

FINAL REPORT

Children and Family Services Review

Western Service Area

8th Mini CFSR Review

Period Under Review: October 1st, 2010 – October 1st, 2011

Report Date: October 2011

Executive Summary

Final Report: Children and Family Services Review (CFSR)

Western Service Area – 8th Mini CFSR Review

This document presents the findings from the 8th 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 in the years 2010 and 2011.

The Western Service Area's 8th Mini-CFSR was conducted from October 18 to 20, 2011. The period under review for the onsite case review was October 1, 2010 to October 1, 2011. 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: Gering, McCook, North Platte, and Ogallala.

The first level reviews of the cases were completed by 8 staff from DHHS. A second level review of 100% of the cases was completed by Lori Posvar, 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 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 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 8th Mini CFSR identified several areas of high performance in the Western Service Area with regard to achieving desired outcomes for children. The Service Area achieved substantial conformity in one of the seven CFSR outcomes. One hundred percent (100%) of cases that were applicable for Safety Outcome 1, children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse, were rated as Substantially Achieved. Although the Service Area did not achieve substantial conformity with the other six outcomes, the Service Area did achieve overall ratings of Strength for the individual indicators pertaining to the following items: Item 3 (services to the family to protect children in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care), Item 5 (foster care re-entries), Item 6 (stability of foster care placement), Item 9 (adoption), and Item 11 (proximity of foster care placement).

The 8th 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 1 (children have permanency and stability in their living situations). This outcome was substantially achieved in only 38% of the cases reviewed. Within Permanency Outcome 1, Western Service Area's lowest ratings were for Item 7 (permanency goal for child) which was rated a Strength in 50% of the applicable cases and Item 8 (reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives which was also rated a Strength in 50% of the applicable cases).

Concerns were also identified with regards to Permanency Outcome 2 (the continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children), which was Substantially Achieved in only 38% of the cases reviewed. The lowest ratings within this outcome were for Item 12 (placement with siblings) which was rated as a Strength in 50% of the applicable cases; Item 13 (visiting with parents and siblings in foster care) which was 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 38% of the applicable 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:	4	100%
Partially Achieved:	0	0.0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0.0%
Not Applicable:	10	71.4%

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 4 of the 14 cases. The item was rated a Strength in all 4 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

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

Reviewer Comments:

- Documentation shows that investigations are being initiated and face to face contact with the child(ren) is being 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 all 4 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 in home cases and 1 foster care case)
 - In all four 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.

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

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	12	85.7%
Partially Achieved:	0	0.0%
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 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in all 8 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 foster care cases)
 - In one case the child was removed from their home due to their own behaviors and need for a higher level of care.
 - 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 another case, an in-home safety plan involving a variety of formal supports and informal safety monitors was developed in order to prevent the child's entry into foster care; however, the child was later placed in a relative foster home after it was discovered that the mother was not following the safety plan and was placing the child in danger.
- (5 in home cases)
 - In all five of these cases, documentation indicated that in home safety and other services including family support, individual and family therapy, tracker services, random drug testing, were provided in order to protect the children and prevent their entry into foster care.

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.

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 12 (85.7%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 2 (14.3%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (6 foster care cases)
 - In all six 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.
- (6 in home cases)
 - In all six 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):

- (2 foster care cases)
 - In one case, reviewers were unable to find documentation of any ongoing risk assessments during the period under review. Reviewers also noted that there were no updates to the safety plan during the period under review for this case.
 - In another case, there was no documentation to show that risk or safety assessments had been completed for the target child's siblings who remained in the family home. It was also noted in this case that there is no documentation of a thorough safety assessment being completed prior to the target child being reunified.

