

**Panelists:**

Alan J. Dettlaff

*Please note: The following is a direct transcription and has not been edited.*

---

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay. Yes, we will go ahead and get started. We have a really small group. So maybe we can like be a little more interactive or something. First, I want to apologize, we were supposed to have a co-presenter Rowena Fong and she developed a lot of this material, we presented a similar presentation a couple of years ago. But then I have a colleague at the Children's Bureau, I'm actually her dissertation chair, and I told her, Rowena is not going to be able to make it so they just took her name off the program, didn't put her in there. So I have to apologize for her because she really is intended to be a co-presenter on this and has quite a background in doing culturally competent evaluations but she has to teach today, so she wasn't able to be here.

So like I said, well, my name is Alan Dettlaff, I work at the Jane Addams College of Social Work at the University of Illinois and Chicago. Then most of my research is on immigrant children and families who come to the attention of the Child Welfare System. And I worked with Rowena over a number of years and helping her develop culturally competent interventions for a lot of the work that she does in Texas with victims of human trafficking. So we've kind of presented on this a couple of times. But as I said we have a really small group. So definitely feel free to raise your hand, ask questions, I really didn't want to just stand up here for an hour and a half, I was hoping that me and Rowena would get to tag team it. So the more that you guys ask, the better and it doesn't sound just like me giving a lecture or something like that.

Why don't we even like do a quick introductions so we have -- since we have five people here. Tell me what your interest in the topic is and kind of what your -- how you practice or in what area you practice?

Panelist: *[Indiscernible] [00:01:35]*

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay. Great, thanks. And let me before we go into the next one, I forgot to say the reminder about this being recorded everybody has heard that already, right. Would you mind closing the door in the back?

Panelist: Certainly.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Thanks appreciated. Okay, go ahead, unless you don't want to give your name because you are being recorded.

Panelist: I don't care...

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay.

**Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families**

Panelist: *[indiscernible]* [00:02:19].

Alan J. Dettlaff: Great. Thanks.

Panelist: My name is Gracie *[indiscernible]* [00:02:43].

Alan J. Dettlaff: Great. Okay, thanks.

Panelist: I'm Maria Rosa and I work at the office of *[indiscernible]* [00:03:15].

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay, thanks. Okay.

Panelist: I'm Courtney Walsh. I work for JBS International in North Bethesda, Maryland, and what I do with them is evaluating the child *[indiscernible]* [00:03:57] lot of my academic and personal research has been with immigrants who were in that *[indiscernible]* [00:03:59].

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay, great.

Panelist: *[indiscernible]* [00:04:06].

Alan J. Dettlaff: Great.

Panelist: My name is *[indiscernible]* [00:04:09].

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay, great. And we are doing some brief introductions just since we had kind of a small group. So maybe we go up here, and then we will go to the back.

Panelist: *[indiscernible]* [00:04:31].

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay, great. And then over here in the back...

Panelist: I'm Leslie *[indiscernible]* [00:04:52] Children's Bureau in Denver.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay, thanks.

Michele Hanna: I'm Michele Hanna, I'm a professor at the University of Denver Graduate School of Social Work and I know Rowena...

Alan J. Dettlaff: Great, I already apologized for her not being here she has to teach today.

Michele Hanna: I know. But anyway so my – one of the things that I'm very interested in learning is more about the immigrant population.

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay, great. Thanks.

Nicole Willis: I'm Nicole Willis. I'm currently a professor of social work at Texas Southern University and spent the last six years as a school social worker and a high poverty, high immigrant in the middle school.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay, great. And Stephanie.

Stephanie Scott: Hi, everybody my name is Stephanie Scott. I'm with the University of Miami, Mailman Center for Child Development and also and I'm on staff as a consultant at the U.S. Catholic Conference of Bishops, Migration and Refugee Services.

Alan J. Dettlaff: I didn't know you moved. Congratulations.

Stephanie Scott: Oh, thank you. So I got the dual hats now.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay, great. And a little bit about me, my background is in the Texas Child Welfare System, I worked in that system for many years doing an investigation of maltreatment and then I supervised a unit of sexual abuse investigators for the last of couple of years while I was there. So that's how I know Rowena, she has been a real hub to me then during my transition into an academic career. And most of my research that I do now is in some ways related to racial disparities and the child welfare system. But as part of that I really focus on Latinos and looking at differences between immigrant and U.S. born Latino populations. And I'm actually going to share some of that research to kind of start the presentation, Stephanie you've heard this before, so you can go for sleep for like 10 minutes.

Stephanie Scott: Okay.

Alan J. Dettlaff: But, I think it's important to think about the changing demographics in both the U.S. and in the child welfare system as kind of a framework of why it is important to be thinking about culturally competent evaluations. And so many of you probably are familiar with this but the immigrant population has grown very rapidly over the past couple of decades, since 1990 the number of children with at least immigrant parent has more than doubled from 8 million in 1990 to 16.4 million in 2008. And children of immigrants a lot of people don't realize this but are nearly one in four of every child living in the United States. One in four children in the U.S. has at least one immigrant parent. And that's a huge increase from 13% in 1990.

But I don't think just your average person realizes how big that children of immigrant population is. More than half of those are Latino, a small number of children of immigrants are foreign born themselves but really as you can imagine the large majority of them 86% are U.S. born citizens. But among children of immigrants nearly 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of them live in mixed status families. So families with different immigration statuses where children are citizens but at least one parent is not a citizen.

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

And this is just to give you kind of an idea of difference among the immigrant and refugee population. You hear a lot about the undocumented immigrant population in the news and the political discourse and things like that. But actually unauthorized immigrants represent less than a third of the entire immigrant population living in the United States, there are these so much of ideas in master work, no it doesn't.

But there are the light bluish up with the top unauthorized immigrants about 30%. Then we have naturalized citizens, so people who are foreign born but are now citizens make up another 31% and then moving along legal permanent residents people who are in the process of foreign born and are in the process of obtaining citizenship and are in the country legally that's close to another 28%. Legal temporary residents that's a small number that's 3% that's like students here attending college, some people who have temporary work visa that type of thing it's pretty a small number. And then refugees are another 7% which are different than all of those other groups because they are here due to a more of a political situation.

And then looking at children, again you hear a lot of unauthorized children or undocumented children, but actually if you look at all of the children in the U.S., your biggest population obviously is children of natives, children – U.S. born children of U.S. born citizens represent about 80% of the children in the U.S. Then you have U.S. born children of immigrants here and then that are U.S. born so they are citizens. And then that small white group is the non-citizen children of immigrant group and that's just a really small component but then they are broken up into legal immigrants undocumented and naturalized and then non-immigrants. But so really have about that 23% there but again most of them are U.S. born themselves.

Some migratory trends this is based on 2000 census data the 2010 census data hasn't come out yet with the breakdown of the foreign born population, so this will likely change quite a bit. But just to give you an idea of the really rapidly changing immigrant population. The blue states here are what we've always call the traditional destinations states the big six states. That's New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Florida, Texas and California. Those six states account for 2/3rds 67% of all immigrants living in the United States are concentrated in those six states. But you could see here the 22 states that are some shade of red those are what's called the new growth states and those states their immigrant population grew by more than 91% between 1990 and 2000.

And then the top 10 growth states the solid red versus the shaded red, their immigrant populations grew from 135% to 274%. The 274% is the biggest one being North Carolina. But the point here is that those 22 states grew more rapidly in their immigrant population than all of the other six traditional destinations states. So even though those six states still account for the bulk of the immigrant population the, the really, really rapid growth is happening in many other states across the country.

