FINAL REPORT

Children and Family Services Review

Western Service Area

6th Mini CFSR Review

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

Report Date: May 2011

Executive Summary
Final Report: Children and Family Services Review (CFSR)
Western Service Area – 6th Mini CFSR Review

This document presents the findings from the 6th Mini-Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the Western Service Area. The Nebraska CQI (Continuous Quality Improvement) team has identified Mini-CFSR 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. The Mini-CFSR is scheduled to take place in each service area, quarterly in the years 2010 and 2011.

The Western Service Area's 6th Mini-CFSR was conducted from April 19 to 21, 2011. The period under review for the onsite case review was April 1, 2010 to April 1, 2011. The findings were derived from file reviews of 14 cases (8 foster care and 6 in home services) which were randomly selected from all child welfare cases which were open at some time during the period under review. The reviews also included interviews with parents, children, foster parents, CFS specialists, and other service providers to assess items 17-20 within the review tool.

In the Western Service Area, 6 of the 14 cases reviewed were brought to the attention of DHHS for juvenile justice services and 1 of the cases was non court involved. Cases reviewed were from the following local offices: Alliance, Gering, Lexington, McCook, North Platte, Ogallala, and Sidney.

The first level reviews of the cases were completed by 8 staff from DHHS and one external stakeholder. A second level review of 100% of the cases was completed by Lori Posvar and Leslie Schlecht- DHHS.

Background Information

The mini CFSR is modeled after the Federal CFSR 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 of 95 percent of the applicable cases reviewed are rated as Strength. Performance ratings for each of the seven outcomes are based on item ratings for each case. A Service Area may be rated as having **"Substantially Achieved," "Partially Achieved,"** or **"Not Achieved"** the outcome. The determination of whether a Service Area is in substantial conformity with a particular outcome is based on the percentage of cases that were determined to have Substantially Achieved that outcome. In order for a Service Area to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95 percent of the cases reviewed must be rated as having Substantially Achieved the outcome. The standard for substantial conformity is based on the standard set for the Federal CFSR. The standards are based on the belief that because child

welfare agencies work with our country's most vulnerable children and families, only the highest standards of performance should be acceptable. The focus of the CFSR process is on continuous quality improvement; standards are set high to ensure ongoing attention to the goal of achieving positive outcomes for children and families with regard to safety, permanency, and well-being.

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

Key CFSR Findings Regarding Outcomes

The 6th Mini CFSR identified several areas of high performance in the Western Service Area with regard to achieving desired outcomes for children. The Service Area achieved substantial conformity in two of the seven CFSR outcomes. Safety Outcome 1 (children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect) was rated as Substantially Achieved for one hundred percent (100%) of the applicable cases. This outcome is comprised of Item 1 (timeliness of initiating investigations) and Item 2 (repeat maltreatment). Well-Being Outcome 2 (children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs), also rated as Substantially Achieved for one hundred percent (100%) of the applicable cases. The rating for this outcome is based on Item 21 (educational needs of the child). Additionally, the Western Service Area achieved overall ratings of Strength for the individual indicators pertaining to Item 3 (services to protect children in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care), Item 5 (foster care re-entries), Item 6 (stability of foster care placement), Item 10 (other planned permanent living arrangement), and Item 12 (placement with siblings).

The Mini-CFSR also identified key areas of concern with regard to achieving outcomes for children and families. Concerns were identified with regard to Permanency Outcome 1 (children have permanency and stability in their living situations), which was substantially achieved in 50% of the cases reviewed. Within this outcome, Item 7 (permanency goal for child) was rated a Strength in 50% of the cases that were applicable for this item.

Concerns were also identified with regard to Well-Being Outcome 3 (children receive appropriate services to meet their physical and mental health needs). This outcome was substantially achieved in 54% of the cases reviewed. Within Well-Being Outcome 3, the Western Service Area achieved a Strength rating of 33.3% for Item 22 (physical health of the child).

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:	2	100.0%
Partially Achieved:	0	0.0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0.0%
Not Applicable:	12	85.7%

Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment
In assessing item 1, reviewers were to determine whether the response to a maltreatment report occurring during the period under review had been initiated in accordance with child welfare agency policy. A new intake tool was implemented in 2003, which is based upon a priority response model with Priority 1 calling for a response by the worker within 24 hours of the time that the report is received by DHHS. Priority 2 designated reports are to have face to face contact with the alleged victim by Protection and Safety within 0 to 5 days from the time the intake is received and Priority 3 has a response time of 0-10 days. Data is generated monthly to ensure compliance with the response times.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 1 was applicable for 2 of the 14 cases. The item was rated a strength in the 2 (100.0%) applicable cases.

Strengths:
- (2 in home cases)
  - In both cases, the timeframes for initiating investigation and making contact with child victims was met.

