

Indian Child Welfare Case Review
Washington State Tribes
and
The Department of Social and Health Services
The Children's Administration



Region 1
2009 Report

Children's Administration is committed to:

- § Preserving the cultural heritage of Indian children by ensuring that staff identify Tribal children and connect these children to their Tribes through early Tribal notification.
- § Recognizing Tribal rights and cooperating with the Tribe's efforts toward enhanced self-determination relative to child welfare matters.
- § Establishing policies and procedures that protect Indian children from unnecessary removal from their families and Tribal communities.

I. Inquiry of Indian Status: Statewide and Regional Results 2007-2009

The Children’s Administration’s (CA) Case Review Team has tracked compliance in the inquiry of Indian status on a large sample of cases regardless of identified race or ethnicity. The results below indicate the progress made during the last three years to ask both the mother and the father of possible Indian status on all cases served by CA. The number in parenthesis is the total number of cases that were applicable.

Were efforts were made to discover the child’s American Indian/Alaska Native/Canadian Indian status by asking the mother and father about Indian status?							
Year	Statewide Results	Regional Results					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
2007	67% (777)	73% (130)	72% (116)	74% (144)	49% (124)	58% (91)	71% (142)
2008	71% (668)	76% (198)	65% (57)	74% (83)	68% (117)	53% (40)	73% (173)
2009	73% (535)	90% (80)	80% (103)	73% (101)	61% (101)	49% (84)	86% (66)

II. Purpose of the ICW Case Review

The purpose of the ICW case review is to assess in more detail, ICW compliance and quality of practice in cases where a child may be Native American. In 2005 Washington State began a collaborative effort to develop the Indian Child Welfare (ICW) case review. This effort was led by Washington State Tribes, the Indian Policy Advisory Committee (IPAC), and Children’s Administration (CA) staff. The first statewide ICW case review occurred in the summer of 2007 and this review created state and regional practice baselines on ICW compliance and quality of practice.

In the fall of 2009, the second ICW Case Review occurred utilizing the same methodology, questions and decision rules. The second review identifies areas of statewide and regional practice improvement, as well as areas still needing improvement.

The purpose of ICW Case Review is to:

- Assist CA social work staff in understanding the Indian Child Welfare Act and the practice requirements outlined in the Washington State ICW manual.
- Improve the quality of services to Indian children and their families.
- Collaborate with Tribes and Recognized American Indian Organizations (RAIO) to evaluate and improve statewide ICW practice.
- Provide CA management, supervisors and social workers with reliable and meaningful data on current practice that will identify strengths and areas needing improvement.
- Facilitate quality improvement activities at the regional and statewide level.

III. ICW Case Review Model

The ICW case review utilizes questions and decision rules drafted by a workgroup that included Tribal partners, IPAC members, regional ICW staff and the Central Case Review Team.

The ICW Case Review is comprised of 29 questions that are divided into nine sections. Six sections apply directly to ICW compliance and the last three sections focus on Safety, Well Being and Permanency. All ICW compliance questions reference the Washington State ICW Manual or the Washington Tribal/State Agreement.

This model utilizes a blended team of reviewers comprised of Tribal and RAIO child welfare representatives, CA ICW staff, and the Central Case Review Team. All reviewers have a minimum of two years experience working in ICW, demonstrate excellence in social work practice and knowledge of ICW, and are recognized for having a culturally responsive and collaborative approach. Reviewers are required to attend training on the ICW Case Review model, questions and decision rules.

To enhance consensus building and ensure inter-rater reliability, each case is reviewed by two team members. After each regional review, a team debrief is held with Tribal and CA reviewers to identify regional trends, systemic barriers to ICW practice, and provide feedback on the case review process. Ideas are shared for practice improvement.

The regional case review results are shared with CA managers and social workers at the close of the review in an exit meeting. Individual feedback sheets are developed by the reviewers on each case summarizing areas of strength and areas needing improvement. The feedback sheets are provided to the social worker, supervisor, and area administrator.