And at the same time the Child Welfare System is experiencing changes in their population particularly among the Latino population. Rates of African American representation in the Child Welfare System has slightly declined over the past couple of

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

decades, white children have stayed about the same, slight declines. But it's really the Latino children many of whom are likely have immigrant parents where the real increases have happened. Since 1995 the percentage of Latino children confirmed has victims of maltreatment has more than doubled from 10% to 20.8% in 2008. And at the same time the population of Latino children in foster care has more than doubled from 8% in 1990 to 20% in 2008. Stephanie?

Stephanie Scott: Would you prefer for questions at the end or...?

Alan J. Dettlaff: No, go ahead. We don't have that many people so...

Stephanie Scott: Have you noticed or are there any numbers out there about Latino children, any unaccompanied or undocumented children, coming into the Child Welfare System as a result of their family being split, with parents being returned to the country of origin and the child is a U.S. citizen and is going into the welfare system?

Alan J. Dettlaff: Yeah, well, as you probably know and I think maybe one or two slides later, I'd talk about that. But there is a real challenge in knowing among the Latino population particularly but really among any racial or ethnic group what proportion of those children are immigrants or what proportion of them have a foreign born parent because that data is not collected Child Welfare Systems. Most state systems don't collect that and then it's not collected at the federal level. So in like the NCANDS and AFCARS you could find out anything you want about the breakdown of racial groups. But then you can't find out say of Latinos which one had – which one were children of immigrants and which one weren't or which one were foreign born children and which one aren't.

Some states collect data on non-citizen children and care because it affects for your ability but even that data isn't necessarily reliable because some workers are afraid to enter that kind of data. So it's been really hard to identify that. I know that anecdotally there is reports coming from states particularly some of these high new growth states like Georgia, North Carolina, Arizona that are really experiencing a problem with children coming into the system because of a parent being arrested and detained or deported something like that. And that's really not what the Child Welfare System is designed to be addressing that's not maltreatment.

And then don't know how to really handle these cases particularly with these international issues. What I do know is that there is a group called the Applied Research Center are you familiar with them ARC, Seth Wessler, he is one of their researchers. And they have been doing research in the field for like the past year and a half, actually have an appointment to talk to him on Thursday where we wanted to run some of his findings by me because they are developing a report based on exactly that issue, the extent to which children are coming into Child Welfare Systems due to the arrest or detention of a parent. So hopefully within the next maybe 3 to 4 months some more detail be coming our about that but you can't go into any child welfare administrative data base and find that out.

**Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families**

Stephanie Scott: I have a question about a piece of information right here.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Oh, okay, I forgot the recording.

Stephanie Scott: My question is and I just want to know your opinion, do you think that this doubling especially the 1990 to 2008 percentage has anything or how much do you think it has to do with the reporting requirements, the whole Hispanic yes or no, you know the fact that because I was a worker during this time and we did – we put people in different categories. So my question is how much do you think that that accounts for those increases?

Alan J. Dettlaff: Yeah, that's a really good point that you brought out. In the first, I meant to say right after I finish these. So this is not necessarily indicative of any kind of problem because this increase in the Child Welfare System is happening at the same time with really rapid increases in the population. So the population has rapidly increased over the past 20 years and when that happens you are going to expect some increase then in the representation in child welfare systems.

So this isn't necessarily indicative of a problem because happening at the same time is general population growth. But having said that you have to keep in mind that any kind of data or research that you read related to Latino children in the child welfare system particularly could possibly be subject to some error because of the way that states collect that information. In Illinois we have some thing like a 20 to 25% population of Latinos in the state and we have about 3% population of Latinos in foster care. I mean, that just seems impossible. But kind of everyone in the system kind of acknowledges that there is really serious data collection problems to that. Because of Hispanic ethnicity not being a race workers have to select a race but they don't have to select an ethnicity. So there is a feel that says like Hispanic yes or no and they don't have to check that. It's not a mandatory field. And so it makes some real data problems.

Stephanie Scott: And that's my point, and one of the states that I worked in you couldn't get out of that screen without checking, yes or no.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Good, good.

Stephanie Scott: So you had to make a choice...

Alan J. Dettlaff: I understand.

Stephanie Scott: And so I would – depending on of course the accuracy of the record whose decision they were making that.

Alan J. Dettlaff: That's an important point too. What we hear in our state is the workers aren't really asking families what their race or ethnicity is, they just kind of eyeballing them and then entering into the system. So there is error there too. So, yeah, system can

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

keep in record particularly when you are looking at data Latinos that there is going to be some error that affects their representation definitely.

Okay, so then in terms of what we know about immigrant children and the system as I mentioned we know very little or much less than we know about racial groups in the system because you can get that information from AFCARS and NCANDS. But there has been a lot of literature at least over the past kind of 10, 20 years. As the immigrant population has increased people have speculated that immigrant children are likely at considerable risk for maltreatment because of all the stresses associated with their immigration, acculturation experiences greater likelihood of living in poverty all of that.

A lot of that sources of risk include things like financial challenges, loneliness, isolation, language, excuse me, language difficulty, fear, hopelessness, at the same time all of that happening at the same time that they are leaving their support systems from their country of origin. So there has been speculation that these children are at increased risk of maltreatment. But what we have actually known about whether that's true or not has been really limited because of the inability to get data on that.

So I wanted to briefly share with you some research that we have done out of Jane Addams College of Social Work in Illinois, using data from the National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well Being. This has been a really great resource for researchers who are interested in doing data on immigrant families because it's the only national child welfare data set available that includes information on whether children and parents are foreign born. So the exact thing like AFCARS and NCANDS are missing. So if you are researcher and you are not familiar with NCANDS this is a great source of data.

This analysis was done on NSCA 1, NSCA 2 was just released about a month and a half, two months ago. And NSCA 2 includes even additional information about citizenship status which NSCA 1 didn't. So that's going to be even a more interesting or to have more information but using NSCA 1 the team that I work with was able to look at children in the Child Welfare System at a national level and look at children who come to the attention of the system. How many of them have foreign born parents and how many of them have U.S. born parents.

And what were able to determine is that children living with foreign born parent comprise 8.6% of all children who come to the attention of the Child Welfare System. And the little footnote on the bottom says that that's children living with a biological parent but sometimes children not living with the biological parent maybe living with the primary care giver who is like an aunt, uncle, and older sibling. So if you include those people who are foreign born the percent of children living with a foreign born primary care giver is 9.6%. So almost 10% of children who come to the attention of Child Welfare Systems have at least one immigrant parent and that's in and of itself much more information than we knew prior to this.

Most of them are Hispanic, more than 4 to 5, 82.5, I'm sorry 82.5% are U.S. born citizens more than 2/3rds are Hispanics, 67.2% followed by a non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

black and non-Hispanic Asian but Hispanics by far the largest. So that seems like kind of in the high number 8.6% of children of immigrants. But when you really think about it going back to the previous slide that says children of immigrants are 23% of the general population. That shows that children of immigrants are actually quite underrepresented in among children who come to the attention of the Child Welfare System.

Although there are some interesting racial differences so the graph or the pie chart on the left there is the racial breakdown of children in the general population and the graph on the right is the racial breakdown of children of immigrants who come to the attention of the Child Welfare System. And you could see that Hispanics are quite a bit over represented among children of immigrants who come to the child welfare population compared to their percentage in the population whereas Asian children and white children are slightly underrepresented and then African immigrants are slightly overrepresented.

