

FINAL REPORT

2nd Mini Children and Family Service Review

Central Service Area

(April 26th-28th 2010)

Executive Summary Children and Family Services Review (Central Service Area)

This document presents the finding from the 2nd mini Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the Central Service Area. The Nebraska CQI (Continuous Quality Improvement) team has identified the mini CFSR review as an important activity for assessing the performance of each service area and the state as a whole with regard to achieving positive outcomes for children and their families. Mini CFSR reviews are scheduled to take place in each service area once every quarter in year 2010 and 2011.

The Central Service Area had its second mini CFSR review from April 26th through April 28th, 2010. The period under review for the onsite case review was April 1st, 2009 through April 5th, 2010. The findings were derived from file reviews of 14 cases (8 foster care and 6 in home services) 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, and other service providers to assess items 17-20 within the review tool.

In the Central Service Area, six of the 14 cases were brought to the attention of DHHS for juvenile justice services. The cases were from the following area offices: Grand Island, Hastings, Kearney, and Broken Bow.

The review was completed by 5 teams of two reviewers made up of both staff from DHHS and Out of Home Reform providers (Boys and Girls Home). 100% of the cases were reviewed by the following second level reviewers: Kayl Dahlke and Kathy Anstine

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 2nd Mini CFSR identified several areas of high performance in the Central Service Area with regard to achieving desired outcomes for children. The service area did not achieve substantial conformity with any of the seven CFSR outcomes, although 93 percent for Safety 2 (Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate) was very close. 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-entries (item 5), other planned permanent living arrangement (item 10), proximity of foster care placement (item 11), and placement with siblings (item 12). These items were strengths in 100 percent of the applicable cases reviewed.

The mini CFSR review also identified key areas of concern with regard to achieving outcomes for children and families. Concerns were identified with regards to Well Being 1, (Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs) which was substantially achieved in only 36 percent of the cases reviewed. Within Well Being 1, Central Service area's lowest rating was for item 20 (caseworker visits with parent(s)), which was rated as a Strength in 36 percent of the cases reviewed. Well-Being 3(Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs) was only substantially achieved in 43 percent of the cases. Within Well-Being 3, item 22(physical health of child) was rated a Strength in 54 percent of the cases and item 23(mental/behavioral health of a child) in 60 percent of the cases.

Concerns identified in other individual indicators included permanency goal of the child (item 7), rated a strength in 38 percent of the cases; reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives (item 8), 38 percent of the cases; and visiting with parents and siblings in foster care (item 13), 33 percent of the cases.

KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

I. SAFETY

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

Status of Safety Outcome S1

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	3	75%
Partially Achieved:	1	25%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	10	71%

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:

- *4 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item.*
- *3(75%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *1(25%) case was rated an area needing improvement*
- *2 of the cases rated as strengths were in-home cases and 1 was out-of-home*
- *The case rated as needing improvement was an out-of-home case*

Strengths: For the cases rated as strengths reviewers found documentation that the face-to-face contact with the child was occurring during the established timelines.

Areas needing improvement: For the case rated as an area needing improvement the face-to-face contact protocol was not met and there was no documentation stating why this happened.

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:

- 2 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item
- 2(100%) cases were rated as strengths
- 0 cases were rated as needing improvement
- 1 of the cases rated as a strength was an in-home case and 1 was an out-of-home

Strengths: In both cases rated as strengths there was 1 incident of maltreatment during the period under review but no additional substantiated maltreatment six months before or after this incident.

Areas needing improvement: There were no cases rated as needing improvement.

S1. Outcome reviewer comments: Reviewers commented that it appeared investigation timelines were being met in most cases and there did not appear to be any concerns with maltreatment occurring. There was a case in which the finding of the assessment was not finalized within 30 days.

