FINAL REPORT

Children and Family Services Review

Southeast Service Area

5th Quarter - Mini CFSR Review

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

Report Date: March 2011

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Final Report: Children and Family Services Review (CFSR)
(Southeast Service Area 5th Quarter Review)

This document presents findings from the 5th mini Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the Southeast Service Area. A table with all of the items and outcome results for this review is found on page 24 of this report. The Nebraska Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) team has identified the mini CFSR review as an important activity for assessing the performance of each Service Area and the State as a whole with regard to achieving positive outcomes for children and their families. Mini CFSR reviews are scheduled to take place in each Service Area once every quarter in year 2010 and 2011. Please note that a table with all the items and outcome results for all quarterly mini CFSR reviews conducted in the Southeast Service Area since January 2010 is found on page 25 of this report.

The Southeast Service Area's 5th Quarter mini CFSR review was conducted on February 7th – 9th, 2011. The period under review for the onsite case review was January 1st, 2010 – January 1st, 2011. The findings were derived from file reviews of 14 cases (8 foster care and 6 in home cases) which were randomly selected from all open child welfare cases at some time during the period under review. The reviews also included interviews with parents, children, foster parents, CFS specialists, Service Coordinators and other service providers to assess items 17-20 within the review tool.

Two (2) of the 14 cases were brought to the attention of the Department of Health and Human Services for juvenile justice services and four (4) of the cases were non court involved. The cases were from the following Southeast Service Area offices: Lincoln, York and Seward.

The review was completed by staff from the Department of Health and Human Services and Out of Home Reform provider KVC Behavioral Healthcare Nebraska. 100% of the cases were reviewed by the following second level reviewers: Sheila Kadoi from the Department of Health and Human Services and Travis Payne from KVC Behavioral Healthcare Nebraska.

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 90 percent of the applicable cases reviewed are rated as a 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 5th quarter mini CFSR review identified several areas of high performance in the Southeast Service Area with regard to achieving desired outcomes for children and families. Although the Service Area did not achieve substantial conformity with any of the seven outcomes, 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), achievement of permanency goal of reunification or guardianship (item 8), achievement of permanency goal of other planned living arrangement (item 10), placing children in close proximity to their parents (item 11), placement with siblings (item 12), preserving family connections (item 14), assessing and providing services to meet the child's educational needs (item 21), and assessing and providing services to meet the child's mental and/or behavioral health care needs (item 23).

The 5th quarter mini CFSR review also identified key areas of concern with regard to achieving outcomes for children and families. Concerns were identified with regard to Safety Outcome 2 (children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate), which was Substantially Achieved in 71 percent of the cases reviewed. The lowest rating within this outcome was for item 4 (risk assessment and safety management) which was rated as a Strength in 71 percent of the cases reviewed.

Concerns were also identified with regards to Permanency Outcome 1, (children have permanency and stability in their living situations) which was Substantially Achieved in 25 percent of the cases reviewed. Within Permanency Outcome 1, the Southeast Service Area's lowest ratings were for item 7 (timeliness of establishing a permanency goal for the child) which was rated as a Strength in 38 percent of the cases reviewed and item 9 (achieving permanency goal of adoption), which was rated as a Strength in 0 percent of the cases reviewed.

In addition, concerns were also identified with regard to Well-Being Outcome 1 (families have enhanced capacity to provide for children's needs), which was Substantially Achieved in only 29 percent of the cases reviewed. The lowest ratings were for item 17 (needs and services to child, parents and foster parents), which was rated as a Strength in 50 percent of the cases reviewed; item 18 (child and family involvement in case planning), which was rated as a Strength in 57 percent of the cases reviewed; item 19 (caseworker visits with the child) which was rated as a Strength in 50 percent of the cases reviewed, and item 20 (caseworker visits with parent(s)), which was rated as a Strength in 29 percent of the cases reviewed.

* *Figures displayed for applicable cases in the tables within the report may not total 100 percent due to rounding.*

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:	6	86%
Partially Achieved:	1	14%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	7	50%

** Figures displayed for applicable cases in the table may not total 100 percent due to rounding.*

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 the Department of Health and Human Services. 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.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 1 was applicable for 7 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 6 (86%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 1 (14%) of the applicable cases. The following is a list of response levels assigned to the intakes in the 7 applicable cases: 2 intakes (Priority 1) 5 intakes (Priority 2) and 3 intakes (Priority 3). A couple of these cases had multiple intakes during the period under review.

Strength:

- (2 foster care cases)
  - In these two cases, the investigation was initiated in a timely manner and contacts with the child(ren) was/were made in a timely manner according to State policy.