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

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	3	37.5%
Partially Achieved:	5	62.5%
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 four of the cases, documentation showed that the child experienced only one placement setting during the period under review. In all four cases, the reviewers found that the child's foster care placement stable.
 - In four 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 4 (50.0%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 4 (50.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (4 foster care cases)
 - In all four 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):

- (4 foster care cases)
 - In two cases, the permanency goal was not established in a timely manner. In one case, the child had been in out of home placement for 2 ½ months and in the other case the child had been in out of home placement for 4 months prior to the goal being established; however permanency goals should be established within 60 days from the child's entry into care.
 - In one case, the child's permanency goals did not appear to match case circumstances. In this case, the goal of Family Preservation was documented, however, it was determined that this was not appropriate as the child was placed out of home and Reunification would have been a more appropriate permanency goal.
 - 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 4 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 2 (50.0%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 2 (50.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (2 foster care cases)
 - In one case, documentation shows that concerted efforts by the agency resulted in successful achievement of the child's permanency goal of reunification within 10 months.
 - In another case, concerted efforts being made toward the permanency goal of reunification as well as the child's concurrent goal of guardianship. In this case reunification was achieved after the child had been in foster care for 13 months.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (2 foster care cases)
 - In one case, the child was in foster care for 31 months before achieving permanency through guardianship. It was noted by the reviewers that the permanency goal for this case was originally reunification with guardianship as the concurrent goal. After the child had been in placement for 28 months the primary permanency goal was changed to guardianship.
 - In another case, reviewers found no documentation or evidence to support that any efforts are being made toward the child's permanency goal of reunification since the child was placed at YRTC.

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 2 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 2 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (2 foster care case)
 - In one case, adoption was achieved after the child had been in out of home care for 8 months. In this case, adoption was identified in the case narrative as the primary permanency goal within 60 days of the parents relinquishing parental rights.
 - In another case, documentation shows concerted efforts are being made toward the permanency goal of adoption with the child's current relative foster parents who are interested in adoption.

Reviewer Comments:

- ☑ The documentation showed active efforts on the part of the agency to achieve the permanency goal of adoption.
- ☑ Documentation included information regarding barriers or particular circumstances to justify the delay in achieving the child's permanency goal when the child had been in foster care for longer than 12 months.

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

	Total Number	Total Percentage
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 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 cases, the child was placed in the same community as their parents.
 - In three cases, 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 2 of the 14 cases. This item was rated a strength in the 1 (50.0%) applicable case and rated as an area needing improvement in 1 (50.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, the target child was placed with their siblings in the same foster care setting.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In one case, the target child and her sibling are placed in separate foster homes during the period under review. It was noted that the children were originally placed in the same foster home but were later separated; however reviewers noted that there was not documentation in the case file to explain the reason for the separation of the 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 4 (50.0%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 4 (50.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (4 foster care cases)
 - In one case, documentation shows that the agency developed visitation plans to ensure sufficient contact between the child and his grandmother / guardian. Documentation also shows that the agency has made ongoing concerted efforts to locate and contact the child's father. This resulted in the father being located during the period under review. While the child's father is incarcerated out of state, arrangements were made to allow phone contact between the child and his father.
 - In one case, documentation shows that the child was able to have frequent visitation with her mother. Documentation also shows that the agency made concerted efforts to locate and involve the child's father who was reported to have had no contact with the child since she was an infant; however he did not respond to any of the agency's efforts.
 - In one case, the reviewers found documentation of weekly visits with the child's mother. In this case the child's father is not applicable as he is deceased.
 - In another case, documentation in the case file shows that the agency made concerted efforts to arrange for visits between the child and her father; however the child refused to have contact with her father. Documentation does show that the child had contact with her sibling on a monthly basis including holidays. In this case, the child's mother is not applicable as she is deceased.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (4 foster care cases)
 - In one case, documentation did not provide sufficient information regarding the frequency or the quality of visitation between the child and his parents.
 - In two 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.
 - In another case, the reviewers found documentation regarding frequency and quality of visits between the child and the mother but were not able to find documentation regarding frequency or quality of visits between the child and the father.

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, documentation shows that the child was able to maintain connections with extended family.
 - 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 children were kept in the same daycare and were able to have contact with extended family.
 - In one case, the child was able to remain in his home community and continue in the same school.
 - In one case, the child was able to have monthly contact with her former step mother and half siblings. In this case, efforts were also made to contact the child's tribe, and to provide information regarding Native American cultural activities.

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.