So as a whole children of immigrants are very underrepresented 8.6% compared to the 23% but then there is these different racial break downs among who comes to the attention of the system, where Hispanic children of immigrants have a much greater likelihood of coming to the attention of the system.

And then I wanted to just briefly go over a few slides before we get into the cultural competent evaluation stuff because I think its relevant just understand that there really are differences between immigrants and children of U.S. born parents. Related to some of that literature that's speculated that children of immigrants are at greater risk of maltreatment. Actually what we found in this data is that there is really no difference between rights of substantiation between children of immigrants and children of U.S. born parents. You could see that the immigrants are the bright blue and children with the U.S. born parents are the greenish bar, practically no difference in the rights of substantiation between children of immigrants and children of U.S. born parents.

But there are some differences that are interesting when you look at types of maltreatment. This is looking at all children of immigrants who come to the attention of the system and you could see here the once with the asterisk where they are statistically significant differences. So immigrant children are more than twice as like than children of U.S. born parents to be substantiated for some type of emotional abuse whereas U.S. born children are something like 7 to 8 times more likely to be involved in a substantiated case of physical neglect. Physical neglect being some type of environmental neglect like ranging from dirty houses to unstable housing that type of thing.

So it is some really interesting differences when you look at types of maltreatment. And then the same thing holds true, we did the same analysis for the Latino children of immigrants just because they are such a large group of that immigrant population. And here again you have some really interesting differences you have same finding in regards to physical neglect where children of U.S. born parents are much more likely to be involved in case on substantiated cases than children of immigrants. But here you have children of immigrants are about 6 times more likely than children of U.S. born parents to be involved in cases of substantiated sexual abuse.

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

With this particular data system I can't really say why that is I know that finding about sexual abuse is pretty consistent in other studies that have been done looking at Latino populations particularly immigrant Latino populations. So that's definitely something that needs to be looked at further. But its interesting to see that there are these differences there.

Panelist: The sexual abuse is there age break down?

Alan J. Dettlaff: Yeah, I'm, sure there is, I don't have it with me.

Panelist: I was just wondering because culturally Latinos start active relationship younger?

Alan J. Dettlaff: Yeah, when I've like speculated about this in the past and again just going back, I did sexual and basic investigations for about 8 years in Texas. So there was a lot of Latinos there. I mean, the things that I would say anecdotally I think contribute to this where Latino women girls who were like 14 or 15 that had their 22 or 23 year old fiancée living in the house with them and that's considered sexual abuse.

Culturally it may not have been in their country of origin. The other thing that I saw a lot happen in Texas was immigrant families tended to have a lot of transient men coming through their house who were friends of friends of friends that they were trying to help as part of their immigration journey. And then we are taking advantage of the children in those homes.

Again you can't figure that out unless you really -- you are able to do some type of case of analysis study which I'd love to do some data really if I know like what's going on in these homes and when they say sexual abuse what it is really look like and how is it different. But there are these -- these pretty big differences that have been consistent in a number of studies. But overall the rights of maltreatment are not different there is just some differences according to type.

But then the last thing I wanted to show you as to do with risk factors. Again thinking kind of going back to the literature that says children of immigrants have experienced greater risk because of their family's experiences with immigration acculturation in that N-Square database these are all of the risk areas that are assessed, I mean, this comes from the investigator case work who does a risk assessment. And so in the left column there they are saying the percentage that this particular risk factor is present in families with U.S. born parents and in the right percentage of families where these risk factors is present with immigrant parents.

And you could see here in all of the shaded purple areas where there were statistically significant differences the presence of that risk factor was more likely to be present in the U.S. born families. So U.S. born families were more likely than immigrant families to be actively abusing drugs, actively abusing alcohol, have an intellectual or cognitive

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

impairment or physical impairment or a recent history of arrest. So I think what this kind of shows is that children of immigrants certainly do experience a number of risks because of their family's experience with immigration acculturation that children of U.S. born parents may not experience. But at the same time immigrant parents likely bring with them many family strengths that are not present in U.S. born families and that is consistent with a lot of the acculturation adaptation literature if you look at that where we know particularly in some the health sciences and the health literature. People think about acculturation as a positive thing like people becoming acculturated to U.S. norms but what's actually happening when people acculturate is that they are culturating to all of the bad things about U.S. society at the same time. The longer someone lives in the United States the more likely they already used drugs, to use alcohol, to experience domestic violence for youth to be involved in gangs, to have delinquent activity all of those strengths that immigrant families bring with them tend to erode over time. So things that you see in the first generation of immigrants in very small numbers increase in the second generation and then exponentially increased by the third generation. So that's what I think a lot of times in child welfare research and evaluation to kind of bring it back to that that we don't think about a lot.

Child welfare tends to be a really deficit oriented system or always thinking about risks and things like that. And not thinking as much about strengths particularly when we are thinking of immigrant families because its not just this research that I'm showing you but any study that you could find out find looking at negatives suicidal outcomes in a population that compares immigrants versus non-immigrants you will find that there these huge strength within immigrant families that service buffers against many of the negative outcomes that U.S. born -- children of U.S. born parents experience.

So that's important to keep in mind as you are thinking about cultural adaptations or programs. If you heard in the plenary session this morning the last speaker was – was very focused about cultural adaptations of interventions that involve really bringing in the strengths of that culture into the intervention. And that's what really needs to happen in terms of thinking of program planning and evaluation. How do you bring in those strengths to that intervention and the evaluation?

So then the role of cultural competence in evaluation why it's even important and please again as I'm going through some of this, if some of you have been involved in these type of studies have your own experiences please feel free to share them. I'm really just kind of hitting the tip of the iceberg with all of this because there is a lot of things to get through that I wanted to touch on and I can certainly refer you to some additional resources but if you have your own experiences it would be great to have some case examples.

But the whole idea of cultural competence and evaluation is based on the idea is that historically our evaluation activities not just in child welfare but across the board in the U.S. are kind of based on a dominant culture perspective where the whites standard is the norm. When we evaluate some thing we look at outcomes we look at the outcomes that white children should experience that's just the way that Americans think kind of across

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

the board. Outcomes are usually developed by white people they decide what is the outcome what's good, what's positive well being. All of those things are decided by white people historically even if you think of things like whites maltreatment when the laws the define whites maltreatment were developed they weren't developed a multicultural group of people who considering how culture impacts those.

It's all developed by white people that come up with this. So we usually have this dominant majority culture view and our history of program evaluation in the United States, it's really kind of pervasive.

And what we know about that is that evaluations that impose ideas from the majority culture can be restricted by a number of factors, conceptual mismatches, language barriers being a very obvious one. But then things like these conceptual mismatches different values differences in the meaning and manifestation of emotions all of those things can affect what we call an outcome in the way that we interpret an outcome. And if we are not cognizant of that and thinking closely about that that can lead to poor or limited data resulting in an ineffective evaluation.

Panelist: You know I wanted to, the challenges that we have in Miami of course would be trying to find measurements that are not normed on Mexican children.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Yeah.

