

# **FINAL REPORT**

## **Children and Family Services Review**

### **Western Service Area**

### **9<sup>th</sup> Mini CFSR Review**

Period Under Review: January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011 – January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012

*Report Date: January 2012*

**Executive Summary**  
**Final Report: Children and Family Services Review (CFSR)**  
Western Service Area – 9<sup>th</sup> Mini CFSR Review

This document presents the findings from the 9<sup>th</sup> Mini-Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the Western Service Area. The Nebraska CQI (Continuous Quality Improvement) team has identified Mini-CFSR 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. The Mini-CFSR is scheduled to take place in each service area, quarterly beginning in the year 2010.

The Western Service Area's 9<sup>th</sup> Mini-CFSR was conducted from January 10 to 12, 2012. The period under review for the onsite case review was January 1, 2011 to January 1, 2012. The findings were derived from file reviews of 14 cases (8 foster care and 6 in home services) which were randomly selected from all child welfare cases which were open at some time during the period under review. The reviews also included interviews with parents, children, foster parents, CFS specialists, and other service providers to assess Items 17-20 within the review tool.

In the Western Service Area, 4 of the 14 cases reviewed were brought to the attention of DHHS for juvenile justice services and 1 of the cases was non court involved. Cases reviewed were from the following local offices: Alliance, Gering, McCook, North Platte, Ogallala, and Sidney.

The first level reviews of the cases were completed by 9 staff from DHHS. A second level review of 100% of the cases was completed by Lori Posvar, DHHS and Terri Farrell, DHHS.

### **Background Information**

The mini CFSR is modeled after the Federal CFSR 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 of 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 the 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 9<sup>th</sup> Mini CFSR identified several areas of high performance in the Western 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 for the individual indicators pertaining to the following items: Item 5 (foster care re-entries), Item 6 (stability of foster care placement), and Item 11 (proximity of foster care placement).

The 9<sup>th</sup> Mini-CFSR also identified key areas of concern with regard to achieving outcomes for children and families. Concerns were identified with regard to Permanency Outcome 2 (the continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children), which was Substantially Achieved in only 37.5% of the cases reviewed. The lowest ratings within this outcome were for Item 13 (visiting with parents and siblings in foster care) which was rated as a Strength in 37.5% of the applicable cases; Item 15 (relative placement) which rated as a Strength in 50% of the applicable cases; and Item 16 (relationship of child in care with parents) which was rated as a Strength in 14.3% of the applicable cases.

Additionally, concerns were identified with regard to Well-Being Outcome 1 (families have enhanced capacity to provide for children's needs). This outcome was substantially achieved in 48.6% of the cases reviewed. The lowest rating within this outcome was Item 20 (caseworker visits with parents) which rated was rated as a Strength in 46.2% of applicable cases.

Concerns were also identified with regard to Well-Being Outcome 3 (children receive appropriate services to meet their physical and mental health needs). This outcome was substantially achieved in 38.5% of the cases reviewed. Within Well-Being Outcome 3, the Western Service Area achieved a Strength rating of 44.7% for Item 22 (physical health of the child).

## 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:	4	66.7%
Partially Achieved:	1	16.7%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	16.7%
Not Applicable:	8	57.1%

#### **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 Protection and Safety within 0 to 5 days from the time the intake is received and Priority 3 has a response time of 0-10 days. Data is generated monthly to ensure compliance with the response times.

**Review Findings:** The assessment of Item 1 was applicable for 6 of the 14 cases. The item was rated a Strength in 5 (83.3%) of the applicable cases and as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 1 (16.7%) of the applicable cases.

#### **Strength:**

- (1 in home case and 4 foster care cases)
  - In all five cases, the timeframes for initiating investigation and making contact with child victims were met.

#### **Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (1 foster care cases)
  - In one case, for one of the maltreatment reports received, the case file did not contain documentation of when or if face to face contact was made with the child nor did it contain a date of finding for this report. There is also no documentation to explain why the response to this intake was delayed.

#### **Reviewer Comments:**

- Documentation needs to include reasons why contact with the child(ren) was not completed in a timely manner according to state policy.

**Item 2: Repeat maltreatment**

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 report identified. Cases were considered not applicable for assessment if the child or family had never had a maltreatment report.

**Review Findings:** The assessment of Item 2 was applicable for 4 of the 14 cases. The item was rated a Strength in 3 (75.0%) of the applicable cases and as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 1 (25.0%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (1 in home case and 2 foster care cases)
  - In all three cases, there were no additional substantiated maltreatment reports within a 6 month period before or after the substantiated maltreatment report that was received during the period under review.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (1 foster care case)
  - In one case, it was identified that repeat maltreatment did occur. Reviewers noted that there was one substantiated report of maltreatment during the period under review. It was also found that during the 6 months prior to this report, there were also 2 other substantiated reports of maltreatment of similar circumstances. A safety plan including in home safety services was created but was not successful in preventing repeat maltreatment.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- Documentation was available in the case file to explain the circumstances and findings for any maltreatment reports received within a 6 month period before and after any substantiated maltreatment reports that were received during the period under review.