- (4 in home cases)
  - In all 4 cases, the investigation was initiated in a timely manner and contacts with the child(ren) was/were made in a timely manner according to State policy.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
  - In this one case, contacts with the child(ren) were not made in a timely manner according to State policy and case file documentation did not include information that justified the delay.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation needs to include reasons why contacts with the child(ren) was/were not completed in a timely manner according to State policy.*

Item 2: Repeat maltreatment

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

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 2 was applicable for 5 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in all 5 (100%) applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 in home cases; and 2 foster care cases)
  - In all five 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:

- *Information was readily available 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:	10	71%
Partially Achieved:	2	14%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	2	14%
Not Applicable:	0	0%

** Figures displayed for applicable cases in the table may not total 100 percent due to rounding.*

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

For this item, reviewers were to assess whether in responding to a substantiated/inconclusive/petition to be filed maltreatment report or risk of harm, the agency made diligent efforts to provide services to families to prevent removal of children from their homes while at the same time ensuring their safety.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 3 was applicable for 10 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in all 10 (100%) applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
    - In one of the cases, the child was removed from the home even after services were provided. The child was removed from the home because his mother was admitted to the hospital for medical issues.
    - In two of the cases, the department made efforts to provide services to allow the child to remain at home in the care of their parents. However, it was necessary to remove the child from the home due to the child's uncontrollable behavior and need for a higher level of care.
    - In two of the cases, the children were returned to the care of their parent(s) during the period under review and services were provided to safely maintain them at home.
- (5 in home cases)
    - In all five cases, the file documentation indicated that in home safety and other services were provided in order to protect the children and prevent their entry into foster care.

Reviewer Comments:

- *In all cases, there was evidence to support that in home safety services (drop in visits) and other services to enhance parent protective capacities were provided for the parent(s).*

Item 4: <u>Risk assessment and safety management</u>

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

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 4 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 10 (71%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 4 (29%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (4 foster care cases)
    - In all four cases, the file contained sufficient information to support that initial and ongoing risk and safety assessments were completed for the target child while in foster care and with his/her siblings that remained in the home. Documentation indicated that risk and safety assessments were formally or informally completed and safety plans adjusted as safety threats increased or decreased.

- (6 in home cases)
    - In all six cases, the file contained sufficient information to support that initial and ongoing risk and safety assessments were completed for the child(ren) while placed in the care of their parents. Documentation indicated that risk and safety assessments were formally or informally completed and safety plans adjusted as safety threats increased or decreased.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (4 foster care cases)
    - In one of the cases, the reviewers were unable to find updated safety plans to reflect placement changes for the child.
    - In one of the cases, the reviewers were unable to determine if a suitability of the safety plan participant was conducted. In this case, the youth was placed with his sister who was unable to manage his behaviors and the child ultimately ran from that placement. In this same case, the reviewers also noted that the YLS indicated concerns about the mother's ability to control the child's behaviors, however, the department did not follow up with further assessment of the mother's needs.
    - In one of the cases, the reviewers were unable to find evidence of ongoing safety and risk assessments during the PUR. The reviewers also noted that the safety plan was not updated in this case and a thorough safety assessment was not completed when the child was reunified with the parents and prior to case closure.
    - In another case, the reviewers were able to find evidence of initial and ongoing safety and risk assessments during the PUR, however, a thorough safety assessment was not completed when the child was reunified with the parents.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Workers need to utilize the Nebraska Safety Intervention System (Safety Model) to assess risk and improve safety interventions with children and families. The reviewers identified that in the majority of cases, initial assessments were being conducted and documented, however, ongoing safety assessments were not being completed using the Nebraska Safety Intervention System (Safety Model). Reviewers relied on informal assessments documented during face to face contacts and Family Team Meetings during their review of this item.*
- *Workers need to continually assess risk and safety during face to face contacts with the child, parent(s) and foster parents. Assessment of risk and safety should be very well documented in the narratives provided for required contacts with the child, parents and foster parents.*
- *Safety determination should be made by considering case circumstances absent of department intervention. Safety plans should be implemented in cases in which the children are determined to be unsafe in their current circumstances and without services and intervention from the department.*
- *Safety plans should be continually 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:	2	25%
Partially Achieved:	6	75%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	6	43%

