



**Child
and Family
Services Reviews**



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Administration for Children and Families
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
Children's Bureau





**Welcome
to the Washington Child and Family
Services Review
Exit Conference**



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Administration for Children and Families
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
Children's Bureau



Child and Family Services Reviews



The CFSRs:

- Are a collaborative effort between Federal and State Governments
- Promote continuous quality improvement in child welfare systems nationally
- Evaluate State performance relative to the State Child and Family Services Plan
- Identify both the strengths and areas needing improvement in State child welfare programs



The CFSRs include:

- State data from AFCARS and NCANDS
- Statewide Assessment
- Case-level onsite reviews conducted by a team of Federal and State reviewers
- Interviews with key State and local stakeholders



- The first CFSR in Washington was conducted in 2003.
- As a result, the State entered into a Program Improvement Plan to make improvements in 7 outcomes and 3 systemic factors.
- The State was successful in completing Program Improvement Plan activities and reaching goals and was released from its Program Improvement Plan on December 3, 2007.

Current Review



In the current CFSR, we reviewed 65 cases, including:

- 25 in-home services cases
- 40 foster care cases

We reviewed cases and spoke to community stakeholders in three locations in the State, including:

- King County
- Whatcom County
- Spokane County

Child and Family Services Reviews



The CFSRs are designed to examine State programs from two perspectives. First, the reviews assess the outcomes of services provided to children and families. Second, they examine systemic factors that affect the ability of State agencies to help children and families achieve positive outcomes.

The CFSRs analyze strengths and areas needing improvement with respect to seven outcomes and seven systemic factors.



The *outcomes*, which concern safety, permanency, and well-being, include:

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

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

Child and Family Services Reviews



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

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

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

Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

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

Child and Family Services Reviews



The *systemic factors* include:

- Statewide Information System
- Case Review System
- Quality Assurance System
- Staff and Provider Training
- Service Array
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community
- Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing,
Recruitment, and Retention



Preliminary Findings: Outcomes



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Administration for Children and Families
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
Children's Bureau





The terms “strengths” and “concerns” at this preliminary stage do not necessarily equate to substantial conformity or nonconformity with an outcome or systemic factor. Final determinations are made at a later point in the process.



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

□ CFSR data indicate:

▪ No Maltreatment Recurrence

Of all children who were victims of a substantiated or indicated maltreatment allegation during the first 6 months of the reporting period, what percent were not victims of another substantiated or indicated maltreatment allegation during a 6-month period?

Washington = 93.9% National Standard = 94.6%

Preliminary Findings – Safety Outcome I (cont'd)



- No Maltreatment in Foster Care

Of all children in foster care during the reporting period, what percent were not victims of a substantiated or indicated maltreatment by a foster parent or facility staff member?

Washington = 99.62% National Standard = 99.68%

- **This week's case review shows:**

- Strengths: very low incidence of repeat maltreatment in cases reviewed; some investigations initiated in advance of timeframes
- Concerns: Timeliness of initiating investigations and making face to face contact within required timeframes

Preliminary Findings – Safety Outcome 2



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

□ This week's case review shows:

- Strengths: use of effective home based services; addressing concrete needs; appropriate safety plans; informal assessments of safety/risk; FTDM used to inform assessments; frequent worker contact
- Concerns: Lack of ongoing assessments – not occurring at critical case points; poor quality in assessments; safety plans not monitored/updated; services not targeted at safety issues or parents not engaged; premature case closure; lack of focus on entire family



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

☐ CFSR data indicate:

- Reunification Timeliness and Permanency
Washington = 108.5 National Standard = 122.6
- Adoption Timeliness
Washington = 96.0 National Standard = 106.4
- Permanency for Children
Washington = 120.0 National Standard = 121.7
- Placement Stability
Washington = 95.8 National Standard = 101.5

Preliminary Findings – Permanency Outcome I (cont'd)



□ This week's case review shows:

- Strengths: no re-entries in cases reviewed; stable placements and appropriate moves; implementation of concurrent planning; preparing children for adoption; youth involved in transition planning with effective IL services
- Concerns: FTDM not used to prevent disruption; lack of services and supports to relative homes; lack of focused attention on permanency; inappropriate permanency goals; concurrent goals identified but not worked; guardianship delays; repeated extensions granted in court; delays in TPR achievement



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

- This week's case review shows:**
 - **Strengths:** proximity of foster care placements, placement with siblings, preserving connections, placement with relatives – ongoing search, progressive visitation; unique examples of efforts made to support relationships
 - **Concerns:** contentious relationships between foster and birth parents; only supporting connections to one parent; impact of unclear permanency plans; case transfers impacting continuity of visitation



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

☐ This week's case review shows:

- **Strengths:** comprehensive family assessments; FTDM and shared planning mtgs used effectively to engage parents; frequent and quality home visits; foster families engaging with birth families; individualized case plans
- **Concerns:** lack of focus on entire family; uncertain approach with voluntary cases; assessment missing underlying core issues; quality lacking in worker visits with children; frequency and quality lacking in visits with parents; parent attorneys presenting barriers to early engagement



Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

- This week's case review shows:**
 - Strengths: educational advocates; parents and foster parents advocating for services; ongoing assessment of needs and provision of services
 - Concerns: needs not identified in some cases



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

- ❑ **This week's case review shows:**
 - **Strengths:** highest rated outcome overall!
Appropriate assessments; effective services; involvement of therapists in FTDM, foster parents have access to records; coordination with community to meet needs
 - **Concerns:** primarily IH - lack of follow-up with needed mental health services; inconsistent assessment of needs



Preliminary Findings: Systemic Factors



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Administration for Children and Families
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
Children's Bureau



❑ Statewide Information System

- Strengths: FamLink can identify status, demographic characteristics, location and goals for the placement of children in foster care
- Concerns: Still working out data quality issues resulting from CAMIS conversion; implications of workflow requirements for data entry



Case Review System

- Strengths: timely development of case plans; parent advocates effective at promoting engagement of parents; timely periodic review and permanency hearings; timely filing of TPR or documentation of compelling reasons not to file in many cases; evidence of significant court improvements including data collection
- Concerns: TPR – delays in filing/documenting compelling reasons when extensions being granted in court for parents; engagement of parents in case plan development; caregiver notice of reviews/hearings and right to be heard in hearings



□ **Quality Assurance System**

- Strengths: standards developed and implemented to ensure health and safety of children in care; quality assurance case reviews occurring, ICW case reviews, DLR reviews, focus on disproportionality, accountability via Braam and Governor's office
- Concerns: QA system can be further developed to ensure data is used to evaluate quality of all services, inform policy and practice and promote continuous improvement in outcomes

❑ **Staff and Provider Training**

- Strengths: Requirements in place for pre-service and ongoing training; University partnerships; online training opportunities
- Concerns: Monitoring of ongoing hours is inconsistent for workers and foster parents; quality of pre-service worker training/demonstration of competency; adequacy of foster parent training; access to relevant ongoing training for workers



❑ Service Array

- Strengths: Strong array in parts of the state; evidence-based programs; ability to individualize using flex funds and tailored case plans
- Concerns: impact of budget cuts; gaps exist in post-adoption services, DV, family preservation services, residential substance abuse treatment, services for fathers, culturally-appropriate services, housing; accessibility issues due to waitlists for some services, lack of transportation, income-based eligibility



□ Agency Responsiveness to the Community

- Strengths: stakeholders report being meaningfully engaged by the agency; opportunities for input into planning; transparency with agency has improved through trusted leadership; improved engagement of tribal partners, youth, foster parents and birth parents; working relationship with legislature; demonstrated coordination with other federal programs (TANF agreement, JRA, DDD, Corrections Dept, Courts, HUD, MH, Health, Education)

- ❑ **Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention**
 - Strengths: Licensing standards in place and applied equally; positive work with tribal homes; improved timeliness in processing criminal background checks; targeted local recruitment plans; cross-jurisdictional permanent placements
 - Concerns: significant need for foster homes in King; retention of caregivers; high number of unlicensed relative/kinship homes – impacting permanency



Family Engagement

- Practice Model implementation - SBC
- FTDM, Shared Planning Meetings, Court Teams
- Parent Advocates

Quality Services

- HB2106 – performance based contracting
- Strengthening Quality Assurance system and professional development of supervisors to ensure consistency in practice and continuous improvement
- Focus on front-end prevention and family preservation services



Meaningful engagement with stakeholders

- **Court Improvement Program**
- **Tribal partnerships**
- **Youth, Parents and Caregivers**



Next Steps



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Administration for Children and Families
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
Children's Bureau



Next Steps



The Final Report for Washington will be issued after the onsite review with final determinations of substantial conformity.

- The Children's Bureau Regional Office provides a courtesy copy in advance to the State to review for accuracy.
- The State requests technical assistance as needed.

Next Steps (cont'd)



- If required, State begins/continues work on the Program Improvement Plan, including stakeholders in the process.
- State plans with the Regional Office for training on Program Improvement Plan development through the NRC for Organizational Improvement.
- Final Program Improvement Plan is due to the Regional Office 90 days from receipt of the courtesy copy of the Final Report. Due dates for drafts are negotiated.



Important: The State need not wait for the Final Report to begin developing the Program Improvement Plan!

Next Steps (cont'd)



The Children's Bureau offers Training and Technical Assistance (T/TA) through:

- TA for State Legislators and the National Conference of State Legislatures
- The Children's Bureau-funded NRCs
- The Child Welfare Information Gateway (www.childwelfare.gov) for information and resources
- The Child Welfare Training and Technical Assistance Coordination Center (TTACC) for State-level assessment and coordination of T/TA

National Resource Centers



NRC for Organizational Improvement

NRC for Child Protective Services

NRC on Legal and Judicial Issues

NRC for In-Home Services

NRC on Permanency and Family Connections

NRC for Child Welfare Data and Technology

NRC for Adoption

NRC for Youth Development

NRC for Tribes

NRC for Recruitment and Retention of Foster and Adoptive
Parents at AdoptUsKids



Questions?



THANK YOU!



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Administration for Children and Families
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
Children's Bureau