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

Status of Safety Outcome S2

	Total Number	Total Percentage
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:

- 7 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item
- 7 (100%) cases were rated as strengths
- 0 cases were rated as needing improvement
- 4 of the cases rated as a strength were in-home cases and 3 were out-of-home

Strengths: In two of the cases the agency did not provide services before the child was removed, but it was necessary to ensure the safety of the child. One was due to the parents using and selling drugs out of the home and the other one was a child being removed after birth due to the mother's mental health needs. In the five other cases rated as strengths

reviewers did see agency efforts in arranging for appropriate services. Some of the services included substance abuse treatment, random U/A's, family support services, respite, and parenting assessments. In the seven cases that were not applicable reviewers determined that there were no safety concerns during the period under review. Those included the OJS cases.

Areas needing improvement: There were no cases rated as needing improvement.

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 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *13 (93%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *1 (7%) case was rated as needing improvement*
- *6 of the cases rated as strengths were in-home cases and 7 were out-of-home*
- *The case rated as needing improvement was an out-of-home case*

Strengths: The juvenile justice cases were rated as strengths because there was no risk of harm to these youth. In the other cases rated as strengths the agency conducted initial and ongoing assessments. Reviewers noted visitation and safety plans being updated in three of the cases. In one of the cases there was found to be an ongoing assessment for both reunification planning and case closure.

Areas needing improvement: In the one case found to be needing improvement reviewers noted that there was not an ongoing assessment completed for the purpose of reunification and the child was removed again after only eighteen days at home due to safety concerns with the mother's drinking.

S2. Outcome Review Comments: On the cases that were rated as being substantially achieved reviewers commented that they saw services being implemented, such as drug/alcohol counseling and family support. They also saw ongoing safety assessments being done for reunification, visitation planning, and case closure.

On the cases that were partially achieved reviewers commented that the lack of an ongoing assessment being completed seemed to correlate with reunification being unsuccessful.

II. PERMANENCY

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

Status of Permanency Outcome P1

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	5	63%
Partially Achieved:	3	38%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	6	43%

Item 5. Foster care re-entries

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

Review Findings:

- *4 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *4 (100%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *0 cases were rated as area needing improvement*

Strengths: In the four cases that were rated as strengths there was not a re-entry into foster care after being discharged from foster care during the previous twelve months.

Areas needing improvement: There were no cases that were rated as needing improvement.

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:

- *8 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item*

- 6 (75%) cases were rated as strengths
- 2 (25%) cases were rated as needing improvement

Strengths: In five of the cases rated as strengths the child remained in the same stable foster placement during the entire period under review. Two of these were relative placements. In the other case rated as a strength the youth moved once when the foster parents moved out of state and again when a relative was able to take him. Reviewers considered both moves in the child's best interest.

Areas needing improvement: In one of the cases rated as needing improvement the youth's behavior caused several unplanned placement changes. In the other case needing improvement the reviewers determined that the placement was not a long-term option for the child.

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:

- 8 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item
- 3 (38%) cases were rated as strengths
- 5 (63%) cases were rated as needing improvement

Strengths: In one of the cases rated as a strength the permanency plan of reunification was established within five days of child being placed out of home and then changed to family preservation when child returned home. In the other two cases rated as strengths the reviewers determined that the goal of reunification had been worked on but was appropriately changed to guardianship in one case and independent living in the other.

Areas needing improvement: In four of the cases found to be needing improvement the permanency goal was not established in a timely manner. Three of those took 90 days instead of 60 and the other one took 10 months. In the other case found to be needing improvement the reviewers did not find information regarding termination of parental rights in a case where this appeared to be applicable.

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:

- *8 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *3 (38%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *5 (62%) cases were rated as needing improvement*

Strengths: *In the three cases rated as strengths, the reviewers determined that the agency was making or made efforts to achieve the goal in a timely manner. The agency provided a youth with therapy and U/A's to help achieve reunification. The agency secured a guardianship placement for another youth with their grandparents, who lived out of state, through ICPC. The child has been out of home for 9 months and the mother's mental health needs continue to be a barrier in the other case.*

Areas needing improvement: *In the five cases determined to be needing improvement reviewers saw a lack of effort in achieving permanency in a timely manner. These included a reunification that took 17 months and a youth with a permanency plan of guardianship who has been out of home for 39 months without achieving this goal.*

Item 9. Adoption

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

Review Findings:

- *2 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *1 (50%) case was rated a strength*
- *1 (50%) case was rated an area needing improvement*

Strengths: *In the one case rated as a strength reviewers found that the agency was making active efforts in achieving the permanency goal of adoption in a timely manner by locating a home that is willing to consider adoption.*

Areas needing improvement: *In the case rated as needing improvement, reviewers found that the agency was not making efforts to achieve the permanency goal of adoption even though the 15 month guideline was coming up and there was no progress documented in regard to reunification.*

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:

- *2 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item*

- 2 (100%) cases were rated as strengths
- 0 cases were rated as needing improvement

Strengths: *In the two cases rated as strengths the agency was making efforts to help the youth achieve their planned permanent living arrangement. Both youth had completed the Casey Life Skills Assessment and were currently working on skills such as budgeting, grocery shopping, and cooking. One of the youth had purchased a car, had a savings account, and was working a part-time job.*

Areas needing improvement: *No cases were found to need improvement.*

P1. Outcome reviewer comments: *Reviewer comments on the cases that were substantially achieved were that the children’s placements were stable with no unplanned moves. The agency established permanency goals in a timely manner and were actively working towards them. In the cases rated as not being achieved, reviewers noted that placements were not stable and this correlated with a lack in permanency planning. They also saw that permanency goals were not established timely. Reviewers noted that a GAL seemed to be holding up a guardianship in one of the cases.*

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%

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:

- 8 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item
- 8 (100%) cases were rated as strengths
- 0 cases were rated as needing improvement

Strengths: *In seven of the cases rated as strengths reviewers determined that the child’s placement was in close enough proximity to their parent’s home to encourage face-to-face*

contact between child and parent. In the other case rated as a strength the child's placement was not in close proximity but was with a relative.

Areas needing improvement: No cases were found to need improvement.

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:

- *3 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *3 (100%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *0 cases were rated as needing improvement*

Strengths: In two of the cases rated as strengths the child was placed with his/her siblings who were also in foster care. In the other case rated as a strength the child was not placed with siblings due to behavioral concerns.

Areas needing improvement: No cases were found to need improvement.

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:

- *6 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *2 (33%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *4 (67%) cases were rated as needing improvement*

Strengths: In the two cases that were rated as strengths reviewers determined that the child was having sufficient frequency of visits to promote the relationship with parents and siblings. In one of these cases the visits were taking place on a weekly basis.

Areas needing improvement: The four cases needing improvement were due to lack of agency efforts in ensuring visitation with father. Three of these appeared to be due to the lack of effort by the agency to locate the father to even discuss 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:

- *8 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *6 (75%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *2 (25%) cases were rated as needing improvement*

Strengths: *In the six cases rated as a strength efforts were made to maintain the child's important connections. This included two cases in which the child was placed in the same community and attended the same school. The other strengths included cases in which the child maintained connections with extended family and siblings who were in the parental home.*

Areas needing improvement: *In the two cases needing improvement there was a lack of effort in preserving connections with siblings who were in the parental home and a lack in identifying what the child's actual connections were.*

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:

- *7 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *4 (57%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *3 (43%) cases were rated as areas needing improvement*

Strengths: *In three of the cases rated as strengths the child is/was placed with a relative. In the other strength the child is placed with a former stepfather whom the child had a bond with and also had siblings living there.*

Areas needing improvement: In the three cases rated needing improvement no efforts were documented to identify maternal or paternal relatives for possible placement.

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:

- *8 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *4 (50%) were rated as strengths*
- *4 (50%) were rated as areas needing improvement*

Strengths: In the four cases rated as strengths the agency did make efforts to promote the relationship between the child in foster care and both the mother and the father. This included one case in which the child was able to have visits with an incarcerated father. In another case, the parents moved out of state in order to be closer to their child who was in a guardianship placement with grandparents.

Areas needing improvement: In three of the cases needing improvement there was no effort made to locate and promote the relationship of the child in care and the father. In the other case there were no efforts to promote the relationship of the child in care with either the mother or father.