IV. Practice Improvement Activities

As a result of the first ICW case review that occurred in 2007, practice improvement activities began at both the regional and statewide level. Regional and statewide reports were distributed to CA management, social work staff and Tribes. The statewide report included a number of systemic issues that were identified by the review teams. These issues included:

- Additional workload issues for ICW cases
- Need for an ICW Practice Guide
- Need for specialized ICW training
- Policy clarification within the ICW manual
- Regional differences in forms and methods of documenting ICW compliance
- Regional differences in utilizing Local Indian Child Welfare Advisory Committee (LICWAC) staffings
- FamLink enhancements to document ICW compliance

Tribes and CA regional management teams collaborated in the development of regional priorities for practice improvement. Statewide and regional improvements occurred as a result of the first ICW case review. These improvements included:

- A review of all components of ICW training occurred, including a curriculum review of the four day mandatory ICW training with the National Child Welfare Association (NICWA).
- Additional resources were allocated in some regions to add social workers, supervisors in ICW units, and staff who assist with family search and tribal notification.
- Training was delivered to LICWAC teams and CA staff to support consistent and quality LICWAC staffings.
- A workgroup was established, comprised of DSHS and tribal staff, to update CA ICW forms. The workgroup continues to meet on an ongoing basis.
- Components were developed to allow tribal access to CA's electronic information system, FamLink, as part of the Phase 2 rollout.
- A workgroup developed recommendations for FamLink enhancements to support CA compliance with ICW policies and procedures (on going).

V. Indian Child Welfare in Region 1

There are three federally recognized Tribes in Region 1, which are the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, the Kalispel Tribe of Indians, and the Spokane Tribe of Indians. Two Recognized American Indian Organizations (RAIO) operate in the region, both within the city of Spokane, which are the NATIVE Project/Native Health and the American Indian Community Center.

The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation investigates Intakes of child abuse and neglect on the reservation. Occasionally, the Tribe will contact CA ICW directly and request assistance in investigating an allegation of CA/N on the reservation, particularly if investigation by the tribal ICW staff would constitute a conflict of interest. Some Intakes regarding Colville Tribal children who reside off the reservation are co-investigated by CA and the Tribe. Dependency petitions for Colville Tribal children are filed in Tribal Court.

The Kalispel Tribe of Indians has a Tribal Court and a social service agency. The Tribe determines if they or CA will investigate Intakes of child abuse and neglect exclusively or concurrently for Kalispel Tribal children residing both on the reservation and off of the reservation. Dependency petitions for Kalispel Tribal children who reside on the reservation are filed in Tribal Court. CA and the Tribe have a detailed communication protocol regarding investigation of child abuse and neglect cases as well as for cases that are opened to the Department for payment only.

The Spokane Tribe investigates all Intakes of child abuse and neglect for all children who reside on the Spokane Reservation regardless of Tribal affiliation. CA investigates all Intakes of child abuse and neglect for Spokane Tribal children who reside off of the reservation. The Tribe files Youth in Need of Care (dependency) petitions in Tribal Court for children who reside on the reservation.

All three tribes provide social services including; Indian Health Services, mental health counseling, chemical dependency treatment and Head Start services for children. Additionally, The Spokane Tribe and the Colville Tribe operate Tribal TANF programs. All three Tribes are licensed Child Placing Agencies and license foster homes on and off

the reservation. The Colville Tribe operates the Paschal Sherman Indian School (preschool through 9th grade) in Omak, Washington.

The two RAIIO's in the Region provide numerous services. NATIVE Project/Native Health provides substance abuse treatment, Indian Health Services, mental health counseling and youth services to Indian families. The American Indian Community Center provides family services including parenting classes, a food bank, an ECEAP program and adult education services.

