

# **FINAL REPORT**

## **5th Mini Children and Family Services Review**

### **Northern Service Area**

**(January 10<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup>, 2011)**

## **Executive Summary Children and Family Services Review (Northern Service Area)**

A mini CFSR was held in Norfolk on January 10-12<sup>th</sup>, 2011. 14 cases were reviewed. The period under review was January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010 through January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011. 8 cases were foster care cases and 6 were in home cases. Seven cases were abuse/neglect, two were status offender cases, and five were juvenile offender cases. The offices where the cases were reviewed from were Blair, Columbus, Dakota City, Fremont, Ainsworth, Pender and Norfolk. There were 5 Health and Human Service workers that conducted this review. Second level review was completed by Quality Assurance worker Leslie Schlecht.

### **Background Information**

The mini CFSR is modeled after the Federal CFSR reviews and assesses the service area's performance on 23 items relevant to seven outcomes.

With regards to outcomes, an overall rating of Strength or Area Needing Improvement (ANI) is assigned to each of the 23 items incorporated in the seven outcomes depending on the percentage of cases that receive a Strength rating in the onsite case review. An item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 95 percent of the applicable cases reviewed are rated as Strength. Performance ratings for each of the seven outcomes are based on item ratings for each case. A service area may be rated as having "substantially achieved," "partially achieved," or "not achieved" the outcome. The determination of whether a service area is in substantial conformity with a particular outcome is based on the percentage of cases that were determined to have substantially achieved that outcome. In order for a service area to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95 percent of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome. The standard for substantial conformity is based on the standard set for Federal CFSR. The standards are based on the belief that because child welfare agencies work with our country's most vulnerable children and families, only the highest standards of performance should be acceptable. The focus of the CFSR process is on continuous quality improvement; standards are set high to ensure ongoing attention to the goal of achieving positive outcomes for children and families with regard to safety, permanency, and well-being.

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

### **Key CFSR Findings Regarding Outcomes**

The service area achieved substantial conformity on Well Being 2(Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs). The 5<sup>th</sup> Mini CFSR identified several areas of high performance in Northern Service Area with regard to achieving desired outcomes for children. The service area did achieve overall ratings of strength for the individual indicators pertaining to repeat maltreatment (item 2), services to family to protect child(ren) in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care (item 3), foster care re-entry (item 5), reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives (item 8), adoption (item 9), other planned living arrangement (item 10), proximity of foster care placement (item 11), placement with

siblings (item 12), preserving connections (item 14), relative placement (item 15), educational needs of the child (item 21), and mental/behavioral health of the child (item 23).

The mini CFSR review also identified key areas of concern with regard to achieving outcomes for children and families. Concerns were identified with regard to Permanency Outcome 1 (children having permanency in their living situation), which was substantially achieved in only 38 percent of the cases reviewed. The lowest rating within this outcome was for item 7 (permanency goal for child), which was rated as a strength in 38 percent of the cases reviewed.

Concerns were also identified with regards to Well Being Outcome 1 (families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs), which was substantially achieved in only 57% of the cases reviewed. The lowest rating was item 20 (caseworker visits with parents)-rated as a strength in 54% of the cases reviewed.

There were three outcomes that had only one case that received a partially achieved rating. The three outcomes were: S2. (Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible), P2. (The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children), and WB3. (Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs).

## 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	80%
Partially Achieved:	0	0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	20%
Not Applicable:	9	64%

#### 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:*

\*Five of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item.

\*4 (80%) cases were rated as strengths

\*1 (20%) case was rated as area needing improvement

\*9 cases were not applicable

\*Two cases that were rated as strengths were out of home cases and the other two were in home cases. The case that was rated as needing improvement was an out of home case.

*Strengths: One case had only one intake during the period under review and the timeframes were met. The priority on that intake was priority 3. In one case that was rated as a strength, there were no intakes that were received during the period under review.*

*Areas needing improvement: In the one case needing improvement it was noted that there was no initial assessment located in the case file. Therefore, the reviewer was unable to determine when contact was made with the family or if it was done within the designated time frame.*

#### 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:**

\*Three of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item

\*3 (67%) cases were rated as strengths

\*0 cases were rated as area needing improvement

\*11 cases were not applicable

\*Two cases rated as strengths on this item were in home cases and the other one was an out of home case.

