

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

Program Improvement Plan

I. General Information

County/Tribal Agency: Carlton County		Address: 14-North 11 th Street, Cloquet, MN 55720 Telephone Number: 218-878-2588
Primary Person Responsible for PIP: Brenda Carlson		E-mail Address: brenda.carlson@co.carlton.mn.us Telephone Number: 218-878-2588
DHS Quality Assurance Contact: Steve Johnson		E-mail Address: steve.h.johnson@state.mn.us Telephone Number: 651-230-2532

To be completed by DHS:	
Date of Agency/DHS PIP Meeting: 4/3/15	Date PIP Approved: pending
Due Dates for PIP Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update 1: January 2016 • Update 2: April 2016 • Update 3: July 2016 • Update 4: October 2016 	Date PIP Progress Reviews Received/Occurred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pending • • •
PIP Completion Date: October 2016	

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

PIP RECOMMENDATIONS

SAFETY:

1. Improve timely contact with children in reponse to maltreatment reports. (Timeliness data reports)
2. Conduct face-to-face visits with children at a frequency sufficient for ongoing assessment of safety and risk. (MnCFSR item 3)
3. Address factors related to re-entry following discharge from foster care. (Federal Indicator C1.4)

PERMANENCY:

4. Improve stability and permanency for children/youth in foster care for extended period. (Federal Indicators 2.3, C2.4, C2.5, 4.2, 4.3, C3.1 and C3.3)
5. Improve relative search and visitation practices with non-resident parent, father's. (MnCFSR Items 8 and 10)

WELL BEING:

6. Ensure adequate engagement of non- resident parent, fathers, in caseworker visits, services and case planning efforts.
7. Ensure Children's Mental Health Screening Tools (CMHST) are completed in a timely manner. (Child Welfare Data Dashboard)

SYSTEMIC:

8. Internal Quality Assurance process.

Goal #1: Improve timely contact with children in response to maltreatment reports.

Barriers identified in the review: No barriers identified in the case review. All applicable cases were rated Substantially Achieved.

Agency identified barriers: Inaccurate contact information and challenges in coordinating meeting times with families

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

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			
	Q1 15	Q2 15				
SCE	66.7 4/6	54.5% 6/11				
NSCE-Inv	100% 6/6	100% 8/8	Goal met			
NSCE-FA	74.7 56/7 5	74.6% 44/59				

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. The supervisor will monitor the timeliness of contact with children in response to maltreatment reports by running the "child maltreatment screening timeliness" report under the Intake Tree View in General Reports.		1: 2: 3: 4:

<p>The report will be reviewed on a weekly basis with staff.</p>		
<p>b. Supervisor will run the "Time to Initial Contact with Victim" report under general reports and will give a copy to each worker for their individual cases. This will be done on a monthly basis and given to each appropriate staff member by the first staff meeting of each month. Supervisor will run the "Time to Initial Contact with Victim" report under general reports and will give a copy to each worker for their individual cases. This will be done on a monthly basis and given to each appropriate staff member by the first staff meeting of each month.</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>
<p>c. Analyze the reports to determine the reasons for the delays and develop new strategies to address the reasons.</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>

Goal #2: Conduct face-to-face visits with children at a frequency sufficient for ongoing assessments of safety and risk.		
Barriers identified in the review: gaps in caseworker visits in child protection in home and children's mental health cases		
Agency identified barriers: Size of caseload can affect a caseworker's ability to reschedule canceled visits.		
Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development) MNCFSR Item 3; 7/9 cases were rated as Strength		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual/Quarterly Performance Data (if applicable to PIP development) Qtr. 4 2014: 93.3% Caseworker Visit Report
Performance Goal/Method of Measurement:		Performance Goal/Method of Measurement: 95% of all children in out of home placements will have a face to face visit with a caseworker each and every month they are in placement, using the MN CW Data Dashboard as a method of measurement
Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
a. The CP and CMH supervisors will clarify agency expectations and statutory requirements for a minimum of one monthly face-to-face visit with children in out of home placement. Supervisor will also clarify that agency expectations requiring that <u>ALL</u> children in an in-home case be seen every month and ensure proper documentation in SSIS.		1: 2: 3: 4:
b. Supervisor will run the SSIS General Report "Monthly Contacts with Children in Continuous Placement" and "Contact with Clients Report" on a monthly basis. Reports will be shared with the specific case worker on each case. Summary information will be provided to staff on a monthly basis during a unit meeting.		1: 2: 3: 4:
c. Supervisor will conduct case reviews to monitor progress towards worker visits and quality of		1:

visits. Team Consultation will also be utilized every other week to ensure frequency and quality of caseworker visits are being met.		2: 3: 4:
d.		1: 2: 3: 4:

Goal #3: Address factors related to re-entry following discharge from foster care

Barriers identified in the review: No barriers were identified in the case review.
Agency identified barriers: Parents that experience substance abuse relapse and youth with significant emotional/behavioral challenges.