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 5 (83.3%) of the applicable cases and as an area needing improvement in 1 (16.7%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care case)
 - 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):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, the child was not placed with relatives. Documentation shows that the maternal grandparents were considered but determined to be inappropriate for placement. However, there is no documentation to show that efforts were made to identify or locate any paternal relatives.

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 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)
 - In all three of these cases, documentation showed that the agency had made efforts to support and maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the target child and their parents.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (5 foster care cases)
 - In one case, 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 one case, there was no documentation of efforts to maintain a positive relationship between the child and his legal guardian / grandmother.
 - 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

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	11	78.6%
Partially Achieved:	2	14.3%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	7.1%
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 12 (85.7%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 2 (14.3%) 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 14 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (8 foster care cases)
 - In these eight cases, the needs of the children were assessed in a variety of ways including Family Team Meetings, OJS evaluation, ongoing safety assessments, pre-treatment assessments, drug and alcohol evaluation, Comprehensive Child and Adolescent Assessment, Youth Level of Service / Case Management Inventory, and caseworker visits with the child, parents, and foster parents.
 - In these eight cases, the needs of the children were met through providing assistance with transportation, individual and family therapy, out of home placement, tracker services, a mentor, 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 in the home were assessed both formally and informally through psychological evaluation, 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, intensive family preservation, individual and family therapy, in home safety services, and tracker services. Reviewers found no unmet needs for the children in these cases.

Item 17b: Needs Assessment and Services to Parents: The assessment of Item 17b was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 12 (85.7%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 2 (14.3%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (7 foster care cases)
 - In these seven cases, the needs of the parents were assessed on an ongoing basis using both formal and informal means including initial and ongoing safety assessments, drug and alcohol assessments, Family Team Meetings and regular monthly contact with the caseworker.
 - In these five 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 and appointments.
- (5 in home cases)
 - In these five cases, the needs of the parents were assessed through the following methods: initial safety assessments, substance abuse evaluations, psychological evaluations, family team meetings, service provider reports, and during monthly worker contacts with the parents and children.
 - In these five cases, identified needs were met through the following services: family support services, individual and family therapy, intensive family preservation, random drug testing, education to develop parenting skills, child care, and transportation assistance.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, the case file lacked documentation to show how the parents' needs were assessed. Interviews with the father and the case worker revealed that the father's needs have not been assessed. There have been no services provided to the father. The mother was provided with family therapy; however it was identified that the mother was also in need of parenting classes, but no services have been provided to meet this need.
- (1 in home cases)
 - In this one case, where the mother was in the home but the father was absent, the agency assessed the needs of the mother, but did not sufficiently assess the needs of the father and did not provide services to the father.

Item 17c: Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents: The assessment of Item 17c 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 all 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):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, the reviewers were unable to find information to support that the needs of the foster parents were assessed or that services were provided to meet their needs.

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 10 (71.4%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 4 (28.6%) 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.
- (5 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, the mother and father relinquished parental rights during the period under review; however there was no indication of efforts being made to involve the mother or father in case planning prior to the relinquishment. In one case, it appeared that only the child was involved in case planning. In this case the

child's mother was deceased and there was no indication that efforts were made to involve the child's father 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.
- (1 in home cases)
 - In one case, documentation shows that the father of the child was only involved in one family team meeting during the period under review and there was no indication of other efforts to involve the father in case planning outside of this one meeting.

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 13 (92.9%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 1 (7.1%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (7 foster care cases)
 - In all seven 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.
- (6 in home cases)
 - In all six 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):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, there was documentation of monthly visits between the worker or a courtesy worker and the child; however documentation did not provide sufficient information to support that the visits were of good quality. It was noted that the majority of visits with the child took place prior to court and not in a private setting. It was also noted that documentation lacked information regarding the content of the discussions between the worker and child.

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 all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 7 (50.0%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 7 (50.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 foster care cases)
 - In all five 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 parents. Communication was limited to a few letters between the worker and the child's father and letters to the mother's attorney.
 - In one case, while visits with the mother were found to be of sufficient frequency and quality, there was a lack of information regarding worker visits with the father and therefore reviewers found that worker visits with the father were not of sufficient frequency or quality.
 - In another case, the worker did not have sufficient visits with the father after he was successfully located.
 - In another case, there was no clear documentation to show that the worker had visits with either the mother or the father prior to the relinquishment of their parental rights.