*Strengths: In these cases there was only 1 intake that was received on the family during the period under review and during the life of the case.*

*There were no cases rated as needing improvement for this item.*

*S1. Outcome Reviewer Comments: On the cases that were found to be substantially achieved for this outcome, the intakes received by the Department were investigated within the set time frames and face to face contact with the alleged victim was made within the timeframes. In the case found to not be achieved, it was noted that while the intake was found in the case file, no assessment was found in the case file. Therefore, the reviewer was unable to determine what the outcome of the intake was.*

**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:	13	93%
Partially Achieved:	1	7%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	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:**

\*Four of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item.

\*4 (100%) cases were rated as strengths

\*0 cases were rated as area needing improvement

\*10 cases were not applicable

**\*Two of the cases rated as strengths for this item were out of home cases and the other two were in home cases.**

*Strengths: In three cases it was noted that there were numerous services in place to prevent removal/re-entry into foster care. Those services ranged from intensive outpatient treatment to family support in the home. Other services were tracker, family therapy, transportation assistance, and intensive family preservation. In two cases the child had to be removed from the home due to immediate safety concerns.*

*There were no cases found to be needing improvement on this item.*

#### **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:***

**\*All of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item.**

**\*13 (93%) cases were rated as strengths**

**\*1 (7%) case was rated as area needing improvement**

**\*0 cases were not applicable**

**\*Seven of the cases rated as strengths for this item were out of home cases. Six of the cases rated as strengths for this item were in home cases. The case that was rated as area needing improvement was an out of home case.**

*Strengths: In the 13 cases substantially achieved there were either no safety concerns found on the target child or services were implemented to address safety concerns found through initial/ongoing assessments. In these cases informal assessments were occurring on an ongoing basis through family team meetings.*

*Areas needing improvement: In the one case found to be needing improvement on this item it was noted that while the case file contained an intake, there was no assessment found in the case file to address this intake.*

**S2. Outcome Reviewer Comments: On the cases that were rated as being substantially achieved reviewers had a variety of comments. They ranged from the child's placements being**

*appropriate to meet the child's needs, ongoing assessments being completed through family team meetings, and there being no safety concerns or issues in the facility or home. Reviewer's comments on the case found to be partially achieved was that the case file did not contain the initial assessment completed on the intake. This made it unclear to the reviewer on what the outcome was regarding that report.*

## 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	38%
Partially Achieved:	5	62%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	6	43%

#### Item 5. Foster care re-entries

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

#### *Review Findings:*

- \*Two of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item
- \*2 (100%) cases were rated as strengths
- \*0 cases were rated as area needing improvement
- \*12 cases were not applicable

*Strengths: In both cases the child entered and remained in the same foster home throughout the period under review.*

*There were no files rated as area needing improvement for this item.*

#### 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:*

- \*Eight of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item
- \*7 (88%) cases were rated as strengths
- \*1 (12%) case was rated as area needing improvement
- \*6 cases were not applicable

*Strengths: In two cases the target child had only one placement change during the period under review. In five cases the children had numerous placement changes based upon behavioral and mental health issues.*

*Area Needing Improvement: In the only case rated as needing improvement for this item the child was placed with relatives initially but then was moved to another relative due to a disruption in that placement. Information in the file most recently indicates that the current relative placement is requesting that the child be removed from their home as soon as possible. The reason for this request is not clear.*

**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:*

- \*Eight of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item
- \*3 (38%) cases were rated as strengths
- \*5 (62%) cases were rated as area needing improvement
- \*6 cases were not applicable

*Strengths: In two cases reviewed that were rated as strengths for this item the permanency goals were established and achieved in a timely manner. In one case the goal was adoption and the TPR was filed within the designated time frames.*

*Area needing improvement: In three cases the permanency goal was not established within the 60 day requirement. In three cases it was noted that there was no evidence found in the file that a TPR (termination of parental rights) was discussed/addressed.*

