Child and Family Services Reviews

CJI Team Training July 15 and 18, 2008

Christeen Borsheim, DHS Larry Wojciak, DHS



Presentation Topics

CFSR Overview
Review Federal Data Indicators
Open to questions

Minnesota's CFSR History

- MN's first CFSR 2001
- Program improvement plan successfully completed fall 2004
- MN's second CFSR 2007
- Required greater collaboration with courts, youth and tribes

CFSR Process

- Three stages:
- Statewide Assessment
- Onsite Review
- Program Improvement Plan

Statewide Assessment

- Examine CW Performance & Systemic Factors
- Analysis of performance on federal data indicators
- Discuss and evaluate CW infrastructure in terms of seven systemic factors
- Review policy and practice per safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes

Seven Systemic Factors

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

Case Review System

- Item 25: Written Case Plan
- Item 26: Periodic Reviews
- Item 27: Permanency Hearings
- Item 28: Termination of Paternal Rights
- Item 29: Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers

Onsite Review

- Evaluate case specific performance at thee sites: Carlton, Hennepin and Washington Counties
- 64 Cases: 40 placement and 24 in-home
- Interview stakeholders at three sites and state
- Share preliminary findings at exit conferences

(FED VERSION 2007)

Safety

Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect

Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

Item 1: Timelines of initiating assessments Item 2: Repeat make atment hem 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care
hem 4: Risk assessment and safety management

Permanency

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

- Item 5: Foster Care re-entries
- Item 6: Stability of foster care placement
- Item 7: Permanency goal for child
- Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives

Item 9: Adoption

Item 10: Other planned living arrangement

Outcome P2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

- **item 11:** Proximity of foster care placement
- Hem 12: Placement with siblings
- Item 13: Visits with parents and siblings in foster care
- hem 14: Preservation of connections
- **Hem 15:** Relative placement
- Hem 16: Relationship of child in care with parents

Well-Being

Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents and foster parents

Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning

Item 19: Worker visits with child

Item 20: Workervisits with parent(s)

Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs. Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

Hem 23: Mental/behavioral health of the child

hem 22: Physical health of the child

Item 21: Educational needs of the child

•

Outcome P1: Children Have Permanency and Stability...

- Item 5: Foster care re-entry
- Item 6: Stability of foster care placement
- Item 7: Permanency goal for child
- Item 8:Reunification, guardianship or permanent placement with relatives
- Item 9: Adoption
- Item 10: Other planned living arrangement (LTFC)

Program Improvement Plan

- Address areas determined in need of improvement
- Negotiate performance targets with Children's Bureau
- PIP two year duration quarterly reporting requirement
- Potential financial sanctions if targets not reached

Program Improvement Plan, Cont...

Federal Guidance

- Develop broad PIP strategies that impact multiple systems and areas of practice
- Identify concrete action steps and benchmarks
- Use qualitative and quantitative measures to evaluate progress on an ongoing basis
- Collaborate with key partners: counties, courts and tribes.

Primary Sources of Information

Statewide Assessment Federal Performance Indicators □ Systemic Factors Case Review Performance Outcomes and Items Stakeholder Interviews □ Systemic Factors



Before We Talk About Data!

- Important to keep in mind: the data are about children!
- Each measure expresses a result that we seek to achieve
- Focus should remain on improving practice because good case work/court practices will produce good outcomes
- Data are used to measure the effects of practice and progress toward achieving outcomes; data are tools to inform or guide decisions about practice and policy

Types of Performance Data

National Standards □ 2 Safety Indicators 4 Permanency Composites 7 Components and 15 Measures ■ 75th or 25th Percentile Performance Standard □ 15 Permanency Measures

Establishing National Standards

- NCANDS and AFCARS files (SSIS)
- 2003 and 2004 data
- National standards for composites are set at the 75th percentile, based on performance across states.

Performance standards for measures are set at the 75th / 25th percentile, based on performance across states.

State Performance 2007

Data Indicators/Composites	National Standard	Mn Performance
Maltreatment Recurrence	94.6%	94.7%
CA/N in Foster Care	99.68%	99.59%
Timeliness/Permanency of Reunification	122.6	117.5
Timeliness of Adoptions	106.4	94.9
Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care	121.7	104.5
Placement Stability	101.5	87.9

SUMMARY OF MN PERFORMANCE ON FEDERAL MEASURES 2007	National Standard	↑ ↓	MN Performance 2007
Permanency Composite 1: Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification	122.6	↑	117.5
Component A: Timeliness of Reunification			
C1.1 Reunification in less than 12 months for children exiting foster care	75.2%	1	87.1%
C1.2 Median stay in foster care to reunification (months)	5.4	\rightarrow	3.9
C1.3 Entry cohort of children who reunify in <12 months	48.4%	↑	53.2%
Component B: Permanency of Reunification			
C1.4 Children who exit and re-enter foster care in less than 12 months	9.9%	\rightarrow	24.6%

Permanency Composite 2: Timeliness of Adoptions	106.4	Ţ	94.9
Component A: Timeliness of Adoptions of Children Discharged From Foster Care			
C2.1 Adoption in less than 24 months for children exiting to adoption	36.6%	ſ	50.5%
C2.2 Median length of stay to adoption (months)	27.3	\downarrow	24.0
Component B: Adoption for Children Meeting ASFA Time- In-Care Requirements			
C2.3 Children in foster care for 17 or more months (on day 1 of FY) who were adopted by the end of the FY	22.7%	ſ	14.7%
C2.4 Children in foster care for 17 or more months (on day 1 of FY) who achieved legal freedom within 6 months of start of FY	10.9%	1	2.1%
Component C: Adoption of Children Who Are Legally Free for Adoption			
C2.5 Legally free children adopted in less than 12 mos	53.7%	\uparrow	37.6%

SUMMARY OF MN PERFORMANCE ON FEDERAL MEASURES 2007	National Standard		MN Performance 2007
Permanency Composite 3: Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care	121.7	↑	104.5
Component A: Achieving permanency for Children in Care for Extended Periods of Time			
C3.1 Children (age 17 during the FY) with TPR discharged from foster care to a permanent home prior to age 18	29.1%	1	15.1%
C3.2 Children (age 17 during the FY) in foster care 24+ months discharged to permanent home before the end of FY and age 18	98.0%	ſ	88.2%
Component B: Children Emancipated Who Were in Foster Care for Extended Periods Of Time			
C3.3 Children emancipated/age 18 who were in foster care for 3 years or longer	37.5%	Ļ	38.6%

Permanency Composite 4: Placement Stability (no components)	101.5	↑	87.9
C4.1 Two or fewer placement settings for children in foster care less than 12 months	86.0%	Î	82.6%
C4.2 Two or fewer placement settings for children in foster care for 12 to 24 months	65.4%	1	51.4%
C4.3 Two or fewer placement settings for children in foster care for 24+ months	41.8%	↑	30.0%

Thank you!

- Questions
- Christeen Borsheim
 - □ Christeen.borsheim@state.mn.us
- Larry Wojciak

□ Larry.wojciak@state.mn.us