- In another case, visits with the mother were found to be insufficient in frequency and quality. Face to face visits between the worker and the mother were less than once a month. Visits were determined to be of poor quality as documentation for several of the visits showed that visits did not take place in a confidential setting. Reviewers also found that there was no face to face contact between the worker and the child's father. Documentation of some phone contact was found; however, it is noted that the first phone contact with the father did not occur until after the child had been in out of home care for 6 months.
- (2 in home cases)
 - In one case, visits with the mother occurred weekly and were of sufficient frequency and quality; however there were not sufficient visits with the father. It was noted that the worker interviewed the father at the time of the initial assessment and the worker did not document or report making any other efforts to involve or visit with the father other than this one contact.
 - In another case, while the worker reported in an interview that visits took place once per month, there was no documentation in the case file to support this. In this same case, the parent reported that visits with the worker did not occur monthly and reported that one on one visits with the worker took place only a couple times during the period under review. The reviewers determined, based on information provided in interviews and based on lack of documentation in the case file, that worker visits with the parents were not sufficient.

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

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	8	80.0%
Partially Achieved:	0	0.0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	2	20.0%
Not Applicable:	4	28.6%

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 10 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 8 (80.0%) of the applicable cases and as an area needing improvement in 2 (20.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (7 foster care cases)
 - In all seven 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.
- (1 in home case)
 - In this case, the child's educational needs were assessed through school records and progress reports. An IEP was developed and addressed the child's educational needs which are related to behavioral problems at school.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, there is documentation of informal assessments of the target child's educational needs. The reviewers found that there is not documentation to show that the agency made efforts to address the issue that the child is not on track to graduate due to being short of required credits.
- (1 in home case)
 - In one in home case, documentation showed that the child came into care due to educational concerns. There is no documentation during the period under review regarding the child's educational concerns or progress and no documentation to show that the child's education needs are being addressed.

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:

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	9	75.0%
Partially Achieved:	1	8.3%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	2	16.7%
Not Applicable:	2	14.3%

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 10 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 8 (80.0%) of the applicable cases and as an area needing improvement in 2 (20.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (6 foster care cases)
 - In all six 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.
- (2 in home cases)
 - In two cases, documentation in the case file shows that the children received periodic, age appropriate physical and dental health examinations. The children also received appropriate services to address all identified health needs.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (2 foster care cases)
 - In both cases, the reviewers were unable to find documentation of a current assessment of the child’s physical and dental health needs.

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 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 6 (75.0%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 2 (25.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 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.
- (1 in home cases)
 - In this case, 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):

- (1 foster care case)
 - In this case, 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, there is no documentation to show that the child's mental health needs were assessed during the period under review. While it is noted that counseling and medication services were being provided to the child, documentation was brief and did not support that the mental health needs of the child were being assessed or sufficiently addressed.

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 – October 2011

Type of Review: 8th Mini CF SR

Report Type: Western Service Area

Number of Reviews: 14

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	4	0	10	100.0%	0.0%	71.4%
Item 2:	Repeat maltreatment	4	0	10	100.0%	0.0%	71.4%
Item 3:	Services to family	8	0	6	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%
Item 4:	Risk assessment and safety management	12	2	0	85.7%	14.3%	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	4	4	6	50.0%	50.0%	42.9%
Item 8:	Reunification, guardianship etc	2	2	10	50.0%	50.0%	71.4%
Item 9:	Adoption	2	0	12	100.0%	0.0%	85.7%
Item 10:	Other planned permanent living arrangement	0	0	14	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Item 11:	Proximity of foster care placement	8	0	6	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%
Item 12:	Placement with siblings	1	1	12	50.0%	50.0%	85.7%
Item 13:	Visiting with parents and siblings	4	4	6	50.0%	50.0%	42.9%
Item 14:	Preserving connections	7	1	6	87.5%	12.5%	42.9%
Item 15:	Relative placement	5	1	8	83.3%	16.7%	57.1%
Item 16:	Relationship of child in care with parents	3	5	6	37.5%	62.5%	42.9%
Item 17:	Needs and services	12	2	0	85.7%	14.3%	0.0%
Item 18:	Child and family involvement in case planning	10	4	0	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%
Item 19:	Caseworker visits with child	13	1	0	92.9%	7.1%	0.0%
Item 20:	Caseworker visits with parent(s)	7	7	0	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%
Item 21:	Educational needs of the child	8	2	4	80.0%	20.0%	28.6%
Item 22:	Physical health of the child	8	2	4	80.0%	20.0%	28.6%
Item 23:	Mental/behavioral health of the child	6	2	6	75.0%	25.0%	42.9%