### **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:*

- \*Five of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item**
- \*5 (100%) cases were rated as strengths**
- \*0 cases were rated as area needing improvement**
- \*9 cases were not applicable**

*Strengths: In all five cases rated as a strength for this item it was noted that active and concerted efforts were being made to achieve the permanency goal of reunification. The case file documentation within the case plan and court report reflects these efforts.*

*There were no cases reviewed that were found to be needing improvement for this item.*

### **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:*

- \*One of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item**
- \*1 (100%) case was rated as a strength**
- \*0 cases were rated as area needing improvement**
- \*13 cases were not applicable**

*Strengths: In the one case rated as a strength for this item it was noted in the case file that the TPR (termination of parental rights) was in progress and had begun within 15/22 month timeframe.*

*There were no cases reviewed that were found to be needing improvement for this item.*

### **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:*

- \*Two of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item**
- \*2 (100%) cases were rated as a strength**
- \*0 cases were rated as area needing improvement**
- \*12 cases were not applicable**

*Strengths: In one case, the youth was living in a permanent independent living facility during the period under review. In the other case, documentation in the case file contained within the progress notes, family team narratives and contact narratives reflected discussions and*

*planning for teaching and acquiring skills the youth will need to have in order to be self sufficient.*

*There were no cases reviewed that were needing improvement for this item.*

***P1. Outcome Reviewer Comments: Reviewers comments on the cases found to be substantially achieved were that permanency goals were established within the set time frames and services helped to support and maintain the stability of the placements in these cases. In one case there was a TPR (termination of parental rights) found in the case file and the court ordered that reasonable efforts were no longer required. In two of the cases rated as partially achieved it was noted that the permanency goal was not established within the 60 day requirement. In three cases rated as partially achieved it was noted that there was no information found in the case file as to why a TPR (termination of parental rights) was NOT filed.***

### **Status of Permanency Outcome P2**

	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
Substantially Achieved:	7	88%
Partially Achieved:	1	12%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	6	43%

### **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:***

**\*Seven of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item**

**\*7 (100%) cases were rated as strengths**

**\*0 cases were rated as area needing improvement**

**\*7 cases were not applicable**

***Strengths: In three of the cases the family lives close enough to the child to facilitate visits at least a few times per month as well as attending the child’s family team meetings that are being held on a monthly basis. In one case, the child was not placed within the same community as the parents but was placed within the state. The placement was an independent living facility and was still close enough to the parents and family to ensure the visits were occurring on a regular monthly basis. In three of the cases the child was placed outside the community only due to the child’s extenuating mental/behavioral needs.***

***There were no cases reviewed that were needing improvement for this item.***

### **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:***

**\*Three of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item**

**\*3 (100%) cases were rated as strengths**

**\*0 cases were rated as area needing improvement**

**\*11 cases were not applicable**

***Strengths: In two cases the target youth and siblings were placed in the same foster home and have remained in the same foster home since removal occurred. In the other case the siblings were placed in separate foster homes due to both children's high behavioral and mental health needs. Regular visitation still occurred between the siblings.***

***There were no cases rated as needing improvement on this item.***

### **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:***

**\*Six of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item**

**\*5 (83%) cases were rated as strengths**

**\*1 (17%) case was rated as area needing improvement**

**\*8 cases were not applicable**

***Strengths: In four of these cases contact between parents (mother and father) and siblings in foster care was occurring anywhere from several times per week to several times per month. In one case it was noted that according to the family team meeting notes contact between the parents and target child has been made available to both of the parents but they have not always taken advantage of that. Sibling relationships in this case however, were maintained through monthly contact.***

***Area needing improvement: In the one case rated as needing improvement on this item there was no contact occurring between the youth and the father. There was no evidence found in***

*the case file that attempts were made by the worker to locate and/or involve the father in visitation.*

#### **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:***

**\*Eight of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item**

**\*8 (100%) cases were rated as strengths**

**\*0 of the cases were rated as area needing improvement**

**\*6 cases were not applicable**

*Strengths: In four of the cases connections were maintained through extended family visits and/or holiday celebrations. ICWA was addressed in all of the cases. In two cases it was noted that the child was able to remain in the same school he/she attended before the removal. Mention of connections being maintained through the youth remaining involved in the YMCA, Karate classes and school friendships were noted in three of the cases.*

