FINAL REPORT

8th Quarter Mini Children and Family Services Review

Eastern Service Area

October 3 – 5, 2011

Prepared by DHHS Quality Assurance Program Specialist,
Micaela Swigle

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Final Report: Child and Family Services Review
Eastern Service Area – October 3rd – 5th 2011

This document presents the findings from the 2011 8th Quarter Mini Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the Eastern Service Area. The Nebraska CQI (Continuous Quality Improvement) team has identified the Mini CFSR Review as an important activity for assessing the performance of each service area and the state as a whole with regard to achieving positive outcomes for children and their families. Mini CFSR Reviews are scheduled to take place in each Service Area once every quarter in year 2010, 2011 and 2012.

The Eastern Service area 8th Quarter Mini CFSR Review was conducted on October 3rd through October 5th, 2011. The period under review for the onsite case review was October 1st, 2010 through October 1st 2011. The findings were derived from file reviews of 19 cases (11 foster care and 8 in home services), which were randomly selected from all open child welfare cases at some point in time during the period under review. The reviews also included interviews with parents, children, foster parents, Children and Family Services Specialists (CFSS), Children and Family Outcome Monitors (CFOM) and Family Permanency Specialists (FPS) to assess items 17-20 within the review tool.

In the Eastern Service Area, 13 of the 19 cases were brought to the attention of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) because of abuse/neglect issues. One case was a status offense, five were juvenile justice cases. All of the reviewed cases were from the Omaha and Papillion Offices.

The review was completed by 8 teams of two reviewers made up of both staff from DHHS and Families Matter providers, KVC & Nebraska Families Collaborative (NFC). 100% of the cases were reviewed by the following second level reviewers: Micaela Swigle and Kathy Anstine from DHHS.

Background Information

The Mini CFSR is modeled after the Federal CFSR reviews and assesses the Service Area's performance on 23 items relevant to seven outcomes.

With regards to outcomes, an overall rating of Strength or Area Needing Improvement (ANI) is assigned to each of the 23 items incorporated in the seven outcomes depending on the percentage of cases that receive a Strength rating in the onsite case review. An item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 95 percent of the applicable cases reviewed are rated as Strength. Performance ratings for each of the seven outcomes are based on item ratings for each case. A service area may be rated as having "substantially achieved," "partially achieved," or "not achieved" the outcome. The determination of whether a service area is in substantial conformity with a particular outcome is based on the percentage of cases that were determined to have

substantially achieved that outcome. In order for a service area to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95 percent of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome. The standard for substantial conformity is based on the standard set for Federal CFSR. The standards are based on the belief that because child welfare agencies work with our country's most vulnerable children and families, only the highest standards of performance should be acceptable. The focus of the CFSR process is on continuous quality improvement; standards are set high to ensure ongoing attention to the goal of achieving positive outcomes for children and families with regard to safety, permanency, and well-being.

A Service Area that is not in substantial conformity with a particular outcome must work with their local CQI Team to develop and implement a Program Improvement Plan (PIP) to address the areas of concern associated with that outcome.

Key CFSR Findings Regarding Outcomes

The 8th Quarter Mini CFSR identified several areas of high performance in the Eastern Service Area with regard to achieving desired outcomes for children. Although the service area did not achieve substantial conformity with any of the seven CFSR outcomes, the Service Area did achieve overall ratings of Strength (100%) for the individual indicators pertaining to Item 5 foster care reentry and Item 11 placing children in close proximity to their parents. This round Item 22 physical health of a child was near the 95% mark. Item 3 services to family and Item 23 Mental/Behavioral Health of the child were above 80%.

The mini CFSR review also identified key areas of concern with regard to achieving outcomes for children and families. Concerns were identified with regard to Permanency Outcome 1, (Children have permanency and stability in their living situations), which was substantially achieved in 36 percent of the reviewed cases. The lowest rating within this outcome was Item 7, Permanency Goal for Child, which was rated as Strength in 36% of the 11 applicable cases.

Concerns were identified with regard to Permanency Outcome 2, (Continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children) which was substantially achieved in 36% of reviewed cases. Within Permanency Outcome 2, the lowest ratings within this outcome was for Item 13 (Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care) which was rated as a Strength in 40% of the cases and Item 15 (Relative placement) which was rated a s a Strength in 33% of the cases.

Concerns were also identified with regard to Well-Being Outcome 1 (Families have enhanced capacity to provide for children's needs), which was substantially achieved in 26% of the cases reviewed. The lowest ratings were for Item 17 (Needs and services to child, parents, and foster parents), which was rated as a Strength in 37% of the reviewed cases; Item 18 (Child and family involvement in case planning) was rated as a Strength in 26% of the reviewed cases; and Item 20 (Caseworker visits with parent (s)) was rated as a Strength in 28% of the reviewed cases.

Well-Being Outcome 2 (Children receive appropriate services to meet their education needs) was substantially achieved in 79% of reviewed cases. Well-Being Outcome 3 (Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs) was substantially achieved in 78% of reviewed cases.

KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

I. SAFETY

Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

Status of Safety Outcome S1

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	0	0.00%
Partially Achieved:	3	60.00%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	2	40.00%
Not Applicable:	14	73.68%

Reviewer Comments S1:

- Contact with the victim needs to occur according to Priority. Reasons for the delays were not documented within the case file and/or the documented reason for the delay was not considered to be beyond the control of Agency.
- Delay in completing the assessments within 30-day timeframe.
- One case demonstrated that the investigation was initiated in accordance with the Agency's timeframes.

Item 1. Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment
In assessing Item 1, reviewers were to determine whether the response to a maltreatment report occurring during the period under review had been initiated in accordance with child welfare Agency policy. A new intake tool was implemented in 2003 which is based upon a priority response model with Priority 1 calling for a response by the worker within 24 hours of the time that the report is received by DHHS. Priority 2 designated reports are to have face to face contact with the alleged victim by Children and Family Services Specialist within 0 to 5 days from the time the intake is received and Priority 3 has a response time of 0-10 days.

Review Findings:

- Five of the 19 cases reviewed were applicable to the Item.
- No (0.00%) cases were rated as a Strength.
- Four (16.66%) cases of the five were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
    - Four foster care cases and one in home case was rated as Area Needing Improvement.
    - Two of the foster care cases rated as an area needing improvement involved Office of Juvenile Services (OJS) youth.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Cases were not initiated within the priority response timeframe specified in policy and there was no reason for the delay documented.
- Cases were not documented within 30 days of receiving intake.

Item 2. <u>Repeat maltreatment</u>

In assessing this Item, reviewers were to determine whether there had been at least one substantiated/inconclusive/petition to be filed maltreatment report during the period under review, and if so, whether another substantiated/inconclusive/petition to be filed report occurred within a 6 month period before or after the maltreatment report. Cases were considered not applicable for assessment if the child or family had never had a substantiated maltreatment report during the reporting period.

Review Findings:

- Four of the 19 cases reviewed were applicable to the Item.
- Three (75.00%) of the four cases were rated as a Strength.
  - Two foster care cases and one in home case were rated as a strength.
- One (25.00%) of the four cases was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - One foster care case was rated as an area needing improvement.

Strength:

- Cases with a substantiated report of maltreatment during the period under review did not have a report received in a 6-month period before or after the maltreatment report.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Multiple substantiated reports of maltreatment were received during the period under review that involved similar circumstances.

Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

<u>Status of Safety Outcome S2</u>

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	12	63.16%
Partially Achieved:	2	10.53%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	5	26.32%
Not Applicable:	0	0.00%

Reviewer Comments S2:

- Informal and formal Safety Assessments are not occurring at appropriate times in the case, particularly when a child goes home and at case closing.
- In some cases, children remaining in the home were not assessed by the Agency.

Item 3. <u>Services to family to protect child (ren) in home and prevent removal</u>

For this Item, reviewers were to assess whether in responding to a substantiated/inconclusive/petition to be filed maltreatment report or risk of harm, the Agency made diligent efforts to provide services to families to prevent removal of children from their homes while at the same time ensuring their safety. Five of the 19 cases were excluded from the assessment because there were no substantiated/inconclusive/petition to be filed maltreatment reports or identified risks of harm to children in the home during the period under review, the target child entered foster care prior to the period under review and there were no other children in the home who were at risk of maltreatment or the target child was reunified during the period under review and the reviewer determined there were no safety concerns.

Review Findings:

- Seven of the 19 cases reviewed were applicable to the Item.
- Six (85.71%) of the seven cases were rated as a Strength.
    - One foster care case and five in home cases were rated as a strength.
    - One in home case that was rated as a strength involved an Office of Juvenile Services (OJS) youth.
- One (14.29%) of the seven cases was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
    - The case rated as an area needing improvement was a foster care case.

Strength:

- Services were implemented for both parents and children in order to safely maintain the child (ren) in the home.
- In instances that children were removed from the home, removal was necessary to ensure child safety and or was due to the child's need for higher level of care.
- Services were implemented in order to ensure safety during reunification.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Services were not implemented to address safety concerns, children were ultimately removed from the non custodial parent.

Item 4. <u>Risk of harm to child</u>

The assessment of Item 4 required reviewers to determine whether DHHS had made, or was making, diligent efforts to reduce the risk of harm to the children involved in each case. Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if the Agency terminated the child's parent's rights as a means of decreasing risk of harm for the child (for example, a termination of parental rights would prevent a child from being returned to a home in which the child would be at risk) and has taken action to minimize other risks to the child (for example, preventing contact with individuals who pose a risk to the child's safety). If a case is/was open for services for a reason other than a court substantiated, inconclusive, petition to be filed or unfounded report of abuse or neglect, or apparent risk of harm to the child (ren) (for example, a juvenile justice case), reviewers were to document this information and rate the item as not applicable. Note, however, that for a child (ren) noted as a "child in need of supervision" or "delinquent", reviewers were to explore and determine whether there was a risk of harm to the child, in addition to the other reasons the case may have been opened, prior to rating it as not applicable. Cases were not applicable for assessment of this item if there was no current or prior risk of harm to the children in the family.

Review Findings:

- All of the nineteen cases were applicable to the Item.
- Twelve (63.16%) of the 19 cases were rated as a Strength.
  - Eight of the twelve cases were foster care cases and four were in home cases.
  - Three out of home cases and one in home case that were rated as a strength involved an Office of Juvenile Services (OJS) youth.
- Seven (36.84%) of the 19 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - Three of the seven cases were foster care cases and four were in home cases.
  - One in home case that was rated as an area needing improvement involved an OJS youth.