** Figures displayed for applicable cases in the table may not total 100 percent due to rounding.*

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 (ANI) 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 due to the following reasons: (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 5 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as Strength in all 5 (100%) applicable case.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In these five cases, the child did not 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 7 (88%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 1 (13%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (7 foster care cases)
    - In three of the cases, the file indicated that the child had experienced only one placement setting and remained in the same foster care placement which was meeting his needs until he was successfully reunited with his parent(s).
    - In one of the cases, the file indicated that the child experienced only one placement setting and remains in the same group home placement which is currently stable and meeting all of his needs.
    - In three of the cases, even though the child experienced more than one placement change, these placement changes were necessary in order to provide for the child's needs. In one of these cases, the child was successfully reunited with his parents during the PUR. In another case the child was moved from a treatment group home to a foster placement with her grandmother who was willing to provide permanency for the child.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
    - In this one case, the child's most current placement was in an Emergency Shelter Center, which would not be considered as a stable placement for the child.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Workers need to document the reason for placement changes in the case file. Documentation should address whether or not the placement change was in the best interest of the child and/or was necessary to achieve the child's permanency goals or meet the child's specific needs.*

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

In assessing this item, reviewers were to determine whether the Department of Health and Human Services 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 the Department of Health and Human Services 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 the Department of Health and Human Services had established an appropriate permanency goal in a timely manner. Cases were assigned a rating of Area Needing Improvement ANI) 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 3 (38%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 5 (63%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In these three cases, the child's primary and concurrent goals were established in a timely manner, appropriate for the child's need for permanency and documented in the case file. The following were the goals established in these three cases:
    - 1 case (Primary: Reunification; Concurrent: Independent Living)
    - 1 case (Primary: Independent Living; Concurrent: Reunification)
    - 1 case (Primary: Family Preservation; Concurrent: Adoption)
      - Note: The youth's primary goal of Reunification was achieved during the PUR and goals were changed to Family Preservation and Adoption.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (5 foster care cases)
  - The following were the goals established in these 5 cases:
    - 1 case (Primary: Reunification; Concurrent: Guardianship)
      - In this one case, the child had been in out of home care for over 30 months. However, the reviewers were unable to find any documentation of termination of parental rights or any compelling reasons documented to support why termination of parental rights was not in the best interest of the child.
    - 1 case (Primary: Reunification; Concurrent: Independent Living)
      - In this one case, the child's permanency goals of reunification and independent living were not established in a timely manner according to state policy.
    - 2 cases(Primary: Reunification; Concurrent: Family Preservation)
      - Reviewers were unable to determine how a concurrent goal of Family Preservation was appropriate for the child in these two cases if the child was currently placed out of the home and the primary goal was reunification.
    - 1 case (Primary: Family Preservation; Concurrent: Reunification)
      - Note: The youth's primary goal of Reunification was achieved during the PUR and goals were changed to Family Preservation and Reunification.
      - Reviewers were unable to determine how a concurrent goal of Reunification was appropriate for the child in this case if the child was currently placed in the home.

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 for the child should be established within 60 days from the child's entry into foster care.*
- *Case file documentation needs to reflect any changes in case plan goals.*
- *Case file documentation needs to include all information regarding termination of parental rights (TPR) 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 TPR and/or documentation of compelling reasons for not filing for TPR.*

Item 8: <u>Reunification, Guardianship or Permanent Placement with Relatives</u>
In assessing these cases reviewers determined whether the Department of Health and Human Services 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 the Department of Health and Human Services had made diligent efforts to achieve the goals.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 8 was applicable for 7 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in all 7 (100%) applicable cases.

Strength:

- (7 foster care cases)
  - In these seven cases, the documentation indicated that efforts were made to achieve the child's primary permanency goal of reunification.
    - In three of these cases, the child was successfully reunited with the parents and the agency continued to provide services to maintain the child in the home.
    - In four of the cases, there is documentation in the file to support the department's efforts to meet the child's permanency goal of reunification.
      - In one of these cases, the child has not been in care longer than 12 months and progress continues to be made toward reunification.
      - In three of these cases, the child had been in out of home care longer than 12 months, however, the child's goal of reunification has not been achieved due to the child's continued need for treatment out of the home. In one of these cases, the department is also making efforts to achieve the child's concurrent goal of independent living. In another case, the department is also making efforts to achieve the child's concurrent goal of guardianship.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation clearly explained the agency's efforts in achieving permanency goals of reunification and guardianship established for the child.*
- *If the child has been in foster care for longer than 12 months, documentation included information regarding barriers or particular circumstances that justified the delay in achieving the child's permanency goal.*

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

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 9 was applicable for 2 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 2 (100%) of the applicable cases.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (2 foster care cases)
  - In these two cases, the reviewers were unable to find efforts to achieve the child's concurrent goal of adoption.

