

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

Program Improvement Plan

I. General Information

County/Tribal Agency:	
Isanti County Family Services	Address: 1700 E Rum River Dr. S. STE A, Cambridge, MN 55008-2547 Telephone Number: 763-689-1711
Primary Person Responsible for PIP:	
Penny Messer	E-mail Address: penny.messer@co.isanti.mn.us Telephone Number: 763-689-8152
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: 02/06/15	Date PIP Approved: 8/17/15
Due Dates for PIP Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update 1: October 30, 2015 • Update 2: January 29, 2016 • Update 3: April 29, 2016 • Update 4: July29, 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. Improve the rate of timely responses to maltreatment reports in all three categories of responses.
2. Improve the consistency of practices related to assessing and addressing risk and safety.
3. Decrease rate of re-entry into foster care.

PERMANENCY:

4. Address barriers to stability and permanency for youth in care for extended periods of time.
5. Improve practices that support preservation of children's relationships while they are in placement.
6. Improve practices in timely inquiry into ICWA eligibility and notification to Tribes.

WELL BEING:

7. Improve consistency in concerted efforts to engage and assess needs of fathers.

SYSTEMIC:

8. Develop/strengthen system of quality assurance.

Goal #1: Improve the rate of timely responses to maltreatment reports in all three categories of responses.

Barriers identified in the review: Workload and coverage issues, Presumed Safety

Agency identified barriers:

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

- 2015 Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development)
 - From case review information included here.

Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations (and assessments) of reports of child maltreatment.

- 67% (4/6) cases rated a strength.

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

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

	Baseline		PIP Updates			
	CY 2014	Q1 2015				
SCE	78.3% 18/23	70% 7/10				
NSCE-Inv	0/0	0/0				
NSCE-FA	77% 104/135	78.6% 33/42				

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. As required, worker will observe child victim at school or at home within five days for Family Assessment or document efforts to comply with contact requirements in SSIS.		1: 2: 3: 4:
b. Supervisor will continue providing written notice of date and time of when victim is to be seen to worker at time case is assigned.		1: 2: 3: 4:
c. SSIS general report, Time to Initial Contact, will be reviewed by supervisor on a quarterly basis to monitor performance on timeliness and discussed with staff as needed. (If additional detail is needed Supervisor will review SSIS Analysis and Charting State Indicators MN8, MN9, MN10)		1: 2: 3: 4:
d.		1: 2: 3: 4:

Goal #2: Improve the consistency of practices related to assessing and addressing risk and safety.		
Barriers identified in the review: Frequency of caseworker visits insufficient to monitor risk and safety (in-home case); Screening decision		
Agency identified barriers:		
Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2015 Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development) Item 3: 78% (7/9) were rated as a strength		<input type="checkbox"/> Annual/Quarterly Performance Data (if applicable to PIP development)
Performance Goal/Method of Measurement: 90% of cases will have monthly visits and will be documented in SSIS.		Performance Goal/Method of Measurement:
Action Steps (include person responsibility)	Date Completed	Updates
a. When a new report comes in and an assessment is already being conducted, the new allegation will be added to the open assessment/investigation. If there is a case management workgroup open and a new report qualifies for assessment, a new assessment will be conducted. If it doesn't meet criteria, the case manager will document in SSIS a new report came in and allegation of safety of child will be assessed by case manager.		1: 2: 3: 4:
b. Cases where there are new reports will be reviewed with supervisor soon after contact is made with the family to review identified risk/safety concerns.		1: 2: 3: 4:
c. Workers will continue the use of 3 houses and mapping as a tool to assess risk and safety and		1:

will bring case plans to home visits to review goals. Case plan review with family will be documented in SSIS.		2: 3: 4:
d.		1: 2: 3: 4:

Goal #3: Reduce rate of re-entry into foster care.			
Barriers identified in the review: Parental substance abuse			
Agency identified barriers:			
Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):			
<input type="checkbox"/> 2015 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:			
	Nat'l Standard	2014 (Baseline)	(Update)
C1.4	9.9↓	21.1% (4/19)	
Performance Goal/Method of Measurement:			
15% of children will re-enter foster care less than 12 months from discharge.			
Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates	
a. Prior to discharge from CD treatment, a relapse prevention plan will be written and incorporated in the future service plans.		1: 2: 3: 4:	
b. At the time reunification is being considered, a meeting would be held and services post discharge would be discussed. These agreed upon services would be documented in the next case plan. ICFS will assist the family in referrals for supportive services such as in-home skills/family therapy, individual therapy, psychiatry, social skills for the child/youth,		1: 2: 3: 4:	

<p>parenting education (e.g. Love and Logic classes.) During the trial home visit or home visits prior to discharge from placement, these services would begin and the same provider would continue.</p>		
<p>c.</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>
<p>d.</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>

Goal #4: Address barriers to stability and permanency for youth in care for extended periods of time.

Barriers identified in the review: Use of permanency extensions; Limited ongoing exploration of permanency options.

Agency identified barriers:

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

2015 Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development)

Item 6 Achieving reunification, transfer of custody, adoption or permanent custody to the agency.
67% of cases (4/6) were rated as strength.