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

<input type="checkbox"/> 2014 Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual/Quarterly Performance Data (if applicable to PIP development)								
County Performance on Federal Data Indicator:									
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Nat'l Standard</th> <th>2014 (Baseline)</th> <th>2015 (Update)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>C1.4</td> <td>9.9%↓</td> <td>43.8% 14/32</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Nat'l Standard	2014 (Baseline)	2015 (Update)	C1.4	9.9%↓	43.8% 14/32	
	Nat'l Standard	2014 (Baseline)	2015 (Update)						
C1.4	9.9%↓	43.8% 14/32							

Performance Goal/Method of Measurement:	Performance Goal/Method of Measurement: Safely reduce the re-entry rate by 10%.
--	---

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
a. Review DHS Publication "Examining Child Re-entry into Out-of Home Care" with staff, community and CJI team. After analyzing the re-entry data, develop hypothesis as why		1: 2: 3:

<p>children re-enter foster care, from the child's and families perspective and develop new strategies to address any identified unmet needs</p>		<p>4:</p>
<p>b. Increase the use of Trial Home Visit (THV). Study the current use of THV within the agency (CMH unit included) and identify any common themes. Determine accuracy of SSIS documentation.</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>
<p>c. Prior to discharge, a safety plan will be created to clarify supports and services to be provided to the family that specifically support permanent reunification. Parallel Protection Process on the front end and Family Group Decision Making will be two family engagement practices utilized to develop reunification plans.</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>
<p>d. Improve the upfront relative search practices for both 260D and 260C placements, including the intentional use of relatives for placements.</p> <p>Minnesota child welfare agencies can make the following exceptions to the relative search and notice requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Cases of domestic violence and family violence where safety is a concern <input type="checkbox"/> Placement of a child for the purpose of treatment under Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 260D, in a residential treatment facility consistent with Minnesota Statutes, section 245.4885;; or determination of institutional level of care, home and community-based waiver under Minnesota Statutes, section 256B.092 <p>The agency would immediately inquire of the family, of children at risk of or being placed, relatives/kin and begin the process to safely</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>

<p>place the children within their family network. Continue to increase skill and rigor of social workers/supervisors in developing and monitoring safety plans.</p>		
--	--	--

DRAFT

Goal #4: Improve stability and permanency for children/youth in foster care for extended period.

Barriers identified in the review: Children/youth with significant mental/behavioral health challenges

Agency identified barriers: Parents who have chemical dependency issues are finding it harder to complete their case plans within the timelines. Older youth in foster are more difficult to achieve permanency for due to behaviors and or delinquency issues.

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

2015 Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development)

Annual/Quarterly Performance Data

County Performance on Federal Data Indicator

Indicator	Nat'l Standard	2014 (Baseline)	2015 (Update)
C2.3	22.7%	7.1% 1/14	
C2.4	10.9%	0% 0/12	
C3.1	29.1%	16.7% 2/12	
C3.3	37.5%↓	60% 6/10	
C4.2	65.4%	50% 11/22	
C4.3	41.8%	31.6% 6/19	

Performance Goal/Method of Measurement:

Carlton County will improve by 25% for each indicator.

Performance Goal/Method of Measurement:

Carlton County will improve by 25% for each indicator.

Action Steps	Date Completed	Updates
--------------	----------------	---------

(include persons responsible)		
a. Supervisor will generate Charting and Analysis reports for Federal Measures C2.3, C2.4, C3.1, C3.3, C4.2, and C4.3 for 2015 and 2016.		1: 2: 3: 4:
b. Supervisor will identify youth that do not meet the standard and look for common themes within this group and develop strategies with stake holders and staff to address those needs. FGDM with youth to explore permanency options and improve legal permanency will be explored and utilized.		1: 2: 3: 4:
c. Supervisor will meet with FDL social workers, FDL managers, Probation, county CP case managers, and CMH case managers to explore and develop strategies to improve the achievement of permanency for older youth and for children in care for extended periods of time. Clarify and engage with staff and stakeholders regarding the statute, rule and agency practice align with best practices for children in foster care for extended periods of times.		1: 2: 3: 4:
d. Six month administrative reviews and annual court hearings for children in permanent custody of the agency will include a meaningful review of the parents' and/or relatives' capacity and willingness to provide day-to-day care for the child/youth. Efforts to review alternatives to continue children in the permanency custody of the agency will be documented in the case file and reports submitted to the court for the 12 month review hearings. e. The CMH Supervisor will be developing a process and additional documentation for the		1: 2: 3: 4:

formal review of 260D placements including permanency timelines		
---	--	--

DRAFT

Goal #5: Improve relative search and visitation practices with non-resident parents. (MnCF SR Items 8, 11)

Barriers identified in the review: Father's needed to establish paternity before they were allowed to visit their children. There was limited exploration of paternal relatives in foster care cases.

Agency identified barriers: Clarification for the need of relative placements with 260D youth.

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

Case Review Data

Thirty three percent, 2 of 6 cases were rated as Strength for MNCFSR Item 8.

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

At least 53% of children who are placed in foster care will be placed in relative foster family homes or pre-adoptive homes.

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
<p>a. Improve the upfront relative search practices for both 260D and 260C placements, including the intentional use of relatives for placements. The agency would immediately inquire of the family (of children at risk of or being placed), relatives/kin and begin the process to safely place the children within their family network. Continue to increase skill and rigor of social workers/supervisors in developing and monitoring safety plans.</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>
<p>b. Comprehensive relative searches for appropriateness of relative permanency options at the beginning and during the life of the out-of-home placement cases. This could include the use of Lexis Nexis software for child protection/child welfare case.</p> <p>Minnesota child welfare agencies can make the following exceptions to the relative search</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>

<p>and notice requirements:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Cases of domestic violence and family violence where safety is a concern</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Placement of a child for the purpose of treatment under Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 260D, in a residential treatment facility consistent with Minnesota Statutes, section 245.4885;; or determination of institutional level of care, home and community-based waiver under Minnesota Statutes, section 256B.092</p>				
<p>c. Examine the barriers to parent/child visitation and develop an action step to improve the frequency and quality of visits between children and the parents.</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>		
		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>		
<p>Goal #6: Ensure adequate engagement of non-resident parents, fathers, in caseworker visits, services and case planning efforts.</p>				
<p>Barriers identified in the review: Father's needed to establish paternity before they were allowed to become involved in case planning /caseworker visits. Lack of engagement of fathers negatively impacted ratings across performance items.</p> <p>Agency identified barriers:</p>				
<p>Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Review Data</p> <p>Thirty three percent, 4 of 9 cases were rated as Strength for MNCFSR Item 12B, Item 13, and 3 of 9 for Item 15.</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Annual/Quarterly Performance Data (if applicable to PIP development)</p> </td> </tr> </table>			<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Review Data</p> <p>Thirty three percent, 4 of 9 cases were rated as Strength for MNCFSR Item 12B, Item 13, and 3 of 9 for Item 15.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Annual/Quarterly Performance Data (if applicable to PIP development)</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Case Review Data</p> <p>Thirty three percent, 4 of 9 cases were rated as Strength for MNCFSR Item 12B, Item 13, and 3 of 9 for Item 15.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Annual/Quarterly Performance Data (if applicable to PIP development)</p>			

Workers will make concerted efforts to include fathers in all facets of the case, unless it is contrary to the safety or well being to the child, in at least 80% of cases.

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
a. The supervisor will review the Attorney Brief on Fathers' Issues and the 2015 MnCFSR QA Guideline with all staff during a unit meeting. b. (Both CP/CW and CMH units)		1: 2: 3: 4:
c. When fathers call into the agency and request resources, they will be provided with resource information for MN Fathers and Families Network. Non-custodial parents will also be provided with information related to Family Court and Legal Aid when it is appropriate. There will also be efforts to engage fathers in all cases whenever possible. The supervisor will clarify expectations that in cases where there is a non-resident parent, the agency will start from a position of contacting and engaging that parent to be involved in case planning and determining any possible resources or assets that would have positive impacts for the children the parent could provide. Requests to not contact or engage a parent would require supervisor input and approval.		1: 2: 3: 4:
d. In out-of-home placement cases, the case worker will visit with the mother and father each and every month or at least monthly telephone contact e. Workers will identify non-custodial parents early in the case and make ongoing attempts to locate them and engage them in case planning.		1: 2: 3: 4:

SYSTEMIC FACTOR

Goal #8: 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): Unit case reviews, CJI meetings, Dialogue meetings, follow-up discussions with employees after trainings.

Barriers: Case worker and supervisor time, budgetary constraints, SSIS demands on case worker and supervisor.

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
Establish and maintain a process that yields valid data:		
<p>a. Supervisor will utilize SSIS Charting and Analysis and General Reports that correspond to specific PIP strategies: Federal Data Indicators (Charting and Analysis – quarterly) C1.4: Re-entry C2.3, C2.4, C3.1, C3.3: Permanency C4.2, C4.3: Placement Stability</p> <p>Child Maltreatment Screening Timeliness (General Report – Monthly)</p> <p>Timeliness of Initial Contact with Victim (General Report – Monthly)</p> <p>Monthly Contacts with Children in Continuous Placement (General Report – Monthly)</p> <p>Contacts with Clients (General Report – Monthly)</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>

SMCH Screening Exception Report (General Report – Monthly)		
b.		1: 2: 3: 4:
Develop/implement a process for analyzing and learning from the data:		
c. Supervisor and social worker will discuss each case reviewed to reinforce good practice and consider alternative actions on practices needing improvement.		1: 2: 3: 4:
d. Supervisor will analyze SSIS Charting and Analysis/General Reports and identify any themes/patterns.		1: 2: 3: 4:
Use the data to effectively implement practice and system change:		
e. Share information from CFSR and PIP with CJI and other stakeholders to discuss program improvement plan. Work with CJI, Dialogue Meeting members and other stakeholders to identify improvement areas and offer ideas for improvement.		1: 2: 3: 4:
f. Share information from case reviews and analysis of reports with staff on a quarterly basis as a means of communicating performance results and giving opportunity to discuss potential solutions and clarify expectations and/or provide guidance.		1: 2: 3: 4:
Other:		
g.		1:

		2: 3: 4:
h.		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