Ellen Walker, Cindy Rambo, Ed Nathan
VanLobenSels/RembeRock Kathy Armstrong, Dan Corsello, Ed Nathan

BASSC Staff

Michael J. Austin, Sarah Carnochan, Bart Grossman

BASSC BAY AREA HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Bay Area Human Resource Committee (BAHRC) was launched in 1997 to respond to the staff development and personnel systems associated with implementing Welfare Reform. It soon became apparent to BAHRC participants that the organizational culture of county agencies/departments had a significant impact on the design and implementation of effective training programs beyond welfare to work programs. The Committee began to explore the literature on learning organizations and consulted with experts as a way of preparing to make recommendations for systemic changes to traditional staff development programs

and practices. Since 1997 BAHRC has continued to focus on the implementation and continuous improvement of BASSC member agencies as learning organizations.

The learning organization principles and practices continue to be the top priority for BAHRC as members continuously share information, explore different ways of resolving common issues, learn from each other and develop innovations in the area of human resources. The current priorities focus on the regional sharing of resources based on adopting and learning to use a common software platform (Storyline).

MEMBERS

Michael Aho
San Francisco County

Andrea Banks
Napa County

Marci Castro
Monterey County

Francine Conner
Sonoma County

Bart Ellison
San Francisco County

Nya Flores
Napa County

Jennifer Kaley
Santa Cruz County

Luenna Kim
San Francisco County

Linda Martinez
Santa Clara County

Irina Mass
San Francisco County

Maria Panesi Guerra
Alameda County

Denise Robinson
Alameda County

Larry Sanchez
Alameda County

Marie Sanders
Santa Clara County

Mary Shean
Alameda County

Clarisa Simon
San Mateo County

Dawn Sparks
San Mateo County

Andrew Stewart
Santa Cruz County

Desi Tafoya
San Mateo County

Shelly Todd
Napa County

Katrina Williams
Santa Clara County

Mickey Williams
Contra Costa County

Iliana Rodriguez
San Mateo County
BASSC Liaison

BASSC BAY AREA WELFARE TO WORK COMMITTEE

Launched in the midst of Welfare Reform implementation during the late 1990s, the focus of this Think Tank has been on implementing the CalWORKs program. In recent years, the focus has been on subsidized employment, workforce participation rates, workforce development programs, and family stabilization.

In collaboration with the BASSC Research Response Team, numerous reports have been developed including a book on Changing Welfare Services: Case Studies of Local Welfare Reform Programs emerging out of the early years of incentive funding for caseload reduction and innovative practices in Bay Area counties.

MEMBERS

Sherry Alderman
Sonoma County

Emily Balli
Santa Cruz County

Tracey Belton
San Benito County

Rebecca Darnell
Contra Costa County

Andrea Ford
Alameda County

Lynn Perez
Napa County

Rafaela Perez
Santa Clara County

Angela Shing
Solano County

Noelle Simmons
San Francisco County

Angela Struckmann
Marin County

Wendy Therrian
Contra Costa County

Jennifer Valencia
San Mateo County

Barbara Verba
Monterey County

Lorraine Wilson
Marin County

Elliott Robinson
Monterey County
BASSC Liaison

BASSC BAY AREA ADULT AND AGING COMMITTEE

The BASSC Bay Area Adult and Aging Committee launched in 1999 focuses its Think Tank discussions on policies and values related to improving adult and aging services. The core values include fostering consumer choice and independence, integrating service systems, and promoting cost benefits within a flexible service system to support consumer independence. Its first major BASSC report, *Riding the Wave* (2000) provided a foundation for exploring current policy issues. Over the past several years, the

focus of discussion has been on the policy issues related to In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS). IHSS and long-term care (LTC) policies and programs for low-income noninstitutionalized LTC populations.

In collaboration with the BASSC Research Response Team, several reports were developed related to elder abuse prevention (2002), risk assessment in adult protective services (2009), and long-term care policy (2010).

MEMBERS

Kris Brown
Napa County

Joyce Goodwin
Solano County

Diana Jimenez
Monterey County

Diane Kaljian
Sonoma County

Lisa Mancini
San Mateo County

Mike McConnell
Santa Cruz County

Randy Morris
Alameda County

Jill Nielsen
San Francisco County

Lee Pullen
Marin County

James Ramoni
Santa Clara County

Victoria Tolbert
Contra Costa County

Howard Himes
Napa County
BASSC Liaison

BASSC BAY AREA REGIONAL CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE

Since 1990, the Bay Area Regional Children's Services Committee has been meeting as a regional subcommittee of the County Welfare Directors Association Children's Services Committee and a committee of the Bay Area Social Services Consortium to share program expertise and contribute to the development and implementation of Child Welfare Services policies and programs to improve the lives of vulnerable children throughout the Bay Area and California.

Over the past 2+ decades, discussions of the Bay Area Committee included the challenges facing foster family agency programs, Inter-county Protocol for the coordination of services to families who migrate throughout our region, and collaboration with the BASSC Research Response Team to improve Child Welfare practices. This collaboration included the study of the education of foster

youth (2001), promising Bay Area child welfare practices (2002), and the Child Welfare and the Courts Project (2002). Subsequent collaboration involved the publication (2008) of structured literature reviews (disproportionality, risk assessment, family assessment, child/youth well-being assessment, measuring outcomes, parent education programs, substance abuse treatment programs), national performance indicators project (2013) (preventing the recurrence of maltreatment, achieving timely reunification, preventing re-entry to foster care, achieving timely adoption, achieving exits to permanency for children in long term care, achieving placement stability, using performance measures to manage child welfare outcomes), and the case record data-mining project (2017).

MEMBERS

Maria Corona
San Benito County

Aaron Crutison
Solano County

Sylvia Deporto
San Francisco County

Rebecca Feiner
Napa County

Nick Honey
Sonoma County

Francesca LeRúe
Santa Clara County

Michelle Love
Alameda County

Kathy Marsh
Contra Costa County

Lori Medina
Monterey County

Joan Miller
Santa Cruz County

Deborah Moss
Marin County

Lori Cox
Alameda County
BASSC Liaison

BASSC BAY AREA ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mission

Launched in 2014 under the leadership of Daniel Kaplan (SF Human Services Department), colleagues in the area of finance and administration were invited to form a Think Tank of issues shared by the counties. Using centrally-located bi-monthly meetings members have the opportunity to raise issues of common concern as well as present concerns to invite peer consultation and advice.

The following are among the topics that helped to launch the committee and continue to provide a framework for discussion:

- The IHSS MOU
- ACA Financial Challenges
- Forecasting Methodologies
- Administrative Revenue Simulation Methodologies
- Benefits/Risks of the IV-E Waiver
- Realignment Revenue Management/Forecasting
- Information Technology Strategic Planning
- The Roles of Finance in CCP, IHSS Negotiations and other groups/functions
- Revenue Leveraging/Maximization Strategies
- MediCAL Administrative Budget Methodology

MEMBERS

Jacinta Arteaga San Mateo County	Girlye Jarumay Solano County	Mike Roetzer Contra Costa County
Daniel Crick Santa Clara County	Daniel Kaplan San Francisco County	Sharen Smithcamp Santa Cruz County
Becky Cromer Monterey County	Tess Lapira Solano County	Carl Vanden Heuvel Sonoma County
Emilia Gabriele Contra Costa County	Cynthia Larca San Benito County	Julia Wyman Santa Clara County
Rose Hardcastle Napa County	Maureen Lewis Marin County	Trent Rhorer San Francisco County BASSC Liaison
Gayle Hermann Alameda County	Melissa Mairose Monterey County	
Joseph Huang San Francisco County	Robert Manchia San Mateo County	

BASSC BAY AREA RESEARCH, PLANNING AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Launched in 2012 under the leadership of Dan Kelly (SF) and Jim Cunniff (Alameda), this BASSC think tank and support group engages in bi-monthly meetings to explore areas of common interest. One of the most valuable aspects of these meetings is the check-in, hearing from other counties about what they are involved in, getting new ideas, asking questions, and sharing information. The range of

topics in the early days of the committee included: 1) Performance based contracting and the use of longitudinal data sets (CW), 2) Public Housing and the use of vouchers for homeless families coming into the child welfare system, 3) Supportin leadership changes related to different divisions in the department (CW, CalWORKS, Adult/Aging).

