FINAL REPORT

Children and Family Services Review

Southeast Service Area

3rd Mini CFSR Review

Period Under Review: July 1st, 2009 – July 1st, 2010

Report Date: September 2, 2010

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Final Report: Children and Family Services Review (CFSR)
(Southeast Service Area – 3rd Mini CFSR Review)

This document presents findings from the 3rd mini Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the Southeast 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 Southeast Service Area mini CFSR review was conducted on August 2nd, 2010 to August 4th, 2010. The period under review for the onsite case review was July 1st, 2009 through July 1st, 2010. 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, 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 three (3) of the cases were non court involved. The cases were from the following Southeast Service Area offices: Lincoln, Nebraska City and Seward.

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

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 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 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 3rd Mini CFSR identified several areas of high performance in the Southeast Service Area with regard to achieving desired outcomes for children. The Service Area achieved substantial conformity in one of the seven CFSR outcomes. One hundred percent (100%) of cases that were applicable for Well-Being Outcome 2, children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs, were rated as Substantially Achieved. Although the Service Area did not achieve substantial conformity with the other six outcomes, the Service Area did achieve overall ratings of Strength for the individual indicators pertaining to repeat maltreatment (item 2), foster care re-entry (item 5), achieving permanency goals of reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives (item 8), and placing children in close proximity to their parents (item 11).

The 3rd 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 1 (children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect), which was Substantially Achieved in 57 percent of the cases reviewed. The lowest rating within this outcome was for item 1 (timeliness of initiating investigations), which was rated as a Strength in 57 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 (establishment of permanency goal for the child) which was rated as a Strength in 13 percent of the cases reviewed and item 9 (achieving permanency goal of adoption), which was rated as a Strength in 33 percent of the cases reviewed.

In addition, concerns also were identified with regard to Well-Being Outcome 1 (families have enhanced capacity to provide for children's needs), which was Substantially Achieved in only 14 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 36 percent of the cases reviewed; item 18 (child and family involvement in case planning), which was rated as a Strength in 38 percent of the cases reviewed; and item 20 (caseworker visits with parent(s)), which was rated as a Strength in only 17 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:	4	57%
Partially Achieved:	3	43%
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 4 (57%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 3 (43%) of the applicable cases. The following is a list of response levels assigned to the intakes in the 7 applicable cases: 4 cases (Priority 2) and 3 cases (Priority 3).

Strength:

- (1 foster care case)
  - In this one case, 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.

- (3 in home cases)
  - In all 3 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):

- (2 foster care cases)
  - In these 2 cases, contacts with the child(ren) were not made in a timely manner according to State policy and case file documentation did not indicate circumstances that justified the delay.

- (1 in home 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 indicate circumstances 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.*

NOTE: During the debriefing following the review, CFS Supervisors suggested that N-FOCUS Safety Narrative screens should be printed out during file preparation for the CFSR review. In some instances, documentation addressing time frame response times may be documented in this area in N-FOCUS but not in the safety conclusion and /or supervisory review section of the assessment. A further review of cases selected during the current CFSR review did not reveal any documentation in the narratives to explain why face to face contact was not made in a timely manner according to State Policy. The narrative screens on N-FOCUS will be printed and included in the file in upcoming CFSR Reviews.

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 6 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in all 6 (100%) applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 in home cases; and 3 foster care cases)
    - In all six 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:	8	57%
Partially Achieved:	4	29%
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 11 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 8 (73%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 3 (27%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In one case, the child was reunified with their mother prior to the period under review but was removed during the period under review due to safety reasons resulting from mom's neglectful behavior and lack of engagement in services. While the department provided necessary services to maintain the child in their mother's care, the child entered foster care because their mother abandoned them in a treatment facility.
  - In another case, the child was removed from the home due to their own behaviors and the need for a higher level of care.
  - In another case, the child(ren) was/were removed from their mother prior to the period under review but were united with their father during the period under review and remained in his care as of the date of the case review. The department provided the necessary services to safely maintain the children in the care of their father.
- (5 in home cases)
  - In all five cases, documentation indicates that in home safety and other services were provided in order to protect the children and prevent their entry into foster care.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (2 foster care cases)
  - In one of the cases, the child was removed from the home per court order indicating that it was in the best interest of the child to be placed out of the home in order to address the child's substance abuse and other needs. This case was rated as an area needing improvement because reviewers were unable to find documentation of efforts to assess and provide necessary services to meet the needs of the child and

family prior to the child's removal from the home even though they were already involved with the Department.

