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| Introduction to Common Core |

California’s Common Core Curricula for Child Welfare Workers is the result of the invaluable work and guidance of a great many people throughout the child welfare system in California and across the country. It would be impossible to list all of the individuals who contributed, but some groups of people will be acknowledged here.

The Content Development Oversight Group (CDOG) a subcommittee of the Statewide Training and Education Committee (STEC) provided overall guidance for the development of the curricula. Convened by the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC) and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), CDOG membership includes representatives from the Regional Training Academies (RTAs), the University Consortium for Children and families in Los Angeles (UCCF), and Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services.

In addition to CDOG, a Common Core 3.0 subcommittee comprised of representatives from the RTAs, the Resource Center for Family Focused Practice, and counties provided oversight and approval for the curriculum development process.

Along the way, many other people provided their insight and hard work, attending pilots of the trainings, reviewing sections of curricula, or providing other assistance.

California’s child welfare system greatly benefits from this collaborative endeavor, which helps our workforce meet the needs of the state’s children and families.

The Children’s Research Center provided technical support as well as The Structured Decision Making System that includes the SDM 3.0 Policy and Procedure Manual and Decision Making Tools. These resources are used in compliance with CRC copyright agreements with California. Additionally, content in this curriculum has been adapted from CRC’s SDM 3.0 classroom curriculum to meet the training needs in California.

In compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act (1978) and the California Practice Model, social workers must identify American Indian/Alaska Native children in the system. For an overview of *Implementing the Indian Child Welfare Act* view: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BIQG65KFKGs>

The curriculum is developed with public funds and is intended for public use. For information on use and citation of the curriculum, please refer to:

<http://calswec.berkeley.edu/CalSWEC/Citation_Guidelines.doc>
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| CALSWEC-Logo-Color-Vertical-No-Byline | FOR MORE INFORMATIONon California’s Core Curricula, as well as the latest version of this curriculum, please visit the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC) website: <http://calswec.berkeley.edu> |

|  |
| --- |
| Curriculum Introduction |

EXAMPLE: This half day curriculum focuses on critical thinking activities that link critical thinking to assessment. Throughout the training, the trainer will guide the trainees through the activities and facilitate active participation in the development of a critical thinking framework.

Some content in this curriculum was developed by NCCD and the Northern California Training Academy as part of the Safety Organized Practice Curriculum. Safety Organized Practice (SOP) is a collaborative practice approach that emphasizes the importance of teamwork in child welfare. SOP aims to build and strengthen partnerships with the child welfare agency and within a family by involving their informal support networks of friends and family members. A central belief in SOP is that all families have strengths. SOP uses strategies and techniques that align with the belief that a child and his or her family are the central focus, and that the partnership exists in an effort to find solutions that ensure safety, permanency, and well-being for children. Safety Organized Practice is informed by an integration of practices and approaches including:

* Solution-focused practice[[1]](#footnote-1)
* Signs of Safety[[2]](#footnote-2)
* Structured Decision making[[3]](#footnote-3)
* Child and family engagement[[4]](#footnote-4)
* Risk and safety assessment research
* Group Supervision and Interactional Supervision[[5]](#footnote-5)
* Appreciative Inquiry[[6]](#footnote-6)
* Motivational Interviewing[[7]](#footnote-7)
* Consultation and Information Sharing Framework[[8]](#footnote-8)
* Cultural Humility
* Trauma-informed practice
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| Agenda |

* Segment 1: Welcome and Review of Agenda
  1. Welcome and Orientation
  2. Review Learning Objectives
  3. Icebreaker
* Segment 2:
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| Learning Objectives |

**Knowledge**

**K1.**

**K2.**

**Skills**

**S1.**

**S2**

**Values**

**V1.**

**V2.**
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