Reviewer Comments:

- *The agency should be making active efforts to achieve ALL permanency goals (primary and concurrent goals) established for the child. Reviewers had a difficult time finding information to support agency efforts to achieve concurrent goals that were established.*
- *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.*
- *If the permanency goal of adoption was not achieved within 24 months or is not likely to be achieved within 24 months of the date of the child's most recent entry into foster care, then the documentation in the file should include particular circumstances that warrant the delay.*

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 applicable for 3 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in all 3 (100%) applicable case.

Strength:

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In all three cases, the reviewers were able to find documentation to support the Department's efforts to meet the child's primary or concurrent goal of independent living. Reviewers were able to find case plan goals addressing independent living skills for the child as well as documentation of efforts and services provided to achieve those goals.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation explained the agency's efforts to achieve the child's permanency goal of independent living. Documentation addressed the following for the child:*
  - *Efforts to provide the child with services to adequately prepare the child for independent living when the child leaves foster care.*
  - *Efforts to provide long term stability for the child until he or she reaches adulthood.*

Status of Permanency Outcome P2

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	4	50%
Partially Achieved:	4	50%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	6	43%

** Figures displayed for applicable cases in the table may not total 100 percent due to rounding.*

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

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 11 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in all 8 (100%) applicable cases.

Strength:

- (8 foster care cases)
    - In seven of the cases, the child was placed in the same community or within 50 miles from their parent(s).
    - In one of the cases, the child was not placed in close proximity to his parents', however, the child's placement was necessary to meet the child's specialized needs.

Reviewer Comments:

Case file documentation included information regarding the location of foster care placement and its proximity to the parent(s) location.

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

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 12 was applicable for 1 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in this 1 (100%) applicable case.

Strength:

- (1 foster care case)
    - In this one case, the target child and his sibling were placed in the same relative foster care placement.

Reviewer Comments:

Documentation explained the agency's efforts to place all siblings together.

Item 13: <u>Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care</u>
In assessing this item reviewers determined whether the Department of Health and Human Services (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%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 4 (50%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (4 foster care cases)
    - In all four cases, documentation indicated that the frequency and quality of the visits were sufficient to promote continuity of parent child relationships.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (4 foster care cases)
    - In one of these cases, the target child was placed with their sibling in the same foster care and documentation supports efforts to promote sufficient frequency and quality of visitation between the child and the mother. However, the reviewers were unable to find any documentation of visitations between the child and the father.
    - In two of these cases, documentation supports efforts to promote sufficient frequency and quality of visitation between the child and the mother. However, the reviewers were unable to find any documentation of visitations between the child and the father. The child had no other siblings in foster care.
    - In one of the cases, the reviewers were able to find documentation to support the frequency of visitation between the child and his mother and father. However, the reviewers were unable to find documentation to support sufficient quality of visitations between the target child and their mother and father.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation should explain the frequency of visits between the child and his/her parents (mother and/or father when applicable) and the child and his or her siblings if the child has a sibling who is also in foster care but is in a different placement.*
- *Documentation should explain the quality of visits between the child and his/her parents (mother and/or father when applicable) and the child and his or her siblings if the child has a sibling who is also in foster care but is in a different placement. Documentation should address how the quality of the visit was sufficient to maintain continuity of relationships.*

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

Reviewers determined whether the Department of Health and Human Services 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 all 8 (100%) applicable cases.

Strength:

- (8 foster care cases)
    - In all eight cases, the files contained documentation of efforts made by the department to maintain the child's connections to his community, faith, extended family, friends, tribe and any other connections that were determined to be important to the child.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation addressed the child's important connections and efforts made by the department to preserve those connections.*
- *Documentation indicated 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 an Indian 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 7 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 4 (57%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 3 (43%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (4 foster care cases)
  - In all four cases, the child was either placed with relatives or placed in a treatment setting that was necessary to meet their needs. In these four cases, file documentation indicated that the placement was stable and meeting the child's needs.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (3 foster care case)
  - In all three cases, the child was not placed with relatives and reviewers were unable to find any documentation to support any efforts to identify the child's maternal or paternal relatives.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation should clearly indicate the agency's efforts to identify, locate and evaluate maternal and/or paternal relatives as potential placements for the child.*
- *If the child is not placed with relatives, the documentation should include the reason for not placing the child with relatives (i.e. relatives were unwilling to provide placement, relatives were ruled out or determined to be inappropriate placement options for the child etc.)*