Panelist: Because the Cuban population being so incredibly different and the majority of the our population of study are Cuban children and it can be really hard to find its just not even just the whites stated but going on the assumptions that what's not even one Latino population is going to work on another Latino population.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Great, absolutely. And there is a lot of literature about that I'm going to get to that in the presentation about instruments. But there is a lot of really good literature that talks about how to address instrumentation measurement issues and really the preferred method is to develop your own instruments. There is sometimes you may have to use a standardized instrument but if you really want to get to the core of what a culturally competent evaluation is about then you develop your own measurement instruments with the culture that you are studying would be preferred approach but I will talk about that when we get culture to the end.

So evaluation needs to be culturally competent to ensure in child welfare outcomes of safety permanency and well being are accurately measured. But you have kind of the same problem in the child welfare system with this idea of outcomes and evaluation even the discourse in child welfare focuses primarily on issues of U.S. born populations, in a session prior to this about disproportionality and disparities. And that focuses primarily on African Americans and differences between U.S. born populations. So there is a lot of awareness within child welfare about being culturally competent but I don't think that's extended to immigrants, its extended to U.S. born populations primarily from what I see.

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

And then thinking about what we think about our outcomes again that comes from a nationalist perspective with the achievement of outcomes guided by what we in the U.S. not just white people in the U.S. but just the U.S. norms of what's a good outcome in terms of safety permanency and well being those outcomes are based on the western U.S. idea of what a good outcome of well being is or what a good outcome of permanency is or safety. So it's important to dis-consider that complexity when you are thinking about doing an evaluation with immigrant families to recognize that the outcomes even though for child welfare systems we are kind of stuck with those safety permanency and well being things. Recognizing at least the extent to which there maybe some cultural mismatches there.

So then in terms of thinking of evaluation, what am I trying to get at is that in order to be a culturally competent evaluator it really requires two different sets of skills that need to be merged together. One you need to have evaluation competence on the bottom there. In order to culturally competent evaluations you need to be have skills in evaluation in a general sense no matter how culturally competent you are, if you don't know how to do evaluations then that's not going to matter.

But at the same time you have to have skills and cultural competence and what you are really looking for is a linkage of those two things skills and cultural competence and skills and evaluation design and planning to be able to conduct a culturally competent evaluation.

And this is just a cultural sophistication framework that I thought was interesting that's in the literature that looks at cultural competence from different aspects a cognitive aspect and effective aspect and skills dimension. And you could kind of see it move across this continuum from culturally incompetent to culturally sensitive to culturally competent which would be the idea of being knowledgeable about the population being committed to change being highly skilled and then overall effect of being constructive and in terms of what you are able to bring to that evaluation.

But having said that that term culturally competent or cultural competency has a lot of problems with it in and of itself and that kind of over the years it sometime become misconstrued to a apply this idea that to be culturally competent means you need to know every single thing about the culture that you are involved in to be able to work effectively with them. And most people who are really involved in this work will say that that's just not possible. That is not even entirely that is not even possible to be entirely culturally competent in your own culture because of the diversity within group diversity. So the idea of culture competence particularly thinking of an – as an evaluator that would imply that you have to be entirely knowledgeable of every single culture that you might become involved with in an evaluation. It's just not possible to do that.

So rather than that kind of idea of culture competent what we are really talking about what the goal really is, is to develop skills and cross cultural competency where the evaluator as knowledge skills to work with people from different cultures so having an open mind learning how to ask the right questions and developing how to adopt

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

appropriate evaluation tools. How to immerse yourself in a culture for the time that you are working with them and kind of separate yourself from your own bringing biases what you think is normal and be able to immerse yourself in that culture and the lens through which they look in order to design and conduct this evaluation that's what a cross cultural competency really involves. And you could then conclude that evaluation still without knowing everything there is to know about that culture. But you are able to gather the information that was necessary in order to conduct an evaluation through the lens of that culture that you are working with that's what culturally competent evaluation is really about.

So that involves then investing significant amount of time learning about the history and the culture, knowing what questions to ask but it also in that last bullet point involves significant input and collaboration from community stakeholders with expertise in the social culture historical context in which the program is based.

There is, it's not possible to do a culturally competent evaluation without significant collaboration with the members of the culture that you are evaluating. Because those are the people who are your experts and you are taking information from them and then applying it to your evaluation competence to develop and design this evaluation.

Really important point that I want to kind of bring through the whole thing and you could probably see from what we have been talking so far is that evaluation planning begins at the initial point of program planning. There is absolutely no purpose to design a culturally competent evaluation of a culturally incompetent program or intervention. But a lot times we don't think of it that way we think about culturally competent evaluation as if it just has to do with developing these instruments, developing some evaluation questions, maybe someone could argue differently than me but I think you have to be thinking about cultural competence from the moment that you develop and design the intervention. Again as the plenary speaker – so this morning there was a whole process of cultural adaptation of the intervention that she selected that at the very beginning that involves stakeholders from the community and then as part of that process went along the evaluation methods were developed but it doesn't happen in isolation. And I mean to me it just makes no sense to do a culturally competent evaluation of a culturally incompetent program.

Panelist: And human rights. I'm just going to add a caveat I think slight disagreement I agree with you totally if you are part of the program, but as an outside evaluator you may have a choice so I think the flip side of that is, is an outside evaluator you have to be thinking about cultural competence and being able to provide input into the program piece to help them to be culturally competent.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Great.

Panelist: So you may not have – you may not be involved in the program planning I guess is my point.

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

Alan J. Dettlaff: Great, absolutely.

Panelist: And you are covering after the fact and have to point out these things as you go along.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Great. But then minimally the people that you are working for, people implementing it need to know that there is the potential that your evaluation no matter how much you strive to make the evaluation methods culturally competent it still limited by the fact that the intervention.

Panelist: Right. And as a culturally competent evaluator it's my responsibility to say that.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Right, absolutely, right. Thanks for bringing that up because certainly not all evaluators are involved in the program planning part.

Okay, so let's get into some kind of issues related to culturally competent evaluation. Again there is a lot but kind of going through the literature there is several things that come out as being really important. Cultural incompetence the biggest place where culture incompetence in evaluation occurs are when concepts are transferred across cultures and critically and when translations of tools or instruments correspond exactly to the original without necessary adaptations.

So what we really talking about is a translation, a translation that involves much more than language its about a conceptual equivalency issue. So these things have to do with language conceptual equivalence and then measurement. Obviously language is the biggest one, I mean, at the most fundamental level you can conduct an evaluation on someone with instruments that aren't in their language right. Regardless of what skills and cultural confidence you have I mean, that's kind of obvious. But language is a part of culture I mean obviously it has to be embedded within every aspect of an evaluation when you are working with a group who is not doesn't speak the language. I mean, this doesn't have to do with immigrants but I would say the same thing has to do with some English speaking populations there are differences in meaning and then words across U.S. born population that speak English but I think have to be addressed. But since we are talking about immigrants, with non-English speaking immigrants this is of paramount importance.

But beyond this really there is much more than just translation and we will talk about some caveats with translation in a minute but cultural equivalence often requires translating evaluation towards an instruments into other languages, professional translation obviously is essential to this process having someone from within that particular culture group, Stephanie, you mentioned earlier like differences within Latinos its not just good enough to get someone who is Latino to do translation for you. It has to be someone who is of the particular cultural group there is differences in Cuban Spanish and Mexican Spanish and Spain Spanish or all of those different kinds of languages that have to be accounted for. So the language has to come from within that particular

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

cultural group. But the big point here translating instruments alone doesn't ensure cultural equivalence and that's where this idea of conceptual equivalence comes from and that refers to the extent to which a word or construct has the same meaning across cultures and across languages. So you can translate a word from English into the corresponding word in another language but that doesn't mean it means the same thing. And there is a lot of research about that.

