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C-CFSR Process

- Annual Progress Reports
- County Self-Assessment
- System Improvement Plan
- Peer Review

technical assistance
The System Improvement Plan (SIP)

- An agreement between the CDSS and the county.

- Developed every 5 years by lead agencies in collaboration with their local stakeholders.

- Based on the findings from the self-assessment and peer review, provides an outline for how the county will improve their system of care for children & families.

- Identifies how programs and services funded with CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF funds will address priority needs within the CWS continuum.
LA County’s System Improvement Goals

1. CFSR 3-S2 Recurrence of Maltreatment

2. CFSR 3-P1 Permanency in 12 Months for Children Entering Foster Care

3. County Case Review Items 12 & 13

4. Enhance Quality Assurance System
In 2016:

- 2,304,521 children in the County (ages 0-17)
- 126,859 children referred for child maltreatment (55 children per 1,000)
- 23,768 children with substantiated maltreatment (10 children per 1,000)
- 9,619 children who entered foster care (4 children per 1,000)
### Early CQI
- Data-Driven Decision Making (DDDM) Objectives
- DDDM Guiding Principles
- Data Champions

### SIP Development & Launch
- Self Assessment & Peer Review Processes
- Integration of Qualitative Data
- SIP Stakeholder Conference

### Berkeley “Data Train” Trainings
- Connecting Performance to Vision and Measurement
- Review of Quantitative and Qualitative CFSR Outcomes

### Regional Engagement
- STAT Meetings (with example materials)
- LOG Meetings
- Regional data trainings
Early CQI

- Data-Driven Decision Making (DDDM) Objectives
- DDDM Guiding Principles
- Data Champions
DDDM Objectives

1. Establish and monitor common measures for priority safety, permanency and well-being outcomes (via a “dashboard”) at all levels of the department

2. Collecting, disseminating, and assessing quantitative and qualitative information on key outcome measure to better understand: (a) what is working well, and (b) what needs to be improved at each level of the department in order to achieve priority DCFS outcomes

3. Engaging DCFS staff and stakeholders in ongoing learning at all levels of the organization, thereby enabling them to craft, implement and refine strategies based on relevant and timely information.
DDDM Guiding Principles

Create a safe and continuous learning environment.

Process must include the rigor to know the story behind the data. Numbers are not sufficient.

Willingness to learn, grow, and change.

Divisions and regions must be unified and address data cohesively.

Managers should advocate for children, families and communities they are servicing.

Data should be transparent and shared with internal and external stakeholders.

Accountability: Know your data and be prepared to explain it, take action, and demonstrate follow through.

Requires not just point in time data, but trend data.
Data Champions

- An extension of the Data Partnership since July 2012

- Regional office representatives with specialized training in supporting local offices in utilizing the DDDM language, addressing questions, and adopting data practices

- Role:
  - Advocating for the DDDM process and knowledge resources while supporting ongoing implementation efforts, including the coordination of Office STAT meetings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early CQI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Data-Driven Decision Making (DDDM) Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DDDM Guiding Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data Champions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIP Development &amp; Launch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Self Assessment &amp; Peer Review Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integration of Qualitative Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SIP Stakeholder Conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CFSR Self Assessment & Peer Review Processes

- Stakeholder engagement remains key

- Development of the SIP provided the Office of Outcomes & Analytics an opportunity to demonstrate CQI as a process
  - Plan = Self-Assessment
  - Do = Peer Review
  - Study = Examine Results of Peer Review
  - Act = Writing and Editing of SIP

- Peer Review – A Qualitative Approach
  - 1 full week
  - 100 people
  - 5-7 counties
  - 30 case reviews
  - Interviews with the staff
  - Focus groups with the youth
Integration of Qualitative Data in SIP

- LA County staff recognized that the quantitative goals identified in the SIP (S2 and P1) were tied to child, parent, and caregiver engagement in development of the family case plan.

- To make this explicit, and to encourage continuous monitoring, LA included improvement to Case Review items pertaining to assessment and service provision (Case Review Item 12 A-C) and engagement during case planning (Item 13) in their System Improvement Plan.

- Beginning in April 2016, DCFS began capturing information gathered from qualitative case review. Following the state process, randomly selected cases are reviewed on a quarterly basis by certified County reviewers and the data captured and reviewed using the CFSR Onsite Review Instrument (ORI).

