

**Washington County/Tribe
Minnesota Child and Family Service Review**

Program Improvement Plan

I. General Information

County/Tribal Agency: Washington County Community Services		Address: 14949 62 nd St, Stillwater, MN 55082 Telephone Number: 651-430-6597
Primary Person Responsible for PIP: Sarah Amundson		E-mail Address: Sarah.Amundson@co.washington.mn.us Telephone Number: 651-430-6597
DHS Quality Assurance Contact: Wendy Woessner		E-mail Address: wendy.woessner@state.mn.us Telephone Number: 651-431-4726

To be completed by DHS:	
Date of Agency/DHS PIP Meeting: April 21, 2015	Date PIP Approved:
Due Dates for PIP Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update 1: January 30, 2016 • Update 2: April 30, 2016 • Update 3: July 31, 2016 • Update 4: October 31, 2016 	Date PIP Progress Reviews Received/Occurred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • •
PIP Completion Date:	

II. MnCFSR PIP Recommendations (as identified in the Exit Conference)

PIP RECOMMENDATIONS

SAFETY:

1. Timeliness of response to maltreatment report
2. Safely reduce rate of re-entry and support permanent reunification for children.

PERMANENCY:

3. Maintain children safely in their homes whenever possible and appropriate. Safely reduce use of short term placements of 1-7days

WELL BEING:

4. Achievement of timely permanency (including older youth and children in care for extended periods of time)
5. Children will have frequent, high quality visits with workers....

SYSTEMIC:

6. Maintain/enhance system of case review and quality assurance

Goal #1: Improve timeliness of response to reports of child maltreatment in all categories

Barriers identified in the review: No barriers were identified in CP cases reviewed in March 2015, but ratings for SCE in Q3 showed 84.6%.

Agency identified barriers: Law enforcement requesting time to conduct their investigations without our intervention continues to be a variable that impacts our ratings. Victims out of the county and with a non-offending caretaker or in a hospital setting also have impacted this rating.

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

2015 Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development)

Annual/Quarterly Performance Data (if applicable to PIP development)

Timeliness of Contact in Maltreatment Assessments & Investigations (Source: CW Data Dashboard)

	Baseline		PIP Updates			
	Q3 2014	Q4 2014	Q1 2015	Q2 2015		
SCE	84.6% 22/26	91.3% 42/46	98.1% 51/52	89.1% 41/46		
NSCE- Inv	NA	NA	100% 5/5	92.9% 13/14		
NSCE- FA	96.6% 86/89	100% 80/80	98% 96/98	97.2% 139/143		

Performance Goal/Method of Measurement:

90% of children will have face-to-face contact within statutory timelines, using the MN [CW Data Dashboard](#) as the method of measurement.

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
a. Supervisors will clarify, remind staff of expectations across all categories of response through supervision contacts and annual		1: 2: 3:

performance evaluations- Mary Farmer- Kubler and Nissa Knutson		4:
b. Workers will be trained/reminded about entering case notes regarding reasons if timelines are not met. - Mary Farmer- Kubler and Nissa Knutson.		1: 2: 3: 4:
c. Supervisors will monitor data on the dashboard quarterly and review SSIS "Time to Initial Contact with Victim" report and review with staff for accuracy monthly. - Mary Farmer- Kubler and Nissa Knutson.		1: 2: 3: 4:
d. Review of our contact expectations will be shared with Sherriffs Dept. and LE agencies. Mary Farmer-Kubler.		1: 2: 3: 4:

Goal # 2: Safely reduce rate of re-entry and support permanent reunification for children.

Barriers identified in the review: No barriers around re-entry were identified in the review.

Agency identified barriers:

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

2015 Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development)

Item 2: Services to Family to protect children in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.
100% of cases 10/10 were rated as a strength.

Annual/Quarterly Performance Data

County Performance on Federal Data Indicator:

	Nat'l Standard	2014 (Baseline)	2015 (Update)
C1.4 Children who exit and re-enter foster care in less than 12 months.	9.9	29.6% (29/98)	Q1 16.8% 17/101

Performance Goal/Method of Measurement:

Re-Entry Rate of 18% for children Re-entering foster care will be will be accomplished by December 31, 2016. C1.4 will be monitored quarterly in conjunction with our action steps below.

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
a. Examine data around re-entry to determine if children in short term placement are also contributing to re-entry numbers by August 31, 2015. John Nalezny and CRP members.		1: 2: 3: 4:
b. Explore transition planning from residential settings to home process, as well as collaboration with provider. Define specific		1: 2: 3:

steps to be covered. Completed by Kate Pape CMH by February 28, 2016.		4:
c. Based on this analysis of 2(a) a DAPIM/ CQI process will be scheduled to develop additional action steps by March 31, 2016. - John Nalezny Lead with participation from Children's Division and Stakeholders.		1: 2: 3: 4:
d. Ongoing technical assistance from DHS provided to Agency on ways to reduce Re-entry rate in to foster care . Participation of DHS Partners in the DAPIM/ CQI process by March. 31, 2016 . Wendy Woessner.		1: 2: 3: 4:
e. Based on the outcome of 2 c , the DAPIM/ CQI process above, detailed action steps will be created and reported on in this section by April 20 th , 2016.		
f. Based on our DAPIM/CQI process and Action Steps we plan to decrease our Re-entry into Foster Care Rate to 18% by September 30 th , 2016.		