Concepts of things like home, what does home mean for someone particularly when you are thinking of immigrant populations, I know, when I say home I think of my house where I live like my street address. When other cultures think of home it means something entirely different. When an immigrant family or an immigrant thinks of home, it could mean their country of origin, so what is that mean when you say home?

I know there has been some studies that I read put into this together about concepts like civic engagement, political involvement. What are those concept – those concepts have different meanings volunteerism those kind of things have really different meanings for someone from the U.S. and someone from different cultures.

So thinking of what to these words really mean is what conceptual equivalence is about. And as a culturally competent evaluator you need to be able to ensure that the data that you are collecting as the same meaning across cultures or your findings are you going to be unreliable.

So as I mentioned the meaning of certain constructs can vary considerably across cultures are often have to do with the not just kind of the surface level culture things but the whole historical, political context of a country over 100s and 100s of years shaped the meaning of some of these constructs. So its really important to ensure that you are going well beyond this just language translation piece.

Panelist: I think this is really important. And I will give you an example, I worked in Southwest Houston in the Gulfton area so most immigrant families mostly Latino and there were a few researchers in-charge of developing a needs assessment that they would then administer at different schools with our parents and one of the questions that they had and again we have a lots of parents are day-labors and things like that. One other questions they had was what is your annual salary, now, and they didn't pilot test and this is what I find a lot with evaluators that come in. They never bother to pilot test. They never bother to ask us. Do you think this will work even with teachers and social workers in the school, so when they got their needs assessment back there was no data for that? So they were upset they thought people didn't read it. I said look day labors don't make salaries, if you have a college education, if you *[indiscernible]* *[00:44:51]* to make a salary they are worried about how much they are going to make that day. And can they pay the rent for that week? That's in terms of economic kind of cultural competency they weren't thinking about it in terms of that part of it. So without pilot testing then you can get a lots of missing data and things will just you said that you will have a loss of validity.

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

Alan J. Dettlaff: Right. That's a good example because its not even a cultural difference in the word, its just not even relevant the concept, its not going to mean something different, it's not even relevant within the one culture compared to the other culture. So that piece of conceptual equivalence is really important.

And I will talk in a few minutes about some strategies to develop that. So that then leads to measurement issues obviously inadequate translation or adoption of those are going to result in lower reliability and adequate findings. There is a lot literature about adopting instruments and there is really kind of two camps where the first ones, there is a lot of studies that describe methods to ensure cultural equivalency when translating standardized instruments. I mean that's out there because sometimes its just required that you use standardized instruments. Some times a funder may require that some times, excuse me, you may think it's necessary to use a standardized instrument in order to get funding from another source. So some times it's necessary but there is also huge body of literature that talks about just the challenge in barriers of using that. And the – what most culturally competent evaluators advocate for is that original instruments are developed in collaboration with community members. So times you have to use standardized instruments but the preferred method is to not is to develop your own evaluation instruments.

I wanted to just talk briefly about outcomes and then we will get into a big, much more about the instrument piece. Huh, yeah.

Panelist: *[Indiscernible]* [00:46:46] I'm sorry, the challenge and improvement...

Alan J. Dettlaff: Yeah.

Panelist: Other cultures, I mean, and other cultures understanding the concept in research evaluation and purpose and meaning especially if you are doing something longitudinally, they will be like what I just answered that six months ago for you or whatever. So being able to think about your informed consent as being culturally competent as well and who is collecting the data and because we have a lot of challenges with that because it just doesn't mean anything to them

Alan J. Dettlaff: Right. I think I actually have that on this next, sorry, something related to that.

Panelist: ...that again.

Alan J. Dettlaff: There is this whole issue of time orientation which is really important when you are thinking of outcomes. But in a general sense even before we get to there in terms of recruitment I have this later but I mean, to begin with two of our agencies have a problem with their relationship with immigrant communities to begin with. And that's like kind of the prior issue that before we even think about culturally adaptation of programs or interventions and then how to culturally competently evaluate them. Child welfare systems and people work within child welfare systems have to think about how to

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

improve their relationship with immigrant communities to begin with, how to engage with them successfully in order to help them understand what the purpose of their services are. Why their services might be beneficial to them? Issues of immigration status and what's going to be done with them or distrust over government systems in general are going to be issue. So that's – it's like before we could even think of these things we have to think about that because that's going to effect your recruitment.

But then in terms of thinking of outcomes, there are several things and this is a lot of information these are where we use the slide so sorry that I, I'm going to have to read some of this. But there is some in terms of time orientation looking at your evaluation method the way that we usually think of it is kind of a like pre-post kind of thing before during after but thinking of culturally competent evaluation what you are really asking is, does the client show improvement from one period of time to the next period of time. But you often need to use different periods of timeframe depending on the population that you are working with because just like the baseline three months, six months that we might want to use might not be meaningful to someone from another culture from an immigrant community. It really needs to include more of a process evaluation where the process of engaging in the services part of the outcome. So I'm thinking of time orientation that has to be included within this outcome piece.

Intervention process represents the application of various approaches to suite the needs of the individual client taking into account the clients unique culture that may provide strengths or constraints to the successive treatment this requires a thorough understanding of the client's view of the problem and its possible solutions. I mean that's kind of probably obvious but understanding the clients view of the problem is necessary before you can decide what the outcome of the problem should be. And immigrants view of the problem may be very different than what our view or the U.S. view of the problem is.

So again in terms of thinking of again this is part of that piece of program planning but what is it that you are actually trying to fix or worked on and is there agreement between the extent that it's a problem between you and what you are evaluating and the community that you are working with. Particularly when you are thinking of maybe some of those vaguer areas of maltreatment like some of the neglect things, things that I can think of our like leaving children home alone adult siblings taking care of younger siblings. That might be a problem in this culture but its not a problem in another culture and then how do you give someone a parenting class that teaches them these things when they don't agree what about the fundamental problem is. So understanding the differences in that identification of the problem.

So then the intervention focus it's defined as related to the clients cultural background and expectations. This focus takes the clients perspective into consideration through an evaluative question does this intervention bring about change that is culturally acceptable and reinforced.

So again related to that not just as the problem match in terms of the conceptual definitions but it is where you are trying to go with the problem, the solution does that

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

match conceptually, is there agreement between the evaluator and the culture on the end result of the intervention.

Outcomes will show measurable change based on the problem definition determined jointly by both the client and the practitioner. So again it involves this working together to identify what the outcome is.

If the measurement procedures and methods are presented clearly and agreed upon by the client this will further enhance the clients participation in the intervention process and produce visual impact when time series data are collected and parted. So definitely this kind of relates to what you are saying to that in terms of engagement clients are more engaged when they identify the intervention to begin with. When they identify the problem when they identify the solution, I mean, that's just kind of like child welfare practice one on one even if you are not talking about immigrant families right. That's why we move from the time where I was a practitioner, where there was no family engagement at all in service planning to a time now where that's kind of the standard right. I mean, the family is supposed to be engaged in this process of not just identifying the problem but identifying the solution and creating their plan that kind of thing that's the same principle here, the clients are more engaged when they are responsible for the problem definition and the outcome.