- In one of the cases, the child was initially placed with their mother but was removed during the period under review due to safety reasons. This case was rated as an area needing improvement because reviewers were unable to find documentation of efforts to assess and provide necessary services to address the mother's needs and maintain the child in the home.

- (1 in home case)
  - In this one case, there was ample documentation of the services arranged for the mother to address the safety issues, however, there was no indication in the file that any services were arranged to address the safety issues related to the step father of the children. The step father of the children did have agency substantiated findings on abuse during this reporting period and while there was indication that he was no longer residing in the home, there was indication in the case file that the step father was having regular contact with the children during the period under review.

Reviewer Comments:

- *In most 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).*
- *If there are safety concerns related to the parent/step parent, then the parents/step parent should not be left in charge of managing safety for their children and safety plans should include how safety will be maintained for the children if they continue to have contact with the parent/stepparent.*

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 Servcies 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 9 (64%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 5 (36%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (6 foster care cases)
  - In all six cases, the file contained enough information to support 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 indicates that

risk and safety assessments were formally or informally completed and safety plans adjusted as safety threats increased or decreased.

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

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (2 foster care cases)
  - In these two cases, reviewers were unable to find evidence of ongoing risk and safety assessments. In one of the cases, reviewers were unable to find documentation to support ongoing risk assessment when a new baby was born to the target child's mother, or during visitations between the target child and their mother. It is also unknown if the foster home was assessed as there is no evidence of a home study found in the file. There also appear to be other adults living in the home where the target child is placed and it is unknown what their roles are in providing safety for the child. In another case, there was an intake received alleging physical neglect by the child's father and reviewers were unable to find evidence of a thorough safety assessment or documentation of a finding for the allegations. The child was also placed in the care of their father during the period under review and reviewers were unable to find evidence of a thorough safety assessment prior the child's reunification with their father.

- (3 in home cases)
  - In all three cases, the reviewers were unable to find any formal or informal ongoing safety assessments. Furthermore, there was minimal documentation of contacts between the worker and the children/family and reviewers were unable to determine if ongoing risk assessments were conducted. In one of the cases, reviewers found documentation of possible risk or safety concerns and not enough information documented in the file to address such concerns. Another case contained no documentation of face to face contact between the worker and the children during the period under review.

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

Strength:

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In all three cases, the child did not enter foster care within a 12-month period from being discharged from another entry into foster care. In most instances, the child entered foster care for the first time during the period under review.

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:

- (8 foster care cases)
    - In one 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 their needs until they were successfully reunited with their father.
    - In three of the cases, the file indicated that the child experienced only one placement setting and remains in the same foster care placement which is currently stable and meeting all of their 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 treatment needs.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
    - In this one case, the item was rated as an ANI because reviewers were unable to find documentation addressing the child's history of running from their current foster care placement.

Reviewer Comments:

- *In most cases, the reasons for placement changes were documented in the file.*
- *In most cases, the reviewers were able to determine that the placement changes were in the best interest of the child and necessary to achieve the child's permanency goals and or meet the child's specific needs.*

Item 7: <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 1 (13%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 7 (88%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (**1 foster care case**)
    - In this one case, the child's primary permanency goal of guardianship was established and documented in the case file less than 60 days from the child's entry

into care. The child's permanency goal was appropriate to the child's needs for permanency.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (7 foster care cases)
  - In one of the cases, the child's permanency goal of independent living was not established in a timely manner after the child's guardianship was dissolved.
  - In one of the cases, the child's initial permanency goal of guardianship was not established in a timely manner. The goal was not established within 60 days from the child's entry into care.
  - In two of the cases, the child's initial permanency goal of reunification was not established in a timely manner. The goal was not established within 60 days from the child's entry into care.
  - In two of the cases, documentation of the child's permanency goals did not appear to match case circumstances. In both cases, the goal of Family Preservation was documented when the child was out of the home and Reunification was documented when the child was in the home.
  - In one of the cases, while the child's permanency goal of Independent Living was established in less than 60 days from the child's entry into care, the reviewers were unable to find evidence that other permanency goals were considered prior to the goal of independent living.