Item 16: <u>Relationship of child in care with parents</u>

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 (ANI) 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 5 (63%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 3 (38%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In these five cases, documentation supports that efforts were made to promote and maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and their mother and/or father. The following are lists of services or efforts provided to the families in these five cases:
    - ✓ Therapeutic services were provided for the parent(s) and child in four of the cases. In two of these cases, the child's father refused to participate in services offered to promote continuity of relationships between the father and the child. In one of the cases, the child's father has not been identified. Documentation indicated that several paternity tests were completed during the PUR in order to identify the father but a father has not been identified.
    - ✓ Foster parents served as a role model for the child's mother. In this one case, the child's father was deceased.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In two of the cases, there was no documentation regarding any attempts to support and maintain a positive relationship between the child and his father even though the father's whereabouts were known.
  - In one of the cases, there was no documentation regarding any attempts to locate the child's father.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation should indicate the agency's efforts to provide opportunities or support additional activities to help support, strengthen, or maintain parent-child relationships. Documentation should address mother and/or father's relationships as determined applicable due to case circumstances.*
- *The additional activities referenced here are those outside of planned visitation between the parent and child and would include the following:*
  - *Parent participation in the child's school activities, attendance at doctor's appointments, engagement in after school or extracurricular activities.*
  - *Agency efforts to arrange for or provide transportation for the parent to attend activities mentioned above.*

- *Opportunities for therapeutic situations to strengthen parent child relationships.*
- *Encourage foster parents to provide mentoring or serve as a role model to parents.*

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:	4	29%
Partially Achieved:	6	43%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	4	29%
Not Applicable:	0	0%

** Figures displayed for applicable cases in the table may not total 100 percent due to rounding.*

Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents
In assessing item 17, reviewers were to determine whether the Department of Health and Human Services 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 the 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 7 (50%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 7 (50%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:
- (4 foster care cases)
  - In these four cases, there were concerted efforts to assess the needs of the target child, foster parents and parents (mother and father when applicable) and appropriate services were implemented to address all identified needs.
- (3 in home cases)
  - In these three cases, there were concerted efforts to assess the needs of all children living in the home as well as the parents (mother and father when applicable) and appropriate services were implemented to address all identified needs.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):
- (4 foster care cases)
  - In two of the cases, the reviewers were unable to find information to support that the needs of the child's mother and father were sufficiently assessed during the PUR.

- In one of the cases, the reviewers were unable to find information to support that the needs of the foster parent were assessed or identified.
- In one of the cases, the reviewers were unable to find information to support that the needs of the child's father were sufficiently assessed during the PUR.

- (3 in home cases)
  - In one of the cases, the reviewers were unable to find information to support that the needs of the child's father were assessed. This in home case involved 3 different biological fathers. Case file documentation indicates that efforts were made to locate the biological father's for 2 of the 3 children, however, their whereabouts continue to be unknown. The whereabouts of the father for the third child in home were known to the department during the PUR but there were no efforts were made to assess his needs. The children were in the care and custody of their mother in this case.
  - In one of the cases, the reviewers were unable to find sufficient information to support that the child's mother's needs were assessed or services provided to meet her needs during the PUR. The children were in the care and custody of their father in this case.
  - In one of the cases, the reviewers were unable to find sufficient information to support that services were provided to meet the children's father's needs. The father's needs were assessed during the PUR but reviewers were unable to find documentation of ongoing contacts and services offered to the father. The children were in the care and custody of their mother in this case.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation should include detailed information of the agency's efforts to achieve an in depth understanding of the needs of the child and family regardless of whether needs were assessed in a formal or informal manner.*
- *It is not enough to simply note that an assessment was completed, it is important that enough information is documented regarding adequacy of the assessment.*
- *Needs should be clearly identified and documented.*
- *Services should be clearly identified and should match identified needs.*

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

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

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 18 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 8 (57%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 6 (43%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In all five foster care cases, the reviewers determined that when applicable the mother, father, and target child were actively involved in the development and evaluation of case plan goals.

- (3 in home cases)
    - In all three in-home cases, the reviewers determined that when applicable the mother, father, and the children were actively involved in the development and evaluation of case plan goals.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (3 foster care case)
    - In all three foster care cases, the reviewers were unable to find documentation of active efforts to involve the child's biological father in the development and evaluation of case plan goals.
- (3 in home cases)
    - In all three in-home cases, the reviewers were unable to find documentation of active efforts to involve the child's biological father in the development and evaluation of case plan goals.
        - In one of these cases, the reviewers were also unable to find a case plan and documentation of active efforts to involve the children and their mother in case planning.
        - In two of the cases, the reviewers found a case plan in the file. However, reviewers were unable to determine how the children were actively involved in the case planning based on the documentation in the file.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation and interviews should clearly identify the extent to which the child (if developmentally appropriate) was involved in determining: (1) his or her strengths and needs, (2) the type and level of services needed, (3) and his or her goals and progress towards them.*
- *Documentation and interviewers should clearly identify the extent to which the parents (mother and/or father) whenever appropriate/applicable were involved in (1) identifying strengths and needs, (2) identifying services and service providers, (3) establishing case plan goals, (4) evaluating progress toward goals, and (5) discussing the case plan in case planning meetings.*