OUTCOME RESULTS

Performance Outcome	COUNTS (#)				PERCENTAGES (%)			
	SA	PA	NA	N/A	SA	PA	NA	N/A
Safety 1 (Items 1-2)	4	0	0	10	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	71.4%
Safety 2 (Items 3-4)	12	0	2	0	85.7%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
Permanency 1 (Items 5-10)	3	5	0	6	37.5%	62.5%	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)	11	2	1	0	78.6%	14.3%	7.1%	0.0%
Wellbeing 2 (Item 21)	8	0	2	4	80.0%	0.0%	20.0%	28.6%
Wellbeing 3 (Items 22-23)	9	1	2	2	75.0%	8.3%	16.7%	14.3%

KEY:

N/A = Not Applicable
S = Strength

PA = Partially Achieved
SA = Substantially Achieved

NACH = Not 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
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
Number of Cases	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Item 1	100%	100%	100%	60%	100%	100%	50.0%	100.0%
Item 2	75%	50%	100%	67%	100%	100%	0.0%	100.0%
Outcome: S1	80%	80%	100%	60%	100%	100%	50.0%	100.0%
Item 3	71%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%	90.9%	100.0%
Item 4	57%	71%	43%	50%	71%	79%	64.3%	85.7%
Outcome: S2	57%	71%	43%	50%	71%	79%	64.3%	85.7%
Item 5	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%	66.7%	100.0%
Item 6	100%	100%	75%	75%	88%	100%	100.0%	100.0%
Item 7	44%	75%	38%	63%	63%	50%	37.5%	50.0%
Item 8	83%	100%	100%	67%	100%	83%	83.3%	50.0%
Item 9	50%	100%	50%	100%	33%	N/A	33.3%	100.0%
Item 10	100%	33%	100%	50%	100%	100%	0.0%	N/A
Outcome: P1	33%	75%	50%	50%	38%	50%	12.5%	37.5%
Item 11	100%	100%	100%	100%	88%	88%	100.0%	100.0%
Item 12	100%	100%	50%	100%	0%	100%	100.0%	50.0%
Item 13	50%	67%	38%	71%	71%	50%	71.4%	50.0%
Item 14	78%	75%	100%	63%	63%	63%	42.9%	87.5%
Item 15	57%	100%	50%	75%	40%	100%	25.0%	83.3%
Item 16	38%	63%	50%	71%	71%	25%	66.7%	37.5%
Outcome: P2	44%	75%	38%	63%	50%	63%	62.5%	37.5%
Item 17	64%	50%	50%	36%	57%	29%	78.6%	87.5%
Item 18	50%	50%	29%	43%	85%	21%	69.2%	71.4%
Item 19	64%	79%	71%	86%	93%	93%	92.9%	92.9%
Item 20	43%	38%	29%	33%	62%	71%	69.2%	50.0%
Outcome: WB1	36%	50%	36%	21%	57%	64%	64.3%	78.6%
Item 21	64%	91%	60%	75%	78%	100%	83.3%	80.0%
Outcome: WB2	64%	91%	50%	75%	78%	100%	83.3%	80.0%
Item 22	83%	89%	67%	56%	80%	33%	100.0%	80.0%
Item 23	100%	100%	58%	88%	90%	92%	83.3%	75.0%
Outcome: WB3	83%	83%	50%	58%	75%	54%	84.6%	75.0%

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)