Reviewer Comments:
- ☑ The Western Service Area has achieved 100% Strength for Item 1 during five of the six quarterly mini-CFSRs that have been completed since January 2010.
- ☑ The Western Service Area continues to show high achievement for this item by meeting the time frames for initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment. Contact with children who are the subject of child maltreatment reports is occurring in accordance with the timeframes for the priority assigned to the allegations.

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 2 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength the 2 (100.0%) applicable cases.

Strengths:
- (2 in home cases)
  - In both cases, there were no additional substantiated maltreatment reports within a 6 month period before or after the maltreatment report that was received during the period under review.

Reviewer Comments:
☑ Documentation in the case file was 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:	11	78.6%
Partially Achieved:	2	14.3%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	7.1%
Not Applicable:	0	0.0%

Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal
For this item, reviewers were to assess whether in responding to a substantiated/inconclusive/petition to be filed maltreatment report or risk of harm, the agency made diligent efforts to provide services to families to prevent removal of children from their homes while at the same time ensuring their safety.

Review Findings: The assessment of item 3 was applicable for 10 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all 10 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (4 foster care cases)
  - In two cases, while the child was removed without first having provided services to prevent entry into foster care, it was determined that immediate removal was necessary due to the child's uncontrollable behavior and need for a higher level of care.
  - In one case, the child was returned to the care of their parent(s) during the period under review and services were provided to safely maintain them at home.
  - In another case, efforts to prevent removal were documented and it was found that supports including tracker, counseling, and drug and alcohol evaluation were utilized to try to prevent removal from the child's home.
- (6 in home cases)
  - In all six of these cases, a variety of formal supports including family support, therapy, random drug testing, and tracker services were provided to protect the children and prevent entry into foster care.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Reviewers identified that a wide variety of services are being provided to families to protect children and prevent entry or re-entry into foster care.

Item 4: <u>Risk of harm to child</u>

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

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 4 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 11 (78.6%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 3 (21.4%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In all five of these cases, there was sufficient documentation to show that initial assessments and ongoing risk and safety assessments were completed for the target child while in foster care and for the other children remaining in the home. Documentation also indicated that risk and safety assessments were formally or informally completed and safety plans were adjusted as safety threats increased or decreased.
- (6 in home cases)
  - In all six of these cases, there was sufficient documentation to show that initial and ongoing risk and safety assessments were completed both formally and informally while the children were placed in the care of their parents and that safety plans were adjusted as safety threats increased or decreased.

Areas needing improvement:

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In one case, the safety plan was not updated as needed at the time of reunification.
  - In one case, the initial safety plan was not updated at any point during the life of the case.
  - In another case, the reviewers were able to find evidence of initial and ongoing safety and risk assessments; however, a thorough safety assessment was not completed when the child was reunified with the parents.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ The Nebraska Safety Intervention System (Safety Model) should be utilized to assess risk and improve safety interventions with children and families. Reviewers found that while the Nebraska Safety Intervention System was utilized for the majority of initial assessments, it was not used as consistently for ongoing safety assessments. Reviewers relied on informal assessments documented during face to face contacts and Family Team Meetings during their review of this item.

☑ Reviewers identified that safety plans are not in place or are not updated as needed to reflect changes in the case.

☑ Risk to children remaining in the home should also be evaluated.

II. PERMANENCY

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

Status of Permanency Outcome P1

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	4	50.0%
Partially Achieved:	4	50.0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0.0%
Not Applicable:	6	42.9%

Item 5: Foster care re-entries
Reviewers rated this assessment a Strength if during the period under review a child did not have an entry into care within a 12-month period from being discharged from another entry into foster care. Reviewers also rated this item as a Strength if a re-entry was an isolated incident during which the agency did what was reasonable to manage the risk following reunification but the child re-entered care for another reason (for example, the death of a parent). Reviewers rated this item as an Area Needing Improvement if re-entries occurring within a 12-month period were due to the same general reasons or same perpetrators. Reviewers rated this item as Not Applicable if : (1) the child entered foster care before, and remained in foster care during, the period under review; or (2) the child entered foster care before, and exited foster care during, the period under review and there was not another entry into foster care during the period under review.

Review Findings: The assessment of item 5 was applicable for 1 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in the 1 (100.0%) applicable case.

Strengths:
- (1 foster care case)
  - In this case the child did not enter foster care within a 12-month period from being discharged from another entry into foster care.

Item 6: Stability of foster care placement
In assessing this item, reviewers were to determine whether the child experienced multiple placement changes during the period under review, and if so, whether the changes in placement settings were necessary to achieve the child's permanency goal or meet the child's service needs.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 6 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all 8 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (8 foster care cases)
  - In three of the cases, documentation showed that the child experienced only one placement setting during the period under review. The foster care placements were found to be stable.
  - In five of the cases, while the child experienced more than one placement change, these placement changes were necessary in order to provide for the child's needs.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Reasons for placement changes were documented in the file.