P2. Outcome Reviewer Comments: *On the cases where the outcome was substantially achieved, reviewers noted frequent visitation between the child and their parents and siblings. They noted cases in which the foster parent was helping the child have good visitation with their siblings and a case in which the parents moved to another state to be closer to the guardianship home their child was in. Reviewers also noted that there was sufficient information obtained in reference to ICWA. Genograms were located in some files but not in others. Reviewers found this information helpful when looking at potential relative placements.*

In the cases that were partially achieved, reviewers noted that there were not attempts made to locate or contact fathers to involve them in the cases. They also saw a lack of effort in having sibling visitation and in locating relatives for possible placement. Poor documentation in the cases file was also noted in these 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:	5	36%
Partially Achieved:	7	50%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	2	14%
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 14 of the cases were applicable for this item*
- *8 (57%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *6 (43%) cases were rated as needing improvement*
- *4 of the cases rated as strengths were in-home cases and 4 were out-of-home*
- *2 of the cases rated as needing improvement were in-home cases and 4 were out-of-home*

The following is a breakdown for child, parent, and foster parent:

A. Child

Strengths: In eleven out of the fourteen cases reviewers felt that the child's needs were assessed and services were provided to meet these needs if necessary. Four were in-home cases and seven were out-of-home. Reviewers saw needs being assessed informally through family team meetings and also in a more formal manner such as YLS evaluations or family assessments. Services provided included therapy to help with family relationship, Independent living skills, and involvement in school activities. There were many cases in which the child/youth was assessed but no needs were identified other than mental or behavioral health which are captured in other items.

Areas needing improvement: Two out of the three cases rated as needing improvement were in-home cases. In two of these cases reviewers found that the youth was assessed informally and a need was identified to get the child involved in some type of extra curricular activity. This need was not followed through with. In the other case the reviewers did not find any type of assessment completed to determine if the child had any needs.

B. Parents

Strengths: In seven out of the fourteen cases reviewers felt that the parent's needs were assessed and services were provided to meet those needs if necessary. Three were in-home cases and four were out-of-home. Reviewers saw that needs were assessed informally through family team meetings and formally through family assessments. Services provided included individual therapy, U/A's, medication evaluation, domestic violence classes, and sex offender treatment.

Areas needing improvement: Seven out of the fourteen applicable cases for parents' needs being assessed were rated areas needing improvement. Three were in-home cases and four were out-of-home. These included five cases in which the father was not assessed and one in which the mother was not assessed. Reviewers noted a lack of effort in locating or trying to involve the father in many of the cases.

C. Foster Parents

Strengths: Seven out of the eight applicable cases for assessing foster parents needs were rated as strengths. Reviewers saw that needs were being assessed informally through family team meetings or visits with the foster parents. Respite was an identified service provided in one of the cases. In the other cases the foster parents were assessed but had no identified needs.

Areas needing improvement: In the case needing improvement, reviewers found that the foster parents' needs were not assessed and there was a lack of contact from the worker.

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 14 of the cases were applicable for this item*
- *7 (50%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *7 (50%) cases were rated as needing improvement*
- *3 of the cases rated as strengths were in-home cases and 4 were out-of-home*
- *3 of the cases rated as needing improvement were in-home cases and 4 were out-of-home*

Strengths: In the cases rated as strengths reviewers found that the family was involved in the case planning process through family team meetings and visits. In four of the cases the child was too young to be involved in case planning.

Areas needing improvement: In three of the cases needing improvement the father was not involved in case planning. Reviewers saw this related to a lack of effort in locating the non-custodial parent to see if they wanted to be involved in case planning. Two of the cases did not have either the mother or father involved and one case did not involve the mother 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 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *10 (71%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *4 (29%) cases were rated as needing improvement*
- *4 of the cases rated as strengths were in-home cases and 6 were out-of-home*
- *2 of the cases rated as needing improvement were in-home cases and 2 were out-of-home*

Strengths: In the ten cases that were rated strengths reviewers noted at least monthly contact between the child and the worker. They also saw and heard during interviews that these visits were good quality in that they discussed issues related to case planning or permanency. Other times workers would meet privately before or after a family team meeting. The reviewers saw that many visits took place at the child's home or placement.