Additional services for Indian families in Region 1 include Spokane Tribal TANF, the Medicine Wheel Academy and the Healing Lodge of the Seven Nations. The Medicine Wheel Academy is an alternative high school for Native youth and is administered through the Spokane Public Schools. The Healing Lodge of the Seven Nations provides residential chemical dependency treatment for Native youth, ages 12-18, and is a collaboration among the three Tribes in Region 1 plus the Umatilla Tribe, the Nez Perce Tribe, the Coeur D'Alene Tribe and the Salish-Kootenai Tribes.

Region 1 encompasses a large geographical area with ten field offices. The Spokane office is the only office in the region with specialized ICW units serving all of Spokane County. The units are supported by a Home Support Specialist and a Tribal payment worker.

There is one unit serving Child Protection Services (CPS), Family Voluntary Services (FVS) and Family Reconciliation Services (FRS) cases for Indian families. The unit consists of 5 social workers. There are two Child and Family Welfare services (CFWS) units in the Spokane office. Between the two units, there are 10 social workers, one Native American Inquiry specialist and one home support specialist. The remaining offices in the region do not have specialized ICW units.

There is one LICWAC and LICWAC-CPT that supports the Spokane, Colville, Republic, Newport and Lincoln County offices and both conduct staffings one time per week. Another LICWAC team supports the Omak, Wenatchee and Moses Lake offices and also staff cases one time per week. Cases requiring LICWAC staffings in the Clarkston and Colfax offices are frequently staffed with the Nez Perce Tribe, located across the Idaho/Washington border.

VI. Characteristics of the ICW Cases Reviewed in Region 1

A. Programs Reviewed

The Region 1 ICW Case Review was conducted September 21, 2009 through September 24, 2009.

A random sample of 35 Children's Administration cases was reviewed. Cases were eligible for the sample pull if the child or parent was identified as Native American in FamLink. Cases reviewed were open during one or more of the months of December 2008 through May 2009. Cases in the program areas of Child Protective Services (CPS), Family Voluntary Services (FVS) and Child and Family Welfare Services (CFWS) were reviewed.

CPS Cases	FVS Cases	CFWS Cases	Total # of Cases
10	10	15	35

B. Offices Included in the Review

Office	Total # of Cases
Spokane	24
Moses Lake	3
Omak	3
Wenatchee	2
Colville	2
Ferry County (Republic)	1
Total	35

C. Tribal Affiliation of the Children Included in the Review

The child's Tribal affiliation included all Tribes identified by a parent or family member including:

- Tribes that have determined the child's Indian status;
- Tribes with whom the child's Indian status is still pending;
- Tribes identified by a parent or family member, with whom inquiry of Indian status was not completed with the Tribe.

Some children were identified as having more than one Tribal affiliation. In 15 out of 35 cases, multiple Tribes were identified. Below is a list of all Tribes identified in the Region 1 case review.

Tribe	Total # of Children
Apache: White Mountain Apache Tribe	1
Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation	2
Blackfeet Nation	4
Cherokee Nation	2
Chippewa: Bad River Band Of Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians	1
Chippewa: Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation	1
Chippewa: Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana (Not Federally Recognized)	2
Chippewa: Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians	4
Coeur d' Alene Tribe	2
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	15
Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Nation	2
Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation	2
Crow Tribe of Indians	1
Fort Belknap Indian Reservation - Gros Ventre	3
Klamath Tribes	1
Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin	1
Nez Perce Tribe	2

Penticton Indian Band – Canada	1
Puyallup Tribe of Indians	1
Quinault Indian Nation	1
Sioux: Oglala Sioux Tribe	1
Sioux: Standing Rock Sioux Tribe	1
Sioux: Yankton Sioux Tribe	1
Spokane Tribe of Indians	2
Sun'aq Tribe of Kodiak	1
Three Affiliated Tribes - Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Nation	1
Walker River Paiute Tribe	1

D. Children from Washington Tribes

Children were identified as Indian children from Washington State Tribes, Indian children from out-of-state Tribes or children having Tribal affiliation with both Washington state and out-of-state Tribes. This was done in an effort to assess if there were practice and compliance differences when serving Washington State Indian children and children from out of state Tribes.