MEMBERS

Anissa Basoco-Villarreal
Alameda County

Ben Bunyi
Napa County

Oscar Chavez
Sonoma County

David Dubrowski
Santa Cruz County

Randolph Hudson
Contra Costa County

Dan Kelly
San Francisco County

Bridgette Lery
San Francisco County

Devorah Levine
Contra Costa County

George Malachowski
Sonoma County

Robbie Matheson
Solano County

Madeline Noya
Santa Cruz County

Karl Porter
Napa County

Ana Rasquiza
Marin County

Gina Sessions
Santa Clara County

Catherine Vu
Santa Clara County

Trent Rhorer
San Francisco County
BASSC Liaison

BASSC BAY AREA ACADEMY TRAINING ADVISORY BOARD (TAB)

The Bay Area Academy offers training courses, conferences, coaching, implementation support, technical assistance and consultation services to public child welfare and adult services in the greater San Francisco Bay Area social service

community. Funded through state and local partnerships, the Bay Area Academy promotes safety, permanency, well being and whole person care in public social services.

Michelle Love Alameda	Chelsea Stoner Napa	Olisha Hodges San Mateo
Robin Lockett Alameda	Becky Feiner Napa	Linda Martinez Santa Clara
Larry Sanchez Alameda	Maria Sabeih Napa	Francesca LeRúe Santa Clara
Mary Shean Alameda	Julieanna Avera San Benito	Marie Sanders Santa Clara
Svetlana Lesova Alameda	Maria Corona San Benito	Mary Bergman Santa Cruz
Vicky Quinto Contra Costa	Shyloh Stearns San Benito	Andrew Stewart Santa Cruz
Kathy Marsh Contra Costa	Jackie Credico San Benito	Aaron Crutison Solano
Marcy Williamson Contra Costa	Brad Dawson San Benito	Debbie Powell Solano
Bree Marchman Marin	Sylvia Deporto San Francisco	Rhonda Smith Solano
Maria Affinito Marin	Melissa Connelly San Francisco	Nick Honey Sonoma
Deborah Moss Marin	Penny Kumta San Francisco	Francine Conner Sonoma
Lori Medina Monterey	Loc Nguyen San Mateo	Jo McKay Sonoma
Alice White Monterey	Donna Woher San Mateo	Kathy Gallagher and Howard Himes BASSC Liaisons

BASSC RESEARCH RESPONSE TEAM

The BASSC Research Response Team, housed in the Center for Social Services Research at the University of California School of Social Welfare was established in 1995 to respond rapidly to the emerging research needs of Bay Area county social service agencies for current information about their changing environments. Exploratory research projects are undertaken in close collaboration with agency administrators and program staff and include structured literature reviews, large scale surveys, case studies and case record data-mining. Research projects completed over the past several decades are listed below.

ADULTS & AGING

- Lehning, A. & Austin, M.J. (2010). Long-term care in the United States: Policy themes and promising practices. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 53(1), 43-63.
- Anthony, E.K., Lehning, A.J., Peck, M.D. & Austin, M.J. (2009). Assessing elder mistreatment: Instrument development and implications for Adult Protective Services. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 52(8), 815-836.
- Austin, M.J., Malks, B. & Schmidt, C. (2002). Elder abuse prevention program: A case study of the Santa Clara county financial abuse specialist team (FAST). *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 13(3), 23-40.

CHILD WELFARE

- Henry, C., Carnochan, S. & Austin, M.J. (2017) Using qualitative data-mining for practice-based research in child welfare. *Child Welfare*, 93(6), 7-25.
- Carnochan, S., Samples, M., Lawson, J. & Austin, M.J. (2013). The context of child welfare performance measures. *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 10(3), 147-160.
- Carnochan, S., Rizik-Baer, D., & Lawson, J. & Austin, M.J. (2013). Preventing the recurrence of maltreatment. *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 10(3), 168-178.
- Carnochan, S., Lee, C., Lawson, J., & Austin, M.J. (2013). Achieving timely reunification. *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 10(3), 179-195.
- Carnochan, S., Rizik-Baer, D., Lawson, J. & Austin, M.J. (2013). Preventing re-entry to foster care. *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 10(3), 196-209.

- Carnochan, S., Moore, M. & Austin, M.J. (2013). Achieving timely adoption. *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 10(3), 210-219.
- Carnochan, S., Lee, C., Lawson, J. & Austin, M.J. (2013). Achieving exits to permanency for children in long term care. *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 10(3), 220-234.
- Carnochan, S., Moore, M. & Lawson, J. & Austin, M.J. (2013). Achieving placement stability: *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 10(3), 235-253.
- Samples, M., Carnochan, S. & Austin, M.J. (2013). Using performance measures to manage child welfare outcomes: Local strategies and decision-making. *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 10(3), 254-264
- Anthony, E.K., King, B., & Austin, M.J. (2011). Reducing child poverty by promoting child well-being: Identifying best practices in a time of great need. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(10), 1999-2009.
- Anthony, E.K., Cormier, D.R., & Austin, M.J. (2010). Early detection of drug and alcohol abuse in pregnant mothers: Implications for child welfare practice. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 32(1), 6-12.
- Anthony, E., Samples, M., de Kervor, D. N., Ituarte, S., Lee, C. & Austin, M.J. (2010) Coming back home: The reintegration of formerly incarcerated youth with service implications. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 32(10), 1271-1277.
- Kimberlin, S., Anthony, E.K. & Austin, M.J. (2009). Re-entering foster care: Trends, evidence and implications. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(4), 471-481.
- Lemon, K., D'Andrade, A. & Austin, M.J. (2008). Understanding and addressing racial/ethnic disproportionality in the front end of the child welfare system. Special Issue, *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 5(1/2), 9-30.
- D'Andrade, A., Benton, A. & Austin, M.J. (2008). Risk and safety assessment in child welfare: Instrument comparisons. Special Issue, *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 5(1/2), 31-56.

- D'Andrade, A., Lemon Osterling, K. & Austin, M.J. (2008). Understanding and measuring child welfare outcomes. Special Issue, *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 5(1/2), 135-156.
- Lemon Osterling, K. & Austin, M.J. (2008). Substance abuse interventions for parents involved in the child welfare system: Evidence and implications. Special Issue, *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 5(1/2), 157-189.
- Johnson, M.A., Stone, S., Lou, C., Ling, J., Claassen, J. & Austin, M.J. (2008). Assessing parent education programs for families involved with child welfare services: Evidence and implications. Special Issue, *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 5(1/2), 191-236.
- Johnson, M.A., Stone, S., Lou, C. & Austin, M.J. (2008). Family assessment in child welfare: Instrument comparisons. Special Issue, *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 5(1/2), 57-90.
- Lou, C., Anthony, E., Stone, S., Vu, C. & Austin, M.J. (2008). Assessing child and youth well-being: Implications for child welfare practice. Special Issue, *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 5(1/2), 91-133.
- Han, M., Carnochan, S. & Austin, M.J. (2007). The challenges to promoting collaboration between child protection services workers and court professionals: An exploratory study of case records. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 1(3), 115-131.
- Stone, S., D'Andrade, A. & Austin, M.J. (2006). Educational services for children in foster care: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 1(1), 53-70.
- Prince, M.J. (2005). Inter-agency collaboration in child welfare and child mental health systems. *Social Work in Mental Health*, 4(1), 1-15.
- Carnochan, S., Taylor, S., Abramson-Madden, A., Han, M., Rashid, S., Maney, J., Teuwen, S., & Austin, M.J. (2002). Child welfare and the courts: An exploratory study of the relationship between two complex systems. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 1(1), 117-136.
- WELFARE TO WORK SERVICES**
- Taylor, S., Carnochan, S. & Austin, M.J. (2016). Engaging employers as partners in subsidized employment programs. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 43(1), 149-169.
- Carnochan, S., Taylor, S. & Austin, M.J. (2014). Employer-employee relationships in subsidized employment programs: The role of soft skills. *Families in Society*, 95(3)
- Austin, M.J., DeMarco, A. & Chow, J. (2009). Making the transition from welfare to work: Employment experiences of CalWORKs participants in the San Francisco Bay Area. *Journal of Human Behavior and the Social Environment*, 14(1), 414-440.
- Vu, C.M., Anthony, E.K. & Austin, M.J. (2009). Strategies for engaging adults in welfare-to-work activities. *Families in Society*, 90(4), 359-366.
- Austin, M.J., Chow, J., Johnson, M., DeMarco, A. & Ketch, V. (2008). Delivering welfare-to-work services in county social service organizations: An exploratory study of staff perspectives. *Administration in Social Work*, 32(4), 105-126.
- Anthony, E.K., Vu, C.M., & Austin, M.J. (2008). TANF child-only cases: Identifying the characteristics and needs of children living in low-income families. *Journal of Children and Poverty*, 14(1), 1-20.
- Hastings, J, Taylor, S. & Austin, M.J. (2006). The status of low-income families in the post-welfare reform environment: Mapping the relationships between poverty and family. Special Issue, *Health and Social Policy*, 21(1), 33-63.
- Chow, J.C, Johnson, M. & Austin, M.J. (2006). The status of low-income neighborhoods in the post-welfare reform environment: Mapping the relationship between poverty and place. Special Issue, *Health and Social Policy*, 21(1), 1-32.
- Lemon, K. & Austin, M.J. (2006) Promising programs to serve low-income families in poverty neighborhoods. Special Issue, *Health and Social Policy*, 21(1), 65-94.
- Lemon, K. Leer, E. & Austin, M.J. (2006). Promising practices for meeting the multiple needs of low-income families in poverty neighborhoods. Special Issue, *Health and Social Policy*, 21(1), 95-117.
- Johnson, M. Ketch, V. Chow, J.J., & Austin, M.J. (2006). Implementing welfare to work services: A study of staff decision-making. *Families in Society*, 87(3), 317-325.
- Millar, J. & Austin, M.J. (2006). The role of social workers in welfare-to-work programs: International perspectives on policy and practice. *Journal of Policy Practice*, 5(2/3), 149-158.