Strength:

- Safety Assessments included all family members.
- Safety Assessments and/or risk assessments were completed prior to case closure.
- Safety Assessments and safety plans were updated as needed.
- Informal assessment of safety for all children within the home.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Ongoing Safety Assessments were not completed as needed (reunification, case closure).
- Safety Plans were not completed and/or not updated as needed by the Agency.
- Safety Plans were not monitored by the Agency.
- Assessment of safety did not occur on all children residing in the family.
- Safety concerns were not appropriately addressed by the Agency.

II. PERMANENCY

Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

Status of Permanency Outcome P1

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	4	36.36%
Partially Achieved:	7	63.64%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	00.00%
Not Applicable:	8	42.11%

Reviewer Comments P1:

- There were no foster care re-entries.
- Four foster care cases were Substantially Achieved for Permanency Outcome 1.
- Permanency goals/case plans need to be established and updated in a timely manner.

- Placements were stable and/or change of placement occurred to achieve or move towards permanency goal.
- Case files did not contain documentation for an exception or a compelling reason for not filing TPR.

Item 5. <u>Foster care re-entries</u>

Reviewers rated this assessment as a Strength if during the period under review a child did not have an entry into care within a 12-month period from being discharged from another entry into foster care. Reviewers also rated this item as a Strength if a re-entry was an isolated incident during which the Agency did what was reasonable to manage the risk following reunification but the child re-entered care for another reason (for example, the death of a parent). Reviewers rated this item as an Area Needing Improvement if re-entries occurring within a 12-month period were due to the same general reasons or same perpetrators. Reviewers rated this item as Not Applicable if : (1) the child entered foster care before, and remained in foster care during, the period under review; or (2) the child entered foster care before, and exited foster care during, the period under review and there was not another entry into foster care during the period under review.

Review Findings:

- Two of the eleven cases were applicable to this Item.
- Both cases were (100.00%) rated as a Strength.
    - One of the two cases rated as a strength involved an OJS youth.

Strength:

- Children were removed during the period under review; there were no prior history of foster care placements.

Area Needing Improvement:

- None noted.

Item 6. <u>Stability of foster care placement</u>

In assessing this Item, reviewers were to determine whether the child experienced multiple placement changes during the period under review, and if so, whether the changes in placement settings were necessary to achieve the child's permanency goal or meet the child's service needs.

Review Findings:

- All of out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Eight (72.73%) out of eleven cases were rated as Strength.
    - One out of the eight cases that was rated as a strength involved an OJS youth.
- Three (27.27%) of the eleven cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
    - Two out of the three cases that were rated as an area needing improvement involved OJS youth.

Strength:

- Child remained in the same foster/relative placement; home is committed to concurrent goal of adoption.
- Placement change reflected the agency efforts to achieve permanency for the target child.
- Child experienced only one placement during the period under review.

Area Needing Improvement:

- The child experienced several placements during the period under review; including shelter, treatment, group home; it appears that there was a lack of placement resources to meet the youth's needs.
- Placement moves did not meet the child's needs.

Item 7. <u>Permanency goal for child</u>

In assessing this Item, reviewers were to determine whether DHHS had established an appropriate permanency goal for the child in a timely manner, including filing for termination of parental rights when relevant. Reviewers examined the appropriateness of a goal that ultimately rules out adoption, guardianship, or return to family. Reviewers assessed whether the child's best interests were thoroughly considered by DHHS in setting a goal of other planned living arrangement, and that such a decision is /was continually reviewed for ongoing appropriateness. Cases were assigned a rating of Strength for this item when reviewers determined that DHHS had established an appropriate permanency goal in a timely manner. Cases were assigned a rating of Area Needing Improvement when permanency goals were not changed in a timely manner to reflect current case circumstances, when it was apparent that reunification was unlikely to happen, termination of parental rights was not filed when the child had been in foster care for 15 of the past 22 months and no compelling reasons were noted in the file, or the goal established for the child was not appropriate. Cases were identified as Not Applicable if the child was not in foster care.

Review Findings:

- All eleven out of home cases reviewed were applicable to the Item.
- Four (36.36%) of the eleven cases were rated as a Strength.
    - Two of the four cases rated as a strength involved OJS youth.
- Seven (63.64%) of the eleven cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
    - One of the seven cases that was rated as an area needing improvement involved an OJS youth.

Strength:

- Timely implementation of primary and concurrent permanency goals that were appropriate to meet the child's needs.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Permanency goal (s) were not developed in a timely manner.
- Updates to the permanency goals were not completed in a timely manner to address the child's current needs.
- Case files did not include documentation of an exception or a compelling reason for not filing for TPR.

Item 8. <u>Reunification, Guardianship or Permanent Placement with Relatives</u>
In assessing these cases reviewers determined whether DHHS had achieved children's goals of reunification, guardianship or placement with relatives in a timely manner. If the goals had not been achieved in a timely manner reviewers determined whether DHHS had made diligent efforts to achieve the goals.