Tribal Affiliations of Children	Total # of Children
Washington State Tribes	13
Out-of-State Tribes	14
Both Washington State and Out-of-State Tribes	8
Total	35

There were no cases in which the parent indicated Indian status but the Tribe was unknown.

VII. Region One ICW Case Review Results

A. Comparison of State and Region 1 Averages

The following results were the averages for each of the nine sections. Results below compare the 2007 statewide averages to the 2009 statewide and regional averages. The results are the fully achieved averages in each of the nine sections. Many sections contain multiple questions. The average for each section was obtained through dividing the number of cases that were fully achieved for all questions in each section by the total number of applicable cases.

The 2007 review included cases that were in Tribal court. After consultation with the Office of the Attorney General and CA ICW program managers, it was decided that the 2009 review would exclude cases in Tribal court. Tribal court orders take precedent over ICWA and CA ICW policy. This change may have led to a variance in some of the results.

Section		State Results		Region 1 Results	
		2007	2009	2007	2009
1	Inquiry of Indian Status <i>(Questions 1-6)</i>	57%	68%	59%	82%
2	Engagement of Family and Tribes <i>(Questions 7-13)</i>	55%	52%	71%	72%
3	Maintaining Cultural Connections <i>(Questions 14-17)</i>	55%	56%	61%	73%
4	Voluntary Placement <i>(Questions 18-21)</i>	54%	55%	71%	N/A
5	Dependency <i>(Questions 22-23)</i>	45%	31%	44%	41%
6	Tribal Placement Preference <i>(Questions 24-26)</i>	74%	69%	70%	70%
7	Safety <i>(Question 27)</i>	69%	77%	68%	83%
8	Well-Being <i>(Question 28)</i>	77%	73%	78%	91%
9	Permanency <i>(Question 29)</i>	81%	75%	94%	84%

B. Region One Results for Each Case Review Question

Some questions had partially achieved ratings, and some did not. Partial compliance was used for some questions when half or more, but not all, of the required activities occurred.

Section 1: Inquiry of Indian Status

Question #1	Were efforts made to discover the child's American Indian/Alaska Native/Canadian Indian/Metis status by asking the father/Indian custodian and or the paternal relatives, about the child's Indian status?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	58%	72%	63%	79%
Total Applicable Cases	142 cases	172 cases	19 cases	29 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- 0 80% fully achieved (8 out of 10 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 73% fully achieved (8 out of 11 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 88% fully achieved (7 out of 8 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #2	Were efforts made to discover the child's American Indian/Alaska Native/Canadian Indian/Metis status by asking the mother/Indian custodian and or the maternal relatives about the child's Indian status?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	87%	97%	92%	100%
Total Applicable Cases	172 cases	214 cases	25 cases	35 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- 0 100% fully achieved (13 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 100% fully achieved (14 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 100% fully achieved (8 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #3	If the parent(s) and/or relatives indicated American Indian/Alaska Native/Canadian Indian/Metis status, were inquiry letters sent to all Tribes or the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to determine the child's Indian status?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	51%	69%	41%	83%
Partially Achieved*	21%	19%	22%	6%
Total Applicable Cases	173 cases	216 cases	27 cases	35 cases

* Cases were rated partially achieved when inquiry letters were sent to some, but not all of the Tribes identified.

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- 0 77% fully achieved (10 out of 13 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 79% fully achieved (11 out of 14 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 100% fully achieved (8 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #4	If the child's Tribe(s) was known, was the Tribe(s) contacted no later than one working day following discovery of the Tribe's identity?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	37%	40%	45%	62%
Total Applicable Cases	141 cases	181 cases	20 cases	34 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- 0 62% fully achieved (8 out of 13 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 62% fully achieved (8 out of 13 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 63% fully achieved (5 out of 8 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #5	If the Tribe(s) or BIA did not provide verification of Indian status within 30 days, was a second written request or telephone contact made with the Tribe(s) or BIA?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	33%	49%	25%	82%
Partially Achieved*	21%	13%	50%	-
Total Applicable Cases	39 cases	63 cases	4 cases	11 cases

* Cases were rated partially achieved when a second contact to verify Indian status was made with some, but not all Tribes.