- These data are reviewed and compared to baseline performance regularly.
SIP Stakeholder Conference

- Planned and held jointly by Child Welfare & Probation
- Attendees are stakeholders, not staff (approx. 300 people)
  - Community-based organizations, faith-based leaders, members of the Director’s Advisory Council, Relative caregivers, Parents, Youth, Counseling agencies, FFAs, court staff and commissioners, etc.
- Sharing & Listening
  - Review of data
  - Goals
  - Strategies
  - Stakeholder feedback
Early CQI

- Data-Driven Decision Making (DDDM) Objectives
- DDDM Guiding Principles
- Data Champions

SIP Development & Launch

- Self Assessment & Peer Review Processes
- Integration of Qualitative Data
- SIP Stakeholder Conference

Berkeley “Data Train” Trainings

- Connecting Performance to Vision and Measurement
- Review of Quantitative and Qualitative CFSR Outcomes
Making Connections

• Child welfare staff are aware of the outcomes under strategic focus and why.

• They understand how county plans/programs are supposed to help them influence these outcomes.

• Child welfare staff know how outcomes are measured.

• They know which groups are most impacted by outcomes.

• They connect their daily activities to these outcomes.
Mission

**Connect** current practice to best practice and desired outcomes

- This training attempts to get at this final, most difficult, but essential process by engaging child welfare staff in thinking about outcome measurement and system improvement in their daily work.

- This training also helps child welfare staff understand how their work is understood in a national and historical context, related to outcome measures, and how quantitative outcomes are related to qualitative outcomes.

- Finally, this training will show child welfare staff how to track and understand child welfare outcome data.
S2: Recurrence of maltreatment*

Children with a substantiated allegation during the 12-month period: 6

Children with another substantiated allegation within 12 months: 3

Performance (P1): 50%

National Standard: <=9.1%
P1: Permanency in 12 months for children entering*

- Children entering care during the year: 6
- Children achieving permanency within 12 months: 4
- Performance (P1): 67%
- National Standard: >=40.5%
Case Review Outcomes Example

- **Case Review Item 12**: Needs and Services of Child (12A), Parents (12B), and Foster Parents (12C)
- **CR Item 13**: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning
- **CR Item 14**: Caseworker Visits with Child
- **CR Item 15**: Caseworker Visits with Parents
Case Review Item 12A
Needs & Services of Children
Strengths Ratings

- Engage with youth, even if initially rejected
- Not just SDM
- Spend adequate time
- Collect information and follow up
- Provide culturally appropriate services, not referrals
- Break through barriers
Case Review Item 12B

Needs & Services of Parents

Strengths Ratings

- Find parents whose whereabouts are unknown
- Engage with parents, even if initially rejected or parents are incarcerated
- Not just SDM
- Spend adequate time
- Collect information and follow up
- Provide culturally appropriate services, not referrals
- Break through barriers
Case Review Item 12C
Needs & Services of Caregivers
Strengths Ratings

- Conduct timely home approvals
- Visit caregivers (at least monthly)
- Consider caregivers’ skills and needs
- Talk about:
  - Placement stability
  - Permanency options
  - Court process
  - Progress of case
  - Visitation
- Include caregivers in children’s services (Regional Center, Wraparound, etc.)
Case Review Item 13
Involvement in Case Planning
Strengths Ratings

- Parents are sought out, even non-custodial and incarcerated parents
- Continuous efforts are made to engage, even if initially rejected
- All parties are included, including school-age children
- Case Plan meetings are scheduled around the family
- Case Plans are:
  - Revisited often
  - Updated as needed (not just every 6-months)
  - Not generic
  - Not court-driven
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Early CQI
- Data-Driven Decision Making (DDDM) Objectives
- DDDM Guiding Principles
- Data Champions

SIP Development & Launch
- Self Assessment & Peer Review Processes
- Integration of Qualitative Data
- SIP Stakeholder Conference

Berkeley “Data Train” Trainings
- Connecting Performance to Vision and Measurement
- Review of Quantitative and Qualitative CFSR Outcomes

Regional Engagement
- STAT Meetings (with example materials)
- LOG Meetings
- Regional data trainings
Monthly STAT Meetings