Annual/Quarterly Performance Data

County Performance on Federal Data Indicator

	Nat'l Standard	2013 (Baseline)	2015 (Update)
C3.1	29.1%↑	0% (0/6)	
C3.2	98%↑	NA	
C3.3	37.5%↓	50% (1/2)	
C4.3	41.8%↑	33.3% (3/9)	

Performance Goal/Method of Measurement:

For children in care for two years or more, at least 50% of the CP and 50% CMH of the court reports will be reviewed. 80% will have documented concerted efforts towards permanency.

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
a. Continued Monthly Permanency Team mtg. w/CMH cases as CP cases are reviewed regularly in court. Permanency review includes a critical team discussion of current status, efforts to address reasons for placement, family involvement, and barriers to reunification.		1: 2: 3: 4:

Practice changes in CMH include consider CHIPS petitions earlier, re-examine permanency options with older youth, and engage in specialized recruitment for state wards.		
b. Use of local foster home resources afford the family the ability for early and frequent engagement with the teen so reunification can occur earlier within the Close To Home program.		1: 2: 3: 4:
c. ICFS has been meeting with REM to develop a specialized corporate foster home to meet the behavioral needs of three youth whose behaviors prevent them from being adopted or placed with relatives. Also, form 6021 has been sent to the state to initiate the licensing process.		1: 2: 3: 4:
d. When there are relative and non-relative providers who have developed a relationship with the youth but are not willing and able to take on the legal responsibility to raise teens due to the teens' behaviors, transfer of custody or adoption will be regularly discussed and documented in the case file.		1: 2: 3: 4:
e. Practice of pursuing natural supports during first six months of CMH case in preparation for potential permanency discussions if placement is deemed necessary.		1: 2: 3: 4:

Goal #5: Improve practices that support preservation of children's relationships while they are in placement.

Barriers identified in the review: Independent inquiry and timely follow up into possible ICWA eligibility and notification of Tribes. Inconsistent visitation practices with non-resident parents and siblings in separate placement settings.

Agency identified barriers:

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

2015 Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development)

Item 8- 60% (3/5) were rated as a Strength

Item 9 - 83% (5/6) were rated as a Strength

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

Performance Goal/Method of Measurement: 90 % of 10 cases randomly reviewed, will have documented efforts to engage fathers and assess their needs.

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
a. Non-resident parents of children placed in foster care via 260C and who have not engaged with the agency, will be contacted monthly. This is reviewed during case consultation with supervisor, is documented in the case file, and is communicated via court reports submitted to the court.		1: 2: 3: 4:
b. Visits between siblings who are not placed together is documented in the case plan as well in the case file. Visits will be scheduled as deemed appropriate by the treatment team.		1: 2: 3: 4:
c. For non-resident parents of children placed for voluntary reasons under 260D and when appropriate, explore safe ways to have contact with non-resident parent.		1: 2: 3: 4:

<p>d. ICWA inquiry has been added to an internal document, Assessment/Investigation Outline, to ensure ICWA identification has occurred. Per ICWA/MIFPA Social Worker Checklist, timely notification will be made via letter which will be documented in SSIS.</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>
<p>e.</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>
<p>f.</p>		<p>1: 2: 3: 4:</p>

Goal #6: Improve consistency in concerted efforts to engage and assess needs of fathers.

Barriers identified in the review: Ongoing assessment of needs; Engaging fathers in case planning; Frequent quality visits
Agency identified barriers:

Baseline (Performance at the time of the review):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2015 Case Review Data (if applicable to PIP development) Item 12B: 56% (5/8) were rated as as Strength Item 13: 78% (7/9) were rated as a Strength Item 15: 63% (5/8) were rated as a Strength	<input type="checkbox"/> Annual/Quarterly Performance Data (if applicable to PIP development)
---	---

Performance Goal/Method of Measurement: 90 % of 10 cases randomly reviewed, will have documented efforts to have consistent visitation between siblings placed separately and between fathers and children.

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
a. Continued use of CP process checklist and outline to engage fathers. Include review of case plan, ongoing assessment of needs		1: 2: 3: 4:
b. Once engaged, the case plan will be reviewed with the non-resident parent monthly.		1: 2: 3: 4:
c. CMH case managers will encourage primary custodial parents throughout the life of the case, to seek and accept the support of other important adults in the child/adolescent's life. With the approval of the custodial parent, it is the expectation that the primary case manager will contact the nonresident parent(s) and actively work to involve them in the assessment		1: 2: 3: 4:

and case planning unless it is deemed contrary to the welfare of the child.		
d.		1: 2: 3: 4:

SYSTEMIC FACTOR

Goal #7: Develop/strengthen system of Quality Assurance.

Current process/practice(s):

Barriers:

Action Steps (include persons responsible)	Date Completed	Updates
Establish and maintain a process that yields valid data:		
a. Continue random supervisory review of cases using CFSR tools.		1: 2: 3: 4:
b. In CP unit meetings, have a standing agenda item as dashboard information. Discuss specific cases and trends and ideas for improvement.		1: 2: 3: 4:
c. Continued use of permanency team and coordination with County Attorney's Office when needed.		1: 2: 3: 4:
d. It has been requested of DHS that Promoting Placement Stability and Permanency through Caseworker Visits training be offered in Isanti County to allow more staff to attend.	5/7/15	1: Promoting Placement Stability and Permanency Through Case Worker Visits was held at ICFS on 5/7/15. 2: 3: 4:
e.		1: 2: 3: 4:

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?