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

**Status of Safety Outcome S2**

	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
Substantially Achieved:	10	71.4%
Partially Achieved:	2	14.3%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	2	14.3%
Not Applicable:	0	0.0%

### **Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal**

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.

**Review Findings:** The assessment of Item 3 was applicable for 10 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 9 (90.0%) of the applicable cases and as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 1 (10.0%) of the applicable cases.

#### **Strength:**

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In one case documentation shows that efforts were made to prevent the child's removal from the home; however, despite the efforts made and services provided, the mother stopped complying with the safety plan and repeat maltreatment occurred and the children were at that point removed from the home.
  - In another case, the child was reunified during the period under review and services were provided to ensure the child's safety and prevent re-entry into foster care.
  - In one case, while the child was removed without efforts first being made to prevent entry into foster care, documentation in the case file clearly supported that immediate removal was necessary to ensure the safety of the child.
- (6 in home cases)
  - In all six of these cases, documentation indicated that in home safety and other services including family support, individual and family therapy, tracker services, and school intervention, were provided in order to protect the children and prevent their entry into foster care.

#### **Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (1 foster care case)
  - In one case, the children were reunified with their mother during the period under review. There was no safety plan developed at the time of reunification and there was no documentation of efforts to prevent the children's re-entry into foster care. There is no indication of services being provided or offered to the family upon reunification despite indication of ongoing concerns.

#### **Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ Reviewers identified that a wide variety of services are being provided to families to protect children and prevent entry or re-entry into foster care.
- ☑ All children in the home should be evaluated to determine what services are needed to protect the children in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care.
- ☑ If there are safety concerns related to the parent/step parent, then the parent/step parent should not be left in charge of managing safety for their children and safety plans should include how safety will be maintained for the children if they continue to have contact with the parent/step parent

#### **Item 4: Risk of harm to child**

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:** The assessment of Item 4 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 10 (71.4%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 4 (28.6%) of the applicable cases.

#### **Strength:**

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In all five of these cases, there was sufficient documentation to show that initial assessments and ongoing risk and safety assessments were completed for the target child while in foster care and for the other children remaining in the home. Documentation also indicated that risk and safety assessments were formally or informally completed and safety plans were adjusted as safety threats increased or decreased.
- (5 in home cases)
  - In all five of these cases, there was sufficient documentation to show that initial and ongoing risk and safety assessments were completed both formally and informally while the children were placed in the care of their parents and that safety plans were adjusted as safety threats increased or decreased.

#### **Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In two cases, reviewers were unable to find documentation of any risk or safety assessments, formal or informal, during the period under review.
  - In one case there was no documentation of ongoing risk assessments. Safety assessments were completed; however it was found that the ongoing safety assessment was completed based upon the children's safety in the foster home and not based upon safety in the family home. The safety plan was not updated or revised at reunification as it should have been.

- (1 in home case)
  - In this one case, reviewers found some minimal informal safety and risk assessments pertaining only to the target child’s sibling. There were no documented safety or risk assessments regarding the target child.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ The Nebraska Safety Intervention System (Safety Model) should be utilized to assess risk and improve safety interventions with children and families. Reviewers found that while the Nebraska Safety Intervention System was utilized for the majority of initial assessments, it was not used as consistently for ongoing safety assessments. Reviewers relied on informal assessments documented during face to face contacts and Family Team Meetings during their review of this item.
- ☑ Workers should continue to assess risk and safety during face to face contacts with the children, parent(s) and foster parents. These assessments should be well documented in the narratives provided for required contacts with the children, parents and foster parents.
- ☑ Safety plans should continually be monitored and updated as circumstances change and as safety threats increase or decrease.

**II. PERMANENCY**

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

**Status of Permanency Outcome P1**

	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
Substantially Achieved:	5	62.5%
Partially Achieved:	3	37.5%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0.0%
Not Applicable:	6	42.9%

**Item 5: Foster care re-entries**

Reviewers rated this assessment 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:** The assessment of Item 5 was applicable for 4 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all 4 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (4 foster care case)
  - In all four cases, the child did enter foster care within a 12-month period from being discharged from another entry into foster care.

**Item 6: Stability of foster care placement**

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:** The assessment of Item 6 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all 8 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (8 foster care cases)
  - In five of the cases, documentation showed that the child experienced only one placement setting during the period under review. In all five cases, the reviewers found that the child's foster care placement stable.
  - In three of the cases, while the child experienced more than one placement change, documentation clearly showed that the placement changes were necessary in order to provide for the child's needs.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- Reasons for placement changes were documented in the file.
- Reviewers were able to determine that the placement changes were in the best interest of the child and necessary to achieve the child's permanency goals and / or meet the child's specific needs.