- Carnochan, S., Ketch, V., DeMarco, D., Taylor, S., Abramson, A. & Austin, M.J. (2005). Assessing the initial impact of welfare reform: A synthesis of research studies (1998-2002). *Social Policy Journal*, 4(1), 3-31.
- Austin, M.J. (2003). The changing relationship between non-profit organizations and public social service agencies in the era of welfare reform. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(1), 97-114.
- Prince, J. & Austin, M.J. (2003). The implications of managed care and welfare reform for the integration of health and welfare services. *Journal of Health and Social Policy*, 18(2), 1-19.
- Austin, M.J. & Carnochan, S. (2002). Implementing welfare reform and guiding organizational change. *Administration in Social Work*, 26(1), 61-77.
- Prince, J. & Austin, M.J. (2001). Innovative programs and practices emerging from the implementation of welfare reform. *Journal of Community Practice*, 9(3), 1-14.
- Svihula, J. & Austin, M.J. (2001). Fostering neighborhood involvement in workforce development: The Alameda County neighborhood jobs pilot initiative. *Journal of Community Practice*, 9(3), 55-72.
- Benton, A. & Austin, M.J. (2010). Managing nonprofit mergers: The challenges facing human service organizations. *Administration in Social Work*, 34(4), 458-479.
- Anthony, E.K., & Austin, M.J. (2008). The role of an intermediary organization in promoting research in schools of social work: The case of the Bay Area Social Services Consortium. *Social Work Research*, 32(4), 287-293.
- Goldberg, S., Cullen, J. & Austin, M.J. (2001). Developing a public information and community relations strategy in a county social service agency. *Administration in Social Work*, 25(2), 61-79.
- DuBrow, A., Wocher, D. & Austin, M.J. (2001). Introducing organizational development (OD) practices into a county human services agency. *Administration in Social Work*, 25(4), 63-83.
- Austin, M.J., Dal Santo, T., Goldberg, S. & Choice, P. (2001). Exploratory research in public social service agencies: An assessment of dissemination and utilization. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 29(4), 59-81.
- Austin, M.J., Martin, M. Carnochan, S., Duerr Berrick, J., Goldberg, S., Kelley, J. and Weiss, B. (1999). Building a comprehensive agency-university partnership: The Bay Area Social Services Consortium. *Journal of Community Practice*, 6(3), 89-106.

HUMAN SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

- Graaf, G., Hengeveld-Bidmon, E., Carnochan, S., Radu, P. & Austin, M.J. (2016). The impact of the Great Recession on county human service organizations: A cross case analysis. *Human Service Organizations*, 40(2), 152-169.
- Radu, P., Carnochan, S. & Austin, M.J. (2015). Obstacles to social service collaboration in response to the great recession: The case of the Contra Costa County Safety Net Initiative. *Journal of Community Practice*, 23(3/4), 323-347.
- Lee, C. & Austin, M.P. (2012). Building organizational supports for knowledge sharing in county social service agencies: Cross-case analysis of works-in-progress. *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 9(1/2), 3-18.
- Kimberlin, S., Schwartz, S. & Austin, M.J. (2011). Growth and resilience of pioneering nonprofit human service organizations: A cross-case analysis of organizational histories. *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 8(1/2), 4-28.

BASSC POLICY ANALYSIS AND ORGANIZATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

Over the past 25 years (1992-2017), BASSC has completed a number of policy development and organizational implementation reports. These documents have been useful in assisting county directors in identifying and acting upon various policy and implementation initiatives.

- 2017 Adult Offender Community Reentry: Policies, Plans, and Programs
- 2017 Low-income Fatherhood: A Review of the Literature with Implications for Practice
- 2017 Exploring Innovation in Public Human Service Organizations: A Cross Case Analysis
- 2017 Service User Involvement in UK Social Service Agencies and Social Work Education – *Journal on Social Work Education*, 53(1)
- 2017 The managerial and relational dimensions of public-nonprofit human service contracting – *Journal of Strategic Contracting and Negotiation*
- 2017 Supporting Evidence-informed Practice in Human Service Organizations: An Exploratory Study of Link Officers – *Human Service Organizations*, 41(1)
- 2017 The Multi-dimensional Nature of Evidence-informed Practice in County Human Service Agencies – *Human Service Organizations*, 41(1)
- 2015 Organizational and individual determinants of practitioner evidence use in public human service Organizations – *Human Service Organizations*, 39(4)
- 2015 Redefining the Bureaucratic Encounter between Service Providers and service users: Evidence from the Norwegian HUSK Projects – *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 12(1)
- 2014 The Organizational Context of Research-minded Practitioners: Challenges and Opportunities – *Research on Social Work Practice*, 25(4)
- 2012 Boundary-crossing careers of senior human service administrators: A cross-case analysis – *Administration in Social Work*, 36(2)
- 2011 Reducing Child Poverty by Promoting Child Well-being: Identifying Best Practices in a Time of Great Need – *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(10)
- 2010 Coming Back Home: The Reintegration of Formerly Incarcerated Youth with Service Implications – *Children and Youth Services Review*, 32(10)
- 2008 The Culturally Responsive Social Service Agency: The Application of an Evolving Definition to a Case study – *Administration in Social Work*, 32(3)
- 2008 Strategies for Transforming Human Service Organizations into Learning Organizations: Evidence-based Practice and the Transfer of Learning – *Journal of Evidence-based Social Work*, 5(3/4)
- 2004 *Changing Welfare Services: Case Studies of Local Welfare Reform Programs* (Haworth Press)
- Implementing Welfare Reform and Guiding Organizational Change
- Overview of Innovative Programs and Practice
- Connections Shuttle: Transportation for CalWORKs Participants
- The Guaranteed Ride Home Program: Transportation Services for Welfare-to-Work Participants
- Training Exempt Providers to Build High-Quality Child Care
- Integrating Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services into a County Welfare-to-Work Program
- Combining Business with Rehabilitation in a Public Work Center for Disabled and Low-Income Participants
- The Family Loan Program as a Public-Private Partnership
- The Adopt-a-Family Program: Building Networks of Support
- Utilizing Hotline Services to Sustain Employment
- Hiring TANF Recipients to Work in a County Human Services Agency
- Promoting Self-Sufficiency through Individual Development Accounts (IDAs)

Fostering Neighborhood Involvement in Workforce Development		Crossover Services between Child Welfare and Welfare-to-Work Programs
Neighborhood Self-Sufficiency Centers	2003	The Implications of Managed Care and Welfare Reform for the Integration of Health and Welfare Services – <i>Journal of Health and Social Policy</i> , 18(2)
A Community Partnership Approach To Serving the Homeless		
Wraparound Services for Homeless TANF Families Recovering from Substance Abuse	2001	A Comparative Analysis of Prop 10 Strategic Plans Developed by Ten Bay Area Counties
Building a Coalition of Non-Profit Agencies to Collaborate with a County Health and Human Services Agency	2001	Step by Step: Building the Infrastructure for Transforming Public Social Service Agencies into Learning Organizations
Collaborative Partnerships Between a Human Services Agency and Local Community Colleges	2001	Aging Out of Foster Care: What Do We Know about Helping to Emancipate Youth and the Independent Living Programs in the Bay Area
Introducing Organizational Development (OD) Practices in a County Human Services Agency	1999	Overview of Affordable Housing Issues in Relationship to Welfare Reform
Preparing Human Service Workers to Implement Welfare Reform: Establishing the Family Development Credential in a Human Services Agency	1999	Overview of Transportation Issues in Relationship to Welfare Reform
Merging a Workforce Investment Board and a Department of Social Services into a County Department of Employment and Human Services	1999	Overview of Issues Related to Ups and Downs in the Business Cycle Affecting Current and Former Welfare Recipients
Blending Multiple Funding Streams into County Welfare-to-Work Programs		