Goal #3: Maintain children safely in their homes whenever possible and appropriate. Safely reduce use of short term placements of 1-7days

Barriers identified in the review: No barriers were identified in the review.

Agency identified barriers: Agency self assessment identified an interest in examining the increase in short term placements and developing actions steps to address the increase.

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

2015 Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development)

Annual/Quarterly Performance Data (if applicable to PIP development) DHS Child Welfare Report / County Data regarding children placed from 1- 7 days.

Length of placement episodes

Days	2012	2013	2014	
1-7 days	27.4% 31/113	38.7% 53/137		

DHS Research, Planning and Evaluation

Performance Goal/Method of Measurement:

Rating for <8 day placements for 2015 and 2016 will be reduced to 20 %. Method of measurement will be DHS Child Welfare report and the above action steps mentioned for Goal #2 Safely reduce rate of re-entry and support permanent reunification for children.

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
a. Examine the data around children in short term placements (which have increased in the past year) using SSIS Children in out of home care by removal date report, DHS Child Welfare Dashboard re-entry into foster care data and SSIS Charting and Analysis measure C1.4.		1: 2: 3: 4:
b. Based on this analysis of 1(a) a DAPIM/ CQI process will be scheduled to develop additional action steps by March 31, 2016. - John Nalezny		1: 2: 3:

Lead with participation from Children's Division and Stakeholders.		4:
c. Coordinate with law enforcement to address reasons for placements and alternatives- Mary Farmer-Kubler.		1: 2: 3: 4:
d. Examine data around re-entry to determine if children in short term placement are also contributing to re-entry numbers by August 31, 2015. John Nalezny and CRP members.		1: 2: 3: 4:

DRAFT

Goal #4: Achievement of timely permanency (including older youth and children in care for extended periods of time)

Barriers identified in the review: Permanency delays related to Northstar Care black out period, ICPC process including training for licensure.

Agency identified barriers:

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

2015 Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development)

Annual/Quarterly Performance Data (if applicable to PIP development)

County Performance on Federal Data Indicator

	Nat'l Standard	2014 (Baseline)	2015 (Update)
C2.3	>22.7%	16.7% (3/18)	
C2.4	>10.9%	0% (0/11)	
C3.1	>29.1%	25% (3/12)	

Performance Goal/Method of Measurement:

All youth in Foster Care will have timely permanency goals reflected in their out of home placement plans and in SSIS Permanency Screens. This will be monitored during Internal QA reviews and using the SSIS Continuous Placement report specifically monitoring Concurrent Permanency Plan and Date in the report quarterly.

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
a. Monitor permanency goals and determine if there is concurrent permanency goal established. This will be to specifically review case plans on our specialized concurrent caseloads of children under the age of 8.		1: 2: 3: 4:

Responsible person(s) Megan Roy and Kira Gengler by February 28, 2016.		
b. Defining when permanency conversations are started with youth about transition - could they be earlier? Kate Pape, Placement Team, John Nalezny by April 30, 2016.		1: 2: 3: 4:
c. Education for CMH around permanency goal, when to determine, and how to maintain parental involvement. Schedule discussion meeting with Perm Team and Placing Supervisors by May 31, 2016. Responsible person John Nalezny, Kate Pape, Heidi Bischoff, Suzanne Pollack, Placement Team and Perm Team		1: 2: 3: 4:
d. This Goal will be monitored in our Scheduled QA reviews, Specifically Item #5. Information gleaned from this item during reviews will be used to inform our child Division of subsequent action steps. Responsible person, John Nalezny, QA lead.		1: 2: 3: 4:

Goal #5: Children will have frequent, high quality visits with workers....

Barriers identified in the review: Barriers to frequency and quality visits included three cases with missed visits, one case where the child was seen but the issue of safety in the home was not addressed with the child. Finally, in one of the cases where there was a missed visit with children and the worker met with parent but there was no indication of conversation about the children.

Agency identified barriers: Agency self assessment identified a need for closer monitoring of visits as performance has declined slightly at a time when the federal standard has increased to 95%.

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

2015 Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development)
Item 14 Caseworker visits with child
11/15 cases rated a strength for 73%

Annual/Quarterly Performance Data (if applicable to PIP development)

Monthly Caseworker visits with Children in Foster Care

State Goal	Q4, 2014	Q1, 2015	Update
95% ↑	89.3% (779/872)	90.1%	

Performance Goal/Method of Measurement:

High quality visits with children open for case management is expected for all children open for case management services. This will be monitored quarterly during our QA reviews item #14 and during Worker / Supervisor supervision meetings monthly.