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 5 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in all 5 (100%) applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In all five cases, documentation indicated that efforts were made to achieve the child's permanency goal of reunification and /or guardianship. In one of these cases, the child had been in foster care less than 12 months and the parents were actively involved in services and working toward reunification. In one of these cases, the child was successfully reunited with their father and the agency continued to provide services to meet the goal of family preservation. In one of the cases, the department made efforts to locate and involve the parents during the period under

review but the parents' whereabouts were unknown for most of the period under review. In this particular case, the Department had also been actively addressing the concurrent goal of adoption and a request had been submitted to the county attorney to file termination of parental rights (TPR). In one of the cases, there is documentation in the file to support the department's efforts to meet the child's permanency goal of guardianship.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation should clearly explain the agency's efforts in achieving ALL permanency goals established for the child.*
- *If the child has been in foster care for longer than 12 months, documentation should also include information regarding barriers or particular circumstances to justify the delay in achieving the child's permanency goal.*

Item 9: Adoption

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

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 9 was applicable for 3 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 1 (33%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 2 (67%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (1 foster care case)
  - In this one case, concerted efforts were made to achieve the child's concurrent goal. The department made concerted efforts to locate and involve the parents during the period under review but the parents' whereabouts were unknown for most of the period under review. The department has been actively addressing the concurrent goal of adoption and a request has been submitted to the county attorney to file termination of parental rights (TPR).

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (2 foster care cases)
  - In one of the cases, there was a concurrent goal of adoption established at the same time that the primary goal of reunification was established for the child. However, there was no evidence in the file to support that the concurrent goal of adoption was being addressed by the agency. In another case, the child was placed with their father within 7 months after entry into foster care, however, there was a concurrent goal of adoption established at the same time the primary goal of reunification was established for the child and no evidence in the file to support that the goal of adoption was addressed by the agency.

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's 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 in 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: <u>Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement</u>
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 4 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 3 (75%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 1 (25%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:
- (3 foster care cases)
  - In these three cases, there was evidence of concerted efforts to achieve the child's primary or concurrent goal of independent living. In all three cases, there was evidence that appropriate needs assessments were completed and case plan goals and/or independent living plans were established to meet the child's independent living needs. There is also documentation in the file regarding department efforts to meet those needs and goals identified in the case plan and/or independent living plan.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):
- (**1 foster care case**)
  - In this one case, the reviewers were able to find an independent living plan with recommendations of what must be addressed for the child. However, reviewers were unable to find documentation of progress or how the goals in the plan were being addressed.

<u>Status of Permanency Outcome P2</u>

	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 6 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in all 6 (100%) applicable cases.

Strength:

- (6 foster care cases)
    - In five 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 placed with relatives after the death of her mother. The father's rights were terminated prior to the period under review and the child continues to reside with the same relatives.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation should include 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 an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) for this 1 (100%) applicable case.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
    - There was no documentation in the file to explain why the target child was not placed together with her sister who was also in foster care.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation should explain the agency's efforts to place all siblings together. Documentation should address the circumstances or reasons for not placing 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 sever 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 7 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 3 (43%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 4 (57%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 foster care cases)
    - Documentation in all three cases indicated that the frequency and quality of the visits were sufficient to promote continuity of parent child relationships. In these instances, the child was either placed in the same foster home with their sibling or did not have any other siblings in foster care.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (4 foster care cases)
    - In three of the cases, the reviewers were unable to find any documentation of active efforts to locate and involve the father in visitations with their child.
    - In one case, the reviewers were unable to find documentation to support sufficient frequency and quality of visitations between the target child and her sister who is also in foster care.

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 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 all five 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 important to the child.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (3 foster care cases)
    - In one of the cases, the child identified a strong connection with their grandparents and reviewers were unable to find documentation of efforts to preserve this connection for the child.
    - In another case, documentation indicated possible ICWA (Indian Child Welfare Act) connections for the child and reviewers were unable to find documentation of efforts or sufficient inquiry by the department regarding ICWA connections that should be maintained for the child.

