

Family Team Meeting QA

Review Period: April - June 2010

Results by:

Service Area

Note: Due to data entry error, there is a discrepancy in the total number of applicable cases for indicators 2A, 2C, 3A, and 3C for Eastern Service Area, Northern Service Area and Western Service Area.

- The number of applicable cases for item 2 indicator A and item 3 indicator A should be the same.

- The number of applicable cases for item 2 indicator C and item 3 indicator C should be the same.

Central Service Area				
Report Period: April - July 2010			<i>Total # of Planned Reviews</i>	27
			<i># Cancelled or CFSS Not Present</i>	0
Number of Meeting Attendees:		Average	Entered	Total Applic
<i>* All attendees including CFS Specialist, Service Coordinator and/or meeting facilitator.</i>		7	16	104
CFS Specialist was Present at the Meeting:		%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>CFS Specialist was Present at the Meeting:</i>		100%	16	16
Length of Meeting:		%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>Less than 1 hour</i>		81%	13	16
<i>1 and half hours</i>		13%	2	16
<i>2 hours</i>		6%	1	16
<i>Over 2 hours</i>		0%	0	16
Location of Meeting:		%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>In the Family Home</i>		0%	0	16
<i>Not in the Family Home</i>		100%	16	16
ITEM #1: Facilitator Preparation				
Indicator		%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) At the beginning of the meeting, did the facilitator explain the purpose and goals of the current Family Team Meeting?		69%	11	16
B.) Was the facilitator prepared for the Family Team Meeting?		100%	16	16
C.) Did the Facilitator have needed documents and materials prior to the meeting?		75%	12	16
D.) Did the facilitator summarize the Family Team Meeting content at the end of the meeting, including next steps, timeframes and responsibilities?		81%	13	16
Item #1 Score				
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident	
0%	0	16	<i>0 = None of the indicators were evident</i>	
6%	1	16	<i>1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident</i>	
19%	3	16	<i>2 = Half of the indicators were evident</i>	
19%	3	16	<i>3 = More than half of the indicators were evident</i>	
56%	9	16	<i>4 = All of the indicators were evident</i>	

Item #2: Team Membership & Attendance			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Mother is a team member and present at the meeting.	85%	11	13
B.) Father is a team member and present at the meeting.	22%	2	9
C.) Child is a team member and present at the meeting.	88%	7	8
D.) A key natural/informal support for the family is a team member and present.	38%	6	16
E.) Key out-of-home providers are team members and are present.	64%	9	14
Item #2 Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	16	<i>0 = None of the indicators were evident</i>
31%	5	16	<i>1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident</i>
19%	3	16	<i>2 = Half of the indicators were evident</i>
38%	6	16	<i>3 = More than half of the indicators were evident</i>
13%	2	16	<i>4 = All of the indicators were evident</i>
Item #3: Team Member Involvement			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Was the mother actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	85%	11	13
B.) Was the father actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	22%	2	9
C.) Was the child actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	88%	7	8
D.) Was the key natural/informal support for the family actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	25%	4	16
E.) Was the key out of home provider actively involved in the team meeting?	71%	10	14
Item #3 Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
6%	1	16	<i>0 = None of the indicators were evident</i>
19%	3	16	<i>1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident</i>
38%	6	16	<i>2 = Half of the indicators were evident</i>
25%	4	16	<i>3 = More than half of the indicators were evident</i>
13%	2	16	<i>4 = All of the indicators were evident</i>

Item #4: Facilitator Effectiveness			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate outcomes that are directly related to safety threats and/or Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) elements?	88%	14	16
B.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team member in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate needs that are directly related to outcomes?	81%	13	16
C.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate strategies that are directly related to the identified needs?	88%	14	16
D.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying appropriate functional strengths to help execute identified strategies?	94%	15	16
E.) Did the facilitator effectively assist the family in identifying and/or reviewing informal supports to help execute identified strategies?	56%	9	16
F.) Did the facilitator demonstrate a respect for the family's values, beliefs, and traditions?	100%	16	16
G.) Was the facilitator able to manage disagreement and conflict and elicit underlying interests, needs, and motivations of team members?	100%	2	2
Item #4: Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	16	<i>0 = None of the indicators were evident</i>
6%	1	16	<i>1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident</i>
6%	1	16	<i>2 = Half of the indicators were evident</i>
38%	6	16	<i>3 = More than half of the indicators were evident</i>
50%	8	16	<i>4 = All of the indicators were evident</i>