**Item 7: Permanency goal for child**

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 goals of reunification were not changed in a timely manner when it was apparent that reunification was unlikely to happen, termination of parental rights was not filed when the child had been 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:** The assessment of Item 7 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 5 (62.5%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 3 (37.5%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In all five cases, the child's permanency goals were established in a timely manner, documented in the case file, and were appropriate to the child's needs for permanency.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In two cases, the permanency goal was not established in a timely manner. In both cases, the children had been in out of home placement for 5 months prior to the goal being established; however permanency goals should be established within 60 days from the child's entry into care.
  - In another case, the child had been in placement for more than 15 out of 22 months. There had been no request for Termination of Parental Rights, nor was there documentation in the case file regarding an exception or compelling reason for not filing for Termination of Parental Rights.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ Permanency goals need to be identified in the case file. Documentation of permanency goals should accurately reflect goals that are being addressed for the child.
- ☑ The first permanency goal of the child should be established within 60 days from the child's entry into foster care.
- ☑ Case file documentation needs to include all information regarding termination of parental rights for children who have been in foster care at least 15 out of the most recent 22 months. Documentation should include evidence of a petition for termination of parental rights and / or documentation of compelling reasons for not filing for termination of parental rights.

**Item 8: Reunification, Guardianship or Permanent Placement with Relatives**

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:** The assessment of Item 8 was applicable for 7 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 6 (85.7%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 1 (14.3%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (6 foster care cases)
  - In two cases, documentation shows that concerted efforts by the agency resulted in successful achievement of the child's permanency goal of reunification.

- In two cases, documentation in the case file shows concerted efforts being made to achieve the permanency goal of reunification in a timely manner.
- In two cases, the case file contains documentation to support that the agency has made concerted efforts towards the permanency goal of guardianship.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (1 foster care case)
  - In one case, the reviewers determined that the agency has not made sufficient efforts to achieve the child’s permanency goal of guardianship or concurrent goal of reunification. The child has been in out of home care for 23 months and neither goal has been achieved. Reviewers noted that the agency did not seek out other options for guardianship after the child’s maternal grandmother refused guardianship.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ The agency should be making active efforts to achieve ALL permanency goals (primary and concurrent goals) established for the child.
- ☑ If the child has been in foster care for longer than 12 months, documentation should also include information regarding barriers or particular circumstances to justify the delay in achieving the child’s permanency goal.

**Item 9: Adoption**

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:** The assessment of Item 9 was applicable for 5 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 4 (80.0%) of the applicable cases and as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 1 (20.0%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (4 foster care case)
  - In three cases, documentation shows concerted efforts have been made toward the concurrent goal of adoption while also pursuing the primary goal of reunification.
  - In another case, documentation shows concerted efforts have been made toward the concurrent goal of adoption while also pursuing the primary goal of guardianship.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (1 foster care case)
  - In one case, reunification was identified as the primary goal and adoption was established as a concurrent goal. There was no documentation of any efforts being made toward the concurrent goal of adoption.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ The agency should be making active efforts to achieve ALL permanency goals (primary and concurrent goals) established for the child. Reviewers had difficulty finding information to support the agency efforts to achieve concurrent goals that were established.

**Item 10: Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement**

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:** The assessment of Item 10 was not applicable for any cases reviewed this quarter.

**Status of Permanency Outcome P2**

	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
Substantially Achieved:	3	37.5%
Partially Achieved:	5	62.5%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0.0%
Not Applicable:	6	42.9%

**Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement**

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:** The assessment of Item 11 was applicable for 7 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all 7 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (7 foster care cases)
  - In five cases, the child was placed in the same community as their parents.
  - In one case, the child was placed in close proximity to their parent at the time of removal; however the mother later moved resulting in the child’s placement being over 60 miles away. The agency has made efforts to maintain close contact despite this move by providing the parents with transportation assistance.
  - In one case, while placement was not in close proximity to the child’s parents and home community, documentation showed that the placement was in the closest available facility which could meet the child’s needs.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ Documentation included information regarding the location of foster care placement and its proximity to the parents(s).
- ☑ The review identified that whenever possible, children are placed in close proximity of their parents.
- ☑ In cases where placement was not within close proximity to the child's family, it was identified that this occurred because an appropriate placement was not available in the child's home community and that the closest appropriate placement was utilized.

**Item 12: Placement with siblings**

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:** The assessment of Item 12 was applicable for 5 of the 14 cases. This item was rated a strength in the 4 (80.0%) applicable case and rated as an area needing improvement in 1 (20.0%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (4 foster care case)
  - In three cases, the target child was placed with their siblings in the same foster care setting.
  - In one case, documentation in the case file shows that attempts had been made to place the siblings together in the same home; however, efforts were unsuccessful due to the target child's behaviors with lead to him being placed separate from his sibling in a residential treatment facility.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (1 foster care case)
- In this case, two older siblings had previously been removed from the home and placed into foster care. There is no documentation in the case file to show that consideration was given to place the child in the same foster home as her siblings.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ Documentation should explain the agency's efforts to place all siblings together.
- ☑ Documentation should clearly address the circumstances or reasons for not placing all siblings together.

**Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care**

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:** The assessment of Item 13 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 3 (37.5%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 5 (62.5%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In one case, documentation shows that the child was able to have frequent visitation, several times a week, with his mother and siblings. Documentation also shows that the agency made concerted efforts to locate and involve the child's father; however he did not respond to any of the agency's efforts and has had no involvement during the life of the case.
  - In another case, during the child's 20 day out of home placement, the child was allowed at least 5 visits per week with his parents.
  - In one case, documentation shows that the child and his sibling were able to have visits at least monthly. In this case, visits with the mother and father were determined to be not applicable as parental rights had been terminated prior to the period under review.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In one case, while there were efforts to promote visitation with the child's parents, there was no documentation in the case file to show that visitation occurred with the child's siblings who are placed in another foster home.
  - In another case, documentation did not provide sufficient information regarding the frequency or the quality of visitation between the child and his parents.
  - In three cases, while documentation shows sufficient visitation between the child and the mother, the visitation between the child and the father was not sufficient in frequency or quality and the case file did not indicate that concerted efforts were made for the father to have more frequent contact with the child.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- Visitation with the child and his/her parents (mother and /or father when applicable) and the child and his/ her siblings in foster care should be clearly documented in the case file.
- Documentation should describe both the frequency and quality of visits.

**Item 14: Preserving connections**

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:** The assessment of Item 14 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 7 (87.5%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 1 (12.5%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (7 foster care cases)
  - In two cases, the child was placed in a relative foster home in their own community which allowed for the child to maintain contact with extended family and to continue participation in extracurricular activities.
  - In one case, the child was placed in a nearby community for a short period of 20 days. This child's important connections to school were maintained.
  - In one case, documentation shows that the child was able to remain in the same school and continue involvement in sports and church. This child is also able to maintain contact with an adult sibling.
  - In one case, the child was able to remain in his home community and continue in the same school and maintain social connections.
  - In one case, the child was able to remain in the same school district. In this same case, possible tribal affiliation was reported and the agency did contact the tribe and was notified that the child was not eligible for membership with the tribe.
  - In one case, documentation shows that the child was able to maintain connections to an important adult figure in his life whom he considers a "surrogate grandmother".

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (1 foster care case)
  - In this case, there was no documentation of efforts being made to identify or maintain important connections for the child while in foster care. Reviewers noted that while the child's connections would be minimal as the child was removed as a newborn, there were no documented efforts to support connections to the child's siblings who are not in foster care or to the child's extended family.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ Documentation needs to identify the child's important connections and efforts made by the department to preserve those connections.
- ☑ Documentation should include information to support that sufficient inquiry was conducted with both mother and father and relatives to determine whether or not the child may be a member of or eligible for membership in a Native American tribe.

**Item 15: Relative placement**

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. Reviewers were to check not applicable if the child was placed with relatives.

**Review Findings:** The assessment of Item 15 was applicable for 6 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 3 (50.0%) of the applicable cases and as an area needing improvement in 3 (50.0%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In all five cases, the child was placed with relatives and documentation supports that this placement is stable and meeting the child’s needs.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In two cases, it was noted that there were no documented efforts to identify either maternal or paternal family members.
  - In one case, the child had been in placement with his maternal grandmother prior to the period under review. This relative placement ended prior to the period under review at the grandmother’s request, and there was no do documented efforts to identify other maternal or paternal family members for placement.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- Both maternal and paternal relatives should be identified.
- Efforts to identify and pursue appropriate relative placements should be clearly documented in the case file.

**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:** The assessment of Item 16 was applicable for 7 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 1 (14.3%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 6 (85.7%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (1 foster care case)
  - In this case, documentation showed that the agency had made efforts to support and maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the target child and his parents.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (6 foster care cases)
  - In three cases, there was no documentation showing that efforts were made to support and maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child and his parents.
  - In three cases, while there was documentation of efforts to promote a positive relationship between the child and his/her mother, there was no documentation regarding any attempts to support and maintain a positive relationship between the child and his/her father.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ Documentation should clearly describe the agency’s efforts to provide opportunities or to support additional activities to promote, strengthen, or maintain parent-child relationships.

**III. WELL-BEING**

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

**Status of Well-Being Outcome WB1**

	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
Substantially Achieved:	6	42.9%
Partially Achieved:	6	42.9%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	2	14.3%
Not Applicable:	0	0.0%

**Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents**

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:** The assessment of Item 17 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 9 (64.3%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 5 (35.7%) of the applicable cases. The overall rating for Item 17 is based on the combination of the following three sub-items:

**Item 17a: Needs Assessment and Services to Children:** The assessment of Item 17a was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all 13 (92.9%) of the applicable cases and as an area needing improvement in 1 (7.1%).

**Strength:**

- (7 foster care cases)
  - In these seven cases, the needs of the children were assessed in a variety of ways including Family Team Meetings, OJS evaluation, initial and ongoing safety assessments, Comprehensive Child and Adolescent Assessment, Youth Level of Service / Case Management Inventory, and caseworker visits with the child, parents, and foster parents.
  - In these seven cases, the needs of the children were met through providing assistance with transportation, child care, out of home placement, tracker services, random drug testing, visitation supervision, and case management. Reviewers found no unmet needs for the children in these cases.
- (6 in home cases)
  - In these six cases, the needs of all of the children were assessed both formally and informally through psychological evaluations, Youth Level of Service / Case Management Inventory, during Family Team Meetings, and during worker contacts with the child, family, and safety plan participants.
  - In these six cases, identified needs of the children were met through assistance with family support services, in home safety services, and tracker services. Reviewers found no unmet needs for the children in these cases.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (1 foster care case)
  - In this case, while the information gathered through interviews indicated that informal assessments of the child's needs were completed, there was no documentation in the case file to show that needs assessments were completed. Information gathered from interviews also indicated that while the worker would write down needs that were identified during visits, the agency failed to follow through with providing services to meet these needs.