- In another case, the target child identified an important connection to her older sibling and reviewers were unable to find documentation of efforts to preserve this connection for the child. There was also minimal documentation regarding other possible important connections for the target child.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation needs to include the child's important connections and efforts made by the department to preserve those connections.*
- *Documentation should include information to support that sufficient inquiry was conducted with both mother and father and relatives to determine whether or not the child may be a member of or eligible for membership in 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 5 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 4 (80%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 1 (20%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (4 foster care cases)
  - Documentation supports that the child was placed with a relative in three of the cases. Documentation also supports that the current placement is stable and meeting the child's needs.
  - In one case, the child's maternal and paternal relatives were identified but determined to be inappropriate placement options for the child.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 foster care case)
  - In this one case, there was no documentation to support the agency's efforts to identify the child's maternal and 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 6 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 3 (50%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 3 (50%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In all three 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.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In all three of the cases, there was no documentation regarding any attempts to support and maintain a positive relationship between the child and his/her father.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation should 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:	2	14%
Partially Achieved:	9	64%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	3	21%
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 5 (36%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 9 (64%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:
- (3 foster care cases)
  - In these three 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.
- (2 in home cases)
  - In these four 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):

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In three of the cases, the reviewers were unable to find information to support that the needs of the child's father were assessed or identified. In general reviewers were unable to find documentation to support the agency's efforts to locate and/or involve the father in all three cases.
  - 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 both parents were assessed or identified. There was minimal to no contact between the worker and the child's parents in this case.

- (4 in home cases)
  - In all four cases, the department made efforts to assess and provide services to meet the children's needs. However, documentation indicated a lack of effort in assessing and providing the needs of both parents in two of the cases, and particularly with the father in the other two cases.

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 13 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 5 (38%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 8 (62%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (2 foster care cases)
  - In both 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 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):

- (5 foster care case)
  - In all five 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 three of these cases, the reviewers were unable to find documentation of efforts by the department to locate the child's father. In the other two cases, while the whereabouts of the child's father was known, documentation did not contain enough information to address their level of involvement in the development and evaluation of case plan goals.
- (3 in home cases)
  - In two of the cases, there was no evidence of the father's involvement in the development and evaluation of case plan goals.
  - In one case, there was no information in the file to support efforts to involve the children and both parents in case planning. There was no formal case plan in the file and limited narrative regarding the case. The mother concurred in the interview that she and the children were not involved in case planning.

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 9 (64%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 5 (36%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In all 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.
- (4 in home cases)
  - In all four 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 all three cases, the typical pattern of visitation between the caseworker and the target child was less than once a month. In all three cases, the reviewers were unable to determine the quality of visits due to lack of information in the file and during the interviews.
- (2 in home cases)
  - In both 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 from case documentation if the quality of the visits with the child(ren) were sufficient to ensure safety, permanency, well-being and achieve case plan goals.
    - In one of the cases, there was minimal contact between the worker and the children in the home.
    - In another case, reviewers were unable to find documentation to explain why the worker was unable to have face to face contact with the children during several months when face to face contact was not documented as having taken place.

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 12 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 2 (17%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 10 (83%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (2 in home cases)
  - In one of the cases, there was evidence that the frequency and quality of visits between caseworker and the 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.
  - In the other case, there was evidence that the frequency and quality of the visits between the caseworker and the mother were sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency and well-being of the children. There was also evidence that the caseworker made attempts to have face to face contacts with the child's father but the child's father refused to participate in any visits with the caseworker.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (6 foster care cases)
  - In two of the cases, the reviewers determined that the typical pattern of visitation between the worker and the mother/father was less than once a month. Furthermore, the reviewers were unable to determine from case documentation if the quality of the visits with mother/father was sufficient to ensure safety, permanency, well-being and achieve case plan goals.
  - In three of the cases, there was no documentation of efforts to locate and or meet with the child's father during the period under review.
  - In one case, there was insufficient documentation of efforts to engage and meet with the mother on a monthly basis during the period under review.
- (4 in home cases)
  - In two of the cases, the reviewers determined that the typical pattern of visitation between the worker and the mother/father was less than once a month. Furthermore, the reviewers were unable to determine from case documentation if the quality of the visits with mother/father was sufficient to ensure safety, permanency, well-being and achieve case plan goals.
  - In two of the cases, there was no documentation of efforts to locate and or meet with the child's father during the period under review.

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:	11	100%
Partially Achieved:	0	0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0%
Not Applicable:	3	21%

** 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 11 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in all 11 (100%) applicable cases.