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

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

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 19 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 7 (50%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 7 (50%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
    - In these five cases, the frequency and quality of visits between the caseworker and the target child were sufficient to ensure safety, permanency and well-being of the child and achieve case plan goals.
- (2 in home cases)
    - In these two cases, the worker had face to face contacts with all of the children living in the home. The frequency and quality of visits between the caseworker and

each child were sufficient to ensure safety, permanency and well-being of the children and achieve case plan goals.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In two of the cases, the typical pattern of visitation between the caseworker and the target child was less than once a month. In both cases, the reviewers were unable to determine the quality of visits due to lack of information in the file and during the interviews.
  - In one of the cases, the typical pattern of visitation between the caseworker and the target child was at least once a month. However, the reviewers were unable to determine the quality of visits due to lack of information in the file and during the interviews.
- (4 in home cases)
  - In three of the cases, the reviewers determined that the typical pattern of visitation between the worker and the child(ren) was less than once a month. Furthermore, the reviewers were unable to determine the quality of visits due to lack of information in the file and during the interviews.
  - In one of the cases, the typical pattern of visitation between the caseworker and each of the children was at least once a month. However, the reviewers were unable to determine the quality of visits due to lack of information in the file and during the interviews.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation should address the frequency of worker's visits with the child. If the face to face contact between the worker and the child was less than once a month, the documentation should include reasons why the face to face contact between the worker and child did not occur.*
- *Documentation should include enough information to determine that the quality of the visit between the worker and the child was sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and promote achievement of case plan goals. It is important to document length of visit, location of visit and items that were discussed during the visits.*

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

Reviewers were to assess whether the caseworker had sufficient face to face contact with parents to encourage attainment of their children's permanency goal while ensuring safety and Well-Being. Cases were not applicable for this item if parental rights had been terminated prior to the period under review and parents were no longer involved in the lives of the children.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 20 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 4 (29%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 10 (71%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (2 foster care cases)
  - In these two cases, the frequency and quality of visits between the caseworker and the target child's parents were sufficient to ensure safety, permanency and well-being of the child and promote achievement of case plan goals.

- (2 in home cases)
    - In these two cases, the frequency and quality of visits between caseworker and the child's parents (mother and/or father) were sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency and well-being of the children and promote achievement of case plan goals.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (6 foster care cases)
    - In one of the cases, the reviewers determined that the typical pattern of visitation between the worker and the child's mother and father was less than once a month. Furthermore, the reviewers were unable to determine the quality of the visits based on the documentation found in the file. In this case, there were also no documented face to face contacts between the worker and child's father.
    - In one of the cases, the typical pattern of visitation between the caseworker and the child's mother was at least once a month. However, the reviewers were unable to determine the quality of visits due to lack of information in the file and during the interviews. No contacts were applicable for the child's father in this case as he is deceased.
    - In four of the cases, the reviewers determined that the worker had monthly face to face contact with the child's mother and the quality of the visits were sufficient to address safety, permanency and well-being of the child. However, there were either no documented contacts or minimal contacts documented between the worker and the child's father in each of these cases.
- (4 in home cases)
    - In three of the cases, the reviewers determined that the worker met with the children's mother at least once a month and the quality of the visits were sufficient to address safety, permanency and well-being of the child. However, in all three cases there was no evidence that the worker had any face to face contacts with the children's father during the period under review. The children were placed in the care and custody of their mother in each of these 3 cases.
    - In one of the cases, there was no evidence of face to face contacts between the worker and the children's mother during the PUR. The children were placed in the care and custody of their father in this case.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation should clearly address the frequency of worker's visits with the parents (mother and/or father) as determined to be applicable and appropriate. If the face to face contact between the worker and the parent was less than once a month, the documentation should include reasons why the face to face contact between the worker and parent did not occur.*
    - *If the reason for lack of contact with the parent is due to the parent's whereabouts being unknown, the file needs to include enough information regarding the departments' efforts to locate and involve the parent.*
- *Documentation should include enough information to determine that the quality of the visit between the worker and the parent were sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety, permanency, and well-being of the child and promote achievement of case plan goals. It is important to document the length of the visit, location of the visit and items that were discussed during the visits.*

Status of Well-Being Outcome WB2

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	10	100%
Partially Achieved:	0	0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	4	29%

** Figures displayed for applicable cases in the table may not total 100 percent due to rounding.*

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 all 10 (100%) applicable cases.