Review Findings:

- All out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Six (54.55%) of the eleven cases were rated as a Strength.
    - Three out of the six cases that were rated as a strength involved OJS youth.
- Five (45.45%) of the eleven cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

Strength:

- Agency was making efforts to achieve permanency goal in a timely manner.
- In two cases, the concurrent goal was actively addressed while pursing the primary permanency objective.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Reunification exceeded twelve months; child was in foster care for 22 months despite the fact that the child is in an adoptive home little efforts are being made to achieve the concurrent goal.
- Child was in care for 35 months, there is no indication a motion for termination of parental rights
- Reunification with parent did not take place in a timely manner.
- No concerted efforts to achieve guardianship.

Item 9. <u>Adoption</u>
In assessing this Item, reviewers were to determine whether appropriate and timely efforts (within 24 months of the most recent entry into foster care) had been or were being made to achieve finalized adoption.

Review Findings:

- Six of the eleven out of home cases reviewed were applicable to the Item.
- Three (50.00%) of the six cases were rated as Strength.
- Three (50.00%) of the six cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

Strength:

- Adoptive homes were located for the target child.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Case file documentation does not support that the Agency is making concerted efforts to achieve the permanency goal of adoption by:
    - Not addressing fathers/mothers rights timely
    - Not changing the goal to adoption timely

Item 10. <u>Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement</u>
Reviewers determined whether the Agency had made or was making diligent efforts to assist children in attaining their goals related to other planned permanent living arrangements (Independent Living, Self-Sufficiency or Family Preservation).

Review Findings:

- Two of the eleven out of home cases was applicable to the Item.
- One (50.00%) of two cases was rated as a Strength.
- One (50.00%) of two cases was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - This case identified as an area needing improvement involved an OJS youth.

Strength:

- Target child's current home is committed to assisting the youth in learning independent skills as well as providing placement until the youth is able to be independent.

Area Needing Improvement:

- There was no plan for a permanent living arrangement in order to assist the youth in achieving permanency goal of Independent Living.

Outcome P2: Continuity of family relationships and connections are preserved for children.

<u>Status of Permanency Outcome P2</u>

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	4	36.36%
Partially Achieved:	7	63.64%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0.00%
Not Applicable:	8	42.11%

Reviewer Comments P2:

- Staff makes efforts to place youth in their communities and near their families.
- No concerted efforts to locate and involve non-custodial fathers.
- Relative placements were utilized in some instances. In other instances, Agency needs to ensure that the file contains documentation of efforts to locate and evaluate relatives for placement.
- Need to document how we are preserving family connections.
- Need to ensure file contains documentation for sibling separation.

Item 11. <u>Proximity of foster care placement</u>
Reviewers were to determine whether the child's foster care setting was in close proximity to the child's parents or close relatives. Cases determined to be not applicable were those in which termination of parental rights had been completed prior to the period under review, or in which contact with parents was not considered to be in the child's best interest.

Review Findings:
- Ten of the eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- All (100.00%) of the cases were rated as Strengths.

Strength:
- Majority (8 of 10) of the placements were within the same community as the children's parent.
- Two of the youth were placed outside the community based on their behavioral/treatment needs, but it was close enough to allow for frequent visitation.
    - These two youth were involved in Office of Juvenile Services, one requiring specialized treatment for sex offender issues.

Area Needing Improvement:
- None noted.

Item 12. <u>Placement with siblings</u>
Reviewers were to determine whether siblings were or had been placed together and if not, was separation necessary to meet the needs (service or safety needs) of one or more of the children.

Review Findings:
- Six of the eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Four (66.67%) of the six cases were rated as a Strength.
    - One out of the four cases that was rated as a strength involved an OJS youth.
- Two (33.33%) of the six cases was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

Strength:
- Target child and his siblings were separated due to two out of three siblings having high behavioral health needs.
- In three cases, target child was able to be placed with their sibling (s).

Area Needing Improvement:
- There was no case file documentation to indicate the reason why for sibling separation.

Item 13. <u>Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care</u>
In assessing this Item, reviewers determined whether DHHS had or was making diligent efforts to facilitate visitations between children in foster care and their parents and siblings. Reviewers also determined whether these visits typically occurred with sufficient frequency to meet the needs of the children and families. Non applicable cases were those where the child had no siblings in foster care, if the parents could not be located, and/or if

visitation with the parents was considered not in the best interests of the child. Reviewers rated this item for the period under review based on the individual needs of the child and family, rather than on the DHHS policy regarding visitation. The DHHS visitation guidebook recommends a minimum of one visit every two weeks between child and parent unless it would not be in the child's best interest because the parent is the perpetrator of severe physical abuse or sexual abuse. DHHS Policy requires that siblings placed separately must have a minimum of one visit per month. Other forms of communication including phone calls and letters are strongly encouraged.

Review Findings:

- Ten out of the eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Four (40.00%) of the ten cases were rated as a Strength.
  - One out of the four cases that was rated as a strength involved an OJS youth.
- Six (60.00%) of the ten cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - Two out of the six cases that were rated as area needing improvement involved OJS youth.

Strength:

- The case file indicated that the Agency was making concerted efforts for the children to have regular visitation with their parents and siblings.
- Visits were sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship as the visits were occurring in the parental home, allowed for morning and evening routines to be followed, and the sibling that was placed elsewhere was also in attendance.