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- Ø 100% fully achieved (2 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- Ø 83% fully achieved (5 out of 6 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- Ø 67% fully achieved (2 out of 3 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #6	Was the case staffed at LICWAC, for determination of non-Indian status, if there was no response from the Tribe(s) or the child's Tribe was unknown?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	38%	46%	60%	100%
Total Applicable Cases	29 cases	28 cases	5 cases	2 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- Ø 100% fully achieved (1 case) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- Ø 100% fully achieved (1 case) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- Ø No cases for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Section 2: Engagement of Family and Tribe(s)

Question #7	If the child was a member of a Washington State Tribe(s), was the Tribe(s) contacted to discuss exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction within one working day?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	41%	32%	0%	73%
Partially Achieved*	11%	5%	33%	-
Total Applicable Cases	66 cases	98 cases	3 cases	15 cases

*Cases were rated partially achieved when the Washington State Tribe was contacted to discuss jurisdiction after one working day, but within ten days.

Question #8	Were ongoing “active efforts” made to involve the identified father(s)/Indian custodian and/or the paternal relatives in major decisions and in the development of the case plan?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	46%	48%	73%	57%
Partially Achieved	24%	18%	20%	13%
Total Applicable Cases	117 cases	149 cases	15 cases	23 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child’s Tribal affiliation:

- 0 67% fully achieved (4 out of 6 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 64% fully achieved (7 out of 11 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 33% fully achieved (2 out of 6 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #9	Were ongoing “active efforts” made to involve the mother/Indian custodian and/or the maternal relatives in major decisions and in the development of the case plan?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	70%	66%	81%	79%
Partially Achieved	17%	26%	19%	21%
Total Applicable Cases	131 cases	192 cases	16 cases	28 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child’s Tribal affiliation:

- 0 75% fully achieved (6 out of 8 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 77% fully achieved (10 out of 13 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 86% fully achieved (6 out of 7 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #10	Were ongoing “active efforts” made to involve the child(ren) in major decisions and in the development of the case plan?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	56%	48%	100%	58%
Partially Achieved	24%	30%	-	25%
Total Applicable Cases	72 cases	91 cases	6 cases	12 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child’s Tribal affiliation:

- 0 100% fully achieved (2 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 63% fully achieved (5 out of 8 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 0% fully achieved (0 out of 2 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #11	Were there ongoing “active efforts” to include the child’s Tribe(s) in case planning?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	47%	43%	63%	77%
Partially Achieved	21%	25%	13%	17%
Total Applicable Cases	131 cases	173 cases	16 cases	30 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child’s Tribal affiliation:

- 0 89% fully achieved (8 out of 9 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 71% fully achieved (10 out of 14 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 71% fully achieved (5 out of 7 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #12	Were there ongoing “active efforts” to provide social services to the family to maintain the child in the parental home or allow the child to safely return home?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	64%	63%	69%	79%
Partially Achieved	25%	26%	31%	17%
Total Applicable Cases	118 cases	192 cases	16 cases	29 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child’s Tribal affiliation:

- 0 75% fully achieved (6 out of 8 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 79% fully achieved (11 out of 14 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 86% fully achieved (6 out of 7 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #13	If the Tribe(s) or LICWAC did not agree with the department's case plan for the child, was an impasse staffing held?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	-	-	-	-
Partially Achieved	-	-	-	-
Total Applicable Cases	<i>No applicable cases</i>	<i>No applicable cases</i>	<i>No applicable cases</i>	<i>No applicable cases</i>

This question was intended to measure if the impasse procedures outlined in the Washington State ICW manual are being adhered to when the Tribe and/or LICWAC did not agree with the department's case plan.

For both the 2007 and the 2009 ICW case reviews, there were no cases that documented an impasse. For 2009, there were several cases in which it appeared that the Tribe did not agree with the department's case plan, however rather than utilizing the impasse procedure, the Tribe took jurisdiction of the case, the case transferred to Tribal court and the case plan changed direction.