BASSC EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN THE HUMAN SERVICES

The Executive Development Program in the Human Services, completing its 24th year in 2017 with over 700 graduates, is a successful collaboration between the Bay Area Social Service Consortium (BASSC), the UC Berkeley School of Social Welfare, and UC Berkeley Extension. It is designed to meet the challenges of a changing organizational environment and develop strategies to better serve client and community needs. Upper level managers from Bay Area Social Services Departments are selected by top management to participate in this innovative training program that received the “Best Program in the Professions Award” by the University Continuing Education Association in 1999.

The Executive Development Program is presented in three one-week modules over the academic year. The major issues covered include:

MODULE ONE

On Leadership and Organizational Context

- Client-Centered Administration
- Historical and Policy Overview of Human Services
- Legislative Issues and Political Context
- Working with CBOs and Unions
- Peer Learning, Coaching and Support
- Leadership Development

MODULE TWO

On Core Knowledge and Skills

- Presentation Skills (workshop)
- Creating a Learning Organization
- Public Relations
- Personnel Issues
- Information Technology
- State and County Budgeting Process

MODULE THREE

On the Integration of Learning and Practice

- Case Presentations
- Strategic Planning
- Serving Diverse Populations
- Community Organization and Outreach
- Thinking Like a Senior Manager
- Critical Issues on the Horizon

A 15 day internship project and case study—which stimulates collaborative exchanges of information and creative learning opportunities across participating counties—is scheduled between Modules Two and Three. The case studies are published each year as a Participants’ Casebook.

Funding is provided by the individual counties as well as federal Title IVe grant funds through the California Social Work Education Consortium (CalSWEC) that supports participants working in the area of child welfare.

Andrea DuBrow MSW, MPH serves as the Program Coordinator, and Stan Weisner, Ph.D. as Program Director. Professor Michael Austin serves as the lead faculty advisor and teaches in the program along with other UC Berkeley School of Social Welfare faculty, Bay Area Social Service Department Directors, and outside consultants.

EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM GRADUATES

ALAMEDA

1994-1995

Carol Collins
Chris Czaplá
Barbara Hedani-Morishita
Jill L'Esperance
Mario Solis

1995-1996

Patti Castro
Gana Eason
Rita Hayes
Linda Kretz
Elliott Robinson

1996-1997

Tom Clancy
Marilyn Ghiorso
Will Johnson
Joyce Richardson
Erika Shore
John Tran

1997-1998

Emmie Hill
Brendan Leung
Patsy Pinkney Phillips
Kenneth Shaw, Jr.
Stewart Smith
Laura Valdivia

1998-1999

Melissa Lim Brodowski
Pauline Keogh
Sylvia Myles
Kris Perry
Joe Rodrigues
Mark Woo

1999-2000

Lynn Brooks
Sherri Brooks
Neola Brown
Tamarra Brown
Frank A. Robertson
Susan Schorr
Glenn Wallace

2000-2001

Don Edwards
Dorothy Galloway
Amada Robles
Rosemary Salters

2001-2002

Diana D. Cruz
Carl Pascuals
Renee D. Sims
Augustus Yiu

2002-2003

Dorothy Hicks
Ada Lillie
Sandy Stier

2003-2004

Hannia Casaw
Jim Damian
Teri Donnelly
Robin Lockett
Mary Packard Miller

2004-2005

Yolanda Baldovinos
Saundra Barnes
Dora Fisher
Jon Pettigrew

2005-2006

Irene Chavez
Andrea Ford
Victoria Tolbert

2006-2007

Lisa Lahowe
Connie Linas
Marsha Rice
Cynthia (Cindy) Rinker
Lea Spencer

2007-2008

Faith Battles
Rhonda Boykin
Lorena Briseno
Millicent Miles
Amy Thompson

2008-2009

Jim Cunniff
Maria Panesi Guerra
Michelle Love
Julia Martinez
Marcella Velasquez

2009-2010

Paul Kim
Randy Morris
Lula Parker
Fina Perez
Denise Robinson

2010-2011

Rosa Beaver
Renaye Johnson
Robyn Scott
Huong Tran

2011-2012

Antionette Burns
Dana Castillo
Sonya Frost Fenceroy
Shress Moten
Tracy Murray
Beverly Warren

2012-2013

LaTrelle Martin
LaTonya Phillips
Jennifer Uldricks
Elizabeth Verduzco

2013-2014

Kathy Chen
Saundra Pearson
Laura Schroeder

2014-2015

Joanne Cattaneo
Kouichoy Saechao
Detra Teal

2015-2016

Lauren Baranco
Regina Dean
Michelle Key
Vivien Xia

CONTRA COSTA

1994-1995

Stefanie Guynn
John Lee
Ralph McGee
Bill Weidinger

1995-1996

Sharon Bacon
Shirley Kalinowski
Bob Sessler

1996-1997

Charles Couch
Jewel Mansapit
Christina Moore-Linville
Ken O'Day

1997-1998

Christine Gallagher
Steve Peavler
Pamela Phillips
Lois Rutten

1998-1999

Pat Herrera
Jennifer Jody Rellar
Joe Stoddard
Paul Ward

1999-2000

Debi Moss
Beverly Wright
John Zimmerman

2000-2001

Carl Dudley
Lori Larks
Eloise Sotelo
Tonya Spencer

2001-2002

Dennis Bozanich
Paul Buddenhagen
Denise Carey
Donna Thoreson

2002-2003

Karen Bridges

Mitchell Martinez
Toni Nestore

2003-2004

Neely McElroy
Vincent Odusanya
Patricia Perkins

2004-2005

Ralph Alvarado
Valerie Chatman
Kathy Marsh

2005-2006

Hollidayle Hertweck
Denise Reynolds
Valerie Stewart

2006-2007

Christine Craver
Eric Cho
Peggy Henderson
Nhang Luong
James Paulsen
Patricia Wyrick
Ralph L. White

2007-2008

Dan Abrami
Stephen Baiter
Sena Perrier-Morris
Amy Rogers
Ron Stewart

2008-2009

Terrie Adams
Jagit Bhambra
Scott Danielson
Magdalene Gabel

2009-2010

Donlon William Adamich
Patricia Crain
Joan Miller
Matthew Welch

2010-2011

Richard Bell
David Eisenlohr
Roxane Foster
Eric Pormento
Jan Watson

2011-2012

Rebecca Darnell
Renee Giometti
Anna Pineda-Martinez
Anne Struthers

2012-2013

Rosalyn Guillory
Lawrence Jones
Ken Kinard
Kristina Miller
Joanne Sanchez-Rosa
Rhonda Smith

2013-2014

Barbie Guardino
Lori Juarez
Christina Reich
Leilani Scharff-Lunch
Kelli Zenn

2014-2015

Susan Bain
Nancy Hager
Lindsay Kennedy
Cecilia A. C. Merchan
Michael A. Roark
Hannah Slade