And then this last piece is really important the cross cultural exchange must take place in a multicultural environment. The practitioners role is not only to implement services or intervention but also to help clients and practitioners learn how different cultures may view the same evaluative results in different ways by providing evidence-based results with respect to cultural relevance the client will be encouraged to share how the outcomes may lead to self directed behaviors interacting with the multifaceted environment.

This one comes from Patrick -- Monit Cheung and Patrick Leung's book, they are both at University of Houston and they have written a lot about culturally competent evaluation. But the idea is that this is a really important piece in terms of how do you share your evaluative results back with the community and the ways and the mechanisms that you share them, are they culturally relevant. Even from a simple thing to like how do you present them visually does it make sense, how do you present them in a written form, how does the community take those results and then use them, how did they feel, what do you need to do to make sure that they feel that the results are relevant to them. A pie chart or bar graph or something like that may not be the most meaningful way to do that it maybe demonstrating something through some other method. But again the idea is and again if you are only coming into do an evaluation you are limited to some extent on what the program is based on, but the more that you are doing each one of these steps with people from the culture the better overall evaluation you are going to have.

Okay, so let's talk about the tools issue, as I mentioned there is lots of challenges for using existing instruments challenges to reliability, one of the biggest problems with it that I was just talking about is that it lacks participatory engagement. You are defining how your outcomes are measured not just by you but by somebody that this community

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

doesn't even know, it doesn't has never heard off. They could care less who develop the CBCL and how much research and science went behind it. They had nothing to do with this tool and now you are coming to them and saying that this going to tell me whether or not we are going to do this. Now to see if your child has problems and then six months we are going to do this thing and see if your child still has problems. I mean, it really just creates a barrier from the very beginning between you as an evaluator and your relationship with the community that you are evaluating because they initially are not going to trust you or going to think that you don't think their opinions about their outcomes and how they would measure change, you don't think that's important. You are going to tell them that going from 3 to 1 and the scale means something. That might mean something to you but it might mean absolutely nothing to them. That's the challenge of standardized instruments.

So the development of culturally appropriate tools as part of the participatory and collaborative approach to the evaluation offers the opportunity to receive stakeholder input and the cultural validity of it.

Panelist: What are your thoughts on conservation *[indiscernible]* *[00:56:02]* about mother's attachment to child, so what do you think about like observational instruments like that, do you see any specific challenges to using something like that or do you think that it might put you in a better position to use something like that?

Alan J. Dettlaff: I would say like on a continuum of bad to baddest like an observational tool is closer to just bad than really bad. It's never standardized extra bit it goes. But I would still think, I don't mean, the benefit to something like an observational tool would be I think that there would be more room for cultural adaptation of the instrument of itself. I mean, it would be really hard to culturally adapt the CBCL, thinking of that. But I think you could culturally adapt something that was an observational tool. I mean, you have to be sure that the behaviors that you are observing are culturally relevant behaviors. If it's – is it like problem behaviors, I'm not familiar with it or is it positive parenting behaviors or...

Panelist: It's positive parenting behaviors and attachment *[indiscernible]* *[00:57:06]* attachment theory.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay.

Panelist: It just looks like mother-child engagement?

Alan J. Dettlaff: I would say that the way that we've defined attachment and bonding and engagement may not be the same way that other cultures define that. If you are observing certain things you may be able to take like some of the basics of an instrument that has observational ratings on it. And in collaboration with the culture make some adaptations to it by asking them what are the behaviors that indicate attachment and come with another that's not attachment but that indicate that you have a close and loving relationship with your child how is that demonstrated in your culture, that would be part

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

of your evaluation planning. And so I think you have more room to do that with something that's observational because you can't do that with just a Likert scale type or it would be more difficult to do with a Likert scale type instrument.

Okay. So in terms of developing evaluation tools then if you are going to develop them on your own which again would be the preferred method. As I mentioned before you need to observe that it addresses both linguistic equivalency and conceptual equivalency kind of the fundamental things are working with the cultural translator that is just in learning understanding the nuances of the program community. Ideally a cultural translator comes from the community itself sometimes you could have cultural translators who are experts in a particular culture may not be from that particular community but you need to put some thought into finding these cultural translators. So you are working with them and this is not necessarily just a language issue this is the conceptual equivalency issue where you are really working with someone who understands the nuances of the history, the sociopolitical environment of the culture helping you understand what outcomes should you be looking for like what's a positive parenting behavior in this culture. How do you show that how is attachment or bonding the way we think about it here. How is it thought off in this culture and how is that demonstrated and if you wanted to look at how that might improve over time what should be the things that we are looking for. That's where a cultural translator comes in.

Then beyond the cultural translator you want to conduct a discussion groups which are really just kind of like focused groups, informal focused groups with members of the cultural group that explore the meanings of those words and concepts in English and then in the groups native language or something like attachment bonding that's like a perfect example for that. Attachment maybe one of those words that's not even relevant in another culture. It doesn't have the same kind of meaning that we have. But there is some concept in other cultures that implies the same thing a bonding, a closeness between the parent and the child what is that called? What does it look like? How can you, in talking to the community, how could you tell the difference between a mother who is attached to her child and a mother who isn't? So that you would have with the discussion group with this people from the community.

And then this is an important one there is just a few studies about this and I wasn't really familiar with it until recently I'm going to serve looking that some with this literature. But there is we want to think about what your response categories are, because there is some literatures that shows that liker scales are an appropriate freeze and some cultures just the kind of linear concept of one to two to three to four to five, what that really means it, kind of makes sense to us, because we're so familiar with that.

But, the difference between like two and three could have been something completely differently to us than the difference between two and the three means for someone and another culture. So the liker scale are some resistant, so is that liker scales may not be good with non-U.S. foreign populations.

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

And then as you mentioned before like absolutely essentially have to then pilot test this, even when you use the cultural translator even when you dumb the discussion groups, you have to pilot test it with a broader range of people, because you're still giving a limited view with your culture translator, your discussion groups. You want it as broad of the pilot testing as you can get.

So that's the preferred method. And then you're going to beyond that and you're going to test that for reliability with the results from your pilot tests and all of that we have, you feel is a pretty robust instrument. Adapting tools is where the kind of bigger problem comes in, again as I mentioned the reasons for using them, you may have to use a tool within your agency that corresponds to safety permanency and while being.

Again those are like nationalist concepts that we came up with what they meant. But sometimes you just stuck with them and you want to really comes down to it that's a challenge that child worker systems how is that, these concepts are really not negotiable. I mean the U.S. nationalistic concept of safety is not negotiable with an immigrant community when you're trying to improve safety.

When they are living in the U.S. and your intervention is designed to improve safety, it's not negotiable for the most part. I mean what you have to do is a culture that confident evaluator is to explain to the extent that you can, how that concept was developed, what it means until you get to the place where there is some share at least agreement of what the concept means within this country. And that this isn't something that's negotiable, but you want to negotiate the understanding of it. So that the community understands why this is important within the context of this culture.

Because it is just those are the kinds of things that just aren't negotiable particularly probably on the safety, maybe on some of the well being in the cadres as well. Particularly may be like in the education outcome or something. Well know mental health is probably even a better example. There is many, much different views about mental health between U.S. culture, American culture and other countries in terms of the need for services, what counts as a mental health, the behavioral problem. I mean and that's like a distant valiant of the CBCL and general I think there is quite a bit of literature about that and that is not necessarily appropriate across culturally outside of the U.S. because the behaviors are not just aren't.