☑ 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 DHHS had established an appropriate permanency goal for the child in a timely manner, including filing for termination of parental rights when relevant. Reviewers examined the appropriateness of a goal that ultimately rules out adoption, guardianship, or return to family. Reviewers assessed whether the child's best interests were thoroughly considered by DHHS in setting a goal of other planned living arrangement, and that such a decision is /was continually reviewed for ongoing appropriateness. Cases were assigned a rating of Strength for this item when reviewers determined that DHHS had established an appropriate permanency goal in a timely manner. Cases were assigned a rating of Area Needing Improvement when goals of reunification were not changed in a timely manner when it was apparent that reunification was unlikely to happen, termination of parental rights was not filed when the child had been foster care for 15 of the past 22 months and no compelling reasons were noted in the file, or the goal established for the child was not appropriate. Cases were identified as Not Applicable if the child was not in foster care.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 7 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 4 (50.0%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 4 (50.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (4 foster care cases)
  - In all four cases, the child's permanency goals were established in a timely manner, documented in the case file, and were appropriate to the child's needs for permanency.

Areas needing improvement

- (4 foster care cases)
  - In two cases, the child's permanency goal was not established in a timely manner. The goal was not established within 60 days from the child's entry into care. In one case the permanency goal was established 90 days after the child entered care and in the other case as the child had been in placement for five months before the permanency goal was established.
  - In two cases, the child had been in placement for more than 15 out of 22 months. There had been no request for Termination of Parental Rights, nor was there documentation in the case file regarding an exception or compelling reason for not filing for Termination of Parental Rights.

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 of the child should be established within 60 days from the child's entry into foster care.

☑ Case file documentation needs to include all information regarding termination of parental rights 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 termination of parental rights and / or documentation of compelling reasons for not filing for termination of parental rights.

Item 8: <u>Reunification, Guardianship or Permanent Placement with Relatives</u>

In assessing these cases reviewers determined whether DHHS had achieved children's goals of reunification, guardianship or placement with relatives in a timely manner. If the goals had not been achieved in a timely manner, reviewers determined whether DHHS had made diligent efforts to achieve the goals.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 8 was applicable for 6 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 5 (83.3%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 1 (16.7%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In three cases, documentation in the case file shows concerted efforts being made to achieve the permanency goal of reunification in a timely manner.
  - In one case, the case file documentation shows that concerted efforts are being made both toward the permanency goal of reunification and toward the concurrent goal of guardianship.
  - In another case, the original permanency goal of reunification was not reached within a year of the child entering placement; however documentation shows that the achievement of this goal has been delayed as a result of the child's treatment needs and concerted efforts continue to be made toward the child's permanency goal of reunification.

Areas needing improvement

- (1 foster care cases)
  - In this case, the child had been in care for 44 months before the permanency goal was achieved. Reviewers were unable to find documentation in the case file to show concerted efforts being made toward the permanency goal of guardianship with relatives.

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 not applicable for any of the 14 cases reviewed.

Item 10: Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement

Reviewers determined whether the agency had made or was making diligent efforts to assist children in attaining their goals related to other planned permanent living arrangements (Independent Living, Self-Sufficiency or Family Preservation).

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 10 was applicable for 4 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all 4 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (4 foster care cases)
  - In these cases, there was evidence of concerted efforts to achieve the child's primary or concurrent goal of independent living including the completion needs assessments and the provision of services to assist specifically with the development of independent living skills.

Status of Permanency Outcome P2

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	5	62.5%
Partially Achieved:	3	37.5%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0.0%
Not Applicable:	6	42.9%

Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement

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

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 11 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 7 (87.5%) of the applicable cases and as an area needing improvement in 1 (12.5%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (7 foster care cases)
  - In one of the cases, the child was placed in her home community.
  - In six cases, while placement was not in close proximity to the child's parents and home community, documentation showed that the placement was in the closest available facility which could meet the child's needs. Five of these six cases involved OJS wards.

Areas needing improvement

- (1 foster care cases)
  - In this case, the child was placed in an agency based foster home that was over 400 miles from his family home. The case file contained no documentation on the availability of placement closer to the child's home.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Documentation should include information regarding the location of foster care placement and its proximity to the parents(s).

☑ For most cases where placement was not within close proximity to the child's family, it was identified that this occurred because an appropriate placement was not available in the child's home community and that the closest appropriate placement was utilized.

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 a strength in the 1 (100.0%) applicable case.

Strengths:

- (1 foster care case)
  - In this case, documentation in the case file showed that the target child and his sibling could not be placed together as the sibling needed a higher level of care and was placed in a residential treatment facility in order to meet those needs.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Documentation clearly addresses 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 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 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 4 (50.0%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 4 (50.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (4 foster care cases)
  - In one case, documentation showed that the child had visits with his parents at least weekly. Documentation also contained information about the quality of the visits including activities that the child participated in during the visits.
  - In one case, initially the visits were of sufficient frequency; however, the frequency of actual visits decreased during the period under review. Documentation in the case file shows that the CFSS discussed the decreasing frequency of visits with the parents and encouraged them to maintain frequent visits with the child. The CFSS also made efforts to promote visitation by providing parents with travel reimbursement.
  - In another case, the visitation plan promotes weekly visits between the child and his parents through a combination of phone calls and day passes.
  - One case shows that frequent visitation occurred between the child and his adoptive mother. In this case, visits with the father are not applicable as the biological father's parental rights were terminated and there is no other father, such as adoptive.