Area Needing Improvement:

- In one case, case file documentation did not indicate Agency efforts to encourage sibling and parent visitation.
- No documentation contained in the case file indicating the quality of the visits between youth and parents.
- Agency did not encourage visits between the father and child.

Item 14. <u>Preserving connections</u>

Reviewers determined whether DHHS had or was making diligent efforts to preserve the child's primary connection and characteristics while in foster care. Reviewers had to make a professional judgment about the child's primary connections and then explore whether those connections have been preserved through case planning and service delivery.

Review Findings:

- All eleven of the out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Six (54.45%) of the eleven cases were rated as a Strength.
  - One of the six cases that were rated as a strength involved an OJS youth.
- Five (45.45%) of the eleven cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - Two of the five cases that were rated as an area needing improvement involved OJS youth.

Strength:

- Extended family connections were maintained and/or re-established for the child.
- Sibling relationships were maintained with sibling residing in the parental home.

- Sufficient inquiry was conducted by the Agency to determine eligibility for membership in an Indian Tribe.

Area Needing Improvement:

- File documentation did not indicate the Agency made sufficient inquiry to determine eligibility for tribal membership/and or create a cultural plan when ICWA did apply.
- Child changed schools, child care and psychiatrists since being placed out of home.
- Agency did not promote contact with siblings, did not promote contact with extended family members and did not maintain cultural connections for child.

Item 15. <u>Relative placement</u>

Reviewers had to focus on the title IV-E provision that requires States to consider giving preference to placing the child with relatives, and determine whether the State considered such a placement and how (for example, seeking out and evaluating the child's relatives). Relatives include non-custodial parents, such as fathers not in the home, if applicable to the case. Reviewers had to determine the extent to which the Agency identified relatives who had some reasonable degree of relationship with the child and with whom the child might reside. There did not need to be in the case record a formal evaluation of relatives with whom the child might reside, but for reviewers to have answered "yes" evidence must exist, through either the case documentation or the case interviews, that relatives were evaluated and considered. Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if (1) the Agency assessed the child's needs and determined that he/she required special services *and* (2) the Agency assessed potential relative placements and determined that the relative placements did not have the capacity to meet the child's needs. Reviewers rated this item as a Strength unless no efforts were made to locate or identify relatives for placement, or placement with a family known to the child. Reviewers rated this item as not applicable if (1) the Agency determined upon the child's initial entry into care that his/her needs required residential treatment services and a relative placement would be inappropriate, or (2) if relatives were unable to be identified despite the Agency's diligent efforts to do so, or in situations such as abandonment in which the identity of the parents and relatives remains unknown despite efforts to identify them.

Review Findings:

- Nine of the eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Three (33.33%) of the nine cases were rated as a Strength.
- Six (66.67%) of the nine cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
    - One of the six cases rated as an area needing improvement involved an OJS youth.

Strength:

- Child was placed in relative care.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Relatives were identified in the case file, but there was no documentation that they were ever contacted regarding placement.
- Case file did not indicate a maternal or paternal relative search.

Item 16. Relationship of child in care with parents

In assessing this Item, reviewers determined if there was evidence of a strong, emotionally supportive relationship between the child in foster care and the child's parents during the period under review. Reviewers assigned a rating of Strength for this item when there was evidence of regular visitation between parent and child. Reviewers assigned a rating of Area Needing Improvement when they determined the Agency had not made diligent efforts to support the child's relationship with the father or mother. A case was considered not applicable if a relationship with the child's parents was contrary to the child's safety or best interest during the period under review.

Review Findings:

- Ten out of the eleven out of home cases were applicable to the Item.
- Seven (70.00%) of the ten cases were rated as a Strength.
  - Three of the seven cases that were rated as a strength involved OJS youth.
- Three (30.00%) of the ten cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

Strength:

- Family team meetings and services were in place to encourage and promote a positive bond between the child and parents.

Area Needing Improvement:

- In two cases, the agency did not make concerted efforts to encourage the father's participation.
- In one case, the agency did not make concerted efforts to encourage either parents' participation.

III. WELL-BEING

Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

Status of Well-Being Outcome WB1

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	5	26.32%
Partially Achieved:	9	47.37%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	5	26.32%
Not Applicable:	0	0.00%

Reviewer Comments WB1:

- No concerted efforts to locate and/or involve the non-custodial fathers in case planning.
- Child (ren), family and foster parents' needs were not consistently assessed and addressed by the Agency.

- Worker contact with the youth and parents needs to occur monthly, documentation of these visits should reflect the worker is discussing safety, permanency and wellbeing in order to promote the achievement of case plan outcomes.
- Needs, services and case planning were addressed at Family Team Meetings and during required contacts.
- In home cases need to assess and visit all children residing in the home.

Item 17. <u>Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents</u>
In assessing Item 17, reviewers were to determine whether DHHS adequately assessed the needs of children, parents and foster parents AND provided the services to meet those needs. Reviewers rated item 17 as a strength if (1) a needs assessment was conducted for the child (ren), parents, and foster parents, and (2) appropriate services were provided in relation to the identified needs of the target child in foster care cases, or for all children in in-home cases. Education and physical or mental health services to the target child were not rated for this item (these are rated in items 21, 22, and 23). Reviewers had to document whether these services were provided to parents.