2015-2016

Kenya Campbell
Blanca Hanley
Jennifer Klein
Natasha Paddock

MARIN**2001-2002**

Elinor J. Marcelous
Heather Ravani

2003-2004

Marty Graff
Paula Robertson

2004-2005

Alva Ackley

2005-2006

Chua Chao

2007-2008

Julie Lenhardt

Lee Pullen

2008-2009

Kari Beuerman
Racy Ming

2009-2010

Carlos O. González

2010-2011

Ana Bagtas

2011-2012

Lupe Reyna-Coffin
Paula Glodowski-Valla
James Villella

2012-2013

Andrea Bizzell
Angela Struckmann

2013-2014

La Valda Marshall

2014-2015

Mark Vanderscoff

2015-2016

Bree Marchman
Therese Prior

MONTEREY**1997-1998**

Helen Shaw
Robert Taniguchi

1998-1999

Sue Appel
Henry Espinosa

1999-2000

Priscilla McPherson
Barbara Verba

2000-2001

Cindy Cassinelli
Anne Herendeen

2001-2002

Mary Goblirsch
Cheryl A. Pirozzoli

2002-2003

Christine Lerable
Kim Petty

2003-2004

Susan Reid

2004-2005

Diana Jimenez

2005-2006

Margaret Huffman
Sam Trevino

2006-2007

Ron Mortenson
Marilyn Remark

2007-2008

Rosemarie DeFranco
Margarita Zarraga

2013-2014

Marcie Castro
Emily Nicholl

2014-2015

Jerry Kulper
Lauren Miller

2015-2016

Melissa A. Mairose
Virginia Pierce

NAPA**1994-1995**

Joan Luzney
Teresa Zimny

1996-1997

Denise Traina

1997-1998

Nancy Forrest
Roger Humble

2003-2004

Rebecca Feiner
Darlene Washburn

2010-2011

Kris K. Brown

2013-2014

Ben Guerrieri
Sarah Hayes
Akon Walker

2014-2015

Kristin James-Bowe
Jennifer Marcelli
Alli Muller
Adriana Navarro

2015-2016

Andrea Banks
Rocío Canchola-Parra
Jennifer Swift

SAN FRANCISCO**1994-1995**

Jimmy Gilyard
Dolores Heaven
Wanda Jung
Leo O'Farrell
Liz Strand

1995-1996

Jim Buick
Mary Counihan
Johnny Jefferson
Sylvia Segovia
Rosana Soriano

1996-1997

Michele Antoinette Byrd
Tom Conrow
Maggie Donahue
Julie Murray Brenman

1997-1998

Tracy Harrison Burris
Peter Dahlin
Ralph Escoriaza
Christiane Medina
Kim Stepney
John Tsutakawa

1998-1999

Helene Cohen
Liz Crudo
Gladys Escoriaza
Magaly Fernandez
Ellen Jane Gould
Sophia Isom

1999-2000

Eugene Freeman
Dariush Kayhan

Daniel Kim
Jana Rickerson
Megan Rosenberg

2000-2001

Janice Anderson-Santos
Susan Arding
Teresa Kirson
Aregawie Yosef

2001-2002

Diana Christensen
Maria Gonzales
James Whelly

2002-2003

Bill Beiersdorfer
Deborah Goldstein
Leo Levenson
Tony Lugo
Cindy Ward

2003-2004

Ylonda Calloway
Larry Chatmon
Christiane Medina
John Murray
Jeanne Zarka

2004-2005

Nancy Bliss
Derek Chu
Joyce Crum
Kimberly O'Young
Florence Hays

2005-2006

Mary Adrian
Stephanie Coram
Robert Hays
Edward (Ron) Patton
Leo Saucedo
Mario Navarro-Sunol

2006-2007

Jose Mejia
Ana Osegueda
Noel Panelo
Brian Reems
Scott Walton
Hugh Wang

2007-2008

Denise Cheung
Bart Ellison
Renee Grevenberg
Brenda McGregor
Helga Zimmerer

2008-2009

Taninha Ferreira
Ronda Johnson
Edlyn Kloefkorn
N. Michelle Lewis
Ria I. Mercado

2009-2010

Michelle Berry
Josef Bruckback
Heather KL Davis
Candace Gray
Penny Kumta
Kean Tan

2010-2011

Terri Austin
Gregory Kats
Luenna Kim
Angela Ramos
Patricia Rudden
Nicolas P. Stathakos

2011-2012

Eileen Cavan
Margarita Gallo
Christina Iwasaki
Patricia Torres
Carrie Wong

2012-2013

Shane Balanon
Susie Lau
Bernadette Santos
Bertina Tan
Tiana Wertheim

2013-2014

Viktoriya Dostal
Jonelle Fournet-Collazos
Elizabeth Harris
Jill Nielsen
Edgardo Pagaduan

2014-2015

Jason Adamek
James Choi
Veronica Moran-Diaz
Celia Pedroza
Debra Solomon

2015-2016

Emily Gerth Gibbs
juliet Halverson
Rebecca Needens
Sandra Teixeira

SAN MATEO**1994-1995**

Paula Lee Hekimian
Sher Huss
Madelyn Martin
Becky Thurston

1995-1996

Susan Brooks
Jamie Buckmaster
Judith Davila
Betsy ZoBell

1996-1997

Elsa Dawson
Len Kruszecki
Phil Naylor
Theresa Rude

1997-1998

Roberta Deis
Robert Schwab

1998-1999

Linda Holman
Jeanette Ward
Donna Wochoer

1999-2000

Gary Beasley
Michael Katrichak
Micky Leung
Patrick Morrisey

2000-2001

Aaron Crutison
Jennie Loft
Debra Samples

Selina Toy

2001-2002

Ursula Bischoff
Kristin Cornuelle
Beverly Dekker-Davidson
Dennis Myers

2002-2003

Barbara Joos
Toan S. Le
Jerry Lindner
Laura Martell
James V. Miller

2003-2004

Elaine Azzopardi
Lorena Gonzalez
Richard Holman
Robert Machia

2004-2005

Ellen Bucci
Carmen O'Keefe
Fred Slone
Clarisa Simon Soriano
Shannon Speak

2005-2006

Pali Basi
Amy Kaiser
Matthew Radisch
Jenell Thompson

2006-2007

Clara Boyden
Emma Gonzalez
Stefan Luesse
Lorna Strachan
Arcel Vasquez
Amy Yun

2007-2008

Lenita Ellis
Marnita Garcia-Fulle
Marissa King
Pravin Patel
Margaret Wong

2008-2009

Sofia Gomez
Amanda Kim

Eduardo Kiryzun
Kenneth Kong
Karyn McElroy

2009-2010

Amabel Baxley
Susan Naylor
Carlos Smith

2010-2011

Doris V. Hinton
Jennifer Rogers
Desi A. Tafoya

2011-2012

Bill Harven
Kimberly Pearson
Sherri Rosenberg
Mark Skubik

2012-2013

Rex Andrea
Natasha Bourbonnais
Edwin Chan

2013-2014

John Fong
Freda Cobb
Sonya Morrison
Deborah Patten
Michele Tom

2014-2015

Mieke Bryant
Tammy Chan
Darla Nicholson
Nancy Rodriguez

2015-2016

Ayse Dogan
Almera E. Milanés

SANTA CLARA

1994-1995

Raul Aldana
Celia Anderson
Noemi Baiza
Sheila Jorden
Gil Villagran
Zonia Sandoval Waldon

1995-1996

Mary Chaboya
Sharon Gilson
Betty Malks
Margie Martinez
Frances Munroe

1996-1997

Joe Andrade
Susan Chestnut
Patrick Garcia
Lorraine Gonzales Moore
Jim Ramoni
Gwen Westphal

1997-1998

Maria Elena Delgado
Jorge Gonzalez
Nellie Jorge
Jim Lockwood

1998-1999

Lisle Smith Cohen
Lynette Harrisson
Les Lindop
Fernando Valcarcel

1999-2000

John Bordman
Judy Bushey
Debra Dake
Prabhkar Isaac
Quyen Nguyen

2000-2001

Julie Aragon
Michael Bobadilla
Diana Kalcic
Connie Vega

2001-2002

Cynthia Burnett
Mary Cardenas
Ellen Edelstein
Victoria Fedor-Thurman
Lydia Mendoza
Nhat Nguyen

2002-2003

Tracy Bowers
Patty Carrillo
Deborah Hinton-Kondo

Jeff Lewis
Jan Panell
Roger Sanchez

2003-2004

Laura Cunningham
Mary Grimm
Stanley Lee
Frank Motta
Katherine Sanchez

2004-2005

Agustin Gomez
Phaivanh Khovong
Beth McGhee
Jonathan Weinberg

2005-2006

Dana McQuary
Yvonne Moore
Adesh Siddhu
Gerardo Silva
Daniel Vo

2006-2007

Cindie Ambar
Sunny Burgan
Wendy Kinnear-Rausch
Valerie Smith
Rafaela Perez

2007-2008

Felipa Carrillo
Barbara Herlihy
Terri Possley
Roxanne Stephens
Miday Tovar

2008-2009

Nicole Huff
Renee Paquier
Robert Sacasa
Cilla Shaffar
Emily Tjhin

2009-2010

Guillermo Caceres
Meheret Sellassie
Kathleen Stahr

2010-2011

Martha Huettl

Sylvia Jefferson
 Mark Lapid
 Don Long
 Verónica Q. Moreno
 Carlotta Royal
 Patricia Sun