Areas needing improvement

- (4 foster care cases)
  - In two cases, there was no documentation of a visitation plan or other efforts to promote visits between the child and their parents.
  - In another case, the reviewers found documentation regarding the frequency of visits between the child and his mother but were not able to find information regarding the frequency of visits between the child and his father. Reviewers also did not find documentation in the case file to support sufficient quality of visitation between the child and his mother or father.
  - In one of the cases, the case file contained information to support the frequency of visitation between the child and his mother and father. However, no documentation was found that showed quality of visitation between the child and his parents.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Visitation with the child and his/her parents (mother and /or father when applicable) and the child and his/ her siblings in foster care should be clearly documented in the case file. Documentation should describe both the frequency and quality of visits.

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

Reviewers determined whether DHHS had or was making diligent efforts to preserve the child's primary connection and characteristics while in foster care. Reviewers had to make a professional judgment about the child's primary connections and then explore whether those connections have been preserved through case planning and service delivery.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 14 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 5 (62.5%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 3 (37.5%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In two cases, important connections were maintained as arrangements were made for the child to have visits with siblings that remained in the family home. The child was able to continue involvement in extra-curricular activities.
  - In one case, the enhanced treatment group home is following the educational curriculum of the child's school so that the child will be able to graduate with his home town class.
  - In one case, the case file shows that the child has been able to maintain connections with extended family through camping trips, vacations, holidays and other family celebrations.
  - In another case, documentation clearly shows that the worker made concerted efforts to interview the child about his connections and to identify any connections that could be appropriately maintained given the child's behaviors. The child was able to maintain a connection to a father figure in his life through telephone contact and letters.

Areas needing improvement

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In all three cases, there was no documentation of efforts being made to preserve connections for the child while in foster care.
  - In one of these cases, it was noted that the case file contained no documentation of efforts to contact or notify the tribe even though there is documentation that the child is Native American.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Documentation needs to identify 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 a Native American 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 2 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as an area needing improvement in both (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

Areas needing improvement

- (2 foster care case)
  - In one case, it was noted that there were no documented efforts to identify either maternal or paternal family members.
  - In another case, while the case file contained information regarding relatives to the child, the child was not placed with relatives and the case file does not contain information regarding why a relative placement was not pursued.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Both maternal and paternal relatives should be identified.

☑ Efforts to identify and pursue appropriate relative placements should be clearly documented in the case file.

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 when they determined the agency had not made diligent efforts to support the child's relationship with the father or mother. A case was considered not applicable if a relationship with the child's parents was contrary to the child's safety or best interest during the period under review.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 16 was applicable for 8 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 6 (75.0%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 2 (25.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (6 foster care)
  - In all six of these cases, documentation showed that the agency had made efforts to support and maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the target child and their parents.

Areas needing improvement

- (2 foster care cases)
  - In one case, there was no documentation showing that efforts were made to support and maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child and their parents.
  - In another case, while there is documentation of efforts to promote a positive relationship between the child and his mother, there was no documentation regarding any attempts to support and maintain a positive relationship between the child and his father.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Documentation should clearly describe the agency's efforts to provide opportunities or to support additional activities to promote, strengthen, or maintain parent-child relationships.

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:	9	64.3%
Partially Achieved:	5	35.7%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0.0%
Not Applicable:	0	0.0%

Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents
In assessing item 17, reviewers were to determine whether DHHS adequately assessed the needs of children, parents and foster parents AND provided the services to meet those needs. Reviewers rated item 17 as a strength if (1) a needs assessment was conducted for the child(ren), parents, and foster parents, and (2) appropriate services were provided in relation to the identified needs of the target child in foster care cases, or for all children in in-home cases. Education and physical or mental health services to the target child were not rated for this item (these are rated in items 21, 22, and 23). Reviewers had to document whether these services were provided to parents.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 17 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 10 (71.4%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 4 (28.6%) of the applicable cases. The overall rating for item 17 is based on the combination of the following three sub-items:

Item 17a: Needs Assessment and Services to Children: The assessment of item 17a was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 14 (100%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (8 foster care cases)
  - In these eight cases, the needs of the children were assessed in a variety of ways including Family Team Meetings, OJS evaluation, drug and alcohol evaluation, Comprehensive Child and Adolescent Assessment, Youth Level of Service / Case Management Inventory and caseworker visits with the child, parents, and foster parents.
  - In these eight cases, the needs of the children were met through providing assistance in obtaining alarms and monitors for the family home, out of home placement, residential treatment, drug screening and testing, and teaching of self sufficiency and independent living skills. Reviewers found no unmet needs for the children in these cases.