Section 3: Maintaining Cultural Connections

Question #14	Were “active efforts” made to identify and encourage the involvement of community services and resources specifically for Indian families?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	49%	44%	50%	63%
Partially Achieved	12%	14%	5%	17%
Total Applicable Cases	138 cases	176 cases	22 cases	30 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child’s Tribal affiliation:

- 0 78% fully achieved (7 out of 9 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 57% fully achieved (8 out of 14 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 57% fully achieved (4 out of 7 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #15	If the child was placed in out-of-home care, were there ongoing efforts to encourage and support the child’s contact with his/her parents and extended family members?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	69%	78%	88%	88%
Partially Achieved	23%	17%	6%	12%
Total Applicable Cases	94 cases	102 cases	16 cases	17 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child’s Tribal affiliation:

- 0 100% fully achieved (6 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 88% fully achieved (7 out of 8 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 67% fully achieved (2 out of 3 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #16	If the child was placed in out-of-home care, were ongoing efforts made to encourage and support the child's participation in Tribal customs and activities?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	51%	46%	55%	63%
Partially Achieved	6%	10%	-	6%
Total Applicable Cases	95 cases	93 cases	18 cases	16 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- 0 80% fully achieved (4 out of 5 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 50% fully achieved (4 out of 8 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 67% fully achieved (2 out of 3 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #17	Was the case staffed with LICWAC for case planning if the child's Tribe(s) was not available, unknown or the Tribe(s) requested the case be staffed with the LICWAC?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	55%	75%	54%	91%
Partially Achieved	8%	2%	8%	-
Total Applicable Cases	62 cases	48 cases	13 cases	11 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- 0 100% fully achieved (3 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 83% fully achieved (5 out of 6 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 100% fully achieved (2 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Section 4: Voluntary Placement

Question #18	If the child was placed under a Voluntary Placement Agreement (VPA), was a court Validation Hearing was held?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	100%	17%	100%	N/A
Total Applicable Cases	4 cases	6 cases	2 cases	0 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

There were no cases reviewed that applied to this item in Region 1.

Question #19	If there was a court Validation Hearing, was the Tribe(s) notified at least five (5) business days in advance of filing the Petition for Validation?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	25%	100%	50%	N/A
Partially Achieved*	25%	0%	50%	N/A
Total Applicable Cases	4 cases	1 case	2 cases	0 cases

*Cases were rated partially achieved when the Tribe was notified less than five business days prior to filing the Petition for Validation.

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

There were no cases reviewed that applied to this item in Region 1.

Question #20	Were copies of the Voluntary Placement Agreement (VPA) sent to the non-consenting parent/Indian custodian prior to filing the Petition of Validation with the court?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	25 %	N/A	50%	N/A
Total Applicable Cases	4 cases	0 cases	2 cases	0 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

There were no cases reviewed that applied to this item in Region 1.

Question #21	If the parent withdrew their consent to the Voluntary Placement Agreement (VPA), was the child returned to the parent's care or taken into custody?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Total Applicable Cases	1 case	4 cases	1 cases	0 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

There were no cases reviewed that applied to this item in Region 1.

Section 5: Dependency

Question #22	Was the child's Federally Recognized Tribe(s), Band or Nation or the BIA, if the child's Tribe is unknown, notified 15 working days prior to all court hearings?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	43%	22%	36%	38%
Partially Achieved*	20%	30%	7%	25%
Total Applicable Cases	89 cases	100 cases	14 cases	16 cases

* Cases were rated partially achieved when the Tribe was notified 15 working days in half or more of the court hearings, or when a Tribal representative was present at the court hearing, but it could not be determined when the Tribe was notified.