**Item 17b: Needs Assessment and Services to Parents:** The assessment of Item 17b was applicable for 13 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 8 (61.5%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 5 (38.5%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (4 foster care cases)
  - In these four cases, the needs of the parents were assessed on an ongoing basis using both formal and informal means including drug and alcohol assessments, Family Team Meetings and regular monthly contact with the caseworker.
  - In these four cases, identified needs were met through individual and family therapy, family support services, supervised visitation, random drug testing, drug and alcohol treatment, and assistance with transportation for visitation.
- (4 in home cases)
  - In these four cases, the needs of the parents were assessed through the following methods: family team meetings, service provider reports, and during monthly worker contacts with the parents and children.
  - In these four cases, identified needs were met through the following services: family support services, individual and family therapy, domestic violence education, medication management, education to develop parenting skills, and parent advocacy.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In two cases, there was not sufficient information through interviews or in the case file documentation to show that either of the parents' needs were sufficiently assessed or that appropriate services were provided to meet their needs.
- (2 in home cases)
  - In one case, where the father was in the home but the mother was absent, the agency assessed the needs of the father, but did not sufficiently assess the needs of the mother and did not provide services to the mother.
  - In another case, the case file contains no documentation of concerted efforts to assess the needs of the mother or the father. The mother and father continued to participate in counseling which they had started prior to the agency's involvement. No other services were provided to the parents.

**Item 17c: Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents:** The assessment of Item 17c was applicable for 6 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 2 (33.3%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 4 (66.7%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (2 foster care cases)
  - In both of these cases, it was noted that the needs of the foster parents were assessed informally through involvement in Family Team Meetings, phone calls, and monthly worker visits with the foster parents. In all cases the needs of the foster parents were found to have been met.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (4 foster care case)
  - In one case, the reviewers were unable to find information to indicate that the needs of the foster parents were assessed or that services were provided to meet their needs.
  - In one case, while the foster parents were provided with child care and respite services after requesting these, no information could be found to show that the agency made efforts to assess the needs of the foster parents.
  - In another case, information gathered through interviews indicated that the foster parents did have several needs which they communicated to the agency; however they were not provided with appropriate services to meet these needs.
  - In one case, it was reported during interviews that the agency has never completed any type of assessment of the foster parent's needs and that foster parent has provided for any needs relating to the child.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ Reviewers identified that in the majority of the cases the agency performed well in terms of assessing, identifying, and meeting the needs of the child.
- ☑ In terms of the parents, reviewers noted that in some cases the needs of one of the parents were identified and addressed while the other parent's needs were not. Most often, this occurred when one of the parents was absent from the home and it is the absent parent whose needs are not consistently being assessed, identified, or met.
- ☑ Caseworker contacts and Family Team Meetings were the most frequently noted methods of assessing needs for children, parents and foster parents.

**Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning**

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:** The assessment of Item 18 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 9 (64.3%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 5 (35.7%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In all five cases, the reviewers noted that the case worker made active efforts to involve or encourage the child (if age and developmentally appropriate) and both parents to be involved in case planning through family team meetings and caseworker contacts with the child and parents.

- (4 in home cases)
  - In all five cases, the reviewers noted that the case worker made active efforts to involve or encourage the child (if age and developmentally appropriate) and both parents (if applicable) to be involved in case planning through family team meetings and caseworker contacts with the child and parents.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In one case, while the child was involved in case planning, the mother and the father were not involved in case planning.
  - In one case, while reviewers found documentation that the child and the mother were involved in case planning; however, there was no documentation of efforts to involve the father of the child in case planning.
  - In another case, the child and mother were involved in case planning during family team meetings; however the reviewers found that there were not sufficient efforts made to involve the father in case planning. Documentation shows that the father was sent a copy of the case plan, but there was no indication of any other efforts to involve the father in case planning.
- (2 in home cases)
  - In one case, information gathered through interviews showed that efforts were made to involve the mother, the father, and the target child's sibling in case planning; however the agency did not make efforts to involve the target child in in case planning in anyway.
    - It is noted that in this case, the information to support the involvement of the mother, father and sibling in case planning had to be collected through interviews only as there was no documentation in the case file regarding this.
  - In one case, the child and the father were involved in case planning. There is no documentation of efforts to involve the mother, who was the absent parent, or to involve the other children in the home in case planning.

***Reviewer Comments:***

- ☑ Documentation should clearly show concerted efforts by the agency to involve the parents (mother and/or father as applicable) in case planning activities.
- ☑ The reviewers identified that case planning is primarily occurring during monthly contacts with the parents and child as well as during Family Team Meetings.