2011-2012

Leon Bassett Jr.
 Jennifer Hubbs
 Rosario Portillo

2012-2013

Gilbert Murillo
 Marie Sanders

2013-2014

Leslie Griffith
 Kingston Lum
 Welmin Militante
 Larry Merkur
 Lily Vasquez
 Irina Zhuravleva

2014-2015

Minerva Beltran-Gonzalez
 Arturo Garcia
 Deepka Jackie Howe
 Martha Jacquez
 Ana Labrador

2015-2016

Delfina Morris
 Byron Myers
 Idelle Villarreal-Pickering
 Katrina Williams

SANTA CRUZ

1994-1995

Judy Schwartz

1995-1996

Ellen Timberlake

1996-1997

Francie Newfield

1997-1998

Cheryl Bentley
 Mark Holguin

1998-1999

Gary McNeil
 Maryanne Rehberg

1999-2000

Melissa Delgadillo
 Claudine Wildman

2000-2001

Trevor Davis
 Susan Gilchrist

2001-2002

Rick Allemandi
 Angelica F. Glass

2002-2003

Kelli Kopeck

2003-2004

Nancy Virostko

2004-2005

Melissa King

2005-2006

Gail Goudreau
 Cathy Groh
 Gidget Ramirez

2006-2007

Terri German
 Julia Sheehan
 Abby Wexler

2007-2008

Kathryn Maurer
 Nancy Williams

2008-2009

James Dyer
 Raven Harris

2009-2010

David Brown
 Sherra Clinton

2010-2011

Emily Balli
 Mary Greenham

2011-2012

Karina Aragon
 Stephanie Vikati

2012-2013

Sandy Skezas

2013-2014

Sharon Fox

2014-2015

Micki Coca Buss
 Leslie Goodfriend
 Kimberly Petersen
 Andrew Stewart

2015-2016

Alfredo Ramirez

SOLANO

2004-2005

Jacquelyn Butcher-Rankin

2011-2012

Natasha Hamilton
 Brandi Moore

2015-2016

Kelley Curtis
 Joyce A. Goodwin

SONOMA

1994-1995

Katherine Kennedy

1995-1996

Margaret Ahern
 Mary Ann Swanson

1998-1999

Karen Fies
 Diane Kaljian
 Debbie Kelly
 Maureen Lewis

1999-2000

Marion Deeds
 Ray Leonard
 Roy Redlich

2000-2001

Sherry Alderman
 Mimi Rudin

2001-2002

Linda Clifford
 Nick Honey

Kim Seamans

2002-2003

Diane Madrigal
 Van Guilder
 Alfredo Perez
 Al Redwine

2003-2004

Tara Smith

2004-2005

Bob Harper
 James Washington
 Kathy Young

2005-2006

Frederick Jones
 Carol Rex

2006-2007

Meg Easter-Dawson
 Stacy Perkins
 Tracy Repp

2007-2008

Mignon Evans
 Gary Fontenot

2008-2009

Katie Greaves
 Tamara Larimore
 Elden McFarland

2009-2010

Karen Price

2010-2011

Peter Barrett
 Francine Conner
 Paul Dunaway
 Debra Van Vleck

2011-2012

Kathleen Alves
 Janelle Aman
 Hope Hamby
 Kiergan Pegg

2012-2013

Patricia Andrews
 Kathy Halloran
 George Malachowski
 Stephanie Sheridan

2013-2014

Oscar Chavez
Steven Czegus
Kishore Jayaswal
Rebecca West
Leslie Winters

2014-2015

Angie Dillon-Shore
Eric H. Glentzer
Jennifer Kaley
Felisa Pinson

2015-2016

Cindy Becerra
Donna Broadbent
Cyndia Cole
John Daugherty
Julie Sabbag-Maskey

HUMAN SERVICES VISION 2020

A TOOL FOR THOUGHT LEADERS AS CATALYSTS FOR CHANGE

THE EVER-CHANGING CONTEXT:

Trends Past and Future

- Complexity of managing with fluid public funding
- Use of technology to manage and improve organizational operations
- Need for interaction between human services, health and behavioral health services, and criminal justice services
- Changes in community-agency relations and increased need for inter-agency collaboration
- Need to strengthen agency-university partnership

THE EVOLVING PROCESS:

- Improving the human condition by making the transition from “Doing more with less” to “Doing more differently”

COMMUNITY INITIATIVES

- Promoting community well-being and impact assessment with a focus on child and family well-being as well as adult and aging well-being
- Creating a more holistic and integrated safety net to support self-sufficiency in our geographic pockets of poverty in an effort to reduce poverty across the life span

- Redefining the relationship with community non-profit partner agencies, especially related to service experimentation
- Expanding service integration across sectors (public education, criminal justice, behavioral health, and health care)
- Assessing the impact of the built environment in order to reduce the impact of child poverty (safety, access to healthy food, school supports, etc)

PRACTICE INITIATIVES

- Using measures of service outcomes to promote evidence-informed practice and the ongoing development of learning organizations
- Incorporating the health determinants of social well-being into current social service practices
- Increasing the role of client voice at all levels of organizational decision-making including the use of participatory action research
- Integrating university faculty into agency operations and strengthening fieldwork education and applied research in support of inter-disciplinary and evidence-informed practice
- Using technology (e-learning and dashboards) to expand staff knowledge and skills as a way of serving as local human service policy experts

CHAPTER 3

The Evolving BASSC Vision Statements

MICHAEL J. AUSTIN

In addition to tracing its roots to 1987 when the Bay Area Welfare Directors formed the Bay Area Social Services Consortium (BASSC), the network evolved into a dues-paying partnership between county social service directors, university deans and directors, and foundation representatives. Beginning in 1992, BASSC became a think tank and support group that launched shared projects in the areas of research, training, and policy implementation. One of the first activities involved the development of a vision statement that reflected a shared view of how human services might be reconfigured eight years later in the year 2000. This exercise featured a multi-meeting process that encouraged the participants to engage in visionary thinking using provocative, energizing, and futuristic language. Given the responsibilities of BASSC participants to provide leadership in their respective organizations, the brief vision statement was developed for use in

executive team discussions, community presentations, faculty meetings, and the BASSC Executive Development Program designed to prepare future leaders. The vision statement represented a regional approach to thinking about the future and, for many counties, it complemented their own county strategic plans. The vision statement also provided BASSC members with the opportunity to frame meeting discussions through the use of annual regional goal setting that could be linked to implementing the current vision statement over time.

BASSC Vision: Human Services in 2000

One of the major goals of vision statement development is to step back from the daily pressures of service delivery and policy implementation to take into account the ever-changing context of delivering human services. The reflective process allows for a continuous reaffirmation of a focus on poverty and housing amidst changing client demographics. In addition to the ongoing focus on service users, a similar emphasis includes addressing staffing demands related to diversity, turnover, and organizational restructuring. Beyond the internal focus on organizational life, there is a parallel interest in the ongoing building and maintaining of inter-organizational relationships (across

public sector departments, nonprofit partners, and university partners) based on the shared recognition that “it still takes a village” to meet the needs of vulnerable populations. In addition, all of these daily concerns are compounded by the constant demand to manage expanding and contracting funding sources.

As illustrated in *Figure 1*, the first vision statement featured the articulation of core values that inform both current and future service provision. There was considerable interest in the ideas of building system of neighborhood-based community services to support families in need as well as educate them to access available services and thereby empower them gain self-sufficiency. There was also an early recognition of the importance of evaluating service outcomes while also investing in prevention-oriented services.

This recognition also reflected a strong interest in developing family-focused neighborhood community service centers that honored diversity, engaged in community problem-solving, featured the use of flexible government funding, identified pathways to employment and career development (especially connecting the regional economic marketplace with the human service marketplace of services), and promoted the use of inter-disciplinary service provision for all ages. Prospects for service evaluation included such factors as: impact of changing neighborhoods, breadth and depth of culturally competent services, balancing temporary with long-term family supports, the expanding nature of inter-disciplinary practice, the role of advocacy by public sector organizations, and the linkages between the needs of both low-income and middle-class families.

BASSC Vision for the 21st Century:

SUPPORTING LOW INCOME WORKERS

Based on the first BASSC vision statement (1993), the second vision statement (1999) focused on the new millennium of the 21st century related to supporting low-income

Michael J. Austin, PhD, is Staff Director of BASSC.