Areas needing improvement: The four cases needing improvement included 2 cases in which the quality of the visits was lacking, 1 case in which the frequency was insufficient, and 1 case that quality and sufficiency were lacking.

Item 20. Worker visits with parents

Reviewers were to assess whether the caseworker had sufficient face to face contact with parents to encourage attainment of their children's permanency goal while ensuring safety and well being. Cases that were considered not applicable were those when there was 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:

- *All 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *5 (36%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *9 (64%) cases were rated as needing improvement*
- *2 of the cases rated as strengths were in-home cases and 3 were out-of-home*
- *4 of the cases rated as needing improvement were in-home cases and 5 were out-of-home*

Strengths: *In the five cases that were rated as strengths reviewers noted monthly contact between the worker and parent. Reviewers also saw that these contacts were of sufficient quality in that pertinent information relating to the case was discussed during the visits.*

Areas needing improvement: *The nine cases needing improvement included cases in which no efforts were made to locate the father to have visits with him. Reviewers also noted a lack of visit frequency with the mother in two of the cases and a lack of visit quality with the mother in one of the cases.*

WB1. Outcome reviewer comments: *Reviewer comments around the cases that were substantially achieved were that there was a lot of contact and involvement between the worker and the family. The parents and the child knew what was happening with their case and were actively involved in it. They also saw good assessments of needs were being done. Many were during family team meetings. Visits were taking place more than once a month in some of the cases. YLS assessments were being completed on the juvenile justice cases. In the cases that were not achieved or partially achieved reviewers noted a lack of assessments being completed, including YLS's. They noted some of the cases had multiple workers during the period under review. A foster parent did not feel her needs were met in one of the cases. Reviewers also had concerns of documentation showing that a three year old had hardly been seen during the period under review.*

Status of Well-Being Outcome WB2

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	7	64%
Partially Achieved:	0	0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	4	36%
Not Applicable:	3	21%

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:

- 11 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item
- 7 (64%) cases were rated as strengths
- 4 (36%) cases were rated as needing improvement
- 2 of the cases rated as strengths were in-home cases and 5 were out-of-home
- 3 of the cases rated as needing improvement were in-home cases and 1 was an out-of-home

Strengths: In the seven cases that were strengths for this item, it was noted that educational needs were assessed and services were provided to the child when needed. Services included school intervention worker, one-on-one classroom help, and ongoing IEP meetings. Updated school records were also in the files.

Areas needing improvement: In one of the cases needing improvement reviewers had no information on the younger children in the home and whether they had educational needs that needed to be addressed. In the other three cases, reviewers did not find that any type of assessment was completed.

WB2. Outcome reviewer comments: In the cases that were substantially achieved reviewers noted that grades and other school reports were in the case file. They also saw needs being addressed informally through family team meetings and formally through MDT meetings at the school. They did not see a lot of needs being identified for services.

In the cases that were not achieved reviewers noted a lack of assessments being done on other siblings in the home or not being done at all. They also saw school records that were out-of-date in these cases.

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:	6	43%
Partially Achieved:	3	21%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	5	36%
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:

- *13 out of the 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *7 (54%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *6 (46%) cases were rated as needing improvement*
- *1 of the cases rated as a strength was an in-home case and 5 were out-of-home*
- *4 of the cases rated as needing improvement were in-home cases and 2 were out-of-home*

Strengths: *In the seven cases that were rated as strengths for this item reviewers found that medical/dental needs were assessed by annual checkups and services were provided when needed. Eye glasses were one of the needs identified through an exam.*

Areas needing improvement: *In five of the cases rated as needing improvement reviewers found annual exams to be out of date and no other type of assessment was completed. In the other case, reviewers found that there were no assessments done on other children living in the home.*

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:

- *10 of the 14 cases were applicable for this item*
- *6 (60%) cases were rated as strengths*
- *4 (40%) cases were rated as needing improvement*
- *2 of the cases rated as strengths were in-home cases and 4 were out-of-home*
- *3 of the cases rated as needing improvement were in-home cases and 1 was out-of-home*

Strengths: *In the ten cases rated as strengths, reviewers found assessments being done on the child's mental health needs. These were done informally during family team meetings or formally through evaluations. Some services provided include individual counseling, family therapy, day treatment, and medication management.*

Areas needing improvement: In two of the cases needing improvement, there were no assessments done on the child or on the other children in the home. In the other two cases, reviewers found that a service was needed but not provided.