That we would identify as problems don't register the same way with an immigrant population to foreign more in populations. But it maybe your requirement of a foreign of the funding source or you may feel that as a program planner, evaluator you need to use the standardized instrument in order to be able to go to a funding source.

Like you may need to use a standardized instrument on a pilot program in order to go to a funding source to get more money to implement this larger. So you have to kind of think of it then as like a, pros and cons kind of thing. If you don't, you is a culturally competence instrument or one that you develop on your own, then your on the risk of funders turning away because they don't trust your results.

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

If you use standardized instrument pilot adaptations you are potentially limiting the reliability of your results, but if that's helping you obtain, a several hundred thousand dollar grant from some foundation then may be the benefits saw in that at. You just kind of have to weigh those things yourself. But there is reasons why you might have to use standardized instruments.

Minimally though, when your using a standardized instrument as we talked about on the beginning it has to be translated, you can't use an English instrument with a non-English speaking population. So it has to be translated. When there is a lot of literature going back to like the 70s and probably earlier that talks mild translation back translation approaches. That was kind of like the norm trends of 30 years ago there is translation, back translation process.

Well most of the literature now says that well a simple translation back translation is not sufficient enough to obtain that cultural equivalency piece, as it doesn't capture the cultural differences in the meaning interpretation. So you're achieving though linguistic competency through translation back translation, but not the conceptual equivalency.

Then when you come when it comes to sometimes this is just a resource issue. You may not be able to do the best translation of an instrument given the time and money and staff and resources that you have. I'm going to tell you in a minute, a really advanced model for translating an instrument. But when you have limited resources kind of the basic, the minimal thing that should be done, in this third bullet here is a preferred pressure price and minimal of two translators who work independently through a multi-stage process.

So you have the first translator who independently creates a translated version from English to their language. And then the second translator takes their version, the version that they translated in their language and translates it back to the original language. And then compares the two English versions to see where the differences are. And then both of the translators work together to identify the words, phrases that didn't come through in the translation or awkward when kind of translated back. And agree, kind of negotiate where the problems were, where the discrepancies where and come to a point where they agree on the certain word or phrase to use. And then go through the same process.

One person translate the new agreed plan version to the native language, the other person translates it back and then sees the agreement direct. So minimally you have two people during this, the multi-stage process. One person does the translation, one way the other person does it back and so there is agreement between the original and new one, at a minimal.

This group, the human services research institute developed its tool kit on translating and adapting instruments. And you can just Google that and this will come up at HSRI. They have lots of documents like white papers and stuff about this exact issue translating instruments.

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

And they go through this whole process of what they call cultural equivalency model where they go through different levels of equivalents. And this is kind of like similar of thinking of a different levels of validity where you go from phase validity to construct validity is kind of the same kind of thing, where they go from semantic equivalents the meaning of each item and the instrument is similar and the language of each culture group to content equivalents, the content of each item is relevant to each culture group.

Its technical equivalents criteria and equivalents and then ultimately to conceptual construct equivalents that requires that their relationships with other theoretical constructs across cultures are confirmed. So its really elaborate view of assuring conceptual equivalency. So would be like the goal star, or goal standard or at least the best that I have seen in terms of giving to this model.

And again you have – you take these five different levels and way this against the resources that you have. If you have a limited resources then you go through this process here and that's probably hard to see, but I'll go through it is like a ten step process and you start with your original instrument and then going clockwise.

That's translated by a professional translation. Then the review of that translation is done by a bilingual committee, a committee that speaks English and the native language. Then there is a subsequent review by a multi-national bilingual committee. So a community of people who are bilingual but from different countries that speak their language, so in Spanish, there would be someone from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba something like that.

Then focus group discussions of the translated instruments, then discussion of the findings of the focus groups with the multi-national bilingual committee and incorporation of accepted changes into the translated instrument. Then after all of that after those five steps then back translate it, into the original language.

Then the back translation is reviewed by the multi-national bilingual committee, then you test for reliability and validity of the culture readapted in instrument, then you fine tune the culturally adapted instrument according to the results of the reliability, validity testing. Then you have your final adapted version and then you pilot it to get feedback that may lead to additional revisions in the original instrument. And then ultimately you have your instrument. So that seems kind of.

Panelist: Some day you are going to do your evaluation...

Alan J. Dettlaff: You're right. But you know how this works and everything there is like the minimum required, there is the best possible thing you could do and then somewhere in the middle that's usually where you have to plan, depending on your staff you resource. But these are good ideas to know about, I'm turning to things that you might be able to incorporate, maybe you can incorporate five of these things out of the ten or something.

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

And then that's better than the bare minimum, but that's what I think is kind of the globe standard of ensuring conceptual equivalency. Okay, we have 15 minutes and so I want some of these challenges are kind of brought up throughout the time that we've been talking. But, conducting culturally competence evaluations within child work are settings has some inherent challenges that are not present in other settings.

If you just think kind of the – some of the stuff through the literature these are kind of the things that we need to be looking at to ensure cultural competence, use of cultural guides, translator, community collaboration and program planning and implementation, community buy and participation and defining the goals and the outcomes that we measured. Ensuring linguistic and conceptual equivalency and constructs of measures and then providing timely and regular feedback their culturally appropriate methods.

I'm sure just looking at that you could see there are problems with some of these in terms of child welfare systems ability to do some of these, and the resources that they have available to them to do similar fees things. This I already kind of mentioned, a big problem is our principles of safety permanency and well being and then not just our principles of safety permanency and well being those are defined for us, by federal government.

Then you also have statutory definitions of treatment going back to that, what defines mild treatment in this country is may not be what defines mild treatment and other countries. I have learned in my research on disproportionate of the disparities, what defines mild treatment and why people is not what defines mild treatment and other cultures.

So I mean this is a big problem that I think child workers can face, but that we have to acknowledge what makes up mild treatment is not something that we get to negotiate with the people that we're working with. So we're stuck with that. And then beyond that we have this other to dimension of risk and safety factors. We have risk assessment tools that we work with where, the one that I am most familiar within Texas you just have like 86 things that you check yes or no to and then its splits out like a determination to you or to how much at risk this person is. You don't have the option of negotiating some of these things that someone decided was risky. Some of those risk factors are based on empirical studies of factors that are associated with mild treatment, but then you go back to the prior problem in terms of what's defined mild treatment.

The issue here is that you have all of these things that are not negotiable and further past hour or I have been talking about how you need culturally negotiate your outcomes and your problem definition with the culture that you're working with. In child welfare there are some things that you don't have that you're not able to do that with.

When that happens, well what that going on to that last point it doesn't suggest just because you have that conflict doesn't mean that community buying collaboration and participation are not essential in finding for and conducting a culturally competence evaluation. And I think that's we think sometimes well that's what the – well that's

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

abuses here, people who come to this country they just realize that if they, if they are going to live here, they have to follow these rules and then we move on and we do our things.

And that's true to an extent, but it doesn't mean that you then get to skip the whole process of community volume, community collaboration. You have to work then with the community that much harder to get their volume for these concepts that you are evaluating them on, by engaging with them, by helping them to understand how these concepts are culturally relevant here within this culture and what they are based on and why this is considered a risk here.

Whatever it may be, but it requires all of the things that are still that I have talked about even though you may not be able to work with the culture to define the outcomes on these things. But then you need to be working with the culture to define the outcomes that are important to them. Again it doesn't mean that you only have these outcomes to work with, you can work with the culture to define their own outcomes of what's indicators of success.