- (6 in home cases)
  - In these five cases, the needs of all of the children in the home were assessed both formally and informally through the initial safety assessment, OJS evaluation, Youth Level of Service / Case Management Inventory, during Family Team Meetings, and during worker contacts with the child, family, and safety plan participants.
  - In these five cases, identified needs of the children were met through assistance with safety monitors, family support services, in home safety services, and tracker services. Reviewers found no unmet needs for the children in these cases.

Item 17b: <u>Needs Assessment and Services to Parents:</u> The assessment of item 17b was applicable for all 14 cases reviewed. This item was rated as a strength in 10 (71%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 4 (29%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In these five cases, the needs of the parents were assessed on an ongoing basis using both formal and informal means including initial and ongoing safety assessments, interviews conducted by mental health practitioners, Family Team Meetings and regular monthly contact with the caseworker.
  - In these five cases, identified needs were met through individual and family therapy, family support services, supervised visitation, parenting classes, and assistance with transportation to facilitate visitation.
- (5 in home cases)
  - In these five cases, the needs of the parents were assessed through the following methods: initial assessments, protective capacity assessments, family team meetings, and during monthly contacts between the caseworker, service coordinator, and the parents.
  - In these five cases, identified needs were met through the following services: family support services, individual and family therapy, drug screening, intensive outpatient treatment, parenting classes, education on addressing the child's specific needs, assistance with supervision of the child, and transportation assistance.

Areas needing improvement:

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In one case, the case file contains no documentation of concerted efforts to assess the needs of the mother or the father or to provide appropriate services to meet their needs. During interviews the CFSS indicated that the local judge had ruled that reasonable efforts to provide service to the mother and father were not necessary since the parents lived out of state; however this conflicts with federal and state expectations.
  - In two cases where the father was an absent parent, the needs of the mother were assessed and services provided to meet these needs; however there was not a needs assessment completed or services provided to the father.

- (1 in home cases)
  - In this one case, where the mother was in the home but the father was absent, the agency assessed the needs of the mother, but did not make efforts to assess the needs of the father.

Item 17c: <u>Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents:</u> The assessment of item 17c was applicable for 3 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all 3 (100%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In all of these cases, it was noted that the needs of the foster parents were assessed informally through involvement in Family Team Meetings and worker visits with the foster parents, and all needs were found to have been met.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Reviewers identified that in the majority of the cases the agency performed well in terms of assessing, identifying, and meeting the needs of the child.

☑ In terms of the parents, reviewers noted that in some cases the needs of one of the parents were identified and addressed while the other parent's needs were not. Most often, this occurred when one of the parents was absent from the home and it is the absent parent whose needs are not consistently being assessed, identified, or met.

☑ Caseworker contacts and Family Team Meetings were the most frequently noted methods of assessing needs for children, parents and foster parents.

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

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

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 18 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 11 (78.6%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 3 (21.4%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (7 foster care cases)
  - In all seven cases, the reviewers noted that the case worker made active efforts to involve or encourage the child (if age and developmentally appropriate) and both parents to be involved in case planning through family team meetings and caseworker contacts with the child and parents.

- (4 in home cases)
  - In three cases, all of the children in the home and both parents were involved in the case planning process through family team meetings and caseworker contacts with the children and with the parents.
  - In one case, the child and the child's guardian were actively involved in case planning through family team meetings and contacts with the worker. The case file also shows that the biological father has chosen not to participate in case planning despite concerted efforts by the caseworker to locate, contact, and involve the father.

Areas needing improvement:

- (1 foster care case)
  - In this case, while concerted efforts were made to involve the child in case planning, there is no indication that neither the mother nor the father was involved in case planning. It was noted that during interviews, the CFSS indicated that the local judge had ruled that reasonable efforts to involve the mother and father were not necessary since the parents lived out of state; however this conflicts with federal and state expectations.
- (2 in home cases)
  - In one case, reviewers found that while the child and the mother were involved in case planning, concerted efforts were not made to involve the father / absent parent in the development or evaluation of case plan goals. Reviewers noted that during the period under review there was only one documented attempt to contact the father.
  - In one case, efforts were made to involve the mother in case planning during a family team meeting, but efforts were not made to involve the father in case planning despite the father being involved in the child's life and actively seeking to gain custody of the child through the courts.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Documentation should clearly show concerted efforts by the agency to involve the parents (mother and/or father as applicable) in case planning activities.