**Item 19: Worker visits with child**

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:*** The assessment of Item 19 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 9 (64.3%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 5 (35.7%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In all five of these cases, face to face visits between the case worker were found to be of sufficient frequency and were also found to be of sufficient quality as the caseworker addressed issues of safety, permanency and well being as well as case planning with the child.
- (4 in home cases)
  - In all four of these cases, it was found that the caseworker had face to face contacts with all children at least once per month. The visits were found to meet quality as they involved issues of safety, permanency and well-being.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In two cases, while visits were of sufficient frequency, it was determined that these visits were not sufficient in quality.
  - In one case, visits were not of sufficient frequency as they occurred less than monthly.
- (2 in home cases)
  - In one case, there were no worker visits with the target child. The worker only had visits with the target child's sibling. It is noted that the case was open due to the sibling's behaviors; however as this is an in home case, the expectation of the CFSR is that the worker have visits with all of the children in the home.
  - In one case, frequency of visits was insufficient as documentation in the case file and information gathered through interviews showed that only one visit with the child took place in the 5 months that the case was open during the period under review. The documentation was not sufficient to indicate quality.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ Documentation should address the frequency of worker's visits with the child. If face to face contact between the worker and the child was less than monthly, documentation should include reasons why the contact did not occur.
- ☑ Documentation should include enough information to determine the quality of the visit and to show that the visit was sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety, permanency and well-being of the child and to promote achievement of case plan goals.

**Item 20: Worker visits with parents**

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 were those in which there is no plan for further involvement between the parents and the agency or the parents and the child, and the child is not in a permanent home.

**Review Findings:** The assessment of Item 20 was applicable for 13 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 6 (46.2%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 7 (53.8%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (2 foster care cases)
  - In both cases, reviewers found that the visits with the parents were of sufficient frequency; occurring at least monthly. Visits with the parents were also determined to be of sufficient quality as the caseworker and parents discussed issues pertaining to the permanency and well being of the child.
- (4 in home cases)
  - In four cases, documentation in the case file and information gathered through interviews showed that the caseworker visits with both the mother and the father were sufficient in frequency and quality.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In one case, there was no face to face contact between the worker, the child's mother, or father. There is no information in this case to indicate why no visits occurred.
  - In one case, while visits with the mother were found to be of sufficient frequency and quality, there were not face to face visits with the father and it was determined that sufficient efforts were not made to involve the father.
  - In one case, there was no contact between the worker and the child's father. While there was contact between the worker and the child's mother, it was determined that contact was not sufficient in frequency or quality.
  - In two cases, while documentation showed that contacts with the parents were sufficient in frequency, it was determined that the visits were not of sufficient quality.
- (2 in home cases)
  - In one case, while there were monthly quality visits with the child's father, there were no visits with the child's mother.
  - In one case, worker visits with the mother and father were less than monthly and documentation was not sufficient to show that these visits were of sufficient quality.

***Reviewer Comments:***

- ☑ Lack of documentation is a significant contributing factor for not achieving Item 20. Worker visits with the parents (mother and/or father as determined to be applicable and appropriate) should be clearly documented to show both frequency and quality of visits.
- ☑ In out of home cases where the parents do not reside together, the agency tends to achieve sufficient contact with the parent they are seeking to reunify the child with, while less than sufficient contact or no contact is made with the other parent.
- ☑ For the majority of in-home cases, when contact with the child was sufficient, contact with the parent or parents residing in the home with the child was also sufficient, however contact was not sufficient with the absent parent.

## **Status of Well-Being Outcome WB2**

	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
Substantially Achieved:	10	90.9%
Partially Achieved:	0	0.0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	9.1%
Not Applicable:	3	21.4%

### **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:** The assessment of Item 21 was applicable for 11 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 10 (90.9%) of the applicable cases and as an area needing improvement in 1 (9.1%) of the applicable cases.

#### **Strength:**

- (6 foster care and 4 in home cases)
  - In all six cases, documentation in the case file showed that the educational needs of the child were assessed and that the child received appropriate services in order to meet their unique educational needs.

#### **Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (1 foster care case)
  - In this case, there is no documentation of assessments of the target child's educational needs and no information regarding the child's educational progress.

#### **Reviewer Comments:**

- Documentation should show what efforts were made to assess the child's educational needs.
- Documentation should detail what the child's educational needs are and what efforts the agency is making to meet these needs.

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

**Status of Well-Being Outcome WB3:**

	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
Substantially Achieved:	5	38.5%
Partially Achieved:	4	30.8%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	4	30.8%
Not Applicable:	1	7.1%

**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:** The assessment of Item 22 was applicable for 9 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 4 (44.4%) of the applicable cases and as an area needing improvement in 5 (55.6%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In all three of these cases, the case file contained documentation that the child received periodic, age appropriate physical and dental health examinations, and that any identified health needs were met with appropriate services.
- (1 in home cases)
  - In this case, documentation in the case file shows that the child received periodic, age appropriate physical and dental health examinations. The child also received appropriate services to address all identified health needs.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In three cases, the reviewers were unable to find documentation of a current assessment of the child's physical and dental health needs.
  - In two cases, while there was documentation of a current physical exam, there is not documentation of a current dental exam for the child.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ Documentation should show what efforts were made to assess the child's physical and dental health needs.
- ☑ Documentation should detail what the child's physical and dental health needs are and what efforts the agency is making to meet these needs.

**Item 23: Mental health of the child**

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 of the child's mental health and determined that there were no problems in that area, nor any need for mental health services. If there was a need for services then they were offered.