Review Findings:
- All cases were applicable to the Item.
- Eight (42.11%) of the 19 cases were rated as a Strength.
    - Six foster care cases and two in home cases were rated as strength.
    - Two foster care cases rated as a strength involved OJS youth.
- Eleven (57.89%) of the 19 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
    - Five foster care cases and six in home case were rated as area needing improvement.
    - One foster care case and two in home cases rated as area needing improvement involved OJS youth.

Item 17	Child	Parent	Foster Parent
Strength:	15	7	7
ANI:	4	11	1
NA:	0	1	11

Strength: Separating out Items 17A, B, and C.
- Fifteen of 19 cases were rated as strengths for assessing the needs and services to the children (17A).
    - Assessments; Formal and informal assessments were utilized during the period under review. Formal assessments included; Safety Assessment, Ansell Casey, Pretreatment Assessment, Early Development Assessments, Youth Level of Services Inventory (YLSI), Psychological and Psychiatric Evaluations.
    - Identified needs; Communication skills, relationship building with family members, independent living skills, employment, extra circular activities, positive role modeling and supervision.
    - Services to child (ren); family support, family therapy, sibling visitation, wrap-around services, child care, electronic monitoring, juvenile tracker, reporting center, mentoring and independent living services.

- Seven of 18 applicable cases were rated as strengths for assessing the needs and services to the parents (17B).
    - Assessments; Formal and informal assessments were utilized during the period under review. Formal assessments included; Pretreatment Assessment, Mediation Services, Psychological Evaluation and Chemical Dependency Evaluation.
    - Identified needs; Develop age appropriate rules and expectations/consequences, skills to parent child with special needs, family relationships, transportation, communication, budgeting, mental health, housing, substance abuse and employment.
    - Services to parent (s); Family support, visitation, individual and family therapy, transportation services, anger management, domestic violence, psychiatric, parenting classes, substance abuse treatment and drug screening services.
- Seven of eight applicable cases were rated as strengths for assessing the needs and services to the foster parents (17C).
    - Assessments; Informal assessment was utilized during the period under review.
    - Needs and services were addressed accordingly by the Agency.

Area Needing Improvement: Separating out Items 17A, B, and C.

- Four of 19 applicable cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement for assessing the needs and services to children (17A).
    - Reviewers were unable to locate a formal or informal needs assessment for child.
    - Needs were identified but not addressed by the Agency. One case the caregiver stated she requested services of respite, sibling visitation, and increased therapeutic services that were not provided.
    - In home cases, other children residing in the home were not assessed by the Agency.
- Eleven of 18 applicable cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement for assessing the needs and services to the parents (17B).
    - No concerted efforts to locate and assess the father.
    - Reviewers were unable to locate a formal or informal needs assessment for parents.
- One of eight applicable cases were rated as an area needing improvement for assessing needs and services to foster parents (17C).
    - Foster parent stated their needs were never assessed by the Agency. There has been a gap in services due to continual shifting in case managers. Foster parent further reported that there has been a lack of support and respect by the case professionals.

Item 18. <u>Child and family involvement in case planning</u>

In assessing this Item, reviewers were to determine whether the Agency actively involved the parent(s), guardian, child (ren) and other people identified by the family in the case planning activities relevant to the current case plan. A determination of involvement in case planning required that a parent (guardian) and the child (older than 8 and not

incapacitated) had actively participated in identifying the services and goals for the case plan.

Review Findings:

- 19 out of 19 cases were applicable to the Item.
- Five (26.32%) of the 19 cases were rated as a Strength.
  - Four foster care cases and one in home case were rated as strength.
  - Two foster care cases rated as a strength involved OJS youth
- Fourteen (73.68%) of the 19 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - Seven foster care cases and seven in home cases were rated as area needing improvement.
  - One foster care case and two in home cases rated as area needing improvement involved OJS youth.

Strength:

- Case plan involvement was occurring through family team meetings, treatment team meetings and required contact with families.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Lack of documentation to show that attempts were made by the Agency to discuss the case plan at the family team meetings and/or during required contacts.
- Documentation did not indicate the key family members (child, mother, father) were involved in case planning.
- In home cases typically did not involved the other children residing in the home in the case planning process.
- Case file did not demonstrate concerted efforts to locate/involve fathers.

Item 19. <u>Worker visits with child</u>

Reviewers were to determine the typical pattern of visits between the worker and child and if these visits were sufficient to ensure adequate monitoring of the child's safety and well being. Reviewers were also to determine whether visits focused on issues pertinent to case planning, service delivery, and achievement of the goals.

Review Findings:

- All cases were applicable to the Item.
- Eleven (57.89%) of the 19 cases were rated as a Strength.
  - Eight foster care cases and three in home cases were rated as strength.
  - Three foster care cases rated as a strength involved OJS youth.
- Eight (42.11%) of the 19 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - Three foster care cases and five in home cases were rated as area needing improvement.
  - Two in home cases rated as area needing improvement involved OJS youth.