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- Ø 20% fully achieved (1 out of 5 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- Ø 50% fully achieved (4 out of 8 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- Ø 33% fully achieved (1 out of 3 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #23	If the child's parent(s)/ Indian custodian or Tribe requested a transfer of jurisdiction to Tribal court, did the department support the request?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	83%	93%	100%	100%
Total Applicable Cases	6 cases	15 cases	2 cases	1 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- Ø 100% fully achieved (1 case) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.

Section 6: Tribal Placement Preference

Question #24	Was the Tribe(s) asked for their placement preference regarding the child?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	59%	51%	54%	53%
Partially Achieved*	7%	6%	7%	13%
Total Applicable Cases	86 cases	94 cases	13 cases	15 cases

*Cases were rated partially achieved when some but not all of the Tribes were asked their placement preference for the child.

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- Ø 75% fully achieved (3 out of 4 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- Ø 50% fully achieved (4 out of 8 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- Ø 33% fully achieved (1 out of 3 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #25	Was the placement recommendation of the child's Tribe(s) followed?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	91%	96%	100%	89%
Total Applicable Cases	44 cases	45 cases	6 cases	9 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- Ø 100% fully achieved (2 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- Ø 80% fully achieved (4 out of 5 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- Ø 100% fully achieved (2 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Question #26	Were the relatives, identified by the Tribe(s), assessed as to their appropriateness as a placement resource?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	89%	83%	75%	83%
Partially Achieved*	3%	8%	25%	-
Total Applicable Cases	37 cases	36 cases	4 cases	6 cases

* Cases were rated partially achieved when some but not all of the relatives identified by the Tribe were assessed as to their appropriateness as a placement resource.

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- 0 100% fully achieved (2 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 67% fully achieved (2 out of 3 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 100% fully achieved (1 case) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Section 7: Safety

This section measures if there was an adequate response to risk of harm either in the child's home or in out-of-home care through the following activities when appropriate:

- Thorough investigative activities
- Responding to safety concerns identified by the child's Tribe
- Offering or providing services targeted at the identified risk in the family
- Safety planning
- Adequate monitoring of the children
- Removing the child from the home when necessary
- Assessing and responding to safety concerns in the child's out of home placement
- Completion of background clearances as needed

Question #27	Were efforts made to adequately assess and address the risk and safety concerns for the child(ren)?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	69%	77%	68%	83%
Total Applicable Cases	168 cases	217 cases	25 cases	35 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- 0 77% fully achieved (10 out of 13 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 86% fully achieved (12 out of 14 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 88% fully achieved (7 out of 8 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Section 8: Well-Being

The Well-Being section measures if the child's needs were adequately assessed, and if needs were identified for the child, was there was adequate follow up to address the child's needs. This may be through additional assessments or by offering or providing services in the following domains when relevant to the case:

- Physical health
- Education
- Mental health
- Developmental delays
- Other identified needs.

Question #28	Were the needs of the child adequately assessed, and were appropriate services offered or provided to meet the child's needs?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	77%	73%	78%	91%
Partially Achieved	11%	21%	4%	6%
Total Applicable Cases	159 cases	213 cases	27 cases	35 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- 0 92% fully achieved (12 out of 13 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- 0 93% fully achieved (13 out of 14 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- 0 88% fully achieved (7 out of 8 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

Section 9: Permanency

This section measures if in the last year, sufficient and timely steps were taken to complete the permanent plan of:

- Return home
- Guardianship
- Adoption/Customary Adoption
- Third party custody with relatives
- Long Term Foster Care Agreement
- Independent Living

Question #29	If the child was in care over 60 days, were there sufficient and timely steps taken to complete the permanent plan?			
	State Results		Region 1 Results	
	2007	2009	2007	2009
Fully Achieved	81 %	75%	94%	84%
Total Applicable Cases	99 cases	104 cases	18 cases	19 cases

The percentages below break out the Region one results by the child's Tribal affiliation:

- ∅ 88% fully achieved (7 out of 8 cases) for Indian children from Washington State Tribes.
- ∅ 100% fully achieved (8 cases) for Indian children from out-of-state Tribes.
- ∅ 33% fully achieved (1 out of 3 cases) for Indian children from both Washington and out-of state Tribes.

