

CFSR Quality Case Review – 7 Outcome Summary for all cases reviewed during PIP Baseline PURs

28 cases reviewed (6 in home; 22 foster care)

PURs: July 2016 – April 2017

Outcome	Outcome Rating	Purpose of the Outcome	Item Context
Safety Outcome 1 Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	SA = 69.23% PA = 0% NACH = 30.77% NA = 15 cases Total cases = 13	To determine whether, for all accepted child maltreatment reports received during the period under review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response was initiated within the time frames established by agency policies or state statutes. Face-to-face contact with the child(ren) was made, within the time frames established by agency policies or state statutes. 	This outcome is essentially the only “compliance” item. <i>Note: Even when the reason for not meeting the statutes is “beyond agency control”, we are still required to rate it as not achieved. There is a place to indicate that it was out of agency control, but it doesn’t change the rating.</i>
Safety Outcome 2 Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	SA = 60.71% PA = 17.86% NACH = 21.43% NA = 0 cases Total cases = 28	To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide services to the family to prevent children’s entry into foster care or re-entry after a reunification. Assess and address the risk and safety concerns relating to the child(ren) in their own homes or while in foster care. 	There is a clear distinction in the tool between risk and safety and what is to be included in each item. When risk and safety are blended in practice, it may not meet the definition for making concerted efforts to accurately assess. Services for this outcome must be specifically associated to safety (not risk) issues. Reviewers need to find strong evidence that concerted efforts were made to safety plan/provide services to prevent removal. Reviewers need to ensure there was exigency when removing child(ren), which seems to be defined differently in the tool than what occurs in practice.

CFSR Quality Case Review – 7 Outcome Summary for all cases reviewed during PIP Baseline PURs

28 cases reviewed (6 in home; 22 foster care)

PURs: July 2016 – April 2017

Outcome	Outcome Rating	Purpose of the Outcome	Item Context
Permanency Outcome 1 Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	SA = 50% PA = 27.27% NACH = 22.73% NA = 0 cases Total cases = 22	To determine whether during the period under review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Placement is stable and any changes in placement were in best interests of the child and consistent with achieving permanency goal(s). Appropriate permanency goals were established for in a timely manner. Concerted efforts were made, or are being made, to achieve reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement. 	<p>Placement changes have to be assessed as to whether they meet the needs of the child and achieve the permanency goals.</p> <p>The focus is on assessing efforts made to achieve permanency rather than on meeting specific timeframes. So, even if permanency is achieved within established federal guidelines, if it could have been achieved earlier with some additional concerted efforts (ie: don't wait until the next court date), the rating is negatively affected.</p>
Permanency Outcome 2 The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	SA = 50% PA = 31.82% NACH = 18.18% NA = 0 cases Total cases = 22	To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure siblings in foster care are placed together unless separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings. Ensure visitation between child in foster care and mother, father, and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in their relationship. Maintain child's connections to neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, Tribe, school, and friends. Place child with relatives when appropriate. Promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between child in foster care and mother and father or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation. 	<p>Assessment of the frequency and quality of visitation with parents/ siblings considers whether it was sufficient to maintain "continuity of relationship." Following the court order regarding visitation is not enough for a strength rating.</p> <p>Relationships in this item include caregivers from whom the child was removed even if the goal is not reunification to that person and maintaining/ establishing connection to all parents even if they are not the parent from whom the child was removed. It is not about who is getting FR services.</p> <p>If child did not have visits with a parent/sibling due to "not in the best interests of the child," this must be documented somewhere such as contact notes or court documents and revisited on a regular basis (ie: every six months).</p>

CFSR Quality Case Review – 7 Outcome Summary for all cases reviewed during PIP Baseline PURs

28 cases reviewed (6 in home; 22 foster care)

PURs: July 2016 – April 2017

Outcome	Outcome Rating	Purpose of the Outcome	Item Context
Well-Being Outcome 1 Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	SA = 28.57% PA = 39.29% NACH = 32.14% NA = 0 cases Total cases = 28	To determine whether, during the period under review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerted efforts were made to assess needs of children, parents, and foster parents to identify services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family, and to provide appropriate services. • Concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents and children (if developmentally appropriate) in case planning process on an ongoing basis. • Frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and child(ren), and caseworkers and parents, are sufficient to ensure safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals. 	In some items for this outcome, parents, children and foster parents are separated out, but then grouped together in the overall item and the overall outcome measure. We are doing better with some of these groups than others. "Developmentally appropriate" to be involved in case planning is considered to be as young as 8 or 9. Assessment of frequency and quality focuses on whether it was sufficient for safety, permanency and well-being goals. We can meet our minimum requirement (ie: 1x/month) but that does not ensure a strength rating. Assessment of quality can be impacted by what the parents/children report.
Well-Being Outcome 2 Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	SA = 66.67% PA = 11.11% NACH = 22.22% NA = 10 cases Total cases = 18	To assess whether, during the period under review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerted efforts were made to assess children's educational needs at initial contact with the child (if the case was opened during the period under review) or on an ongoing basis (if the case was opened before the period under review) • Identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities. 	Depending on the type of case (in-home case or out-of-home) the expectation of what is assessed and addressed is different. For example, for in-home cases, this item is only relevant if it would be reasonable to expect the agency would be addressing these issues given the circumstances of the case and/or it is relevant to the reason for the agency's involvement.
Well-Being Outcome 3 Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.	SA = 40% PA = 24% NACH = 36% NA = 3 cases Total cases = 25	To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency accurately assessed and addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical health needs of the children, including dental health needs. • Mental/behavioral health needs of the children. 	Depending on the type of case (in-home case or out-of-home) the expectation of what is assessed and addressed is different. For example, for in-home cases, this item is only relevant if it would be reasonable to expect the agency would be addressing these issues given the circumstances of the case and/or it is relevant to the reason for the agency's involvement.