Strength:

- Children and Families Services Specialist and/or Family Permanency Specialist had a pattern of monthly visitation with the child (ren). Case file documentation indicated that the visits were private and were of quality by discussing such things as needs, services, case planning, permanency, visits, behaviors, and education.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Visits between worker and child did not occur monthly.
- Case file indicated that the worker visited monthly with the child, but the documentation was not sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety, permanency and well-being.
- Documentation did not reflect that visits between worker and child were private.
- In Home Cases, Agency did not have regular monthly contact with the other children residing in the home.

Item 20. <u>Worker visits with parents</u>

Reviewers were to assess whether the caseworker had sufficient face to face contact with parents to encourage attainment of their children's permanency goal while ensuring safety and well being. Cases that were considered not applicable if: (1) Agency contact with the mother or father was determined to be contrary to a child's safety or best interests (and this is documented in the case file), (2) the location of the parent was unknown during the entire period under review, despite documented concerted Agency efforts to locate her or him, (3) the parents' parental rights were terminated before the period under review and she or he is not involved in the child's life, or (4) during the entire period under review, the parent was not involved in the child's life or in case planning in any way despite Agency efforts to involve her or him.

Review Findings:

- 18 of the 19 cases were applicable to the Item.
- Five (27.78%) of the 18 cases was rated as a Strength.
  - Three foster care cases and two in home cases were rated as a strength.
  - Two foster care cases rated a strength involved OJS youth.
- Thirteen (72.22%) of the 18 cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - Seven foster care cases and six in home cases were rated as area needing improvement.
  - One foster care case and two in home cases were rated as area needing improvement involved OJS youth

Strength:

- Agency met monthly with parents. Documentation and/or interviews indicated that the visits were high quality, discussing progress toward outcomes and often discussing topics of safety, permanency and well-being.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Contacts were not occurring monthly.
- Documentation needs to reflect that issues of safety, permanency and well-being are being discussed between the worker, mother and father.
- Face to face contact occurred with one parent on a monthly basis, no regular contact with the other parent. Efforts to contact the other parent were not always documented within the case file.
- Concerted efforts to locate and involve the father were not documented within the case file.
- Several documented contacts with the parent occurred via text.

Outcome WB2: Children receive the appropriate educational services to meet their needs.

Status of Well-Being Outcome WB2

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	11	78.57%
Partially Achieved:	0	0.00%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	3	21.43%
Not Applicable:	5	26.32%

Reviewer Comments WB2:

- Child was being assessed and services were being implemented by Early Development Network as needed.
- Documentation of school performance and services were contained within the case file.
- In home cases that presented with educational issues, not all children in the home were assessed to determine if they had similar education needs.

Item 21. Educational needs of the child

When addressing educational issues for families receiving in-home services, reviewers considered whether the educational needs are/were relevant to the reason why the Agency is/was involved with the family, and whether the need to address educational issues is/was a reasonable expectation given the circumstances of the Agency's involvement with the family. (If not, reviewers rated item 21 as not applicable.) Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if (1) the Agency made extensive efforts to address the child's educational needs and the school system was unresponsive, especially if the problems are with a local school or jurisdiction; (2) if the child (ren)'s educational needs were assessed and addressed, including cases where the educational records were missing and the reasons why; or (3) if the Agency conducted an assessment of educational issues and determined that there were no problems in that area, nor any need for educational services.

Review Findings:

- Fourteen of the 19 cases were applicable to the Item.
- Eleven (78.57%) of the fourteen cases were rated as a Strength.
    - Nine foster care cases and two in home cases were rated as strength.
    - Three foster care cases rated a strength involved OJS youth.
- Three (21.437%) of the fourteen cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
    - One foster care case and two in home cases were rated as area needing improvement.
    - One in home case rated as an area needing improvement involved an OJS youth.

Strength:

- Agency assessed the child's educational needs during the period under review and implemented services accordingly.
- Informal tutoring services utilizing a relative were implemented for youth.

- Child was assessed by the Early Development Network and services were implemented to address the child's educational needs.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Agency did not assess/address the youth's educational needs.
- Agency did not address the educational needs of the other children in the home.

Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

Status of Well-Being Outcome WB3

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	14	77.78%
Partially Achieved:	1	5.56%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	3	16.67%
Not Applicable:	1	5.26%

Reviewer Comments WB3:

- The cases rated as strengths had documentation that medical examinations, dental examinations and mental health assessments were completed accordingly.
- Documentation indicated that services were provided to address identified medical, dental and mental health needs.
- Cases identified as area needing improvement lacked documentation of ongoing assessment of the youth's physical, dental and mental health needs.

Item 22. Physical health of the child

When addressing health issues for families receiving in-home services, reviewers considered whether the physical health needs are/were relevant to the reason why the Agency is/was involved with the family and whether the need to address physical health issues is/was a reasonable expectation given the circumstances of the Agency's involvement with the family. (If not, reviewers rated this item as not applicable.) For example, if a child became known to the Agency and was determined to be in need of in-home services at least partly as a result of physical abuse or sexual abuse, then it is reasonable to expect the Agency to provide services to ensure that the child receives the appropriate physical health services. Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if the Agency conducted an assessment of physical health and determined that there were no problems in that area, nor any need for physical health services.

Review Findings:

- Twelve of the 19 cases were applicable to the Item.
- Eleven (91.67%) of the twelve cases were rated as a Strength.
    - Ten foster care cases and one in home case were rated as strengths.