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
a. Develop lead worker responsibilities around monthly contacts, CMH screenings and focus on in-home cases by January 31, 2016. Amy Wolfe, New Child Service Supervisor, Jodi Hilber and John Nalezny		1: 2: 3: 4:
b. New Worker training and overview for all workers presented at a Joint Child Division Meeting by December 31, 2015- John Nalezny,		1: 2:

Megan Roy, Nissa Knutson and Mary Farmer-Kubler.		3: 4:
c. Review/ focus of needs for children in Supervisor/ Worker supervision meetings- John Nalezny, Megan Roy, Nissa Knutson, Mary Farmer-Kubler		1: 2: 3: 4:
d. More indepth analysis of in-home CP cases . Exploring barriers to engagement, monitoring at least monthly contact , and quality of contact by January 31, 2015 - New supervisor and John Nalezny.		1: 2: 3: 4:

SYSTEMIC FACTOR		
Goal #6: Develop, enhance, and/or maintain an internal process for the ongoing evaluation of child welfare practices and systems, leading to program improvements.		
Current process/practice(s): Internal QA system is in place.		
Barriers: Current tool reflects 23 items needs to be updated to reflect 18 items.		
Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
Establish and maintain a process that yields valid data:		
a. An internal QA review will be completed for quarter 3 of 2015 and quarterly there after. Starting October 27,2015 3 QA reviews will be completed in 2016. Lead by John Nalezny		1: 2: 3: 4:
b. Current Word doc. 23 item review tool will be modified internally to reflect the change to 18 items by September 30th, 2015 by John Nalezny, Rebecca Conroy and KaoLee Thoa.		1: 2: 3:

		4:
Develop/implement a process for analyzing and learning from the data:		
c. Incorporate the use of a DAPIM /CQI process to address , service delivery , program, communication, or process issues when deemed appropriate by the Division Manager, and implement action steps based on what we learned from the process . See 2(e) above as an example.		1: 2: 3: 4:
d. Child Welfare Dashboard will be monitored quarterly and action plans implemented on areas deemed a priority for that next quarter by October 2015 and ongoing by Division and Manager and Supervisory team .		1: 2: 3: 4:
e. SSIS charting and Analysis Federal and State indicator reports listed below will be monitored quarterly - action plans implemented on areas deemed a priority by October 2015 and ongoing by Division Manager and Supervisory team.		1: 2: 3: 4:
Use the data to effectively implement practice and system change:		
f.		1: 2: 3: 4:
g.		1: 2: 3: 4:
Other:		
h.		1: 2:

		3: 4:
i.		1: 2: 3: 4:

DRAFT

FEDERAL DATA INDICATORS

C1.1	Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the year shown, and who had been in foster care for eight days or longer, what percent were reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home?
C1.2	Median length of stay in foster care to reunification (months)
C1.3	Of all children entering foster care for the first time in the six-month period just prior to the year shown, and who remained in foster care for eight days or longer, what percentage were reunified in less than 12 months?
C1.4	Of all children discharged from care to reunification in the 12-month period prior to the year shown, what percentage re-entered foster care in less than 12 months from the date of discharge?
C2.1	Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in the year shown, what percent were discharged in less than 24 months from the date of latest removal from home?
C2.2	Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in the year shown, what was the median length of stay in foster care (in months) from the date of latest removed from home to the date of adoption?
C2.3	Of all children in foster care on the first day of the year shown who were in foster care for 17 continuous months or longer (and who, by the last day of the year shown, were not discharged from foster care with a discharge reason of live with relative, reunify or guardianship), what percent were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption by the last day of the year shown?
C2.4	Of all children in foster care on the first day of the year shown who were in foster care for 17 continuous months or longer, and were not legally free for adoption prior to that day, what percent become legally free for adoption during the first 6 months of the year shown?
C2.5	Of all children who became legally free for adoption in the 12-month period prior to the year shown, what percent were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in less than 12 months of becoming legally free?
C3.1	Of all children in foster care for 24 months or longer on the first day of the year shown, what percent were discharged to a permanency home prior to their 18th birthday and by the end of the year (including adoption, guardianship, reunification or transfer of custody to a relative)?
C3.2	Of all children who were discharged from foster care in the year shown, and who were legally free for adoption at the time of discharge, what percent was discharged to a permanent home prior to their 18th birthday (including adoption, guardianship, reunification or transfer of custody to a relative)?
C3.3	Of all children who, during the year shown, either (1) were discharged from foster care prior to age 18 with a discharge reason of emancipation, or (2) reached their 18th birthday while in foster care, what percent were in foster care for three years or longer?
C4.1	Of all children served in foster care during the year shown who were in foster care for at least eight days but less than 12 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings?
C4.2	Of all children served in foster care during the year shown who were in foster care for at least 12 months but less than 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings?
C4.3	Of all children served in foster care during the year shown who were in foster care for at least 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings?

DRAFT