

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

CHILDREN'S DIVISION

P. O. BOX 88

JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI

October, 7, 2009

What's Inside:CFSR Mock
Review Results

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: REGIONAL EXECUTIVE STAFF, CIRCUIT MANAGERS, AND
CHILDREN'S DIVISION STAFF

FROM: PAULA NEESE, DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: CFSR MOCK REVIEW RESULTS

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this memo is to share statewide results of the case reviews which replicated the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR). These reviews were held in Cole County, June, 2009; Greene County, July 2009; St. Louis City, August, 2009; Jackson County, August, 2009.

Process

In preparing for the CFSR, the Children's Division developed a case review process similar to the federal process to gain insight into our practice prior to the actual on-site review scheduled for June 7-10, 2010. The case reviews were held in four sites selected as potential candidates for the actual CFSR.

In each of the chosen review sites twelve cases were reviewed for a total of 48 cases, randomly selected. Of these 48, 39 involved children in out-of-home care (both publicly and privately case managed) and 9 were family-centered service cases. Children's Division employees, juvenile officers, contractors, children advocates and foster parents formed teams and each team reviewed two cases. A review of the case file, interviews with key stakeholders and FACES provided the teams adequate information to complete a detailed questionnaire examining safety, permanency and well-being of children and families.

Results

The questionnaire is broken into seven domains with each domain consisting of several items and questions. The answers from the question determine the item score and the item scores determine the domain scores. The federal benchmark is based on the domain scores which must be at least 95% substantial achieved. Some cases did not apply to all items, therefore the score was rated "not applicable". The "not applicable" were *excluded* from the following percentage calculations.

Domain	Description	Substantially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
Safety 1	Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	79%	16%	5%
Safety 2	Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	68%	18%	14%
Perm 1	Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	39%	58%	3%
Perm 2	The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	66%	34%	0%
WB 1	Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	40%	48%	12%
WB 2	Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	85%	0%	15%
WB 3	Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	67%	0%	33%

Safety Discussion

Safety 1 measures these investigation/assessment elements: timeframes for initial face-to-face contact including all children in household and re-reporting of abuse.

Practice Strength:

- **94%** of the children reviewed were not re-maltreated

Practice Issues:

- **71%** of the cases reviewed met initial investigation/assessment timeframes and **85%** of the household children were seen with the 72 hours

Safety 2 measures these elements: concerted efforts to assess risk and safety concerns and services to prevent removal/re-entry

Practice Strength:

- **89%** of the cases reviewed had adequate services in place to prevent removal or re-entry into out-of-home care

Practice Issues:

- **31%** of the cases reviewed had no initial or ongoing safety or risk assessment completed on the child in care or children remaining in their home

Permanency Discussion

Permanency 1 measures these elements: re-entry into care, stability of the placement and the appropriateness, timeliness and supporting activities for the identified permanent/concurrent plan.

Practice Strength:

- **100%** of the children reviewed had not re-entered substitute care (foster, relative, residential, etc.)

Practice Issues:

- **55%** of the children reviewed had a change in foster care in the past 12 months

- **50%** of the out-of-home children reviewed had reached 15 of the last 22 months in care but no TPR had been filed and no compelling reasons documented in the file as required by law
- **50%** of children with a goal of adoption and in care over 24 months did not have circumstances justifying the adoption delay
- For those youth who had reached their 16th birthday and with a permanency goal of APPLA, **25%** were not provided services to adequately prepare the youth for independent living

Permanency 2 measures these elements: proximity of placement, placement with siblings, child's visitation plan, preserving connections and consideration of relative placements.

Practice Strengths:

- **100%** of foster children were placed in close proximity to preserve connections
- **97%** of foster children were placed with their siblings

Practice Issues:

- **39%** of the cases reviewed did not have sufficient inquiry and documentation regarding Indian heritage
- **79%** of the cases considered *maternal* relatives as a possible placement while only **60%** of *paternal* relatives were considered as a possible placement.
- **87%** of the cases reviewed demonstrated concerted efforts to nurture the relationship between the out-of-home child and his/her mother, while only **66%** demonstrated concerted efforts to nurture the relationship between the child and his/her father

Well Being Discussion

Well Being 1 measures these elements: assessment and appropriateness of needs identified and services provided for mothers, fathers and foster parents; child and family involvement in service planning and visits with parents.

Practice Issues:

- **67%** of the mothers were assessed initially or ongoing during the last 12 months; and **69%** of the mothers were receiving appropriate services per her identified needs
- **39%** of the fathers were assessed initially or ongoing during the last 12 months; and **48%** of the fathers were receiving appropriate services per his identified needs
- **81%** of children were involved in case planning activities (when age appropriate)
- **77%** of mothers were involved in case planning activities
- **51%** of fathers were involved in case planning activities
- **79%** of workers sufficiently visited children (based on policy and child's needs); **79%** of those visits were deemed quality visits (duration, address key issues, flexible location)
- **60%** of workers sufficiently visited mothers (based on policy and child's needs); **58%** of those visits were deemed quality visits (duration, address key issues, flexible location)
- **36%** of workers sufficiently visited fathers (based on policy and child's needs); **41%** of those visits were deemed quality visits (duration, address key issues, flexible location)

Well Being 2 measures appropriate educational needs and Well Being 3 measures adequate services to meet physical, mental and behavioral needs.

Practice Strengths:

- **85%** of the children reviewed had their educational needs met
- **91%** of the children reviewed had their mental/behavioral needs met








Practice Issues:

- **36%** did not receive or have documentation of the initial health screening
- **79%** of children reviewed had adequate dental care

- **72%** of foster parents were supplied with health records in a timely manner

Final Comparison

The chart below compares the 2009 mock findings to the CF SR Round One Results. There are some changes as illustrated by the increase and decrease arrows but the change is not statistically significant.

Domain	Description	2009 Mock Substantially Achieved	First Round Substantially Achieved	Changes
Safety 1	Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	79%	78.7%	
Safety 2	Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	68%	70.0%	
Perm 1	Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	39%	34.6%	
Perm 2	The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	66%	61.5%	
WB 1	Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	40%	42.0%	
WB 2	Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	85%	80.0%	
WB 3	Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	67%	71.4%	

Conclusions

The CF SR mock results provide insight for a unique learning opportunity for practice improvements. In addition, this information will be used as a basis for our upcoming statewide assessment.

We encourage each circuit to use this information in developing/revising as local program improvement plans and in the CQI process.

NECESSARY ACTION

1. Review this memorandum with all Children’s Division staff.
2. All questions should be cleared through normal supervisory channels and directed to:

PDS CONTACT Becky Porter 573 526-3735 Rebecca.L.Porter@dss.mo.gov	PROGRAM MANAGER Meliny Staysa, QA Manager 573 522-8303 Meliny.J.Staysa@dss.mo.gov
CHILD WELFARE MANUAL REVISIONS N/A	
FORMS AND INSTRUCTIONS N/A	
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS AND RESOURCES N/A	
RELATED STATUTE N/A	
ADMINISTRATIVE RULE N/A	
COUNCIL ON ACCREDITATION (COA) STANDARDS N/A	
CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES REVIEW (CFSR) CFSR Instrument	
<u>PROTECTIVE FACTORS</u> Parental Resilience Social Connections Knowledge of Parenting and Child Development Concrete Support in Times of Need Social and Emotional Competence of Children	
FACES REQUIREMENTS N/A	