Eastern Service Area

Report Period: April - July 2010	Total # of Planned Reviews	50
	# Cancelled or CFSS Not Present	21

Number of Meeting Attendees:	Average	Entered	Total Applic
* All attendees including CFS Specialist, Service Coordinator and/or meeting facilitator.	5	29	156
CFS Specialist was Present at the Meeting:	%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>CFS Specialist was Present at the Meeting:</i>	100%	29	29
Length of Meeting:	%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>Less than 1 hour</i>	66%	19	29
<i>1 and half hours</i>	34%	10	29
<i>2 hours</i>	0%	0	29
<i>Over 2 hours</i>	0%	0	29
Location of Meeting:	%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>In the Family Home</i>	38%	11	29
<i>Not in the Family Home</i>	62%	18	29

ITEM #1: Facilitator Preparation

Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) At the beginning of the meeting, did the facilitator explain the purpose and goals of the current Family Team Meeting?	79%	23	29
B.) Was the facilitator prepared for the Family Team Meeting?	97%	28	29
C.) Did the Facilitator have needed documents and materials prior to the meeting?	92%	24	26
D.) Did the facilitator summarize the Family Team Meeting content at the end of the meeting, including next steps, timeframes and responsibilities?	86%	25	29

Item #1 Score

%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	29	<i>0 = None of the indicators were evident</i>
0%	0	29	<i>1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident</i>
10%	3	29	<i>2 = Half of the indicators were evident</i>
24%	7	29	<i>3 = More than half of the indicators were evident</i>
66%	19	29	<i>4 = All of the indicators were evident</i>

Item #2: Team Membership & Attendance			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Mother is a team member and present at the meeting.	65%	17	<u>26</u>
B.) Father is a team member and present at the meeting.	33%	7	21
C.) Child is a team member and present at the meeting.	67%	12	18
D.) A key natural/informal support for the family is a team member and present.	24%	7	29
E.) Key out-of-home providers are team members and are present.	73%	16	22
Item #2 Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	29	0 = None of the indicators were evident
41%	12	29	1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident
14%	4	29	2 = Half of the indicators were evident
34%	10	29	3 = More than half of the indicators were evident
10%	3	29	4 = All of the indicators were evident
Item #3: Team Member Involvement			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Was the mother actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	59%	16	<u>27</u>
B.) Was the father actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	38%	8	21
C.) Was the child actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	67%	12	18
D.) Was the key natural/informal support for the family actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	28%	8	29
E.) Was the key out of home provider actively involved in the team meeting?	73%	16	22
Item #3 Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	29	0 = None of the indicators were evident
38%	11	29	1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident
28%	8	29	2 = Half of the indicators were evident
28%	8	29	3 = More than half of the indicators were evident
7%	2	29	4 = All of the indicators were evident

Item #4: Facilitator Effectiveness			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate outcomes that are directly related to safety threats and/or Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) elements?	62%	18	29
B.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team member in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate needs that are directly related to outcomes?	72%	21	29
C.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate strategies that are directly related to the identified needs?	93%	27	29
D.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying appropriate functional strengths to help execute identified strategies?	72%	21	29
E.) Did the facilitator effectively assist the family in identifying and/or reviewing informal supports to help execute identified strategies?	69%	20	29
F.) Did the facilitator demonstrate a respect for the family's values, beliefs, and traditions?	90%	26	29
G.) Was the facilitator able to manage disagreement and conflict and elicit underlying interests, needs, and motivations of team members?	92%	12	13
Item #4: Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
3%	1	29	<i>0 = None of the indicators were evident</i>
7%	2	29	<i>1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident</i>
3%	1	29	<i>2 = Half of the indicators were evident</i>
45%	13	29	<i>3 = More than half of the indicators were evident</i>
41%	12	29	<i>4 = All of the indicators were evident</i>