FIGURE 1
Human Services 2000: An Evolving Vision Statement (adopted in 1993)

- I. Building a community service system that serves all families in need where neighborhood-based constituencies are both service users and owners of the services by:**
- Serving all people who do not have an intact or strong personal support system (nuclear or extended family to help meet basic needs for survival and growth)
 - Educate consumers to utilize available service supports and empowers them by fostering self-sufficiency
 - Prevention-oriented system where outcomes are measured on the basis of community health and social supports, not by the impact of services on individuals
- II. Specially designed family-focused neighborhood community center**
- People are valued for their individuality and diversity
 - Use of a community approach to problem-solving, not just individually focused
 - Use of “behind the scenes” universal non-categorical government programs that maximize the accumulation of social and financial resources to preserve families
 - All services reflect a commitment to racial and cultural diversity
 - Substantial commitment to the promotion of employment and economic self-sufficiency, along with the provision of role models for working people and youth
 - Comprehensive array of inter-disciplinary services for children, families, adults, and senior citizens.
- III. Core values**
- Collaborative community approach to meeting the needs of individuals and families
 - Professionals and service consumers work together as partners in managing the family-focused neighborhood center
 - Connecting the regional economic marketplace (employment) with the human service marketplace (housing, food, medical care, etc.)
 - Use of tangible outcomes for neighborhood betterment using the following assessment criteria:
 - Community response to changing neighborhood demographics
 - Degree of involvement of extended families in service programs that utilize culturally competent practice
 - Degree to which temporary family supports are complemented by long-term supports,
 - Extent to which professionals work together in inter-disciplinary practice
 - Degree to which neighborhood service systems include advocacy for the total community
 - Extent to which the needs of middle-income families are integrated with those of low-income families.

workers. It featured a set of eight principles designed to guide the development of future practice and policies in the midst of implementing welfare reform that focused more on caseload reduction than addressing broader social problems like poverty. These principles reflected more of a societal focus and featured such macro issues as: 1) targeting economic investments in low-income communities, 2) increasing attention to public-private partnerships that focused on creating healthy families and communities, 3) identifying employment opportunities that contribute to the development of a resilient workforce where skill development keeps pace with the rapidly changing economy, and 4) targeting public policies that increase the income and assets of low

income families by addressing the inequities of the private market.

As illustrated in *Figure 2*, the second vision statement moved beyond the macro focus and called for employment assistance in moving families out of poverty (child care, transportation, housing, and health care). This focus included the implementation of values that featured social inclusiveness, community development, and social investment. This vision called for a new definition of social service practice that reflected a blend of the current responsibilities of assessment, counseling, referral, advocacy, and program development with a new social activism based on an understanding of the work-related values and skills of entry-level employees. In a similar manner, practitioners at the

FIGURE 2
Supporting Low Income Workers in the 21st Century:
An Evolving BASSC Vision Statement (adopted in 1999)

Social Development Approach: Social development focuses on enhancing the capacity of the needy to participate in the economy by targeting investments in specific communities and individuals.

Building Community and Fostering a Civil Society: A civil society recognizes the importance of private, voluntary associations, as well as the ability of government to organize broad initiatives, mobilize resources, and build infrastructure. Social service agencies in a civil society therefore need to work as partners for change in multiple collaborations in order to create healthy families and communities.

Developing a Career Resilient Workforce: Social service agencies have an important role to play in supporting workers and employers in order to ensure that skill development keeps pace with the rapidly changing economy.

Supporting the Family: Social service agencies must seek to help working families to move out of poverty through family-centered investment policies that provide support for child care, transportation, housing, and health care.

Family-Focused, Neighborhood-Based Human Service Systems: Human service systems should be based on values of social inclusiveness, community development, and social investment.

Changing Professional Roles: In order to support workforce development and empower families, agency staff need to blend the current responsibilities of assessment, counseling, referral, advocacy, and program development with a new social activism based on an understanding of the work-related values and skills of entry-level employees.

Social Service Agencies as Catalysts for Private Action: Social service agencies need to expand their roles as catalysts for change in order to ensure that communities do not abandon the neediest families.

Promoting New Public Policy Directions: The unfinished business of welfare reform will require new, more targeted public policies to increase the income and assets of low income families and address the inequities of the private market for those who are working to support their families (e.g. earned income tax credit, child or family allowances, and asset development or micro-investment programs).

administrative and leadership levels of social service organizations needed to expand their roles as catalysts for change in order to ensure that communities did not abandon the neediest families.

BASSC Vision for 2015:

TRANSFORMING HUMAN SERVICES SYSTEMS INTO LEARNING ORGANIZATION NETWORKS

In order to take into account the ongoing complexities of service delivery, the third vision statement (2007) envisioned possible changes in 2015 related to transforming human services systems into networks of learning organizations. It was envisioned that this could be accomplished by revisiting the agency commitments, their enduring values, and current trends impacting the agencies. The commitments included the previously stated service values of self-sufficiency and protections for children and adults, the promotion of healthy environments, and serving as advocates for change in the public and nonprofit sectors. Learning organization networks were defined as capable of promoting knowledge management by gathering information to enhance problem-solving, experimenting, learning

from the past, learning from promising practices, and transferring knowledge through investments in training programs. The enduring values included the commitment to ongoing organizational assessment and renewal, strengthening communities through partnerships, engaging in evidence-informed decision-making and policy development, and empowering those being served who are capable of significant change. And finally, the impact of current trends included the substantial change in the relationship between agencies and community interests (advocacy organizations, businesses, universities, and other human service organizations) and the increased accountability for government funds along with the increased use of technology.

As illustrated in *Figure 3*, the previously noted commitments, values, and trends continued to provide a foundation for identifying a set of three principles for transforming human service agencies into learning organizations. These principles included: 1) making *community-oriented client-centered services* a top priority in order to integrate services and increase client involvement, 2) creating a *supportive organizational culture* to enable staff to focus on client-centered services related to increased involvement in agency

decision-making, collaboration, and teamwork in support of evidence-informed practice, and 3) restructuring agency operations to promote *knowledge sharing and management* in collaboration with universities.

Reflecting upon Works-in-Progress

Each of the four vision statements crafted over a twenty-five year period sought to capture the highlights of discussions carried out by BASSC members seeking to project their thinking into the future. The emerging themes reflect the impact of major pieces of national legislation (Welfare Reform in 1996 and Health Care Reform in 2010) as well as the major changes in the national economy (boom of the 1990s and bust of the Great Recession in 2010). The themes also reflect the impact of emerging technology on communications, public perceptions, and changing federal government priorities. Other emerging themes are more internal to human service organizations in the form of expanding and contracting funding resources, changing priorities of locally elected officials (county boards of supervisors), and the demand for organizational efficiencies emerging from organizational restructuring and job redesign.

In the midst of all this change, each vision statement seeks to define a future state that can address current challenges. While some statements are more visionary than others, they all reflect the considered views and experiences of senior organizational leaders struggling to make sense of current realities while also searching for new directions. This is why all the vision statements represent “works-in-progress”. While the development of Vision Statements in the future will call for new leadership, the rationale for developing these statements include the following:

The value premise for periodically developing a BASSC Vision statement includes:

- thinking about the future using provocative, energizing, and futuristic language,

- developing brief and accessible vision statements for public presentations (Executive Team discussions, Community Presentations, Faculty meetings, BASSC EDP, etc.

- distinguishing the difference between a county strategic plan and a regional BASSC Vision Statement while building upon past vision statements

BASSC Vision 2025:

STRENGTHENED SERVICE DELIVERY PRACTICES AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

The most recently developed BASSC vision statement (2018) returns to a focus on service delivery issues while

significantly expanding a vision of the agency-university partnership as well as the values and principles that guide practice. For example, the service philosophy influenced, in part, by the 2010 Affordable Care Act relates to access to health care and the integration of behavioral health perspectives into social services helps to redefine the process of care; namely, from “whole person care” (health and behavioral health) to “whole family care” (health and social services) to “whole system care” (all aspects of the human services including housing, education, etc.). Each of these elements should become fully defined and operational by 2015. Similarly, the language of service delivery could be redefined within the context of continuing care; namely, moving from the previous service goals of self-sufficiency in welfare to work services and child safety in child welfare services to a major focus on prevention related to sliding into poverty or experiencing child abuse and neglect. Looking across the spectrum of public social services, a new set of core practice principles will be reflected in all service sectors, drawing upon the earlier work on core practice principles in child welfare.