So probably I already said most of this rather increased efforts to facilitate community collaboration and participation need to occur to ensure cultural competence. What you want to get to is the point where a cultural difference is between the target community and the mandates of the child worker system are fully understood, so you understand both parties understand what the cultural differences are with the evaluators in the program, planners understanding the cultural values and perspectives and result in those differences and members of the target community understanding the role of the child welfare system and the need adapt those norms well all are residing in the U.S.

So you get to the point of mutual understanding, you understand their views, they understand the system views and you get to a point where you agree that this is the outcome or one of the outcomes that you're looking for and why that's culturally important here in the United States.

And then although outcomes of safety and well being may not be negotiable that means of achieving those outcomes should be fully driven by the cultural values in context of the community. So that's really where you're buying and participation comes in. How given that now we've agreed on these outcomes these are well we work with, how do we get to those outcomes that's what you work then with the community to do.

And then I think I mentioned there is an additional barrier results from the perception of child worker agencies within many communities particularly minority communities, U.S. board and minority communities not to mention immigrants communities. But when working with immigrant communities, you have to overcome concerns that immigrants have regarding their immigration status, fears of what child worker agencies will do with that status as I mentioned they do a lot of work with immigrant families.

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

Immigrant families don't understand that we're not Is, they don't understand that we don't report to Is. They don't understand that there is not a global computer system that is can go into and look in and look out. I mean to all of those things are concerns within immigrant communities.

Particularly more recently as, there has been really increased immigration enforcement efforts in the U.S. and those immigrants, I've heard less about them in recent years, but actually there has been like more enforcement and more deep rotations under the Obama administration than under the previous administration.

I think a lot of people blamed George Bush for all those deep rotations, but I really think he did a lot of them but we're still doing more now than we were before, I mean its increasing every year. So the problems are the issue of immigration enforcement and deep rotation is a real fear and talent within immigrant communities and that needs to be kind of understood by us and gotten into these communities.

So these are just some ideas I had of things to kind of discuss in our last five or ten minutes I would love to hear some of your stories though if you have other ideas. So how do you could negotiate those concepts, how do you ensure that immigrant family strengths and incorporated into interventions. How do you address that mistrust between immigrant communities related to the role of both government agencies and the immigration status.

And then what resources do you know about that kind of system cultural adaptations or cultural competence and their evaluation. I guess, certain that's you have and you use the microphone.

Panelist: I think in addition to the evaluation instrument and interpreting the findings some of the instruments I think we have to pay a lot of attention to instrument administration as well in terms of culturally competency. I know that, like I said I were to in a middle school, high immigrant, lot of document and parents and one of our regional offices one that you come and do a snapshot of our school, so I wanted to interview parents they had 10 questions all qualitative. And I thought okay qualitative is good, all right to get the perspective from the parents and so can you have during one of your monthly parent meetings so as come in and then we can do our qualitative system, I said sure. So what they meant was they were going to send five people and they were dressed in business suits and ties, they didn't come into our meeting and again our parents bring their little kids because they have little ones at home, they can't leave. They have to go to work, what they wanted to do they set up in another room all five people in business suits lined up with one chair on the other side of the table and they ask me to send in one parent at a time. So that they could interview them and they had a recorder.

So of course our parents can go.

Alan J. Dettlaff: I would be cared of that.

## Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families

Panelist: So I – yeah that made the parents very nervous so again with all the immigration issues and things like that, so I said one they don't know, so you take off your tie, take off your jacket two of you all go into the parent room, I mean they expect them to sit and wait.

Alan J. Dettlaff: All right.

Panelist: 30 parents, 10 minutes each with little kids, they didn't bother to ask us. So they've reluctantly went in the room and the parents had great discussion, and they the evaluators kind of teaching is exactly the book the way they wanted, but they wouldn't have gotten get information like that anyway. So I think it's so important to not just look at the design and the interpretation, but the administration of the instrument has to be closely competent as well.

Alan J. Dettlaff: All right, really good point thanks.

*[Overlapping Conversation] [01:19:50].*

I mean it is a good point I mean that in terms of that United Nations view of human rights. And I guess at some point at some level you have to still reconcile that with the colt you can't discount the norms within a culture and society. Because of what either we consider right or what the United Nations consider right. And I'm assuming you're talking of the things like domestic violence and abuse of women or oppression of women and that kind of thing or girls.

I don't know, I made it earlier it's a problem, I mean if other people have ideas I think at some – you have to be sensitive on some level to a cultures view of a problem. In order to – may be its similar to the issue of safety permanency and well being those non-negotiable kind of things. That you have to understand where that where a discrepancy lies within a culture. And then work towards achieving a different, a different outcome that may not be what the norm is within their culture, but is based on some framework, maybe that's the United Nations definition of human rights.

But it just becomes difficult particularly when there are very, very when there is very strong religious underpinnings to that and there are many – there are people who are being impressed that don't think they are being impressed. And then that becomes challenged too in terms of going and changing behavior so. I don't, I think it's a problem, I don't know the answer to it, does anyone else have ideas.

Panelist: Does have the right to talk the United Nations *[indiscernible]* *[01:22:52]* is probably not too far of the point of saving from its and well being of the child. You know it's really focused more around the traveling child or the refuge child in a camp setting. And you know best interest determinations and things like that. I don't think the United Nations are at least to my experience working in migration refuge services pays a lot of attention to one somebody has been placed or is in residence in the United States, I don't think there is a connection necessarily a discussion between the child welfare system and

**Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families**

refuge and immigrant rights perspective. Because they are really thinking, I think the child and the safety in a camp not an individual child and the safety in the home, when I talk about United Nations rights of children.

Alan J. Dettlaff: I'm not sure. What I see what you were saying that's they are not talking about within the context of their home, they are talking about within the context of a being a shelter facility.

Panelist: Yeah a transient situation.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Okay, any other thoughts?

Panelist: My experience in having read them that worked...

Alan J. Dettlaff: Yeah. Any other thoughts about that or in general? Okay but thanks for bringing that up, it's an important point. I don't know the extent to how that comes into play within child welfare agencies. But I mean I think it's a bigger point that has culturally competent evaluators would need to think of when working across culturally, certainly.

Panelist: I turned it off. One is I don't think cultures are monolithic I don't think you are saying that either?

Alan J. Dettlaff: Right.

Panelist: I also do think people who are impressed know that they are impressed, so that's where we have diverge on that. They – but people need a safe space in which to express that, but what I was really getting at is that the United Nations is not one nation's standards or norms that these are agreed upon by multi-nations with and I think that a multi-nation agreement does make a difference in terms of having built the sub-through a process where countries don't have to sign on to different conventions.

But the Nuremberg trial certainly led us an important human rights in terms of how we conduct research and those, I don't know if all nations have signed on to it by now or not. But I think that those kinds it, when we're thinking about culturally competent work, we're thinking about reaching across cultures. I do think there is guidance that the United Nations can provide us. And that's why I was raising it.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Great.

Panelist: And I know this is all tough stuff.

Alan J. Dettlaff: No, thanks for bringing that up, because I really haven't considered it. Well thank you all for being here today and thanks for just listening to me for an hour and half in stead of a panel or may other co-presenter. I think we have our 15 minute break now and then poster sessions.

**Session 6.4 – Conducting Culturally Competent Evaluations With Immigrant and Refugee Children and Families**

Panelist: In the Research Round Table.

Alan J. Dettlaff: Research Round Table all right. Thanks.