Strength:
- (6 foster care and 5 in home cases)
  - In all eleven 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	71%
Partially Achieved:	3	21%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	7%
Not Applicable:	0	0%

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

Item 22: Physical health of the child
When addressing health issues for families receiving in home services, reviewers considered whether the physical health needs are/were relevant to the reason why the agency is/was involved with the family and whether the need to address physical health issues is/was a reasonable expectation given the circumstances of the agency's involvement with the family. (If not, reviewers rated this item as not applicable.) For example, if a child became known to the agency and was determined to be in need of in home services at least partly as a result of physical abuse or sexual abuse, then it is reasonable to expect the agency to provide services to ensure that the child receives the appropriate physical health services. Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if the agency conducted an assessment of physical health and determined that there were no problems in that area, nor any need for physical health services.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 22 was applicable for 13 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 9 (69%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 4 (31%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In all five foster care cases, the documentation indicated 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.
- (4 in home cases)
  - In all four in home cases, there was documentation to support that the agency conducted an assessment of all of the child(ren)'s physical and dental health needs and provided appropriate services to meet identified needs.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In these three cases, the reviewers were unable to find documentation of a current assessment of the target child's dental health needs. In two of these cases, there was also no documentation of a current assessment of the target child's physical health needs.
- (1 in home case)
  - In this one case, the reviewers were unable to find documentation of current assessments of the child(ren)'s physical and dental health care 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 10 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a Strength in 9 (90%) of the applicable cases and rated as an Area Needing Improvement (ANI) in 1 (10%) of the applicable cases.

Strength:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In all five cases, the documentation indicated that the agency conducted current assessments of the target child's mental/behavioral health needs and provided appropriate services to meet all of the child's identified needs.

- (4 in home cases)
  - In all four cases, the 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.

Area Needing Improvement (ANI):

- (1 in home case)
  - In this one case, file information stated that the mother expressed concerns regarding the oldest child's mental/behavioral health. However, the reviewers were unable to find documentation of the agency's efforts to assess the mental/behavioral health needs of this child.

Reviewer Comments:

- *Documentation clearly addresses the agency's efforts to assess the child's mental/behavioral health needs.*
- *Documentation identified the child's needs and indicated the agency's efforts to address the child's mental/behavioral needs as identified in the assessment.*

Southeast Service Area - 3rd Qtr Mini CFSR Results:

Review Period: *July 1st, 2009 – July 1st 2010*
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	4	3	7	57%	43%	50%
Item 2:	Repeat maltreatment	6	0	8	100%	0%	57%
Item 3:	Services to family	8	3	3	73%	27%	21%
Item 4:	Risk assessment and safety management	9	5	0	64%	36%	0%
Item 5:	Foster care re-entries	3	0	11	100%	0%	79%
Item 6:	Stability of foster care placement	7	1	6	88%	13%	43%
Item 7:	Permanency goal for child	1	7	6	13%	88%	43%
Item 8:	Reunification, guardianship etc	5	0	9	100%	0%	64%
Item 9:	Adoption	1	2	11	33%	67%	79%
Item 10:	Other planned permanent living arrangement	3	1	10	75%	25%	71%
Item 11:	Proximity of foster care placement	6	0	8	100%	0%	57%
Item 12:	Placement with siblings	0	1	13	0%	100%	93%
Item 13:	Visiting with parents and siblings	3	4	7	43%	57%	50%
Item 14:	Preserving connections	5	3	6	63%	38%	43%
Item 15:	Relative placement	4	1	9	80%	20%	64%
Item 16:	Relationship of child in care with parents	3	3	8	50%	50%	57%
Item 17:	Needs and services	5	9	0	36%	64%	0%
Item 18:	Child and family involvement in case planning	5	8	1	38%	62%	7%
Item 19:	Caseworker visits with child	9	5	0	64%	36%	0%
Item 20:	Caseworker visits with parent(s)	2	10	2	17%	83%	14%
Item 21:	Educational needs of the child	11	0	3	100%	0%	21%
Item 22:	Physical health of the child	9	4	1	69%	31%	7%
Item 23:	Mental/behavioral health of the child	9	1	4	90%	10%	29%

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)	4	3	0	7	57%	43%	0%	50%
Safety 2 (Items 3-4)	8	4	2	0	57%	29%	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)	2	9	3	0	14%	64%	21%	0%
Well-being 2 (Item 21)	11	0	0	3	100%	0%	0%	21%
Well-being 3 (Items 22-23)	10	3	1	0	71%	21%	7%	0%

KEY:

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