WB3. Outcome reviewer comments: On the cases that were found to be substantially achieved, the reviewers commented that there was good documentation in the file of how needs were assessed and what services were provided to help with these needs. Up-to-date medical and dental checkups were also in the files.

Reviewer comments on the cases that were partially or not achieved, were that there appeared to be some services needed but not provided in a couple of the cases and a lack of assessments being done at all in other cases. The services reviewers identified as needed but not provided were a mental status exam in one case and in-home therapy and drug/alcohol counseling in another case. Reviewers also noted a lack of dental records in some of the cases.

CSA Results

Case Sample: Mini CFSR Review – April 2010

Type of Review: 2nd Mini CFSR

Report Type: Central Service Area

Number of Reviews: 14

Review Period: April 1st, 2009 – April 5th, 2010

PERFORMANCE ITEM RESULTS

Performance Item		Item Ratings (#)			Item Ratings (%)		
		S	ANI	N/A	S	ANI	N/A
Item 1:	Timeliness of initiating investigations	3	1	10	75%	25%	71%
Item 2:	Repeat maltreatment	2	0	12	100%	0%	86%
Item 3:	Services to family	7	0	0	100%	0%	50%
Item 4:	Risk assessment and safety management	13	1	0	93%	7%	0%
Item 5:	Foster care re-entries	4	0	10	100%	0%	71%
Item 6:	Stability of foster care placement	6	2	6	75%	25%	43%
Item 7:	Permanency goal for child	3	5	6	38%	63%	43%
Item 8:	Reunification, guardianship etc	3	5	6	38%	63%	43%
Item 9:	Adoption	1	1	12	50%	50%	86%
Item 10:	Other planned permanent living arrangement	2	0	12	100%	0%	86%
Item 11:	Proximity of foster care placement	8	0	6	100%	0%	43%
Item 12:	Placement with siblings	3	0	11	100%	0%	79%
Item 13:	Visiting with parents and siblings	2	4	8	33%	67%	57%
Item 14:	Preserving connections	6	2	6	75%	25%	43%
Item 15:	Relative placement	4	3	7	57%	43%	50%
Item 16:	Relationship of child in care with parents	4	4	6	50%	50%	43%
Item 17:	Needs and services	8	6	0	57%	43%	0%
Item 18:	Child and family involvement in case planning	7	7	0	50%	50%	0%
Item 19:	Caseworker visits with child	10	4	0	71%	29%	0%
Item 20:	Caseworker visits with parent(s)	5	9	0	36%	64%	0%
Item 21:	Educational needs of the child	7	4	3	64%	36%	21%
Item 22:	Physical health of the child	7	6	1	54%	46%	7%
Item 23:	Mental/behavioral health of the child	6	4	4	60%	40%	29%

OUTCOME RESULTS

Performance Outcome	COUNTS (#)				PERCENTAGES (%)			
	SA	PA	NA	N/A	SA	PA	NACH	N/A
Safety 1 (Items 1-2)	3	1	0	10	75%	25%	0%	71%
Safety 2 (Items 3-4)	13	1	0	0	93%	7%	0%	0%
Permanency 1 (Items 5-10)	5	3	0	6	63%	38%	0%	43%
Permanency 2 (Items 11-16)	4	4	0	6	50%	50%	0%	43%
Wellbeing 1 (Items 17-20)	5	7	2	0	36%	50%	14%	0%
Wellbeing 2 (Item 21)	7	0	4	3	64%	0%	36%	21%
Wellbeing 3 (Items 22-23)	6	3	5	0	43%	21%	36%	0%

KEY:

N/A = Not Applicable
S = Strength
Improvement

PA = Partially Achieved
SA = Substantially Achieved

NACH = Not Achieved
ANI = Area Needing