Northern Service Area				
Report Period: April - July 2010			Total # of Planned Reviews	27
			# Cancelled or CFSS Not Present	6
Number of Meeting Attendees:		Average	Entered	Total Applic
* All attendees including CFS Specialist, Service Coordinator and/or meeting facilitator.		6	21	131
CFS Specialist was Present at the Meeting:		%	#Yes	Total Applic
CFS Specialist was Present at the Meeting:		100%	21	21
Length of Meeting:		%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>Less than 1 hour</i>		90%	19	21
<i>1 and half hours</i>		10%	2	21
<i>2 hours</i>		0%	0	21
<i>Over 2 hours</i>		0%	0	21
Location of Meeting:		%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>In the Family Home</i>		19%	4	21
<i>Not in the Family Home</i>		81%	17	21
ITEM #1: Facilitator Preparation				
Indicator		%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) At the beginning of the meeting, did the facilitator explain the purpose and goals of the current Family Team Meeting?		81%	17	21
B.) Was the facilitator prepared for the Family Team Meeting?		95%	20	21
C.) Did the Facilitator have needed documents and materials prior to the meeting?		95%	19	20
D.) Did the facilitator summarize the Family Team Meeting content at the end of the meeting, including next steps, timeframes and responsibilities?		90%	19	21
Item #1 Score				
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident	
0%	0	21	<i>0 = None of the indicators were evident</i>	
5%	1	21	<i>1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident</i>	
0%	0	21	<i>2 = Half of the indicators were evident</i>	
24%	5	21	<i>3 = More than half of the indicators were evident</i>	
71%	15	21	<i>4 = All of the indicators were evident</i>	

Item #2: Team Membership & Attendance			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Mother is a team member and present at the meeting.	76%	13	17
B.) Father is a team member and present at the meeting.	47%	7	15
C.) Child is a team member and present at the meeting.	84%	16	<u>19</u>
D.) A key natural/informal support for the family is a team member and present.	29%	6	21
E.) Key out-of-home providers are team members and are present.	85%	11	13
Item #2 Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	21	0 = None of the indicators were evident
19%	4	21	1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident
14%	3	21	2 = Half of the indicators were evident
52%	11	21	3 = More than half of the indicators were evident
14%	3	21	4 = All of the indicators were evident
Item #3: Team Member Involvement			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Was the mother actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	76%	13	17
B.) Was the father actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	47%	7	15
C.) Was the child actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	82%	14	<u>17</u>
D.) Was the key natural/informal support for the family actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	33%	7	21
E.) Was the key out of home provider actively involved in the team meeting?	85%	11	13
Item #3 Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	21	0 = None of the indicators were evident
24%	5	21	1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident
24%	5	21	2 = Half of the indicators were evident
33%	7	21	3 = More than half of the indicators were evident
19%	4	21	4 = All of the indicators were evident

Item #4: Facilitator Effectiveness			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate outcomes that are directly related to safety threats and/or Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) elements?	90%	19	21
B.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team member in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate needs that are directly related to outcomes?	95%	20	21
C.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate strategies that are directly related to the identified needs?	100%	21	21
D.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying appropriate functional strengths to help execute identified strategies?	76%	16	21
E.) Did the facilitator effectively assist the family in identifying and/or reviewing informal supports to help execute identified strategies?	67%	14	21
F.) Did the facilitator demonstrate a respect for the family's values, beliefs, and traditions?	100%	21	21
G.) Was the facilitator able to manage disagreement and conflict and elicit underlying interests, needs, and motivations of team members?	100%	9	9
Item #4: Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	21	<i>0 = None of the indicators were evident</i>
5%	1	21	<i>1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident</i>
0%	0	21	<i>2 = Half of the indicators were evident</i>
33%	7	21	<i>3 = More than half of the indicators were evident</i>
62%	13	21	<i>4 = All of the indicators were evident</i>