**Review Findings:** The assessment of Item 23 was applicable for 12 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 8 (66.7%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 4 (33.3%) of the applicable cases.

**Strength:**

- (4 foster care cases)
  - In these five cases, the case file contained documentation to show that the child's mental/behavioral health needs were assessed and that efforts were made to provide appropriate services to meet each identified need.
- (4 in home cases)
  - In all four cases, there was documentation showing that the mental health needs of all applicable children in the home were assessed and that services were provided to meet all of the children's mental health needs.

**Area Needing Improvement (ANI):**

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In one case there was documentation to support that the child's mental health needs were assessed; however there is no documentation to show that the child received assistance with medication management which was one of the needs identified through the mental health assessment.
  - In two cases, reviewers found no documentation to show that the child's mental health needs were assessed during the period under review.
- (1 in home case)
  - In this case, the file lacks documentation to show that the child's mental health needs were sufficiently assessed during the period under review.

**Reviewer Comments:**

- ☑ Documentation should show what efforts were made to assess the child's mental/behavior needs.
- ☑ Documentation should detail what the child's mental/behavioral needs are and what efforts the agency is making to meet these needs.

## WSA Results

**Case Sample:** Mini CF SR Review – January 2012

**Type of Review:** 9<sup>th</sup> Mini CF SR

**Report Type:** Western Service Area

**Number of Reviews:** 14

**Review Period:** January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011 – January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012

### PERFORMANCE ITEM RESULTS

Performance Item		Item Ratings (#)			Item Ratings (%)		
		S	ANI	N/A	S	ANI	N/A
Item 1:	Timeliness of initiating investigations	5	1	8	83.3%	16.7%	57.1%
Item 2:	Repeat maltreatment	3	1	10	75.0%	25.0%	71.4%
Item 3:	Services to family	9	1	4	90.0%	10.0%	28.6%
Item 4:	Risk assessment and safety management	10	4	0	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%
Item 5:	Foster care re-entries	4	0	10	100.0%	0.0%	71.4%
Item 6:	Stability of foster care placement	8	0	6	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%
Item 7:	Permanency goal for child	5	3	6	62.5%	37.5%	42.9%
Item 8:	Reunification, guardianship etc	6	1	7	85.7%	14.3%	50.0%
Item 9:	Adoption	4	1	9	80.0%	20.0%	64.3%
Item 10:	Other planned permanent living arrangement	0	0	14	N/A	N/A	100.0%
Item 11:	Proximity of foster care placement	7	0	7	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Item 12:	Placement with siblings	4	1	9	80.0%	20.0%	64.3%
Item 13:	Visiting with parents and siblings	3	5	6	37.5%	62.5%	42.9%
Item 14:	Preserving connections	7	1	6	87.5%	12.5%	42.9%
Item 15:	Relative placement	3	3	8	50.0%	50.0%	57.1%
Item 16:	Relationship of child in care with parents	1	6	7	14.4%	85.7%	50.0%
Item 17:	Needs and services	9	5	0	64.3%	35.7%	0.0%
Item 18:	Child and family involvement in case planning	9	5	0	64.3%	35.7%	0.0%
Item 19:	Caseworker visits with child	9	5	0	64.3%	35.7%	0.0%
Item 20:	Caseworker visits with parent(s)	6	7	1	46.2%	53.8%	7.1%
Item 21:	Educational needs of the child	10	1	3	90.9%	9.1%	21.4%
Item 22:	Physical health of the child	4	5	5	44.4%	55.6%	35.7%
Item 23:	Mental/behavioral health of the child	8	4	2	66.7%	33.3%	16.7%

### OUTCOME RESULTS

Performance Outcome	COUNTS (#)				PERCENTAGES (%)			
	SA	PA	NA	N/A	SA	PA	NA	N/A
Safety 1 (Items 1-2)	4	1	1	8	66.7%	16.7%	16.7%	57.1%
Safety 2 (Items 3-4)	10	2	2	0	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%
Permanency 1 (Items 5-10)	5	3	0	6	62.5%	37.5%	0.0%	42.9%
Permanency 2 (Items 11-16)	3	5	0	6	37.5%	62.5%	0.0%	42.9%
Wellbeing 1 (Items 17-20)	6	6	2	0	42.9%	42.9%	14.3%	0.0%
Wellbeing 2 (Item 21)	10	0	1	3	90.9%	0.0%	9.1%	21.4%
Wellbeing 3 (Items 22-23)	5	4	4	1	38.5%	30.8%	30.8%	7.4%

**KEY:**

*N/A = Not Applicable*

*PA = Partially Achieved*

*NACH = Not Achieved*

*S = Strength*

*SA = Substantially Achieved*

*ANI = Area Needing Improvement*

## CFSR - Western Service Area (Item & Outcome Quarterly Results)

### REPORT CODES: Items 1 to 20, 22 and 23

Blue	90% or Above
Yellow	85% - 89.9%
Red	below 50%

*\* For reference - a list and description of CFSR items and Outcomes is found on the following page.*