*There were no cases rated as needing improvement on this item.*

#### **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:***

**\*Four of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item**

**\*4 (100%) cases were rated as a strength**

**\*0 of the cases were rated as area needing improvement**

**\*10 cases were not applicable**

*Strengths: In three of the cases the youth has been placed with a relative and remained with a relative from the beginning of the case. In one case while relatives were sought and located, the youth was unable to be placed with them due to behavioral/mental health needs.*

*There were no cases rated as needing improvement on this item.*

#### **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:**

**\*Seven of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item**

**\*5 (71%) cases were rated as strengths**

**\*2 (29%) cases were rated as area needing improvement**

**\*7 cases were not applicable**

*Strengths: In one case that was rated as a strength for this item, it was specifically noted that both the parents and child were involved in monthly family team meetings. In one case the mother had maintained monthly contact with the children up until she was incarcerated and being held for deportation. In one case while Mom was having regular visits with the child it was deemed detrimental by the therapist and court for the youth to have contact with the father. In one case monthly contact was being made between the mother and child but not between the father and child due to not being able to locate the father, despite worker efforts. In all the cases the youth had visits with their parent(s) in the parental home and were involved in their own community functions: such as church and family gatherings.*

*Area needing improvement: In one case it was noted that there was no documentation found in the case file to show that concerted efforts were made to locate, promote and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his/her father. In one case it was noted that supervised visitation between the youth and both parents was occurring but parents were not involved in maintaining any other involvement to nurture that relationship other than those supervised visits.*

**P2. Outcome Reviewer Comments:** *In the cases where this outcome was determined to be substantially achieved, reviewers commented that visitation was occurring on a regular basis (at least monthly). It was also noted that ICWA was addressed in these cases. In the one case where this outcome was only partially achieved the reviewers commented that there were no documented efforts found to show that the DHHS worker made concerted efforts to locate the fathers in those cases.*

### 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:	8	57%
Partially Achieved:	5	36%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	7%
Not Applicable:	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:*

\*All of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item

\*8 (57%) cases were rated as strengths

\*6 (43%) cases were rated as area needing improvement

\*Three of the cases rated as strengths were in home cases and five were out of home cases. Three of the cases rated as area needing improvement were in home cases and three were out of home cases.

*Strengths: Because 17 is broke down into parts A, B, and C. This item will be broken out into three pieces.*

#### CHILDREN

*17a. Strengths: The child's needs and services were both informally and formally assessed and addressed through initial assessments, ongoing assessments, case management and family team meetings. Some of the services provided to address the identified needs were behavioral assessments, Developmental Disabilities assessments, Electronic Monitoring, Family Support, individual and family therapy and tracker services.*

*17a. Area needing improvement: In the one case that was rated as needing improvement it was noted that the other children remaining in the home did not have their needs assessed or addressed.*

### **PARENTS**

*17b. Strengths: It was noted that the worker did a good job assessing both parents' needs by conducting informal/formal assessments. Informal assessments were completed through face to face contact and family team meetings. Comprehensive Family Assessments were also completed. Some of the services offered to address the identified needs were transportation assistance, drug/alcohol treatment, family support services, parenting classes and therapy.*

*17b. Area needing improvement: In four cases it was noted that while the mother's needs had been assessed and addressed, the father's needs had not been assessed. In one case it was noted there was no information found to indicate that either parents needs had been assessed on an ongoing basis.*

### **FOSTER PARENTS**

*17c. Strengths: In the cases reviewed rated as strengths it was noted that the foster parent's needs were assessed by the worker discussing with the foster parent's their concerns/needs. Needs were also assessed through monthly family team meetings. Services provided were foster care payments, respite care and parenting assistance in dealing with children that have behavioral issues.*

*17c. Area needing improvement: There were no cases that were rated as needing improvement on this item.*

### **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:***

**\*All of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item**

**\*10 (71%) cases were rated as strengths**

**\*4 (29%) cases were rated as area needing improvement**

**\*In the ten cases rated as strengths three were in home cases and seven were out of home cases. In the four cases that were rated as area needing improvement three were in home cases and the other was an out of home case.**