- Standing meetings held at the department, bureau, and office level

- Presentations are made by regional office teams, with support from the Office of Outcomes & Analytics
  - Stat Meeting toolkit
  - Technical assistance

- Held to review priority department indicators, and to use case reviews to highlight and improve practice and outcomes within DCFS
  1. Quantitative Review
  2. Case Review with focus on CFSR items
  3. Case Review to highlight other areas of practice

- An opportunity for staff across the department to discuss best practices, key improvements and provide peer coaching to improve outcomes
Begin Example STAT Materials
Vermont Corridor Office Team

P1. Exit to Permanency in 12 Months for Children Entering Foster Care
Federal Measure 3-P1: Exit to Permanency in 12 Months
Los Angeles County: CY2005-2015
(higher rates preferred)

Data Source: 2017 DCFS Data-driven Decision Making (DDDM) LOG PowerPoint
UC Berkeley, Child Welfare Indicators Project (CWIP)
Presenter, Wendy Wiegmann, Ph.D.
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Federal Measure 3-P1 Exit to Permanency in 12 Months - Department
(Q3 2013 – Q3 2016)

P1. Permanency in 12 Months for Children Entering Foster Care
National Standard ≥ 46.5% | Performance: 34.0%

2-Quarter Daily Report

13-Quarter Trend Report

Data Source: Datamart pulled on 02/14/18
Federal Measure 3-P1: Exit to Permanency in 12 Months
By Race/Ethnicity
Los Angeles County: CY2005-2015

Data Source: 2017 DCFS Data-driven Decision Making (DDDM) LOG PowerPoint
UC Berkeley, Child Welfare Indicators Project (CWIP); Presenter, Wendy Wiegmann, Ph.D.
Federal Measure 3-P1 Exit to Permanency in 12 Months – Vermont Corridor (Q3 2013 – Q3 2016)

P1. Permanency in 12 Months for Children Entering Foster Care
National Standard ≥ 40.5% | Performance: 33.1%

2-Quarter Daily Report

13-Quarter Trend Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanency Children</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Children</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanency %</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Datamart pulled on 02/14/18
Vermont Corridor

- **Strengths in Permanency Efforts:**
  - Relative Placements
  - CPM Coaching
  - Concurrent Planning

- **Challenges/Areas of Need:**
  - Child and Family Team (CFT) Formation
  - Liberalization of visitation
  - Delay in securing permanency plan of adoption and/or legal guardianship
  - Limited resources in community
  - Complexities of family (e.g., multiple sustained allegations, acute mental health issues, domestic violence)
  - Court timeframes
Vermont Corridor

- **Plan of Action**
  - SDM Guidance/Supervision with SCSW
    - Train on proper use of FSNA to prioritize needs
    - Decrease fear/compliance-driven case decisions
    - Review SDM to verify decisions
    - Consistent use of SDM to address implicit bias
  - Strengthen Teaming Efforts
    - Continuous engagement of family members to identify additional supports (QSR)
    - Strengthen protective factors to liberalize visitation and reunify
    - Develop caregivers to be champions of reunification
    - CSW and SCSW participation in MCPC and Wraparound meetings
  - Court Hearings
    - Reminding staff that clock starts at the time of removal
Asian Pacific Program Team
Child and Family Services Review (CFSR)-
Case Review
Well-Being Outcome 1: Item 13
Federal Measure 3-P1 Exit to Permanency in 12 Months – Asian Pacific Program
(Q3 2013 – Q3 2016)

P1. Permanency in 12 Months for Children Entering Foster Care
National Standard: ≥ 40.5% | Performance: 49.0%

2-Quarter Daily Report

13-Quarter Trend Report

Data Source: Datamart pulled on 02/14/18
Children and Family Services Review (CFSR)- Case Review
Q4 2016 – Q3 2017: Well-Being Outcome 1

Item 13 measures ongoing efforts to engage children and parents in the case planning process through case closure, not whether a family ultimately resolves their needs that brought them to the attention of the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Item Title</th>
<th>CY2016- Q4 (n=22)</th>
<th>CY 2017-Q1 (n=25)</th>
<th>CY 2017- Q2 (n=26)</th>
<th>CY 2017-Q3 (n=24)</th>
<th>Total (n=97)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 13: Efforts to Engage Children, Mothers and Fathers in Case Planning</td>
<td>Strength 1</td>
<td>ANI 2</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>ANI</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With two exceptions, an item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 90% or more of the applicable cases reviewed were rated as Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies to those items. For a state to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95% or more of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome.