### Report CODES: Item 21 and ALL OUTCOMES

Blue	95% or Above
Yellow	90% - 94.9%
Red	below 50%

Report Quarter	1st Qtr 2010	2nd Qtr 2010	3rd Qtr 2010	4th Qtr 2010	5th Qtr 2011	6th Qtr 2011	7th Qtr 2011	8th Qtr 2011	9th Qtr 2011
Period Under Review	Jan 09- Jan10	Apr 09- Apr 10	Jul 09-Jul 10	Oct 09- Oct 10	Jan 10- Jan 11	Apr 10- Apr 11	Jul 10-Jul 11	Oct 10- Oct 11	Jan 11- Jan 12
Number of Cases	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Item 1	100%	100%	100%	60%	100%	100%	50.0%	100.0%	83.3%
Item 2	75%	50%	100%	67%	100%	100%	0.0%	100.0%	75.0%
Outcome: S1	80%	80%	100%	60%	100%	100%	50.0%	100.0%	66.7%
Item 3	71%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%	90.9%	100.0%	90.0%
Item 4	57%	71%	43%	50%	71%	79%	64.3%	85.7%	71.4%
Outcome: S2	57%	71%	43%	50%	71%	79%	64.3%	85.7%	71.4%
Item 5	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%
Item 6	100%	100%	75%	75%	88%	100%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Item 7	44%	75%	38%	63%	63%	50%	37.5%	50.0%	62.5%
Item 8	83%	100%	100%	67%	100%	83%	83.3%	50.0%	85.7%
Item 9	50%	100%	50%	100%	33%	N/A	33.3%	100.0%	80.0%
Item 10	100%	33%	100%	50%	100%	100%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
Outcome: P1	33%	75%	50%	50%	38%	50%	12.5%	37.5%	62.5%
Item 11	100%	100%	100%	100%	88%	88%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Item 12	100%	100%	50%	100%	0%	100%	100.0%	50.0%	80.0%
Item 13	50%	67%	38%	71%	71%	50%	71.4%	50.0%	37.5%
Item 14	78%	75%	100%	63%	63%	63%	42.9%	87.5%	87.5%
Item 15	57%	100%	50%	75%	40%	100%	25.0%	83.3%	50.0%
Item 16	38%	63%	50%	71%	71%	25%	66.7%	37.5%	14.4%
Outcome: P2	44%	75%	38%	63%	50%	63%	62.5%	37.5%	37.5%
Item 17	64%	50%	50%	36%	57%	29%	78.6%	87.5%	64.3%
Item 18	50%	50%	29%	43%	85%	21%	69.2%	71.4%	64.3%
Item 19	64%	79%	71%	86%	93%	93%	92.9%	92.9%	64.3%
Item 20	43%	38%	29%	33%	62%	71%	69.2%	50.0%	46.2%
Outcome: WB1	36%	50%	36%	21%	57%	64%	64.3%	78.6%	48.6%
Item 21	64%	91%	60%	75%	78%	100%	83.3%	80.0%	90.9%
Outcome: WB2	64%	91%	50%	75%	78%	100%	83.3%	80.0%	90.9%
Item 22	83%	89%	67%	56%	80%	33%	100.0%	80.0%	44.4%
Item 23	100%	100%	58%	88%	90%	92%	83.3%	75.0%	66.7%
Outcome: WB3	83%	83%	50%	58%	75%	54%	84.6%	75.0%	38.5%

# CFSR

## Items & Outcomes Description

### SAFETY:

**Safety Outcome #1: Children are first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.**

- **Item 1** (Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment)
- **Item 2** (Repeat maltreatment)

**Safety Outcome #2: Children are safely maintained in their homes, whenever possible and appropriate.**

- **Item 3** (Services to family to protect child(ren) in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care)
- **Item 4** (Risk assessment and safety management)

### PERMANENCY:

**Permanency Outcome #1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.**

- **Item 5** (Foster care re-entries – did a child who entered foster care during the period under review re-enter within 12 months of a prior foster care episode)
- **Item 6** (Stability of Foster Care placement)
- **Item 7** (Permanency goal for child – were appropriate permanency goals established for the child in a timely manner)
- **Item 8** (Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives)
- **Item 9** (Adoption)
- **Item 10** (Other planned permanent living arrangement)

**Permanency Outcome #2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.**

- **Item 11** (Proximity of foster care placement)
- **Item 12** (Placement with siblings)
- **Item 13** (Visits with parents and siblings in foster care)
- **Item 14** (Preserving connections – with child's neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, tribe, school, friends)
- **Item 15** (Relative placement)
- **Item 16** (Relationship of child in care with parents)

### WELLBEING

**Well-Being Outcome #1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.**

- **Item 17** (Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents)
  - **Item 17A** (Services to meet the child's identified needs)
  - **Item 17B** (Services to meet parents' identified needs)
  - **Item 17C** (Services to meet the foster parents' identified needs)
- **Item 18** (Child and family involvement in case planning)
- **Item 19** (Worker visits with child)
- **Item 20** (Caseworker visits with parent)

**Well-Being Outcome #2: Children received adequate services to meet their educational need.**

- **Item 21** (Educational Needs of the child)

**Well-Being #3: Children received adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.**

- **Item 22** (Physical health of the child)
- **Item 23** (Mental/behavioral health of the child)