Southeast Service Area

Report Period: April - July 2010	Total # of Planned Reviews	26
	# Cancelled or CFSS Not Present	4

Number of Meeting Attendees:	Average	Entered	Total Applic
<i>* All attendees including CFS Specialist, Service Coordinator and/or meeting facilitator.</i>	7	22	146
CFS Specialist was Present at the Meeting:	%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>CFS Specialist was Present at the Meeting:</i>	100%	22	22
Length of Meeting:	%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>Less than 1 hour</i>	77%	17	22
<i>1 and half hours</i>	18%	4	22
<i>2 hours</i>	5%	1	22
<i>Over 2 hours</i>	0%	0	22
Location of Meeting:	%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>In the Family Home</i>	50%	11	22
<i>Not in the Family Home</i>	50%	11	22

ITEM #1: Facilitator Preparation

Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) At the beginning of the meeting, did the facilitator explain the purpose and goals of the current Family Team Meeting?	91%	20	22
B.) Was the facilitator prepared for the Family Team Meeting?	100%	22	22
C.) Did the Facilitator have needed documents and materials prior to the meeting?	90%	9	10
D.) Did the facilitator summarize the Family Team Meeting content at the end of the meeting, including next steps, timeframes and responsibilities?	91%	20	22

Item #1 Score

%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	22	<i>0 = None of the indicators were evident</i>
0%	0	22	<i>1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident</i>
5%	1	22	<i>2 = Half of the indicators were evident</i>
14%	3	22	<i>3 = More than half of the indicators were evident</i>
82%	18	22	<i>4 = All of the indicators were evident</i>

Item #2: Team Membership & Attendance			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Mother is a team member and present at the meeting.	100%	20	20
B.) Father is a team member and present at the meeting.	25%	4	16
C.) Child is a team member and present at the meeting.	88%	15	17
D.) A key natural/informal support for the family is a team member and present.	50%	11	22
E.) Key out-of-home providers are team members and are present.	86%	12	14
Item #2 Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	22	0 = None of the indicators were evident
9%	2	22	1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident
14%	3	22	2 = Half of the indicators were evident
50%	11	22	3 = More than half of the indicators were evident
27%	6	22	4 = All of the indicators were evident
Item #3: Team Member Involvement			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Was the mother actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	100%	20	20
B.) Was the father actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	19%	3	16
C.) Was the child actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	82%	14	17
D.) Was the key natural/informal support for the family actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	50%	11	22
E.) Was the key out of home provider actively involved in the team meeting?	93%	13	14
Item #3 Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	22	0 = None of the indicators were evident
9%	2	22	1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident
27%	6	22	2 = Half of the indicators were evident
45%	10	22	3 = More than half of the indicators were evident
18%	4	22	4 = All of the indicators were evident

Item #4: Facilitator Effectiveness			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate outcomes that are directly related to safety threats and/or Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) elements?	95%	21	22
B.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team member in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate needs that are directly related to outcomes?	91%	20	22
C.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate strategies that are directly related to the identified needs?	91%	20	22
D.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying appropriate functional strengths to help execute identified strategies?	91%	20	22
E.) Did the facilitator effectively assist the family in identifying and/or reviewing informal supports to help execute identified strategies?	86%	19	22
F.) Did the facilitator demonstrate a respect for the family's values, beliefs, and traditions?	100%	22	22
G.) Was the facilitator able to manage disagreement and conflict and elicit underlying interests, needs, and motivations of team members?	88%	7	8
Item #4: Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	22	<i>0 = None of the indicators were evident</i>
9%	2	22	<i>1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident</i>
0%	0	22	<i>2 = Half of the indicators were evident</i>
5%	1	22	<i>3 = More than half of the indicators were evident</i>
86%	19	22	<i>4 = All of the indicators were evident</i>