☑ The reviewers identified that case planning is primarily occurring during monthly contacts with the parents and child as well as during Family Team 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 13 (92.9%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 1 (7.1%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (7 foster care cases)
  - In all seven of these cases, face to face visits between the case worker were found to be of sufficient frequency and were also found to be of sufficient quality as the caseworker addressed issues of safety, permanency and well being as well as case planning with the child.
    - It is noted that for five of these cases, the supporting information came from a combination of the case file documentation and interviews; however in two of the seven cases, the reviewers noted that the case file lacked or contained minimal documentation of caseworker visits with the child and the rating for this case was based upon the information gained through interviews.
- (6 in home cases)
  - In all six of these cases, it was found that the caseworker had face to face contacts with all children at least once per month. The visits were found to meet quality as they involved issues of safety, permanency and well-being.

Areas needing improvement:

- (1 foster care case)
  - In this case, the frequency of the visits with the child was found to be sufficient; however the quality of the visits were not sufficient as there was no information to support that issues of safety, permanency, or well-being were addressed. It is noted that in this case, that caseworker visits with the child either took place at the family team meeting or at the child's school; however, none of the visits with the child took place in the child's place of residence.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Documentation should address the frequency of worker's visits with the child. If face to face contact between the worker and the child was less than monthly, documentation should include reasons why the contact did not occur.

☑ Documentation should include enough information to determine the quality of the visit and to show that the visit was sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety, permanency and well-being of the child and to promote achievement of case plan goals.

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 that were considered not applicable were those in which there is no plan for further involvement between the parents and the agency or the parents and the child, and the child is not in a permanent home.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 20 was applicable for all 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 10 (71.4%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 4 (28.6%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In all five cases, reviewers found that the visits with the parents were of sufficient frequency; occurring at least monthly. Visits with the parents were also determined to be of sufficient quality as the caseworker and parents discussed issues pertaining to the permanency and well being of the child.
- (5 in home cases)
  - In four cases, documentation in the case file and information gathered through interviews showed that the caseworker visits with both the mother and the father were sufficient in frequency and quality.
  - In one case, documentation in the case file and information gathered through interviews shows that the caseworker had visits with the child's guardian and that these visits were sufficient both in frequency and quality.

Areas needing improvement:

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In one case, while visits with the parents were of sufficient frequency, it was found that the visits were not of sufficient quality.
  - In one case, while visits with the mother were found to be of sufficient frequency and quality, visits with the father were found to be sporadic and the case file lacked information regarding the quality of visits with the father.
  - In another case, there was a lack of documentation regarding caseworker visits with the mother and the father. It was found that visits were not of sufficient frequency, occurring less than once a month, and that there was a lack of documentation and information available regarding the quality of the visits with the parents.
- (1 in home case)
  - In this case, the case file and information gathered during interviews showed that the caseworker had visits with the mother that were sufficient in frequency and quality, but no visits occurred with the father and there is not information to support that concerted efforts were made to have contact with the father / absent parent.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ In out of home cases where the parents do not reside together, the agency tends to achieve sufficient contact with the parent they are seeking to reunify the child with, while less than sufficient contact or no contact is made with the other parent.

☑ For the majority of in-home cases, when contact with the child was sufficient, contact with the parent or parents residing in the home with the child was also sufficient, however contact was not sufficient with the absent parent.

Status of Well-Being Outcome WB2

	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	12	100.0%
Partially Achieved:	0	0.0%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0.0%
Not Applicable:	2	14.3%

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 12 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in all 12 (100.0%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (8 foster care cases)
  - In all eight cases, documentation in the case file showed that the educational needs of the child were assessed and that the child received appropriate services in order to meet their unique educational needs.
- (4 in home case)
  - In one case, the child's educational needs were assessed through a Comprehensive Child and Adolescent Assessment and a Youth Level of Service / Case Management Inventory. An IEP was developed and followed to address the child's educational needs.
  - In another case, the children's educational progress and needs were documented in copies of report cards, IEP, school evaluations, and academic comparison results. Counseling and therapy were provided to address behavioral outbursts in school.
  - In one case, a family support worker assisted the child and guardian with organization and time management. Documentation in the case filed showed an increase in the child's attendance and school performance following the implementation of the family support worker.

- In another case, the child's educational needs were assessed through a Comprehensive Child and Adolescent Assessment which identified learning disabilities for child. Documentation shows that the caseworker made efforts to address these needs by discussing these needs and appropriate available services at family team meetings; however the parents have declined the services available.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Documentation shows what efforts were made to assess the child's educational needs.
☑ Documentation details what the child's educational needs are and what efforts the agency is making to meet these 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:	7	53.8%
Partially Achieved:	5	38.5%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	7.7%
Not Applicable:	1	7.1%

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 9 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 3 (33.3%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 6 (66.7%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (3 foster care cases)
  - In all three of these cases, the case file contained documentation that the child received periodic, age appropriate physical and dental health examinations, and that any identified health needs were met with appropriate services.