*Strengths: In six of the ten cases that were rated as strengths for this item, it was specifically noted that both parents and child (when old enough) participated in the case planning process through monthly family team meetings as well as through monthly face to face contact with the case worker. In three cases the mother and child participated in the case planning process through team meetings but the fathers in these cases chose not to participate despite the efforts made by the caseworker to involve them. In one case the mother and fathers parental rights were terminated and the child was too young to participate in the case planning process.*

*Area needing improvement: In three of the four cases rated as needing improvement for this item it was noted that there was no documentation found in the case file to indicate that the father was involved in the case planning. In the other case the other children residing in the home were not involved in the case planning process.*

**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:*

\*All of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item

\*10 (71%) cases were rated as strengths

\*4 (29%) cases were rated as area needing improvement

Three of the cases rated as a strength for this item were in home cases and seven were out of home. Three of the cases rated as area needing improvement were in home cases and the other one was an out of home case.

*Strengths: There was found to be at least monthly contacts between the worker and the child occurring. The quality of those narratives addressed permanency, safety and well being issues.*

*Area needing improvement: In two cases the other children residing in the home were not seen by the caseworker. In the other two cases it was noted that the narratives were not of quality: meaning they did not address safety, permanency and well being issues.*

**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 if 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:*

\*13 of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item

\*7 (54%) cases were rated as strengths

\*6 (46%) cases were rated as area needing improvement

\*1 case was not applicable

\*Three of the cases rated as strengths for this item were in home cases and four were out of home cases. Three of the cases rated as area needing improvement for this item were in home cases and three were out of home cases.

*Strengths: Visits between worker and parents (mother and father) were occurring at least monthly. The quality of the contact narratives was noted to be very good and addressed the permanency, safety, and well being of the child.*

*Area needing improvement: In four cases it was noted that there was no contact made with the father. In one case it was noted that there was no documentation found to indicate the worker visited with either parent. In one case while contact was made with both parents, the narrative reflected that the visits didn't address safety, permanency and/or well being.*

*WB1. Outcome Reviewer Comments: Reviewers commented on the cases that were rated as being substantially achieved that extensive efforts were made by the Department to ensure the families had the capacity to provide for their children's needs and were assessed formally and informally through ongoing assessments and mental health assessments. Families participated in therapy, family support, utilization of respite care when needed, communication during visits with caseworkers, and involvement in the case planning process. Families got involved in the case planning process through monthly contacts with the DHHS worker and through family team meetings. In the cases where this outcome was found to be partially achieved reviewers commented that in three cases the father's needs were not assessed. In one case the other children in the home did not have their needs assessed and were not involved in case planning. In the case that was rated as not achieved the reviewer commented that the father was not involved in case planning, worker monthly contacts or assessment of needs.*

**Status of Well-Being Outcome WB2**

	<b>Total Number</b>	<b>Total Percentage</b>
Substantially Achieved:	14	100%
Partially Achieved:	0	0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	0	0%

**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:***

- \*All of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item**
- \*14 (100%) cases were rated as strengths**
- \*0 cases were rated as area needing improvement**

\* Six of the cases rated as strengths for this item were in home cases and eight were out of home cases.

*Strengths: Educational needs of the child were assessed and addressed by the case worker by providing educational testing and monitoring at the schools they attended. Services provided to address the needs ranged from IEP's, an ESU referral, and assisting with getting a GED. Grade/report cards were found in the case file.*

*Area needing improvement: There were no cases rated as needing improvement for this item.*

*WB2. Outcome Reviewer Comments: All of the cases reviewed received a substantially achieved rating for this outcome. Reviewers comments on the outcomes found to be substantially achieved were that the children received appropriate services to meet their educational needs. When needs were identified an IEP or GED services were implemented to address this. Grade reports were also found in the case files.*

*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:	12	86%
Partially Achieved:	1	7%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	7%
Not Applicable:	0	0%