Western Service Area				
Report Period: April - July 2010			Total # of Planned Reviews	26
			# Cancelled or CFSS Not Present	3
Number of Meeting Attendees:		Average	Entered	Total Applic
* All attendees including CFS Specialist, Service Coordinator and/or meeting facilitator.		6	23	140
CFS Specialist was Present at the Meeting:		%	#Yes	Total Applic
CFS Specialist was Present at the Meeting:		100%	23	23
Length of Meeting:		%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>Less than 1 hour</i>		83%	19	23
<i>1 and half hours</i>		17%	4	23
<i>2 hours</i>		0%	0	23
<i>Over 2 hours</i>		0%	0	23
Location of Meeting:		%	#Yes	Total Applic
<i>In the Family Home</i>		13%	3	23
<i>Not in the Family Home</i>		87%	20	23
ITEM #1: Facilitator Preparation				
Indicator		%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) At the beginning of the meeting, did the facilitator explain the purpose and goals of the current Family Team Meeting?		74%	17	23
B.) Was the facilitator prepared for the Family Team Meeting?		91%	21	23
C.) Did the Facilitator have needed documents and materials prior to the meeting?		92%	12	13
D.) Did the facilitator summarize the Family Team Meeting content at the end of the meeting, including next steps, timeframes and responsibilities?		83%	19	23
Item #1 Score				
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident	
4%	1	23	<i>0 = None of the indicators were evident</i>	
4%	1	23	<i>1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident</i>	
0%	0	23	<i>2 = Half of the indicators were evident</i>	
30%	7	23	<i>3 = More than half of the indicators were evident</i>	
61%	14	23	<i>4 = All of the indicators were evident</i>	

Item #2: Team Membership & Attendance

Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Mother is a team member and present at the meeting.	77%	17	22
B.) Father is a team member and present at the meeting.	40%	8	20
C.) Child is a team member and present at the meeting.	75%	9	<u>12</u>
D.) A key natural/informal support for the family is a team member and present.	26%	6	23
E.) Key out-of-home providers are team members and are present.	56%	5	9

Item #2 Score

%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	23	0 = None of the indicators were evident
39%	9	23	1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident
17%	4	23	2 = Half of the indicators were evident
39%	9	23	3 = More than half of the indicators were evident
4%	1	23	4 = All of the indicators were evident

Item #3: Team Member Involvement

Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Was the mother actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	68%	15	22
B.) Was the father actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	40%	8	20
C.) Was the child actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	62%	8	<u>13</u>
D.) Was the key natural/informal support for the family actively involved in the Family Team Meeting?	30%	7	23
E.) Was the key out of home provider actively involved in the team meeting?	78%	7	9

Item #3 Score

%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	23	0 = None of the indicators were evident
43%	10	23	1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident
30%	7	23	2 = Half of the indicators were evident
17%	4	23	3 = More than half of the indicators were evident
9%	2	23	4 = All of the indicators were evident

Item #4: Facilitator Effectiveness			
Indicator	%	#Yes	Total Applic
A.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate outcomes that are directly related to safety threats and/or Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) elements?	91%	21	23
B.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team member in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate needs that are directly related to outcomes?	91%	21	23
C.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying and/or reviewing appropriate strategies that are directly related to the identified needs?	87%	20	23
D.) Was the facilitator able to effectively assist the team members in identifying appropriate functional strengths to help execute identified strategies?	74%	17	23
E.) Did the facilitator effectively assist the family in identifying and/or reviewing informal supports to help execute identified strategies?	65%	15	23
F.) Did the facilitator demonstrate a respect for the family's values, beliefs, and traditions?	100%	23	23
G.) Was the facilitator able to manage disagreement and conflict and elicit underlying interests, needs, and motivations of team members?	82%	9	11
Item #4: Score			
%	Yes	Total	# of Indicators Evident
0%	0	23	0 = None of the indicators were evident
9%	2	23	1 = Fewer than half of the indicators were evident
0%	0	23	2 = Half of the indicators were evident
30%	7	23	3 = More than half of the indicators were evident
61%	14	23	4 = All of the indicators were evident