Strength:

- (7 foster care and 3 in home cases)
  - In all seven cases, there was evidence that the child(ren)'s current educational needs were assessed and services were provided to meet identified needs.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation addressed the agency's efforts to assess the child's educational needs and provide services to meet those 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:	10	83%
Partially Achieved:	2	17%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	2	14%

** Figures displayed for applicable cases in the table may not total 100 percent due to rounding.*

Item 22: <u>Physical health of the child</u>
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 12 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 10 (83%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 2 (17%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (8 foster care cases)
  - In these four foster care cases, there was documentation to support that the agency conducted an assessment of the target child's physical and dental health needs and provided appropriate services to meet all identified needs.
- (2 in home cases)
  - In these two in-home cases, there was documentation to support that the agency conducted an assessment of all of the children's physical and dental health needs and provided appropriate services to meet identified needs.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (2 in home cases)
  - In one of these cases, the reviewers were unable to find documentation of current assessments of the child(ren)'s physical health needs.
  - In one of these cases, the reviewers were unable to find documentation of current assessments of the child(ren)'s physical and dental health needs.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation should address the agency's efforts to assess the child's physical and dental health needs.*
- *Documentation should indicate the agency's efforts to address the child's physical and dental health needs as identified in the assessment. It is not enough to simply State the date of the examinations. Documentation should include the results of both physical and dental examinations and services that were provided to meet the needs that were identified during those examinations.*

Item 23: <u>Mental health of the child</u>
Reviewers were to determine whether during the period under review, (1) mental health needs had been appropriately assessed, and (2) appropriate services to address those needs had been offered or provided. 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 mental health needs or that appropriate services were provided to meet all identified mental health needs. Cases were not applicable if the child was too young for an assessment of mental health needs or if the reviewer determined that there was no reason

to expect that, during the period under review, the agency would address mental/behavioral health issues for the child(ren), given the circumstances of the case.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 23 was applicable for 9 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in all 9 (100%) applicable cases.

Strength:

- (7 foster care cases)
  - In all seven cases, the file documentation indicated that the agency conducted informal or formal assessments of the target child's mental/behavioral health needs. Assessments were completed formally through pre treatment assessments or psychological evaluations and informally during family team meetings and worker contacts with the child.
    - Needs identified for each case included impulse control disorder, AHDH, bi polar disorder, depression, alcohol dependence, oppositional defiance disorder, anger and other behavioral issues.
    - Services provided to meet the child's needs in each case included family therapy, individual therapy, medication management, psychiatric consultations, anger management, and outpatient therapy for substance abuse.

- (2 in home cases)
  - In both cases, the file documentation indicated that the agency conducted current assessments of the child(ren)'s mental/behavioral health needs and provided appropriate services to meet all of the child(ren)'s identified needs.
    - In one of the cases, a pre treatment assessment was completed for each of the children in the home. The assessments indicated that two of the children did not need any mental or behavioral services while the 3rd child received individual therapy to meet identified behavioral health needs.
    - In one of the cases, a pre treatment assessment was also completed for each of the children in the home. One of the children was diagnosed with adjustment disorder and the other with depressive disorder, ADHD and anxiety. Medication, individual and family therapy were provided to meet the needs of the children.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation addressed the agency's efforts to assess the child's mental/behavioral health needs.*

Southeast Service Area – 1st Quarter 2011 Mini CFSR Results:

Review Period: *January 1st, 2010 – January 1st, 2011*
Number of Reviews: *14 cases (8 Foster Care, 6 In-Home)*