**Item 22. Physical health of the child**

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

***Review Findings:***

\*Twelve of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item

\*10 (83%) cases were rated as strengths

\*2 (17%) cases were rated as area needing improvement

\*2 cases were not applicable

**\* In the ten cases rated as strength for this item three were in home cases and seven were out of home cases. In the two cases rated as area needing improvement for this item one was an in home case and the other was an out of home case.**

***Strengths: Medical/dental needs were assessed, services were provided when needed and it was documented in the case file.***

***Area needing improvement: One case lacked both physical and dental exam information on the identified child. This case also lacked information regarding the physical/dental needs of the other children in the home being assessed. In the other case, the youth did not have dental needs assessed.***

### **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:***

**\*Twelve of the 14 cases reviewed were applicable to this item**

**\*12 (100%) cases were rated as strengths**

**\*0 cases were rated as area needing improvement**

**\*2 cases were not applicable**

**\* In the twelve cases rated as a strength for this item five were in home cases and seven were out of home cases.**

***Strengths: Initial and ongoing formal/informal assessments were being conducted on the child ranging from the Youth Level of Service evaluation to the Comprehensive Family Assessment. Informal assessments were completed by the DHHS worker through monthly family team meetings and face to face contacts with the youth.***

***Area Needing Improvement: There were no cases rated as needing improvement on this item.***

***WB3. Outcome Reviewer Comments: Reviewers commented on the outcomes found to be substantially achieved that mental health needs were assessed and if there were needs identified that they were also addressed. There was also medical/dental/mental health documentation found in the case file. On the case found to be partially achieved reviewers commented that dental needs were not assessed. In the one case found to not be achieved the reviewer commented that it was because there was no evidence found in the file that any of the children in the home children had their dental and physical needs assessed/addressed.***

## NSA Results

**Case Sample:** *Mini CFSR Review – January 2011*

**Type of Review:** *5th Mini CFSR*

**Report Type:** *Northern Service Area*

**Number of Reviews:** *14*

**Review Period:** *January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010-January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011*

### Performance Item Results

S = Strength

ANI = Area Needing Improvement

N/A = Not Applicable

Performance Item	S	ANI	N/A	S (%)	ANI (%)	N/A (%)	Total
Number of Submitted Review:							14
Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	4	1	9	80	20	64	14
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment	3	0	11	100	0	79	14
Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	4	0	10	100	0	71	14
Item 4: Risk assessment and safety management	13	1		93	7		14
Item 5: Foster care re-entries	2	0	12	100	0	86	14
Item 6: Stability of foster care placement	7	1	6	88	13	43	14
Item 7: Permanency goal for child	3	5	6	38	63	43	14
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	5	0	9	100	0	64	14
Item 9: Adoption	1	0	13	100	0	93	14
Item 10: Other planned permanent living arrangement	2	0	12	100	0	86	14
Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement	7	0	7	100	0	50	14
Item 12: Placement with siblings	3	0	11	100	0	79	14
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	5	1	8	83	17	57	14
Item 14: Preserving connections	8	0	6	100	0	43	14
Item 15: Relative placement	4	0	10	100	0	71	14
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents	5	2	7	71	29	50	14
Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	8	6		57	43		14
Item 18: Child/family involvement in case planning	10	4	0	71	29	0	14

Item 19: Caseworker visits with child	10	4		71	29		14
Item 20: Caseworker visits with parent(s)	7	6	1	54	46	7	14
Item 21: Educational needs of the child	14	0	0	100	0	0	14
Item 22: Physical health of child	10	2	2	83	17	14	14
Item 23: Mental/behavioral health of the child	12	0	2	100	0	14	14

SA = Substantially Achieved (%)

PA = Partially Achieved (%)

NACH = Not Achieved (%)

N/A = Not Applicable

Performance Outcome	SA	PA	NACH	N/A	SA (%)	PA (%)	NACH (%)	N/A (%)	Total
Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	4	0	1	9	80	0	20	64	14
Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	13	1	0	0	93	7	0	0	14
Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	3	5	0	6	38	63	0	43	14
Outcome P2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	7	1	0	6	88	13	0	43	14
Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	8	5	1	0	57	36	7	0	14
Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	14	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	14
Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.	12	1	1	0	86	7	7	0	14