Areas needing improvement:

- (5 foster care cases)
  - In three cases, there was documentation of physical health screenings, but no documentation to show that dental health screenings were completed or that dental health needs were addressed.
  - In one case, there was documentation of a current dental exam and services provided to meet dental needs; however there was no documentation to show that the child had received a current physical exam.
  - In another case, the case file lacked documentation for the period under review. There was no information to support that the child's physical or dental health needs had been assessed during the period under review.
- (1 in home case)
  - In this case, part of the agency's involvement was relevant to the physical health of one of the children in the home, as this child was anorexic, bulimic, and had been engaging in self harming behaviors. There was no documentation regarding efforts to assess the physical or dental health of this child or to provide services to meet the physical and dental health needs that would be expected in a child who has eating disorders and self harming behaviors.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Documentation should show what efforts were made to assess the child's physical and dental health needs.

☑ Documentation should detail what the child's physical and dental health needs are and what efforts the agency is making to meet these needs.

Item 23: <u>Mental health of the child</u>

Reviewers were to determine whether during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the child(ren). Reviewers rated this item as a Strength if the agency conducted an assessment of the child's mental health and determined that there were no problems in that area, nor any need for mental health services. If there was a need for services then they were offered.

***Review Findings*:** The assessment of item 23 was applicable for 13 of the 14 cases. This item was rated as a strength in 12 (92.3%) of the applicable cases and rated as an area needing improvement in 1 (7.7%) of the applicable cases.

Strengths:

- (7 foster care cases)
  - In seven cases, the case file contained documentation to show that the child's mental/behavioral health needs were assessed and that efforts were made to provide appropriate services to meet each identified need.
- (5 in home cases)
  - In these five cases, there was documentation showing that the mental health needs of all applicable children in the home were assessed and that services were provided to meet all of the children's mental health needs.

Areas needing improvement:

- (1 in home case)
  - In this case, the case lacked documentation for the period under review. Due to a lack of documentation there was no information to show that the child's mental health needs had been assessed or that appropriate services had been provided to meet any needs that were present.

Reviewer Comments:

☑ Documentation should show what efforts were made to assess the child's mental/behavior needs.

☑ Documentation should detail what the child's mental/behavioral needs are and what efforts the agency is making to meet these needs.

WSA Results

Case Sample: *Mini CFSR Review – April 2011*
Type of Review: 6th *Mini CFSR* **Report Type:** *Western Service Area*
Number of Reviews: *14* **Review Period:** *April 1st, 2010 – April 1st, 2011*

PERFORMANCE ITEM RESULTS

Performance Item		Item Ratings (#)			Item Ratings (%)		
		S	ANI	N/A	S	ANI	N/A
Item 1:	Timeliness of initiating investigations	2	0	12	100.0%	0.0%	85.7%
Item 2:	Repeat maltreatment	2	0	12	100.0%	0.0%	85.7%
Item 3:	Services to family	10	0	4	100.0%	0.0%	28.5%
Item 4:	Risk assessment and safety management	11	3	0	78.6%	21.4%	0.0%
Item 5:	Foster care re-entries	1	0	13	100.0%	0.0%	92.8%
Item 6:	Stability of foster care placement	8	0	6	100.0%	0.0%	42.9%
Item 7:	Permanency goal for child	4	4	6	50.0%	50.0%	42.9%
Item 8:	Reunification, guardianship etc	5	1	8	83.3%	16.7%	57.1%
Item 9:	Adoption	0	0	14	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Item 10:	Other planned permanent living arrangement	4	0	10	100.0%	0.0%	71.4%
Item 11:	Proximity of foster care placement	7	1	6	87.5%%	12.5%	42.9%
Item 12:	Placement with siblings	1	0	13	100.0%	0.0%	92.9%
Item 13:	Visiting with parents and siblings	4	4	6	50.0%	50.0%	42.9%
Item 14:	Preserving connections	5	3	6	62.5%	37.5%	42.9%
Item 15:	Relative placement	0	2	12	0.0%	100.0%	85.7%
Item 16:	Relationship of child in care with parents	6	2	6	75.0%	25.0%	42.9%
Item 17:	Needs and services	10	4	0	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%
Item 18:	Child and family involvement in case planning	11	3	0	78.6%	21.4%	0.0%
Item 19:	Caseworker visits with child	13	1	0	92.9%	7.1%	0.0%
Item 20:	Caseworker visits with parent(s)	10	4	0	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%
Item 21:	Educational needs of the child	12	0	2	100.0%	0.0%	14.3%
Item 22:	Physical health of the child	3	6	5	33.3%	66.7%	35.7%
Item 23:	Mental/behavioral health of the child	12	1	1	92.3	7.7%	7.1%

OUTCOME RESULTS

	COUNTS (#)				PERCENTAGES (%)			
Performance Outcome	*SA*	*PA*	*NA*	*N/A*	*SA*	*PA*	*NA*	*N/A*
Safety 1 (Items 1-2)	2	0	0	12	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	85.7%
Safety 2 (Items 3-4)	11	2	1	0	78.6%	14.3%	7.1%	0.0%
Permanency 1 (Items 5-10)	4	4	0	6	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	42.9%
Permanency 2 (Items 11-16)	5	3	0	6	62.5%	37.5%	0.0%	42.9%
Wellbeing 1 (Items 17-20)	9	5	0	0	64.3%	35.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Wellbeing 2 (Item 21)	12	0	0	2	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
Wellbeing 3 (Items 22-23)	7	5	1	1	53.8%	38.5%	7.7%	7.1%