- Three foster care cases that were rated strengths involved OJS youth.

- One (8.33%) of the twelve cases was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.
  - One foster care case was rated as area needing improvement.

Strength:

- Cases contained documentation of routine health and dental examinations and services provided to meet any identified needs.

Area Needing Improvement:

- No indications that the Agency followed up on youth's dental health needs.

Item 23. <u>Mental health of the child</u>

Reviewers were to determine whether during the period under review, the Agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the child (ren). Reviewers rated this Item as a Strength if the Agency conducted an assessment, either initially or ongoing, of the child's mental health and implemented appropriate mental health services based upon those needs. In-home services cases are not applicable for an assessment of this Item if the reviewer determines that there is no reason to expect that, during the period under review, the Agency would address mental/behavioral health issues for any children in the family, given the reason for Agency involvement or the circumstances of the case.

Review Findings:

- Fifteen of the nineteen cases were applicable to the Item.
- Twelve (80.00%) of the fifteen cases were rated as a Strength.
  - Nine foster care cases and three in home cases were rated as strength.
  - Three foster care cases and one in home case rated as a strength involved OJS youth.
- Three (20.00%) of the fifteen cases were rated as an Area Needing Improvement
  - Three in home case were rated as area needing improvement.
  - One in home case rated as area needing improvement involved an OJS youth.

Strength:

- Cases contained formal assessments of mental health needs, services provided to meet those needs and documentation in the file to show progress. Evaluations included; psychological/psychiatric evaluations, substance abuse evaluations and mental status exams.
- Services were implemented based upon the child's identified mental health needs.
- Therapy summaries were located in the file.

Area Needing Improvement:

- Mental health assessments were completed not included in the case file. Reviewer was unable to determine whether or not the child's mental health needs were assessed during the period under review..
- Mental health assessments were not completed for all children residing in the home.

ESA Results

Case Sample: 8th - *Mini CFSR Review – October 2011*
Type of Review: 8th Quarter *Mini CFSR* **Report Type:** *Eastern Service Area Mini CFSR*
Number of Reviews: *19 (HHS, 3, KVC 9, NFC 7)* **Review Period:** *October 1st, 2010 – October 1st, 2011*

PERFORMANCE ITEM RESULTS

Performance Item		Item Ratings (#)			Item Ratings (%)		
		S	ANI	N/A	S	ANI	N/A
Item 1:	Timeliness of initiating investigations	0	5	14	0%	100%	74%
Item 2:	Repeat maltreatment	3	1	15	75%	25%	79%
Item 3:	Services to family	6	1	12	86%	14%	63%
Item 4:	Risk assessment and safety management	12	7	-	63%	37%	-
Item 5:	Foster care re-entries	2	0	17	100%	0%	89%
Item 6:	Stability of foster care placement	8	3	8	73%	27%	42%
Item 7:	Permanency goal for child	4	7	8	36%	64%	42%
Item 8:	Reunification, guardianship etc	6	5	8	55%	45%	42%
Item 9:	Adoption	3	3	13	50%	50%	68%
Item 10:	Other planned permanent living arrangement	1	1	17	50%	50%	89%
Item 11:	Proximity of foster care placement	10	0	9	100%	0%	47%
Item 12:	Placement with siblings	4	2	13	67%	33%	68%
Item 13:	Visiting with parents and siblings	4	6	9	40%	60%	47%
Item 14:	Preserving connections	6	5	8	55%	45%	42%
Item 15:	Relative placement	3	6	10	33%	67%	53%
Item 16:	Relationship of child in care with parents	7	3	9	70%	30%	47%
Item 17:	Needs and services	8	11	-	42%	58%	-
Item 18:	Child and family involvement in case planning	5	14	-	26%	74%	-
Item 19:	Caseworker visits with child	11	8	-	58%	42%	-
Item 20:	Caseworker visits with parent(s)	5	13	1	28%	72%	5%
Item 21:	Educational needs of the child	11	3	5	79%	21%	26%
Item 22:	Physical health of the child	11	1	7	92%	8%	37%
Item 23:	Mental/behavioral health of the child	12	3	4	80%	20%	21%

OUTCOME RESULTS

	COUNTS (#)				PERCENTAGES (%)			
Performance Outcome	*SA*	*PA*	*NACH*	*N/A*	*SA*	*PA*	*NACH*	*N/A*
Safety 1 (Items 1-2)	0	3	2	14	0%	60%	40%	74%
Safety 2 (Items 3-4)	12	2	5	-	63%	11%	26%	-
Permanency 1 (Items 5-10)	4	7	0	8	36%	64%	0%	42%
Permanency 2 (Items 11-16)	4	7	0	8	36%	64%	0%	42%
Wellbeing 1 (Items 17-20)	5	9	5	-	26%	47%	26%	-
Wellbeing 2 (Item 21)	11	0	3	5	79%	0%	21%	26%
Wellbeing 3 (Items 22-23)	14	1	3	1	78%	6%	17%	5%

KEY:
N/A = Not Applicable ***PA = Partially Achieved*** ***NACH = Not Achieved***
S = Strength ***SA = Substantially Achieved*** ***ANI = Area Needing Improvement***