VIII. Kinship and Foster Care Placement

According to the Report on Racial Disproportionality in Washington State, Native American children are more likely to be removed from home, and remain in care for over two years.

In accordance with the Indian Child Welfare Act, CA ICW policy establishes the following order of placement preference for Indian children:

- A member of the child’s extended family (see definition of kinship care)
- A foster home licensed, approved, or specified by the child’s Tribe
- An Indian foster home licensed or certified by DSHS (one of the foster parents is a member of a federally recognized Indian Tribe, Alaska Native or Canadian First Nations)

A component was added to the 2009 Indian Child Welfare case review on type of placement. This element documents whether children in the case review sample were placed in kinship care versus placed in foster care.

Type of Placement	Kinship and Foster Care	
	State Results	Region 1 Results
	2009	2009
	Kinship Care	52% (54)
Foster Care	48% (50)	37% (7)
Total # of children	104	19

Definitions:

Kinship care

Placement of a child with:

- i. An adult who is the Indian child's grandparent, aunt, uncle, brother, sister, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, niece, nephew, first or second cousin, or step-parent, even following termination of the marriage;
- ii. An individual, defined by the law or custom of the child's Tribe, as a relative of the child;
- iii. An individual, not related by blood or marriage, who has taken an active part in the care giving of the child and for whom the child has developed a sustained psychological bond.

Foster care

Placement of a child in a home or facility that is required to be licensed or state certified.

IX. Region one ICW Trends

A. Strengths/Areas of Progress

1. There were increased efforts made to discover the child's Indian status by asking both the father or paternal relatives and the mother or maternal relatives about Native American ancestry. Asking the father increased from 63% to 79% and asking the mother increased from 92% to 100%. (*Questions 1 and 2*)
2. In 83% of the cases reviewed, inquiry letters were sent to all identified Tribes or there was verification of the child's Indian status from all Tribes in the case file. (*Question 3*)
3. Active efforts to include the child's Tribe(s) in the case planning process increased from 63% to 77%. (*Question 11*)
4. In 88% of the cases, if the child was placed in out-of-home care, ongoing efforts to encourage and support the child's contact with his/her parents and extended family members were made. An additional 12% of the cases were rated partially achieved as there were documented efforts to involve one of the parents but not both. (*Question 15*)
5. In 91% of the cases reviewed, the case was staffed with LICWAC for case planning if the child's Tribe(s) was not available, unknown or the Tribe(s) requested the case be staffed. (*Question 17*)
6. In 83% of the cases reviewed, ongoing efforts were made to adequately assess and address the risk and safety concerns for the child(ren). (*Question 27*)
7. In 91% of the cases reviewed, the needs of the child were adequately assessed and appropriate services were offered or provided to meet the child's needs. (*Question 28*)

B. Areas Needing Improvement

1. In 62% of the cases reviewed, if the child's Tribe was known, the Tribe(s) was contacted no later than one working day following discovery of the Tribe's identity. (*Question 4*)
2. Active efforts to involve the father and/or paternal relatives in the development of the case plan occurred in 57% of the cases, an additional 13% of the cases were rated partially achieved. (*Question #8*)
3. Active efforts to involve the child in the development of the case plan decreased from 100% to 58%. An additional 25% of the cases were rated partially achieved. (*Question #10*)

4. In 63% of cases, active efforts were made to identify and encourage the involvement of community services and resources specifically for Indian families. An additional 17% of cases were rated partially achieved. (*Question 14*)
5. In 63% of the cases reviewed if the child was placed in out-of-home care, ongoing efforts were made to encourage and support the child's participation in Tribal customs and activities. (*Question 16*)
6. In 38% of the cases reviewed the child's Tribe, Band or Nation or the BIA, if the child's Tribe was unknown, was notified 15 working days prior to all court hearings. (*Question 22*)
7. In 53% of the cases, the Tribe was asked for their placement preference regarding the child. (*Question #24*)