PERFORMANCE ITEM RESULTS

Note: Percentages for applicable cases may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Performance Item		Item Ratings (#)			Item Ratings (%)		
		S	ANI	N/A	S	ANI	N/A
Item 1:	Timeliness of initiating investigations	6	1	7	86%	14%	50%
Item 2:	Repeat maltreatment	5	0	9	100%	0%	64%
Item 3:	Services to family	10	0	4	100%	0%	29%
Item 4:	Risk assessment and safety management	10	4	0	71%	29%	0%
Item 5:	Foster care re-entries	5	0	9	100%	0%	64%
Item 6:	Stability of foster care placement	7	1	6	88%	13%	43%
Item 7:	Permanency goal for child	3	5	6	38%	63%	43%
Item 8:	Reunification, guardianship etc	7	0	7	100%	0%	50%
Item 9:	Adoption	0	2	12	0%	100%	86%
Item 10:	Other planned permanent living arrangement	3	0	11	100%	0%	79%
Item 11:	Proximity of foster care placement	8	0	6	100%	0%	43%
Item 12:	Placement with siblings	1	0	13	100%	0%	93%
Item 13:	Visiting with parents and siblings	4	4	6	50%	50%	43%
Item 14:	Preserving connections	8	0	6	100%	0%	43%
Item 15:	Relative placement	4	3	7	57%	43%	50%
Item 16:	Relationship of child in care with parents	5	3	6	63%	38%	43%
Item 17:	Needs and services	7	7	0	50%	50%	0%
Item 18:	Child and family involvement in case planning	8	6	0	57%	43%	0%
Item 19:	Caseworker visits with child	7	7	0	50%	50%	0%
Item 20:	Caseworker visits with parent(s)	4	10	0	29%	71%	0%
Item 21:	Educational needs of the child	10	0	4	100%	0%	29%
Item 22:	Physical health of the child	10	2	2	83%	17%	14%
Item 23:	Mental/behavioral health of the child	9	0	5	100%	0%	36%

OUTCOME RESULTS

*** 95 % is the target goal for each outcome.**

	COUNTS (#)				PERCENTAGES (%)			
Performance Outcome	*SA*	*PA*	*NACH*	*N/A*	*SA*	*PA*	*NACH*	*N/A*
Safety 1 (Items 1-2)	6	1	0	7	86%	14%	0%	50%
Safety 2 (Items 3-4)	10	2	2	0	71%	14%	14%	0%
Permanency 1 (Items 5-10)	2	6	0	6	25%	75%	0%	43%
Permanency 2 (Items 11-16)	4	4	0	6	50%	50%	0%	43%
Well-being 1 (Items 17-20)	4	6	4	0	29%	43%	29%	0%
Well-being 2 (Item 21)	10	0	0	4	100%	0%	0%	29%
Well-being 3 (Items 22-23)	10	2	0	2	83%	17%	0%	14%

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

CFSR - Southeast Service Area (Item & Outcome Quarterly Results)

REPORT CODES: Items 1 to 20, 22 and 23

Green	*90% or Above*
Yellow	*85% - 89.9%*
Red	*below 50%*

Report CODES: Item 21 and ALL OUTCOMES

Green	*95% or Above*
Yellow	*90% - 94.9%*
Red	*below 50%*

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

Report Quarter	1st Qtr 2010	2nd Qtr 2010	3rd Qtr 2010	4th Qtr 2010	5th Qtr 2011
Period Under Review	Jan 09-Jan10	Apr 09-Apr 10	Jul 09-Jul 10	Oct 09-Oct 10	Jan 10-Jan 11
Number of Cases	14	14	14	14	14
Item 1	33%	80%	57%	88%	86%
Item 2	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Outcome: Safety 1	33%	80%	57%	88%	86%
Item 3	100%	77%	73%	100%	100%
Item 4	64%	57%	64%	71%	71%
Outcome: Safety 2	64%	57%	57%	71%	71%
Item 5	NA	100%	100%	100%	100%
Item 6	89%	100%	88%	75%	88%
Item 7	38%	63%	13%	75%	38%
Item 8	71%	43%	100%	43%	100%
Item 9	33%	20%	33%	67%	0%
Item 10	100%	NA	75%	0%	100%
Outcome: Permanency 1	13%	13%	25%	38%	25%
Item 11	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Item 12	75%	67%	0%	50%	100%
Item 13	50%	50%	43%	50%	50%
Item 14	75%	63%	63%	75%	100%
Item 15	60%	67%	80%	33%	57%
Item 16	75%	50%	50%	75%	63%
Outcome: Permanency 2	50%	50%	50%	63%	50%
Item 17	57%	57%	36%	50%	50%
Item 18	57%	43%	38%	46%	57%
Item 19	43%	43%	64%	50%	50%
Item 20	14%	29%	17%	29%	29%
Outcome: Well-Being 1	29%	21%	14%	36%	29%
Item 21	89%	100%	100%	71%	100%
Outcome: Well-Being 2	89%	100%	100%	71%	100%
Item 22	40%	55%	69%	55%	83%
Item 23	100%	100%	90%	89%	100%
Outcome: Well-Being 3	50%	62%	71%	31%	83%

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)