KEY:

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

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

REPORT CODES: Items 1 to 20, 22 and 23

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

Report CODES: Item 21 and ALL OUTCOMES

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

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

Report Quarter	1st Qtr 2010	2nd Qtr 2010	3rd Qtr 2010	4th Qtr 2010	5th Qtr 2011	6th Qtr 2011
Period Under Review	Jan 09-Jan10	Apr 09-Apr 10	Jul 09-Jul 10	Oct 09-Oct 10	Jan 10-Jan 11	Apr 10-Apr 11
Number of Cases	**14**	**14**	**14**	**14**	**14**	**14**
Item 1	100%	100%	100%	60%	100%	100%
Item 2	75%	50%	100%	67%	100%	100%
Outcome: S1	**80%**	**80%**	**100%**	**60%**	**100%**	**100%**
Item 3	71%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%
Item 4	57%	71%	*43%*	50%	71%	79%
Outcome: S2	**57%**	**71%**	***43%***	**50%**	**71%**	**79%**
Item 5	100%	100%	100%	100%	80%	100%
Item 6	100%	100%	75%	75%	88%	100%
Item 7	*44%*	75%	*38%*	63%	63%	50%
Item 8	83%	100%	100%	67%	100%	83%
Item 9	50%	100%	50%	100%	*33%*	N/A
Item 10	100%	*33%*	100%	50%	100%	100%
Outcome: P1	***33%***	**75%**	**50%**	**50%**	***38%***	**50%**
Item 11	100%	100%	100%	100%	88%	88%
Item 12	100%	100%	50%	100%	*0%*	100%
Item 13	50%	67%	*38%*	71%	71%	50%
Item 14	78%	75%	100%	63%	63%	63%
Item 15	57%	100%	50%	75%	*40%*	0%
Item 16	*38%*	63%	50%	71%	71%	*75%*
Outcome: P2	***44%***	**75%**	***38%***	**63%**	**50%**	**63%**
Item 17	64%	50%	50%	*36%*	57%	*71%*
Item 18	50%	50%	*29%*	*43%*	85%	*79%*
Item 19	64%	79%	71%	86%	93%	93%
Item 20	*43%*	*38%*	29%	*33%*	62%	71%
Outcome: WB1	***36%***	**50%**	***36%***	***21%***	**57%**	**64%**
Item 21	64%	91%	60%	75%	78%	100%
Outcome: WB2	**64%**	**91%**	**60%**	**75%**	**78%**	**100%**
Item 22	83%	89%	67%	56%	80%	*33%*
Item 23	100%	100%	58%	88%	90%	92%
Outcome: WB3	**83%**	**83%**	**50%**	**58%**	**75%**	**54%**

CFSR
Items & Outcomes Description

SAFETY:

Safety Outcome #1: Children are first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

- **Item 1** (Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment)
- **Item 2** (Repeat maltreatment)

Safety Outcome #2: Children are safely maintained in their homes, whenever possible and appropriate.

- **Item 3** (Services to family to protect child(ren) in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care)
- **Item 4** (Risk assessment and safety management)

PERMANENCY:

Permanency Outcome #1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

- **Item 5** (Foster care re-entries – did a child who entered foster care during the period under review re-enter within 12 months of a prior foster care episode)
- **Item 6** (Stability of Foster Care placement)
- **Item 7**(Permanency goal for child – were appropriate permanency goals established for the child in a timely manner)
- **Item 8** (Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives)
- **Item 9** (Adoption)
- **Item 10** (Other planned permanent living arrangement)

Permanency Outcome #2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

- **Item 11** (Proximity of foster care placement)
- **Item 12** (Placement with siblings)
- **Item 13** (Visits with parents and siblings in foster care)
- **Item 14** (Preserving connections – with child's neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, tribe, school, friends)
- **Item 15** (Relative placement)
- **Item 16** (Relationship of child in care with parents)

WELLBEING

Well-Being Outcome #1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

- **Item 17** (Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents)
    - Item 17A (Services to meet the child's identified needs)
    - Item 17B (Services to meet parents' identified needs)
    - Item 17C (Services to meet the foster parents' identified needs)
- **Item 18** (Child and family involvement in case planning)
- **Item 19** (Worker visits with child)
- **Item 20** (Caseworker visits with parent)

Well-Being Outcome #2: Children received adequate services to meet their educational need.

- **Item 21** (Educational Needs of the child)

Well-Being #3: Children received adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

- **Item 22** (Physical health of the child)
- **Item 23** (Mental/behavioral health of the child)