Building upon the service principles are a set of organizational processes that will guide the management of social service agencies. These principles include: 1) balancing the pressure to standardize accountability measures with a growing interest in data-informed service outcomes based on the increased use of technology, 2) increased use of technology, 3) increased attention to enhancing flexibility in the relationships between state-level administrative and legislative leadership and local county policy implementation, 4) creating healthy and thriving workplace cultures that feature the incentives needed to promote staff retention, and 5) new mechanisms for amplifying the voices of service users inside the organization and in the community.

As illustrated in *Figure 4*, the second key element of the 2025 vision statement relates to the partnerships inherent in an intermediary organization like BASSC as it seeks to strengthen the relationships between universities, agencies, and foundations. This three-way partnership features a shared commitment to strengthening the investment in workforce development where staff core competencies are linked to university education competencies that reflect new models for funding and supporting both pre-service and in-service training and education. The shared investment also includes agency-university collaboration in promoting practice-informed curriculum redesign and research in order to prepare future leaders and life-long learners. Similar efforts will be apparent on campus and in the agency with regard

FIGURE 3
Transforming Human Services Systems into Learning Organization Networks:
An Evolving BASSC Vision Statement for 2015 (adopted in 2007)

AGENCY CONTEXT

Agency Commitments

- Improve the health and safety of children, the self-sufficiency of families, and protection of vulnerable adults and the aged in our communities
- Improve our ability to assist people in their efforts to make life better for themselves and their children
- Assist communities to increase their capacity to support families, children and adults in order to enable communities to provide a healthy environment in which their residents can prosper;
- Serve as a catalyst for change in the governmental and non-profit sectors
- Strive to become learning organizations to promote knowledge management by gathering information and problem-solving, experimenting, learning from the past, learning from promising practices, and transferring knowledge.

Agency Enduring Values

- People are capable of significant change when treated with respect and involved in defining their own hopes, dreams and goals;
- Communities can be strengthened through partnership efforts with public and private entities and the shared commitment to measure outcomes over time;
- Public and private agencies are committed to organizational self-assessment and renewal in order to better meet client and community goals
- Social policies and practices are informed by disseminating and utilizing administrative data and evidence from the research community.

Current Trends that Impact the Agency

- **Substantial change in community-agency relations** (based on changing client demographics, increased need for inter-agency collaboration, increased demand for outreach and prevention services, increased involvement of nonprofit partners in service delivery, and the increased impact of advocacy organizations)

- **Increasing accountability for public funds** (due to increased competitive and categorical funding, demand for revenue blending and leveraging, demand for documenting performance outcomes, and to engage in community planning to address changing client needs);
- **Increasing use of technology to manage and improve organizational operations** (based on the increased demand for identifying and using promising practices, the need to retain the workforce and engage in succession planning, the challenges associated with managing the transition of an organizational culture from reactive to more proactive, and the need to assist with capacity building among nonprofit partners)
- **Increasing need to strengthen agency-university partnership related to workforce development and applied research** (based on the need to link program evaluation expertise with the increased demand for service outcome measurement, to monitor and improve the transfer of learning outcomes of pre-service student learning and in-service staff development programs, the need to strengthen the role of agency-based field instruction, and to promote knowledge management related to disseminating and utilizing evidence to inform practice).
- **Increasing interaction with the business community** (based on the need to promote workforce development for welfare-to-work participants as well as children aging out of foster care).
- **Increasing interaction between human services, health and mental services, and criminal justice services** (based on the need to develop a seamless, integrated network of services that reflect the values and commitments of human service agencies).

continued >

to learning and engaging in inter-professional practice. The BASSC research program will serve as one of the primary resources for promoting the development of agency-based knowledge-sharing systems that support evidence-informed practice as well as practice-informed research.

Reflecting upon Works-in-Progress

Each of the four vision statements crafted over a twenty-five year period sought to capture the highlights of discussions carried out by BASSC members seeking to project their thinking into the future. The emerging themes reflect the impact of major pieces of national legislation (Welfare Reform in 1996 and Health Care Reform in 2010) as well as the major changes in the national economy (boom of the 1990s and bust of the Great Recession in 2010). The themes

FIGURE 3 (continued)

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Principle #1: Make *community-oriented client-centered services* a top priority in order to:

- Integrate services across programs using comprehensive screening and evaluation tools;
- Involve clients across generations in developing multi-disciplinary service plans that strengthen families
- Create mechanisms for consumer input, complaints, and feedback.

Principle #2: Create a *supportive organizational culture* to enable staff to focus on client-centered services related to:

- Promoting more participation in agency decision-making
- Promoting team functioning across service programs
- Increasing collaboration with community nonprofit partners
- Engaging in evidence-informed practice.

Principle #3: Restructure agency operations to promote *knowledge sharing and management* in collaboration with universities by:

- *Maximizing IT resources:*
 - track evidence and integrate it into programs and operations (knowledge management);
 - utilize technology and information to increase effectiveness and improve outcomes (continual quality improvement); and

- incorporate research generated by practice and informed by client and community outcome improvements into in-service and pre-service curricula (evidence-informed practitioners).

- *Improving planning processes:*

- develop mechanisms for communicating and educating communities, partners and public officials
- engage in service planning with other county departments including community-based agencies
- enhance financial claiming mechanisms to maximize funding
- establish research priorities to improve practice and service outcomes, including the use of agency-university proposals to foundations.

- *Improving training processes:*

- develop systems for leadership and career development for agency managers and staff
- incorporate evidence-informed practice principles into pre-service and in-service curricula
- evaluate outcomes by capturing the changing nature of practice in infuse pre-service and in-service training programs (especially community-oriented client-centered practice).

also reflect the impact of emerging technology on communications, public perceptions, and changing federal government priorities. Other emerging themes are more internal to human service organizations in the form of expanding and contracting funding resources, changing priorities of locally elected officials (county boards of supervisors), and the demand for organizational efficiencies emerging from organizational restructuring and job redesign.

In the midst of all this change, each vision statement seeks to define a future state that can address current challenges. While some statements are more visionary than others, they all reflect the considered views and experiences of senior organizational leaders struggling to make sense of current realities while also searching for new directions. This is why all the vision statements represent “works-in-progress”. While the development of Vision Statements in the future will call for new leadership, the rationale for developing these statements include the following:

The value premise for periodically developing a BASSC Vision statement includes:

- thinking about the future using provocative, energizing, and *futuristic language*,

- developing *brief and accessible* vision statements for public presentations (Executive Team discussions, Community Presentations, Faculty meetings, BASSC EDP, etc.
- distinguishing the difference between a county strategic plan and a *regional BASSC Vision Statement* while building upon past vision statements
- defining annual regional goals that are linked to implementing the BASSC 2025 Vision over time

A second value premise is to take into account the ever-changing context of delivering human services by:

- reaffirming our *focus on poverty* and housing amidst changing client demographics
- addressing *staffing demands* related to diversity, turnover, and organizational restructuring
- promoting *inter-organizational relationship building/maintenance* (across public sector departments, nonprofit partners, and university partners) – “It still takes a village”
- managing both expanding and contracting *funding sources*.

FIGURE 4
BASSC Vision 2025: Strengthened Service Delivery Practices

SERVICE PRINCIPLES

- Shifting *service philosophy* from “whole person care” to “whole family care” to “whole system care”
- Redefining the *language of service delivery* for continuing care (moving from self-sufficiency or safety to creating access and resources with a focus on prevention and school-linked services)
- Continuing the search for *new ways* to address poverty, housing insecurity, and homelessness
- Integrating *core practice principles* into all forms of current practice

ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESSES

- Balancing *standardization* (accountability measures) with flexibility (innovative practice)
- Increasing the *use of technology* in service delivery to improve data-informed outcomes
- Increasing the attention given to *engaging the state* (both executive and legislative)
- Addressing the link between *staff retention and healthy/thriving workplaces*
- Amplifying the voices of *service users* and the larger community

STRENGTHENED AGENCY-UNIVERSITY-FOUNDATION PARTNERSHIPS

- Addressing shared *workforce development issues* (linkage between pre-service education and in-service training), linking agency staff competencies to university educational competencies and developing *new models of funding* educational programs
- Promoting practice-informed *curriculum redesign and research* in order to prepare future leaders and life-long learners engaged in *inter-professional practice*
- Using BASSC research to build agency-based *knowledge-sharing systems to support evidence-informed practice and practice-informed research*
- Collaborating and learning from other regional consortia in California SACHS, CASSIE, etc.)