1 Area Needing Improvement

Data Source:: DCFS QI Section 02/02/2018
Lessons Learned From CFSR (October 2016-September 2017)
Item 13- Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

- A primary factor that can impact the rating in this item is ongoing engagement with parents about their needs and working with them to develop a strategy to help them meet their permanency and case plan goals.

- There is a need for ongoing discussions of case plans during monthly home visits and other contacts (phone calls) in between home visits.

- Case planning that focuses less on directives and compliance and more on building capacity and insight. Additionally it looks at case plans that evolve to meet the changing needs of children and parents and help families feel engaged in the process.
CFSR Points to Consider

Item 13- Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

- Case planning has to be discussed during monthly face-to-face contacts
- Children, even young school age-children, need to be engaged in case planning
- Families should be encouraged to identify and use their formal and informal supports.
- Family supports should be welcomed in the case planning process.
- Regular team meetings where all members feel comfortable discussing case plan goals.
- Families should be engaged in permanency planning throughout the case; including identifying and changing of permanency case goals.

Data Source:: DCFS QI Section 02/02/2018
Case Review

West Los Angeles Office
Federal Measure 3-P1 Exit to Permanency in 12 Months – West Los Angeles (Q3 2013 – Q3 2016)

Data Source: Datamart pulled on 02/14/18
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Office: West Los Angeles
Genogram - Focus Child: Kay

Office of Outcomes and Analytics/Strategic Planning Implementation
Office: West Los Angeles
Teamogram-Focus Child: Kay

Father
Maternal Grandmother
Maternal Great Aunt
Home Safe Worker
FP Worker
Mother
Paternal Grandmother
Godparents
Day Care Providers
Play Therapist
Foster Mother
CSW
Church Family
SCSW
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Timeline
Focus Child Kay

1st Court/DCFS case closed
07/20/16

5-Day referral received
10/02/16

ER interviews Mother
10/07/16

Removal warrant granted
10/19/16

Kay is placed in foster care
10/25/16

Kay is released back to Mother
01/31/17

Family Preservation begins
03/2017

Father is granted unmonitored visits
07/18/17

Court case closed
01/18/18
Lessons Learned

- Staff consistency provides continuity for the family.

- Importance of partnership with service providers and with court especially in cases with complex domestic violence issues.

- Balancing safety –vs- trauma
  - Utilization of SDM
  - Interoffice communication

- Engagement of fathers

- Insight –vs- Compliance
End Example STAT Materials
Annual LOG Meeting

“State of the County” address, with emphasis on generating energy for the coming year
- Activity over the past year on SIP and other data outcomes
- Current status on SIP and other data outcomes
- Breakout sessions to discuss resources and barriers
- Coming year efforts

An Evolving meeting
- 8th year
- In the first year, this meeting was focused on generating understanding about CQI as a process, then moved toward understanding key performance indicators, now about engaging external partners in continuing efforts toward improvement (SIP strategy)
Regional Data Trainings

- Provided by CA Child Welfare Indicators Project

- Showcases regional office (not LA County) data for SIP goals, broken out by various case and demographic factors to encourage deeper discussion of outcomes

- Similar to the data trainings provided at the county level, but with more emphasis on individual worker and supervisor practices

- Elicits discussion of existing resources and feedback about major barriers to improvement of identified outcomes
Building Connections Activity

Outcome
• Attendees are assigned an official outcome measuring child welfare performance.

Nuances
• Group examines the CCWIP website to understand how various groups are differentially affected. They examine other CCWIP reports that may be relevant to the outcome.

Resources & Barriers
• Groups brainstorm county resources available to influence these outcomes or measure proximate outcomes. They discuss barriers they have encountered in practice to implementing these resources.

Worker Action
• Groups strategize on how individual social workers can overcome barriers and implement the resources available to “move the needle” on their assigned outcome.
Questions?

Wendy Wiegmann
wendy.wiegmann@berkeley.edu

Silvia Salas
SALASS@dcfs.lacounty.gov
Thank You!

The California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP) is a collaboration of the California Department of Social Services and the School of Social Welfare, University of California at Berkeley, and is supported by the California Department of Social Services, Casey Family Programs, and the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation.