



Pennsylvania  
Department of Public Welfare  
Office of Children, Youth and Families

# Quality Services Review Procedures Manual

---

**September 15, 2004**

**Prepared by:  
Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc.**

# CONTENTS

## **Chapter 1. Framework for the Quality Services Reviews**

Purpose of the Quality Services Reviews	1
Conceptual Framework	2
Structure of the Reviews	3
Steps in the Review Process	3

## **Chapter 2. The Review Team**

Composition of the Review Team	5
Functions of the Review Team	6
Leadership of the Review Team	6

## **Chapter 3. Onsite Reviews**

Purpose	8
Advance Preparation for the Onsite Review	8
Case Selection and Review	10
Instruments	14

## **Chapter 4. Rating Case Items and Outcomes**

Determining Item Ratings	15
Resolving Questions Regarding Item Ratings	30
Determining Outcome Ratings	31

## **Chapter 5. County Report**

Purpose of the QSR Report	34
Format of the County QSR Report	34
Analysis of County QSR Data	34

## **Appendices** 35

In-home Sample Methodology	38
Suggested Case Review Schedule	40
Sample Interview Confirmation Letter	41
QSR Interview Schedule	42
QSR Information at a Glance	43
Guide for De-Briefing Cases in Quality Services Reviews	44
Preliminary Case Specific Findings	50
Quality Assurance Checklist	58
Case Rating Summary	61

## *Chapter 1*

# **Framework for the Quality Services Reviews**

## **Purpose of the Quality Services Reviews**

Quality Services Reviews provide a means for assessing the quality of casework practice. The particular reviews being used in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are patterned after the reviews established by the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF) through the Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSR) that have taken place in every state across the country. The Child and Family Services Reviews assess state performance in the areas of child protective services, foster care and adoption, while focusing on goals in the areas of safety, permanency and well-being.

The Pennsylvania Office of Children, Youth and Families' (OCYF) federal CFSR review was completed during August of 2002. Pennsylvania was in substantial conformity for one of the seven outcomes related to the safety, permanency and well-being of children and families as well as six of the seven "systematic factors" assessed by ACF such as training, information systems and licensing. The systemic factor that was not in conformity was case review.

To coordinate Pennsylvania's response to the CFSR findings, OCYF has developed a Performance Improvement Plan Executive Committee. Seven sub-committees are responsible for addressing the areas needing improvement and improving existing strengths. To assess the on-going performance within counties regarding safety, permanency and well-being the Quality Assurance Committee has been charged with developing a process to conduct case reviews similar to those of the Onsite Review phase of the CFSR. The Quality Services Review is a county level assessment of case practice.

The Quality Services Review focuses on the 23 "items" identified in the federal review process that relate to the safety, permanency and well-being of children and families. Pennsylvania's case reviews measure county performance through a review of 15 county children and youth agency cases.<sup>1</sup> Case records are reviewed by local review teams and parties to the case are interviewed to develop ratings for each of the items. Item ratings form the basis of the outcome ratings for the two safety, two permanency and three well-being outcomes.

The reviews are designed to help improve child welfare services and the outcomes for families and children who receive services by identifying strengths and needs within county programs, as well as areas where technical assistance

---

<sup>1</sup> In some instances small counties are clustered for a single review so fewer than 15 cases are read.

can lead to program improvements. Other purposes of the reviews include the following:

- Assist counties to become self-evaluating over time;
- Inform practice at the county;
- Inform resource allocation within the county;
- Assemble data that will inform OCYF policy;
- Use information for federal reporting; and
- Provide timely and specific feedback to OCYF and the counties on program performance and outcomes.

## **Conceptual Framework**

The quality services reviews are based on a number of central principles and concepts, including the following:

- The quality services reviews are a collaborative effort between OCYF and county children and youth agencies and juvenile probation offices. A review team composed of OCYF, county and provider agency staff conduct the reviews and evaluate county performance.
- The reviews rely on information from a variety of sources in making decisions about a county's performance. The sources of information include onsite reviews of a sample of cases comprised of children and families served by the county and interviews with interested parties for each case.
- The reviews are designed to capture both the strengths and needs of county programs. The QSR results should be used as a tool to further investigate child welfare practices and inform policy and practice decision-making on a local and statewide basis.
- The QSR county data is used to develop a Statewide QSR report to assess practice in Pennsylvania.
- The reviews promote practice principles believed to support improved outcomes for children and families, such as family-centered practice, community-based services, strengthening parental capacity to protect and provide for their children and individualizing services that respond to the unique needs of children and families.

## Structure of the Reviews

A sample of 15 cases is generally selected for review in each county. OCYF randomly selects eight cases from the most recent AFCARS file of children in substitute care including one juvenile probation case, and, using guidance from OCYF, counties select seven in-home cases. Using a case record review instrument with detailed instructions, local review teams gather information from case record files that cover the three goals of safety, permanency and child and family well-being. The three goals examine the specific outcomes outlined below through a focus on the quality of services and practice.

- **Safety**

Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

- **Permanency**

Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

- **Child and Family Well-Being**

Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

## Steps in the Review Process

The following outlines steps in the review process which include roles both for OCYF and the counties, as well as some joint responsibilities.

**Determine the dates for the review.** The Quality Assurance Committee and OCYF Regional Offices determine the dates for the review in collaboration with county children and youth and juvenile probation officials. Reviews are conducted on a quarterly basis in each region until all the counties in the region are completed.

**Form the review team.** This step involves identifying OCYF, county agency and juvenile probation and provider agency members to partner as the 10-member review team. It also includes identifying team leaders who are responsible for coordination of the team, answering questions about the review and the

instrument and conducting the first level quality assurance review of each case. The OCYF Regional Office should identify who will be primarily responsible for the second level of quality assurance review and for technical assistance.

**Select the sample and types of cases to be reviewed on site.** The exact number of cases to be reviewed, by location and type of case, i.e., substitute care or in-home, is determined by the Quality Assurance Committee. The substitute care sample and in-home care sample methodology will be forwarded to the team leaders. Generally eight substitute care and seven in-home cases are selected for review in each county. The county team leader, who functions as the contact/coordinator, should review the substitute care sample to ensure cases satisfy the review criteria and coordinate the draw of the in-home sample.

**Prepare for the onsite review.** The county review team leader schedules local stakeholder interviews or arranges for them to be scheduled, prepares reviewer schedules and gathers the 15 sample cases for the onsite review. The county review team leader also schedules a room(s) for the review and room(s) for interviews.

**Onsite review in the County.** The onsite review encompasses the analysis of records, the interviews of parties who are knowledgeable about the case as well as entry and exit interviews with county staff. The review is completed in one week by a joint OCYF, county children and youth agency and juvenile probation and provider review team.

## *Chapter 2*

# **The Review Team**

### **Composition of the Review Team**

Team members are to be selected based on their professional experience and ability to complete the work expected of a QSR review team. The county and OCYF Regional Office should begin to identify the members of the review team approximately three months prior to the onsite review. The purpose of starting at that point is to allow team members to clear their schedules of any conflicts for the review week. Agencies are to be made aware that review team members will be at the review for the entire week and are not to be contacted for agency business. Review team members are only to be contacted in the event of a personal family emergency.

The reviews are conducted by staff members from the following groups:

- Office of Children, Youth and Families' Regional Office Program staff (2);
- County Children and Youth Agency staff (4), two staff members from the county being reviewed and two from a neighboring county;
- County Juvenile Probation Office staff (2) one staff member from the county being reviewed and one from a neighboring county;
- Private service providers of the county being reviewed (2); and
- An alternate team member from the County Children and Youth Agency (1).

The OCYF Regional Office works with the county to select two team leaders, one from the county being reviewed and one from the relevant OCYF Regional Office. Technical assistance is to be provided to the team by one person who has experience as a team member with QSR/CF SR review processes in other counties. It is recommended that an alternate team member also attend the training. The alternate (from the county children and youth agency) can replace a team member if needed. If not needed as a team member, the alternate can assist with miscellaneous duties such as locating information missing from a case record, rescheduling interviews and contacting caseworkers.

Team leaders are designated to perform quality assurance functions during the onsite review in order to ensure consistency and objectivity as cases are reviewed. The technical assistant will also be available to answer case reviewers' questions, perform secondary quality assurance on all cases and assist team leaders with answering questions about the instrument and item ratings. Cases are read in teams of two; generally one person familiar with the child welfare agency is paired with another team member.

## **Functions of the Review Team**

Membership on the review team involves a significant commitment of time and effort. Members of the team must be in a position to fulfill the responsibilities noted below. The functions and responsibilities of QSR team members include the following:

- Participate in scheduled orientation or training sessions prior to or during the review;
- Remain present at the review site(s) for the entire week of the onsite review, including participation in all scheduled review activities from the entrance conference through the exit conference;
- Conduct all assigned activities associated with the review of case records and interviews, including timely completion of the review instruments;
- Assist in compiling a summary of the team's findings during the onsite review;
- Complete review instruments on assigned cases and interviews prior to departing the review site at the end of the onsite review; and
- Remain available for telephone consultation following the review, if needed, to clarify or supplement information recorded on the instruments.

## **Leadership of the Review Team**

As described above, team leaders include a county staff member and an OCYF Regional Office Program representative. The major responsibilities of the team leaders include the following:

- Serve as liaison with county children and youth and juvenile probation leadership in planning review activities;
- Ensure that the out-of-home sample and the in-home sample methodology are sent to the county on a timely basis to ensure cases are selected prior to the start of the onsite review;
- Plan the details of the onsite review with county children and youth and juvenile probation representatives, including arranging conference calls as needed and transmitting review instructions and procedures to county liaisons;
- Coordinate the review schedule with local agency staff, e.g., confirm interview arrangement and develop schedules, including for local entrance and exit conferences;
- Assign review team members to case reviewing teams prior to the two-day team training. At least one person with children and youth agency experience should be on each team.

- Coordinate team members' responsibilities for case record reviews, interviews and other review activities in the local sites, including reassigning members with gaps in their schedules to other tasks;
- Provide leadership for entrance and exit conferences at the beginning and conclusion of the onsite review;
- Provide strong positive leadership to the team by setting the pace of work, assisting members with resolution of problems with their cases or schedules, supporting the team in all ways to complete the work and promoting a positive and objective approach to the review;
- Perform a primary quality assurance review of all onsite review instruments as they are completed to identify missing information and inconsistencies in data collection and to ensure that the performance indicators are used correctly to rate outcomes;
- Ensure that team members complete their assigned review functions, including completing and submitting all instruments prior to departing the local review site;
- Coordinate the completion of the Summary of Findings Form for the local team at the end of the review week, providing all team members with opportunities for input into the document; and
- Forward the completed QSR instruments to Hornby Zeller Associates for analysis and report writing (address appears in next chapter).

During the onsite review, the review team leaders will divide the tasks above as needed among the review team members.

## *Chapter 3*

# **Onsite Reviews**

### **Purpose**

The onsite review is designed to gather both quantitative and qualitative information for a sample of cases. The case reviews collect data on child-specific performance indicators that correspond to outcomes measured from the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) and the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) as well as on factors which are not assessed elsewhere. Examples of the former are repeat maltreatment and foster care re-entries and of the latter are the quality of risk assessments, family participation in case planning and the frequency of parental visits. The onsite review is the only source of information for such types of indicators which most professionals consider necessary to assess program quality.

The onsite review takes considerable preparation. This chapter reviews steps that need to be taken to prepare for the review and what will occur at the review itself.

### **Advance Preparation for the Onsite Review**

Preparation for the onsite review is carried out by the OCYF Regional Offices and county children and youth and juvenile probation agencies. The responsibilities of each of those parties are listed below:

#### **OCYF Regional Office Responsibilities**

- Assign an overall review team leader and other Regional Office team members to serve on the review team (see previous chapter for functions);
- Consult with the county staff about the review team members, following the composition guidelines presented above;
- Forward the substitute care sample list of cases and the in-home care sample methodology to the county team leaders;
- Ensure that county team leaders have a copy of the procedures manual and are oriented to the review process;
- Plan for the orientation and training of review team members; and
- Develop the agenda for the entrance conference in collaboration with the county.

## **County Agency Responsibilities**

- Assign a county review team leader to serve as a liaison with the OCYF Regional Program review team leader in making arrangements for the review;
- Identify county agency, private provider and juvenile probation representatives to participate as members of the review team and provide that information to the review team leaders;
- Orient local staff to the purposes and activities of the review;
- Consult with Regional Office staff on logistical arrangements for the review, including identification of: (1) locations for entrance and exit conferences; and (2) space needed for other scheduled meetings and review activities during the week;
- Ensure that workers assigned to the cases selected for review are scheduled for interviews;
- Schedule and confirm interviews with each person involved in a case who is to be interviewed and orient those persons to the purpose of the review;
- Prepare maps or other written directions for each reviewer to get to the scheduled appointments and arrange for transportation if needed;
- Reserve space for record review, interviews and other planned meetings; and
- Assemble all case records to be reviewed so that they will be accessible and ready for review at the onset of the review.

## **Review Team Leaders Responsibilities**

The county agency and regional office team leaders work together to achieve the following:

- Orient the review team members prior to the start of the review on the instruments used to collect the quantitative and qualitative data as well as the functions of the team. This orientation may supplement the training provided by Competency-based Training and should include a practice exercise which uses photocopies of an actual county case record and the corresponding private provider records. One copy per two-person case review team should be provided for the training;
- Review the out-of-home case sample to assess that the cases meet the standards to be included in the sample. Coordinate the sampling of the in-home cases and review the cases to ensure the selection criteria are satisfied;
- Meet the entire review team at the end of the review week to conduct a final debriefing, compile the Summary of Findings Form and prepare for the exit conference;

- Perform a quality assurance review and debriefing of each case that has been reviewed with the case reviewers who read the case; and
- Conduct informal entrance and exit conferences, where practical, with county children and youth, juvenile probation and county team members at the county review site to provide an overview of tentative findings, plans for next steps and an opportunity to clarify issues related to the preliminary findings.

### **County Agency Team Leaders Responsibilities**

- Schedule a room(s) at the county agency where the case review team can conduct the case record review and room(s) to conduct interviews with individuals and stakeholders in the cases being reviewed;
- Locate the case files for the in-home and substitute care cases and make them available to the review team;
- Develop a master schedule for the review that includes time for case record reviews, stakeholder interviews and travel time to interviews; and
- Schedule appointments for reviewers to interview individuals in the cases being reviewed. The county agency coordinator should schedule the interviews for the same day as the case is scheduled for review, whenever possible.

## **Case Selection and Review**

### **Sample of Cases Reviewed**

The Quality Assurance Committee determines the number and composition of the sample of case records to be pulled for the onsite review, presently 15 cases per county in most instances and five cases per county in “cluster” reviews.<sup>2</sup> The sample of cases includes children in foster care and children receiving services in their own homes.

The sample of substitute care cases is selected randomly from the recent semi-annual AFCARS data file submitted by the county to OCYF. The cases for this part of the review are provided to the team leaders by Hornby Zeller Associates. The sample of in-home cases is selected randomly by the county review team leader from a listing of in-home service cases that were open for service for at least 60 days during the period under review. Cases may have closed during or subsequent to the period of review. A prescribed sampling methodology is included as an appendix in this manual.

---

<sup>2</sup> For very small counties three are grouped to form a review and then five cases are selected from each.

In-home cases are based on the family whereas substitute care cases are based on the child. Cases selected for the sample must have been open for service for at least 60 days during the period under review, although they may be closed at the time of the review. County team leaders should identify the reason(s) for eliminating a case from the review. Additional cases may be requested, if needed, from the OCYF Regional Program representative.

Interviews will be scheduled for all cases selected for review. County team leaders will review the substitute care and in-home cases selected for review to assess the extent to which stakeholders are willing and available to be interviewed. Cases selected for review must have some interviews completed with relevant parties.

### **Location of Case Records**

All case records selected for review should be assembled at the county review site.

### **Preparation of the Records for Review**

Case records should be as orderly and current as possible, including any files maintained separately, e.g., separate child protective service files, separate family and child records and even separate provider files if providers have had major responsibility for the case. Records maintained by private providers should be requested and be made available at the county review site, when appropriate. For counties or provider agencies that use electronic files in lieu of paper files, it will be necessary for the local review coordinator either to make computers and technical support available to the reviewers for viewing the electronic records or to obtain hard copies of the files of at least those portions of the files containing information relevant to the review.

### **Period Under Review**

The Period Under Review is the timeframe that is considered relevant to be reviewed. Some cases have been in the system for a long time and the actions taken years ago may not be reflective of current practice. That is why the period is limited. There is a generic Period Under Review which is the default period and then specific periods that apply to certain questions. The table on the following page shows the Period Under Review for both in-home and placement or substitute care cases. There are two generic periods under review, depending on the case selection dates. These are April 1 to the present or October 1 to the present, with the beginning of the period tracking the federal AFCARS submissions.

Period Under Review: Quick Reference		
Case Type	Case Selection Dates	Period Under Review Dates
In-Home Cases	April 1 – September 30 Or October 1 – March 30	April 1 to present date or date case closed, whichever is earlier Or October 1 to present date or date case closed, whichever is earlier
Placement Cases	April 1 – September 30 Or October 1 – March 30	April 1 to present date or date case closed, whichever is earlier Or October 1 to present date or date case closed, whichever is earlier
Period for Specific Questions		
16 – 20	Safety	All referrals made within the three years prior to the date of the review (April 1 three years ago or October 1 three years ago to present)
21, 23 – 29	Safety	Most recent referral
22	Safety	Second most recent referral
30	Safety	Period under review and three years prior to the date of the review
31 – 34	Permanency	Most recent removal episode
35a	Permanency	Period under review
35c – 44	Permanency	Most recent permanency plan or the last permanency plan if discharged from substitute care
45, 52 – 53	Permanency	Most recent placement
46 – 50	Permanency	Most recent three months or last three months if discharged from substitute care
54	Permanency	Period under review
55	Permanency	Period under review
56 – 59	Well-being	Initial service plan
60 – 77	Well-being	Most recent service plan
78 – 84	Well-being	Past three months
90	Well-being	Period under review

### Case Interviews

The review team member(s) assigned to review a particular case is responsible for interviewing the individuals involved in the case.

A minimum of three people should be interviewed for each case including the following, unless the individual is unavailable or completely unwilling to be interviewed:

- The child (if old enough, at least school age);
- The child's parent(s);
- The child's foster parent(s) if the child is in foster care;
- The family's caseworker with the agency; and
- Any major service providers involved with the child or family. Where there are numerous service providers involved with a family, it may only be necessary to schedule interviews with those most recently involved, those most knowledgeable of the family, or those representing the primary services the family is receiving.

If any of the above parties cannot be interviewed, the reason must be documented in the case review instrument.

As needed on a case-by-case basis, other individuals who have relevant information on the case may also be interviewed, such as the child's guardian ad litem, advocate, or other family members.

Only school-age children will be interviewed unless other arrangements are made with the county. For example, a preschool-age child included in the review may be observed by the reviewer in the foster home while interviewing the foster parent(s).

If possible, interviews should be conducted where the persons to be interviewed are located, i.e., in the foster home or in the family's home. Where travel arrangements, time needed to travel to a location, or preference of the persons to be interviewed do not permit interviews to be conducted outside the county office, the county review team leader may arrange an alternate location. Telephone interviews may be arranged for individuals who are located outside of the local review site.

Interviews with the individuals in a case should follow the time designated on the reviewer's schedule for reviewing the case record. Without first becoming familiar with the circumstances of the case through a review of the record, the reviewer will be unable to explore pertinent issues with the person being interviewed.

County review team leaders will schedule the interviews to not exceed one hour per interview and allow for time between interviews for any necessary travel to the appointments. Maps or other written directions to the interview sites should be prepared in advance and be provided to the reviewer. Both case review team members should attend the interview(s).

Persons to be interviewed should be prepared for the interview by the county review team leader or designee by helping them to understand the purpose of the review. They should be assured that their participation is voluntary, but critical to the success of the review. Also, when the interviews have been scheduled, appointments should be confirmed in writing.



## Instruments

Standardized instruments and instructions are provided by the Quality Assurance Committee for all phases of the review. Orientation to the instruments used during the onsite review will be provided to review team members prior to or at the onset of the review. The following are needed to complete the review:

- Review Instrument with instructions and codes;
- Stakeholder Interview Questions;
- Summary of Findings Form; and
- Case Ratings Summary Sheet; or
- Automated MS Access QSR system for entry of case review data into an electronic format, for case reviewers which prefer that option.

Copies of the instruments and instructions are provided for the review by the Center for Excellence at the county review team training.

Completed instruments should be forwarded on the next business day to: Hornby Zeller Associates, 3314 Market Street, Suite 306, Camp Hill, PA 17011. Team leaders should determine if copies will be made for the county or region office.

## *Chapter 4*

# Rating Case Items and Outcomes

### Determining Item Ratings

Each of the 23 Items in the Quality Services Review is rated based upon the information collected by the case review team from the case record and the interviews with parties to the case. Items can be rated as either a Strength, Area Needing Improvement, or Not Applicable. Definitions for each of the Item Ratings are provided below:

- **Strength:** Most or all questions were marked Yes or Not Applicable. Interviews confirmed or supported information in the file;
- **Area Needing Improvement:** Several questions were marked No and/or the interviews raised concerns or demonstrated needs such that the Item could not be scored as a Strength; and
- **Not Applicable:** The Item does not pertain to this case.

The case review team should rely upon their knowledge of the Pennsylvania Standards for Child Welfare Practice and professional experience to supplement the determination of an Item rating. To produce consistent results, reviewers should not vary significantly from the definitions.

Reviewers will need to consider all the information gathered for each case to make these determinations and weigh the following factors: (1) the result or outcome of services or interventions for the child(ren) or family; (2) the extent to which the child(ren)'s or family's critical needs were met; (3) the appropriateness of the agency's actions relative to the child(ren)'s or family's needs and to applicable agency policies (reviewers should give primary consideration to the needs of the child(ren) or family in the event that existing agency policies do not appear responsive to those needs); and (4) recent practice, primarily considering the period under review unless otherwise directed in the instructions. Reviewers should address only the focus of the item being rated. The following factors should be considered as reviewers are rating each of the 23 items:

#### **Item 1: Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment**

This item focuses on the timeliness of investigations of all reports of child maltreatment, including those assigned to receive an alternative response such as those provided for General Protective Services (GPS) or juvenile probation cases. Reviewers should focus on all children in the family.

Reviewers should note the following definitions when completing this item:

- “Life of the case” refers to the entire time the case was known to the agency;
- “Face-to-face contact” refers to in-person contact with all of the children in the family who are the subject of the report; and
- “Date assigned” refers to the date the report is assigned for investigation or assessment.

If reviewers determine that there was a risk that warranted the provision of services by the agency, they should treat the report as they would an indicated or substantiated report, even if no formal disposition was made. Reviewers should determine whether investigations noted in each of the reports were initiated within the timeframe specified in the State’s policy for a report of that particular type or priority. Reviewers also should examine whether the caseworker actually saw the child(ren) who were the subject of the report as a part of the investigative activities.

Reviewers should rate this item as not applicable if there were no reports of child maltreatment during the period under review. For example, a case might have a long Child Protective Services (CPS) history but no reports during the period under review. In that circumstance, reviewers should document the case history information as background in the space provided below (noted as “life of the case”), but rate the case not applicable in relation only to the period under review.

#### **Item 2: Repeat Maltreatment**

This item focuses on CPS, GPS and JPO reports which have been substantiated or indicated. Reviewers should focus on all children in the family.

“Substantiated” refers to an investigation in which the allegation of maltreatment or risk of maltreatment was supported or founded according to State law or State policy.

“Indicated” means the allegation of maltreatment was indicated, or there was reason to suspect maltreatment, but it was unfounded under State law or State policy.

Repeat maltreatment refers to:

- Two or more substantiated or indicated reports of maltreatment within a 6-month period, with at least one of the reports occurring during the period under review;
- Two or more reports of maltreatment within a 6-month period, with at least one of the reports occurring during the period under review, where the reports were assigned to an alternative response, resulting in a decision that the child had either been maltreated or was at risk of maltreatment; *or*
- A combination of reports described in the first two bullets above within a 6-month period, with at least one of the reports occurring during the period under review.

Reviewers should count substantiated/indicated reports of maltreatment by foster care providers and staff of placement facilities only if there were two or more incidents of maltreatment in the foster care placement within a 6-month period, since this item refers to repeat maltreatment that is due to the same general circumstances or the same perpetrator. Reviewers should address a single incident of maltreatment by a foster care provider or placement facility staff in item 4 if it is unrelated to prior incidents of maltreatment by circumstances or perpetrator.

Reviewers should not consider multiple reports that occurred as a result of the *same maltreatment incident* as repeat maltreatment.

Reviewers must distinguish between reports that occurred during the life of the case and the period under review.

Reviewers should rate the item as a strength if: (1) there were no substantiated/indicated reports during the period under review and there was a prior substantiated/indicated report of child maltreatment; (2) there was a substantiated/indicated report during the period under review, but no other substantiated/indicated reports within six months before or subsequent to the report during the period under review; (3) the repeat occurrences of maltreatment do not involve the same perpetrator or the same general circumstances; or (4) reviewers conclude that the agency's interventions to protect the child following the initial report could not have prevented the subsequent maltreatment.

Reviewers should rate the item as an area needing improvement if a report of maltreatment was received six months before or after the initial substantiated/indicated report and: (1) the additional substantiated/indicated report was due to the same general reasons or same perpetrators; or (2) the agency's response to the initial report was not sufficient to prevent future maltreatment.

Reviewers should rate this item as not applicable if over the life of the case there were no reports of maltreatment for any children in the family (for example, a Juvenile Justice case).

### **Item 3: Services to Family To Protect Child(ren) in Home and Prevent Removal**

This item focuses on the services to the family to protect the child(ren) and prevent removal from the home. Reviewers should assess services provided to the family during the period under the review, including to parent(s) who reside outside the home and who have contact or are involved with the child(ren). Information is used to help identify whether reasonable efforts were made to prevent removal of the child(ren) from the home initially as well as subsequent removals following the reunification of a child with the family.

Reviewers should rate the item as a strength if appropriate services were offered to prevent removal or if the agency's decision to remove the child from the home without providing services was based on the immediate safety needs of the child.

Reviewers should rate the item as an area needing improvement in the following situations:

- When the case was opened for in-home services, no services were provided, and the child was later removed on an emergency basis; or
- If the agency should or could have provided services to prevent removal of the child from the home.

Reviewers should rate the item as not applicable in the following situations:

- If a case is/was open for services for a reason other than a substantiated or indicated report of abuse or neglect or apparent risk of harm to the child, for example, a JPO shared case management case;
- If there were no substantiated or indicated reports of abuse/neglect, or apparent risk of harm during the period under review;
- If the child was in foster care during the entire period under review and there are no other children in the birth family home; or
- When it is/was not a case in which the child was maltreated or at risk of harm.

#### **Item 4: Risk of Harm to Child(ren)**

This item focuses on whether the child(ren)'s safety is/was the primary concern in the case and examines how the county is managing the risk of harm that necessitates continued placement or services to an intact family.

Reviewers should assess services provided to the family, including to parent(s) who reside outside the home and who have contact or are involved with the child(ren).

Reviewers should document whether the agency conducted a risk assessment or developed a safety plan. Reviewers should determine whether, during the period under review, there was risk of harm to the child(ren) in the family's home that warranted the child(ren)'s placement in foster care, or continued placement in foster care if placement occurred before the period under review (foster care cases). This includes an ongoing risk that precludes reunification. For children receiving in-home services, reviewers should determine whether the risk of harm to the child(ren) in the home is/was sufficient to necessitate the provision of services by the agency to protect the child(ren). Reviewers should note that this item is applicable to both a child(ren) receiving in-home services when a decision was made not to remove the child(ren) from their home and to a child(ren) who was removed.

When risk of harm to the child(ren) is/was present, in either instance, reviewers must determine whether the agency provided or arranged for services that targeted the identified risks with the goal of reducing them.

Reviewers should document concerns about the agency screening out reports of

maltreatment or not taking formal reports on cases already opened for services.

Reviewers also should document whether the agency closed the case prematurely. For a child placed in foster care, including a child for whom his/her parent's rights have been terminated, reviewers should assess the child's risk: (1) of being abused or neglected in foster care; (2) of being harmed while visiting with family members; and (3) of being reunified with a family member while safety concerns exist.

Reviewers should rate this item as a strength if the agency terminated the child's parent's rights as a means of decreasing risk of harm for the child (for example, a termination of parental rights would prevent a child from being returned to a home in which the child would be at risk) and has taken action to minimize other risks to the child (for example, preventing contact with individuals who pose a risk to the child's safety).

If a case is/was open for services for a reason other than a substantiated or indicated report of abuse or neglect, or apparent risk of harm to the child (for example, a juvenile justice case), reviewers should document this information and rate the item as not applicable. Note, however, that for a child noted as a "child in need of supervision" or "delinquent," reviewers should explore and determine whether there is a risk of harm to the child, in addition to the other reasons the case may be opened, prior to rating it as not applicable.

Reviewers also should not rate this item as not applicable simply because the child's parent's rights have been terminated

#### **Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries**

This item focuses on the child's re-entries into foster care and applies only to children in foster care. Reviewers should note the following AFCARS definitions when responding to this item:

- "Entry into foster care" refers to a child's removal from his/her normal place of residence, by court order or a voluntary placement agreement, and placement in a substitute care setting, or the removal of custody from the parent or relative guardian, which permits the child to remain in a substitute care setting; and
- "Multiple entries" refers to two or more admissions into the foster care system.

Reviewers also should note the following definition when responding to this item:

- "Discharge" refers to the point when the child is no longer in foster care under the care and responsibility or supervision of the County agency. If the County agency retains supervision of a child and the child returns home on a trial basis, for an unspecified period of time, the child should be considered discharged from foster care after a 6-month period of time.

Reviewers are asked to determine: (1) whether a child had multiple entries into foster care; (2) whether those re-entries resulted from the same general reason or circumstance; (3) how many entries the child had in foster care during the

period under review; and (4) whether any entries during the period under review occurred within a 12-month period of the child being discharged from another foster care entry. Reviewers must distinguish between multiple entries that occurred during the life of the case and the period under review and are asked to consider how the agency maintained the child safely in the home and prevented the child's re-entry into foster care.

A return to a foster care placement after a brief trial visit home does not count as a re-entry unless the child has been discharged from foster care. If, however, a child remains on a trial home visit beyond six months, there is no court order extending the visit beyond six months and the child comes back into foster care, the case would be considered a re-entry into foster care.

If during the period under review, a child does not have an entry into care within a 12-month period from being discharged from another entry into foster care, reviewers should rate this item as a strength.

Reviewers also may rate this item as a strength if a re-entry was an isolated incident during which the agency did what was reasonable to manage the risk following reunification but the child re-entered care for another reason (for example, the death of a parent).

Reviewers should rate this item as an area needing improvement if re-entries occurring within a 12-month period are/were due to the same general reasons or same perpetrators.

Reviewers should rate this item as not applicable if: (1) the child entered foster care before the period under review and remained in foster care throughout the period under review; or (2) the child entered foster care before the period under review and exited foster care during the period under review and there was not another entry into foster care during the period under review.

#### **Item 6: Stability of Foster Care Placement**

This item focuses on the stability of the foster care placement and applies only to children in foster care.

Reviewers should note the following AFCARS definitions when responding to this item:

- "Entry into foster care" refers to a child's removal from his/her normal place of residence, by court order or a voluntary placement agreement, and placement in a substitute care setting, or the removal of custody from the parent or relative guardian, which permits the child to remain in a substitute care setting;
- "Current episode of foster care" refers to a child's current stay in foster care based on the most recent removal of the child from his/her normal place of residence, resulting in his/her placement in a foster care setting and ending upon the child's discharge from foster care; and

- “Placement” refers to the physical setting in which a child in foster care resides. A new placement setting results when the foster care setting changes, for example, when a child moves from one foster family home to another or to a group home or institution.

Reviewers also should note the following definitions when responding to this item:

- “Changes in placement” refers to a change in the place where the child lives during an episode of foster care, excluding trial home visits. Reviewers should count any placement that lasts more than 24 hours while the child is in foster care including emergency or unplanned moves and juvenile justice placement. If, however, the foster family with whom the child is placed moves and the child moves with them, this does not constitute a change in placement. Reviewers should not consider a runaway episode as a placement change, or other temporary living conditions that are not placements, but rather represent a temporary absence from the child’s ongoing foster care placement, including visitation with a sibling, relative, or other caretaker (for example, pre-placement visits with a subsequent foster care provider or pre-adoptive parents), hospitalization for medical treatment, acute psychiatric episodes or diagnosis, respite care, day or summer camps and trial home visits;
- “Discharge” refers to the point when the child is no longer in foster care under the care and responsibility or supervision of the County agency. If the County agency retains supervision of a child and the child returns home on a trial basis, for an unspecified period of time, the child should be considered discharged from foster care after a 6-month period of time; and
- “Stability of the foster care placement” refers to the extent to which the child’s current placement is determined to be free from the risk of an unplanned disruption, or a move not directly related to the achievement of the child’s permanency goal, in the foreseeable future.

Reviewers should document any changes in placement settings (for example, moves from a shelter to foster family home or moves between foster family homes. Reviewers should examine why the change(s) in placement occurred. Some placement changes are planned in accordance with the child’s permanency goals, for example moving from an institution to a family-based setting.

Reviewers should rate this item based on the period under review. If there were no changes in placement during the period under review and the current placement is considered stable, then reviewers should rate this item as a strength.

### **Item 7: Permanency Goal for Child**

This item focuses on the process of establishing the most appropriate permanency goal for the child and applies only to children in foster care.

Reviewers should rate this item for the goal(s) in place during the period under

review.

If a previous goal was in place and unachieved for a considerable length of time before the most recent change, this should be documented and taken into consideration when rating the item (for example, three months before the onsite review, the goal was changed to adoption; however a goal of reunification was in place and unachieved for five years).

Reviewers should examine the appropriateness of a goal that ultimately rules out adoption, permanent legal custodianship, or return to family. Reviewers must assess whether the child's best interests were thoroughly considered in setting a goal of other planned living arrangement, and that such a decision is/was continually reviewed for ongoing appropriateness.

If the County agency is using concurrent planning for the child, the permanency goals recorded for this item should reflect the child's primary permanency goal outlined in the case plan.

For purposes of determining if a child was in foster care 15 of the most recent 22 months, reviewers should consider the date the child entered foster care as the earlier of the following: (1) the date of a judicial finding of abuse or neglect; or (2) 60 calendar days after the child's removal from the home. Reviewers should calculate time cumulatively over a 22-month period and should not include trial home visits or runaway episodes.

Due to changes in circumstances, a caseworker may have identified and provided services in support of a new goal for the child, which is/was not approved by or changed with the court if the plan is to ask the court to change the goal. In this case, reviewers should rate the item based on the goal identified by the agency even if it is/was not the official goal of record with the court.

### **Item 8: Reunification, Permanent Legal Custodianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives**

This item focuses on the achievement of a child's goal of reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives and applies only to children in foster care. Information about a child with a goal of other permanent planned living arrangement where the agency retains care and placement responsibility of the child in a relative's home should be documented under item 10 (Permanency Goal of Other Planned Living Arrangement).

Reviewers should note that a "permanent placement with relatives" is defined as a plan for the child to be discharged from foster care to the permanent care of a relative.

Reviewers should review for and document the reasons for any delays in the child's achievement of the permanency goal.

If the child has been in foster care at least 12 months since the goal was set and the goal is not yet achieved, reviewers must provide substantial justification to rate the item as a strength.

### **Item 9: Adoption**

This item focuses on the achievement of a child's goal of adoption and applies only to children in foster care. Achievement of an adoption goal means finalization of the adoption.

Reviewers should document the reasons for delays in the adoption process and the agency's efforts to address the delays.

If the adoption was not finalized within 24 months, reviewers must provide substantial documentation of agency efforts to finalize the adoption within that period to rate this item as a strength.

### **Item 10: Permanency Goal of Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement**

This item focuses on the achievement of a child's permanency goal of "other planned living arrangement" and includes children with a goal of other planned permanent living arrangement for whom independent living services are appropriate. This item should be completed only for children in foster care with a permanency goal of a planned living arrangement other than adoption, guardianship, or return to family.

Reviewers should complete this item for children in foster care whose goal is continued placement with relatives with the agency retaining placement and care responsibility. This item applies only to children in foster care.

This item is used, in part, to determine whether the County agency is in substantial conformity with Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) requirements that services be provided to assist children to attain permanency in their living arrangements.

Reviewers should consider for a child with a goal of other planned permanent living arrangement whether independent living services are being provided.

If the child does not have a permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement, this item should be rated as not applicable.

### **Item 11: Proximity of Foster Care Placement**

This item focuses on the proximity of a child's placement to the community in which the child's parent(s) reside and pertains to all children in foster care, including those whose parents' rights have been terminated and who are in adoptive placements.

Reviewers should use the child's current placement setting or the most recent foster care placement if the child has been discharged from foster care to answer the proximity questions and all settings in the period under review to answer questions about reasons for living outside the county or state.

If the child's parents are/were living separately, reviewers must determine which parent is/was the most involved in case planning and is/was most likely to be reunified with the child and then base decisions on the location of that parent's

residence.

Reviewers will need to determine whether the child is/was placed in the same community or outside the community in which the primary parent (as determined above) resides. In making this determination, reviewers should consider: (1) identifiable neighborhoods; (2) school districts; (3) the actual distance between the parent's home and the placement; and (4) the general accessibility of the child in placement to family and other social institutions familiar to the child.

Reviewers should document when a child is placed outside the community for specific purposes, such as meeting the individualized needs of the child or keeping the child in closer contact with the family than a same-community placement would allow.

Reviewers should rate this item as not applicable when: (1) the parents' whereabouts are unknown despite agency efforts to locate them; (2) the parents are deceased; or (3) parental rights are terminated with no planned involvement of the parents in case planning or case goals.

### **Item 12: Placement With Siblings**

This item focuses on a child's placement in foster care with sibling(s) who are also placed in foster care. This item attempts to distinguish the extent to which siblings are separated because of factors such as the availability of resources or disrupted placements rather than circumstances in which siblings' individual needs can be met only in separate placements.

Reviewers should look at siblings who are also in foster care and with whom the child lived prior to placement or with whom the child would be expected to live if the child was not in foster care. Reviewers should rate this item for the period under review.

Reviewers may rate this item as a strength when siblings are not placed together to ensure the best interests of the child(ren). Examples include: (1) when there is/was a large sibling group divided between two different placements and they maintain close, regular contact; (2) when one child is/was in an alternative placement to receive needed therapeutic services, with the plan to return that child to the placement with siblings; or (3) when one sibling is/was perpetrating abuse on another.

Reviewers should rate this item as an area needing improvement if siblings are/were placed separately due to the lack of placement resources.

If a brief separation is/was necessary to meet the needs of one sibling, reviewers should consider the efforts of the agency to reunite the siblings as appropriate.

Reviewers should rate this item as not applicable if there are/were no siblings in foster care.

### **Item 13: Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care**

This item focuses on the child's visitation with parents or siblings placed

separately in foster care. Reviewers should rate this item for the period under review based on the individual needs of the child and family, rather than on the State's visitation policy.

Reviewers should determine the most typical visitation pattern in responding to questions in this item. Reviewers should also determine whether other forms of contact are/were occurring, such as by telephone or mail, and note that visitation patterns may vary over time. For this item, it is important that reviewers explore the reasons for visitation restrictions.

Reviewers should explain the circumstances under which visitation is/was contrary to the child's safety or best interests unless there is a court order or a court order is pending. If the parents' whereabouts are/were unknown, reviewers should document the agency's efforts to locate them.

Reviewers should note that visitation with parents may still be appropriate following a termination of parental rights (for example, in cases of an open adoption, or placement with relatives).

The intent of this item is to assess the child's visitation with his/her siblings who are/were placed separately while in foster care. Visitation and contact with siblings not in foster care placement should be documented under Preserving Connections (item 14).

If reviewers rate this item as not applicable because parental rights have been terminated, this information should be documented.

#### **Item 14: Preserving Connections**

This item focuses on the preservation of the child's primary connections, including his or her relationship with previous foster families, schools, friends, communities, tribes/tribal customs and religion/religious observances.

Reviewers should note the following definitions when responding to this item:

- "Connections" refer to ties with family members and other related or non-related individuals with whom the child in foster care has/had a significant, positive relationship before entering foster care; and
- "Characteristics" of the child refer to positive aspects of the values, beliefs, religion, language, traditions and other factors that distinguish the identity of the child and the child's family.

Reviewers should determine whether the child's primary connections are/were preserved during the foster care placement(s) for the entire period under review. Reviewers should document the barriers to preserving connections for the child. For example, are the foster parents facilitating the child's connection to a previously established religious affiliation?

If reviewers find that preserving connections has been partially achieved, they should document the agency's efforts to preserve the child's connections and identify and document the additional efforts needed.

Reviewers should note that ICWA requires that: (1) in the absence of good cause, the State give placement preference to members of the Native American child's extended family; and (2) the State provide Indian tribes with timely notice of a Native American child's involvement in a court proceeding.

#### **Item 15: Relative Placement**

This item focuses on placement of children with relatives, when possible. Reviewers should determine whether relatives were identified and considered as a placement resource for the child. They also should document the reason(s) for the child not being placed with a relative who was considered.

Reviewers may rate this item as a strength if: (1) the agency assessed the child's needs and determined that he/she required special services; and (2) the agency assessed potential relative placements, maternal and paternal, and determined that the relative placements did not have the capacity to meet the child's needs.

Reviewers may rate this item as not applicable: (1) if the agency determined upon the child's initial entry into care that his/her needs required residential treatment services and a relative placement would be inappropriate; or (2) if relatives were unable to be identified despite the agency's diligent efforts to do so, or in situations such as abandonment in which the identity of the parents and relatives remains unknown despite efforts to identify them.

#### **Item 16: Relationship of Child in Care With Parents**

This item focuses on the nature of the parent-child relationship during the period under review and requires that reviewers make professional qualitative judgments. Reviewers can best make those judgments by considering the following when evaluating the parent-child relationship: (1) the child's and parents' expressed feelings toward each other; (2) evidence of sustained attachment between the parents and child throughout the placement; (3) the level of ongoing involvement of the parent(s) in the child's life during the placement; (4) the level of support the parent(s) are/were able to give the child in care; (5) the extent to which the integrity of the parent-child relationship is/was maintained; (6) parents are informed of school conferences; and (7) parents are involved in the child's daily activities such as sports or band. Reviewers should take a broad view on how the agency is/was promoting parental involvement with the child in foster care (not just visitation). This might include, for example, facilitating parental involvement in medical or mental health appointments or other activities through which parents can enhance their ability to connect to and parent the child.

Reviewers should consider what has occurred in the case during the period under review, while noting the circumstances during the life of a case. If there is/was no evidence of a supportive parent-child relationship, reviewers should explore and note in the documentation section below the reasons, for example, "parents' whereabouts unknown."

Reviewers should note that a supportive parent-child relationship may still be appropriate following a termination of parental rights (for example, open adoption or placement with relatives).

Reviewers should rate this item as not applicable if a relationship with the child's parent(s) is contrary to the child's safety or best interests.

### **Item 17: Needs and Services of Child, Parents and Foster Parents**

This item focuses on the needs and services of the child, parents and foster parents. If the child is in foster care, item 17 applies to that specific child only. If the instrument is being completed for a family receiving in-home services, then item 17 applies to all children in the family who are receiving agency services or are/were residing within the family.

Reviewers should examine whether the needs and services are/were addressed for some of the children in the family but not others and consider this information when rating this item. Reviewers should consider which members of the family are/were in the identified service unit and whether it is/was reasonable to expect that they receive services.

Reviewers should rate this item for the period under review, but should consider initial assessments of needs that were conducted outside the period under review and ongoing assessments during the period under review.

Reviewers must determine whether the agency identified the individual needs of the child(ren) and family in relation to the case goals or the agency's involvement with them.

Assessment of needs may take different forms (for example, a psychosocial evaluation conducted by another agency, by contract purchase, or by use of the Rapid Assessment Tool). Reviewers also may find evidence during interviews with caseworkers or service providers that identifiable efforts were made to assess needs through the case planning process (using a process other than formal assessment) and the caseworker has an in-depth understanding of the needs of the child and family upon which to base the case plan.

Reviewers should document whether the services provided are/were appropriately matched to the identified needs. For example, if the agency identified the need to address parental substance abuse, reviewers should explore whether substance abuse assessment, prevention, education, or treatment services are/were provided. Reviewers also should document the reason why services were not provided when a need had been identified.

Reviewers also should explore the accessibility and availability of services being provided (for example, location and schedule).

Reviewers should rate item 17 as a strength if; (1) a needs assessment was conducted for the child(ren), parents and foster parents; and (2) appropriate services were provided in relation to the identified needs of the target child in foster care cases, or for all children in in-home cases. Reviewers should note that education and physical or mental health services to the target child are not rated for this item (these are rated in items 21, 22 and 23). Reviewers should,

however, document whether these services were provided to parents.

### **Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning**

This item focuses on the agency's efforts to involve the child(ren), parent(s) and permanent caregivers (for example, pre-adoptive parents and guardians) in case planning activities. If the child is/was in foster care, item 18 applies to that specific child only. If the instrument is being completed for a family receiving in-home services, then item 18 applies to all children in the family who are/were receiving agency services or are/were residing with the family.

For in-home cases, reviewers should assess whether the primary service recipients in the family were involved in the case plan development. Reviewers should consider if family members have been/were involved in determining the following: (1) their strengths and needs; (2) the type and level of services needed; and (3) their goals and their progress toward meeting them.

If the original case plan was developed before the period under review and the goals remain the same, reviewers should consider the agency's attempts to engage the parent(s) in developing that case plan and also in the ongoing case planning activities that occurred during the period under review, such as updating and evaluating case plans or developing new plans.

Reviewers should rate this item as an area needing improvement if a case plan was not completed.

Reviewers should rate this item as not applicable if: (1) the child(ren) is/was not old enough or is/was incapacitated; and (2) the father and mother's involvement was determined to be contrary to the child(ren)'s safety or best interests or the father and mother were absent and the agency tried to locate them but was unable to do so.

### **Item 19: Worker Visits With Child**

This item focuses on worker visits with the child. Visits are defined as face-to-face contacts between the county and/or private provider caseworker and child. If the child is/was in foster care, item 19 applies to that specific child only. If the instrument is being completed for a family receiving in-home services, item 19 applies to all children in the family receiving agency services or residing with the family.

Reviewers should determine the most typical pattern of visiting during the period under review since the actual frequency may vary for different time periods.

Reviewers should rate this item based on the child(ren)'s need for contact with the county and/or private provider caseworker, not the agency's policy on caseworker visits. For example, reviewers should rate this item as an area needing improvement if there is/was less frequent visiting than needed by the child(ren).

If visits were less frequent than monthly, reviewers must provide substantial documentation to rate this item as a strength.

## **Item 20: Worker Visits With Parent(s)**

This item focuses on county and/or private provider caseworker visits with the parent(s) and permanent caregivers (for example, pre-adoptive parents and guardians). Visits are defined as face-to-face contacts between the worker and the parent(s).

If the child is/was in foster care, item 20 applies to that specific child only. If the instrument is being completed for a family receiving in-home services, then item 20 applies to all children in the family who are/were receiving agency services or are/were residing with the family. Reviewers should determine the most typical pattern of visiting during the period under review since the actual frequency may vary for different time periods.

Reviewers should rate this item based on the parent(s)' need for contact with the county and/or private provider caseworker, not the agency's policy on caseworker visits. For example, reviewers should rate this item as an area needing improvement if there was less frequent visiting than needed by the parent(s).

If visits were less frequent than monthly, reviewers must provide substantial documentation in order to rate this item as a strength.

## **Item 21: Educational Needs of the Child**

This item focuses on the educational needs of the child. If the child is/was in foster care, item 21 applies to that specific child only; if the instrument is being completed for a family receiving in-home services, reviewers should apply item 21 to all in-home children in the family.

When addressing educational issues for families receiving in-home services, reviewers should consider whether the educational needs are relevant to the reason the agency was involved with the family and whether the need to address educational issues was a reasonable expectation given the circumstances of the agency's involvement with the family. (If not, reviewers should rate this item as not applicable.) For example, if a child became known to the agency and was determined to be in need of in-home services and the alleged abuse or neglect was affecting the child's school performance or attendance, then it is reasonable to expect the agency to provide services to ensure that the child receives the appropriate educational assessment and services.

Reviewers may rate this item as a strength if the agency made extensive efforts to address the child's educational needs and the school system was unresponsive, especially if the problems are with a local school or jurisdiction.

Reviewers should rate this item as a strength if the child(ren)'s educational needs were assessed and addressed, including cases where the educational records are not maintained in the case record. In these instances, reviewers should, however, document that the educational records are missing and the reasons why.

Reviewers should rate this item as a strength if the agency conducted an assessment of educational issues and determined that there were no problems in that area, nor any need for educational services.

## **Item 22: Physical Health of the Child**

This item focuses on the physical health of the child. If the child is/was in foster care, reviewers should apply item 22 to that specific child only; if the instrument is being completed for a family receiving in-home services, reviewers should apply item 22 to all children in the family residing in the home.

Reviewers must determine whether the child has/had any identified health needs.

The primary criteria for rating this item is whether the child's health needs were identified in a timely manner and treated appropriately, if applicable. When addressing health issues for families receiving in-home services, reviewers should consider whether the physical health needs are relevant to the reason why the agency is involved with the family and whether the need to address physical health issues was a reasonable expectation given the circumstances of the agency's involvement with the family. (If not, reviewers should rate this item as not applicable.) For example, if a child became known to the agency and was determined to be in need of in-home services at least partly as a result of physical abuse or sexual abuse, then it is reasonable to expect the agency to provide services to ensure that the child receives the appropriate physical health services.

Reviewers should rate this item as a strength if the agency conducted an assessment of physical health and determined that there were no problems in that area, or any need for physical health services.

## **Item 23: Mental Health of the Child**

This item focuses on the mental health of the child. If the child was in foster care, reviewers should apply item 23 to that specific child only; if the instrument is being completed for a family receiving in-home services, reviewers should apply item 23 to all children residing at home.

Reviewers should focus on all of the child's mental health needs, as would be identified by reading the case notes or through case-related interviews, not only those that have been diagnosed by a mental health professional.

The primary criteria for rating item 23 is whether the child's mental health needs were identified in a timely manner and treated appropriately, if applicable. When addressing mental health issues for families receiving in-home services, reviewers should consider whether the mental health needs are/were relevant to the reason why the agency is/was involved with the family and whether the need to address mental health issues is/was a reasonable expectation given the circumstances of the agency's involvement. (If not, reviewers should rate this item not applicable.) For example, if a child became known to the agency and was determined to be in need of in-home services at least partly as a result of the child experiencing recurrent episodes of severe depression as a result of some form of maltreatment for which it is reasonable to expect that mental health issues would be involved (such as sexual abuse), then it is reasonable to expect the agency to ensure that the child receives the appropriate mental health services.

Reviewers should rate this item as a strength if the agency conducted an assessment of the child’s mental health and determined that there were no problems in that area, or any need for mental health services.

## Resolving Questions Regarding Item Ratings

In some situations, the case review team may disagree on how to rate an item. The following matrix shows four typical scenarios along two dimensions: effort and outcome. When both effort and outcome are high, the rating will be a strength. When both effort and outcome are low, the rating will be an area needing improvement. The gray areas emerge when the result (outcome) is good although the agency may not have followed protocol or the outcome is poor but a good deal of effort was made. In making a case rating, particularly in these gray areas, reviewers will first consider the criteria provided for the applicable item above. They should then speak with the team leader who will have a broader perspective on how similar cases were rated in other circumstances.

Outcome	Effort	
	High	Low
High	Strength	Professional Judgment
Low	Professional Judgment	Area Needing Improvement

If the team leaders cannot agree on how to rate a particular item, the technical assistant should be consulted. Further review of the case file, the provider file or review of interview notes may provide additional information to clarify an item rating.

## Determining Outcome Ratings

Outcomes are rated based upon the Items which make up the particular outcome. For example, Outcome Safety 1 is rated by reviewing the Item ratings for Safety 1 and Safety 2. Outcomes are rated as Substantially Achieved, Partially Achieved, Not Achieved or Addressed and Not Applicable. Definitions for the ratings differ between each outcome and are listed below:

### Safety 1 and 2

**Substantially Achieved:** All the Items associated with this outcome are marked as a Strength.

**Partially Achieved:** Some Items were a Strength and some are an Area Needing Improvement.

**Not Achieved or Addressed:** All applicable Items are rated as Area Needing Improvement.

**Not Applicable:** Most or all Items are Not Applicable.

### **Permanency 1**

**Substantially Achieved:** Item 7 is a Strength plus Items 8, 9, or 10 are Strengths. Item 5 and/or 6 is a Strength and relevant items 8 and 9, 8 and 10, or 9 and 10 are Strengths.

**Partially Achieved:** Item 7 is a Strength plus Items 8, 9, or 10 are Strengths. Item 5 and/or 6 is an Area Needing Improvement or Item 7 plus 8, 9, or 10 are Areas Needing Improvement.

**Not Achieved or Addressed:** All applicable items are rated as Area Needing Improvement.

**Not Applicable:** Most or all items were Not Applicable.

### **Permanency 2**

**Substantially Achieved:** No more than one item is an Area Needing Improvement (disregard Not Applicable).

**Partially Achieved:** Two or more but not all of the applicable items are an Area Needing Improvement.

**Not Achieved or Addressed:** All applicable items are rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

**Not Applicable:** Most or all items were Not Applicable.

### **Well-being 1**

**Substantially Achieved:** Item 17 is a Strength, no more than one remaining item is an Area Needing Improvement.

**Partially Achieved:** Item 17 is an Area Needing Improvement; 2 or more but not all other items is an Area Needing Improvement.

**Not Achieved or Addressed:** All applicable items are rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

**Not Applicable:** All items were Not Applicable.

### **Well-being 2**

**Substantially Achieved:** Item 21 is a Strength.

**Partially Achieved:** Item 21 is an Area Needing Improvement although some

components are satisfactorily addressed.

**Not Achieved or Addressed:** Item 21 is an Area Needing Improvement and none of the components are satisfactorily addressed.

**Not Applicable:** Item 21 is rated as Not Applicable.

### **Well-being 3**

**Substantially Achieved:** All the items associated with this outcome are marked as a Strength.

**Partially Achieved:** Some items were a Strength and some are an Area Needing Improvement.

**Not Achieved or Addressed:** All applicable items are rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

**Not Applicable:** Most or all items are Not Applicable.

## *Chapter 5*

# **County Report**

### **Purpose of the QSR Report**

The QSR report is prepared for each county by Hornby Zeller Associates. It is a compilation of the agency's strengths and needs for each of the outcomes and items reviewed. Numeric scores are provided to help the county compare its performance to that of other counties. The county can use the information in the QSR report to identify areas of training for agency staff, request technical assistance from the Center for Excellence, to develop policy or revised practice standards, to develop the Integrated Services Plan and/or develop new initiatives or increased services.

### **Format of the County QSR Report**

Each county QSR Report contains the following analyses:

- Key Findings for Safety, Permanency and Well-being;
- Findings for individual Items;
- Summary Judgments for Safety, Permanency and Well-being;
- Case Rating Summary; and
- Performance Indicators.

The first four analyses provide county specific results. The last analysis, Performance Indicators, compares county QSR results to the initial onsite review conducted for the CFSR and Program Improvement Plan goals.

### **Analysis of County QSR Data**

Data for the county QSR report analyses is drawn solely from the information recorded by the case reviewers on the review instruments. Data is presented in quantitative format for the first three sections (i.e., Key Findings for Safety, Permanency and Well-being; Findings for Items; and Summary Judgments) and is supplemented by the qualitative and interview data. The Case Rating Summary and Performance Indicators are calculated using the reviewers' ratings of each Item and outcome.

## *Appendices*

The following forms have been developed to assist the case review teams to record information during the course of the reviews. They can be photocopied for note-taking.

### **In-home Sample Methodology**

Each county will have to prepare a list for the selection of in-home cases as part of the review. The In-home Sample Methodology describes how the county children and youth agency and the team leaders prepare a case list for sampling and proceed with the sample. The Office of Children, Youth and Families will provide the substitute care sample. The county should review each case selected as part of the samples to determine if the case meets the standards for inclusion in the sample described above in Case Selection and Review.

### **Suggested Case Review Schedule**

Most counties and teams who participate in a Quality Services Review have not previously participated in a QSR or CFSR. The Suggested Case Review Schedule has been developed to emphasize the need for teams to complete a review and interviews for one case on each of the first three days. In addition, the Schedule underscores the need to allow time for primary and secondary quality assurance and de-briefing the team and the participating county. Onsite case review duties are listed for the case reviewers, the team leaders and the technical assistant.

### **Sample Interview Confirmation Letter**

To confirm interviews with parents, children, private agency workers and other parties involved with the case, a confirmation letter should be sent to each person. The letter should be printed on agency letterhead and sent to persons with scheduled interviews at least two weeks prior to the onsite review. The letter should be signed by the County Team Leader or County Agency Director. Reasonable revisions to the letter may be made, in keeping with the basic content and purpose of the letter and review.

### **QSR Interview Schedule**

The Quality Services Review Interview Schedule is used by team leaders and county children and youth and juvenile probation agency staff to develop the master interview and case review schedule for each team. The schedule can be used to identify potential conflicts when scheduling interviews and to identify cases where additional interviews may be needed for the review.

This form should be completed before the teams arrive to conduct the case review. Team leaders must consider travel time to off-site interviews when

developing the schedule for each case. Both review team members are strongly encouraged to attend each interview, so it will be necessary to schedule interviews so they are not concurrent or overlap.

## **QSR Information at a Glance**

To provide review team members with commonly requested information and to save time locating needed numbers during the week of the review, the County Team Leader may complete this form. Changes may be made based upon who the agencies determine will be the act as contacts with QSR team. The County Children and Youth Agency and Juvenile Probation Office should clarify with each contact what type of calls they may receive during the review.

## **Guide for De-Briefing Cases in Quality Service Reviews**

Reviewers should come to de-briefings prepared to present the following information on each case that they have completed reviewing. Generally, a de-brief is done with the team members after the case has been through a Level 1 quality assurance review by the team leaders. This form is solely for the review team members to make notes on to use for the de-brief. It is expunged at the end of the week. Each review team needs to be succinct in presenting the case. The information provided should support the ratings. Reviewers will have approximately 10 minutes to present the case and the ratings.

## **Preliminary Case Specific Findings**

This form is used for the Friday morning team de-brief. In the morning the team members gather as a group. Each pair of reviewers have the cases they reviewed with them open to the Case Rating Summary page (last page of the instrument). A team leader leads the group through an item by item tally. The purposes are two-fold. It provides a snapshot of the individual item and outcome ratings that will be provided to the agency at the preliminary report-out session with agency representatives. This snapshot view of the ratings allows one to look and see if the tallying was done correctly. For instance, if there are seven in-home cases in a sample of 15 reviewed cases, there should be seven Not Applicable's (NA) for Permanency One and Two. If there are five NA's, then the team needs to look for where the problem is. The second purpose is to get the reviewers back into thinking about each case and what they saw in the cases this week.

This form is completed by the team leader asking the teams for input for each outcome area. Reviewers identify a few strengths, a few challenges and, in Other Comments, other issues that may impact on the ratings. The Other Comment section would be where systemic factors can be noted. This review is an outcome review not a systemic factor review but there may be systemic and other factors that are impacting the outcomes. Examples of what to include in this section include: lack of available services; long waiting lists to access services; judge who refuses to terminate parental rights unless an adoptive family has been identified; uncovered caseloads, etc.



After the team completes this process, the team leaders get together and look at the information and identify that which will be provided by the team leaders to the agency as preliminary findings. A written report will follow in approximately a month.

## **Quality Assurance Checklist**

To help the team leaders track the progress of all cases in the review, the Quality Assurance Checklist has been developed for the QSR. Critical review steps are to be initialed by the team leaders and technical assistant after completion of each task. The form will identify if a read case has not received any portion of the quality assurance process.

## **Case Rating Summary**

The case rating summary should be used in concert with the Preliminary Case Specific Findings form. The Case Rating Summary can be used to tally the ratings for each item and outcome for presentation at the county de-brief.

## In-home Sample Methodology

### **SAMPLE DRAWING FOR IN-HOME CASES PENNSYLVANIA QUALITY SERVICES REVIEW**

Each county will select seven (7) in-home cases for inclusion in the quality assurance review, as well as two (2) additional cases to be used in the event any of the seven cannot be found or are otherwise inappropriate for inclusion. Each county should take the following steps to pull its sample.

- 1) Identify all in-home cases which were served any time during the period under review. An in-home case is a case in which no child in the family was in out-of-home care during any part of the period, i.e., no child in the family was or should have been part of the AFCARS data set for that six-month period.
- 2) Eliminate from this list any cases which were not open for at least 60 days during the above six-month period.
- 3) Arrange the list in alphabetical order, or in some other order which does not relate to the histories or facts of the cases. Do not, for instance, arrange the list by case number, if case numbers are assigned sequentially as cases are opened, because this would mean all older cases would be at the top of the list.
- 4) Count the cases in the list. This figure represents the universe. If 200 cases were served in-home for at least sixty days during the six-month period, 200 is the universe.
- 5) Divide the count by 9 and round down to the nearest whole integer. This number is called the interval. If the universe is equal to 200, the interval is 22 (200 divided by 9 = 22.22, rounded down is 22).
- 6) Select a random number between one and the interval. This number is the starting point of the sample. In the example above, any number between one and 22 could be selected.
- 7) Select the case in the list which is equal to the starting point. This is the first of the nine cases to be included. For instance, if the interval was 22 and the random number selected in step 6) was 13, select the 13<sup>th</sup> case.
- 8) Count out a number of cases after the selected case equal to the interval. The case where the counting ends is the second case selected. For instance, if the interval was 22 and the random number selected in step 6) was 13, select the 35<sup>th</sup> case (13 + 22) as the second case in the sample.
- 9) Beginning after the second selected case, repeat step 8) to select the third sample case. To continue with the above example, this would mean selecting the 57<sup>th</sup> case in the list (35 + 22).
- 10) Continue the process until the number of the next case to be selected is larger than the universe.

## In-home Sample Methodology

- 11) This should represent either nine or 10 cases. The first seven cases are the in-home sample. The other two or three cases represent the over-sample to be used only if some of the seven sample cases have to be thrown out, e.g., the case record cannot be found, two of the three categories of persons to be interviewed cannot be interviewed, the case is found actually not to have been open for at least 60 days during the six-month period or it is discovered that some child in the family was in out-of-home care during the six-month period.

## Suggested Case Review Schedule

<b>County Review case review flow</b>			
	<b>Case reviewers</b>	<b>Team Leaders</b>	<b>Technical Assistant</b>
<b>Monday</b>	Review first case and conduct interviews		
<b>Tuesday</b>	Review second case and conduct interviews	Primary quality assurance on first cases	
<b>Wednesday</b>	Review third case and conduct interviews	Primary quality assurance on second cases	Secondary quality assurance on first cases
<b>Thursday</b>	Respond to Primary and Secondary QA	Primary quality assurance on third cases	Secondary quality assurance on second and third cases
<b>Friday</b>	Team Debrief	Team Debrief Plan the verbal (unofficial) report to the county	Technical assistance on the debriefing process

## Sample Interview Confirmation Letter

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Dear \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed as part of the review of the family and children's services program in (County) \_\_\_\_\_. Your interview is scheduled for (time)\_\_\_\_\_ on (date)\_\_\_\_\_ at (location)\_\_\_\_\_. If this appointment is unsatisfactory or you find that you will be unable to be interviewed at this time, please notify me as soon as possible at (phone number)\_\_\_\_\_.

To confirm the purpose of the interview, the Pennsylvania Office of Children, Youth and Families (OCYF) and the County Children and Youth Agency and Juvenile Probation Office are jointly reviewing the child and family services programs in our State. Similar reviews are conducted in all Counties periodically as a means of identifying the strengths of State and County programs and areas where improvements are needed. The review will focus on program areas that include child protective services, foster care, adoption, family preservation and family support.

As part of the review, members of the OCYF-County review team will conduct interviews with individuals and families who are receiving or have received services from this agency, with service providers and with various professional and community representatives who share an interest in the public family and children's services programs in our State. The interviews should not last more than one hour and will focus on the quality of services provided, the outcomes of services and the needs of the families served by the programs.

Information obtained from the interviews will be used in preparing a report on the status of the county and OCYF programs. The comments of individuals interviewed will not be identified by name, but will be used in summary form to describe the findings of the review. Your participation in the review is entirely voluntary. Individuals who choose not to be interviewed will not suffer any adverse effects to the services they now receive or may receive in the future due to the refusal to be interviewed.

Thank you again for your assistance in this important review.

## QSR Interview Schedule

**Team 1**      **date:**

Case	Interview	Time

**date:**

Case	Interview	Time

**date:**

Case	Interview	Time

**Team 2**

Case	Interview	Time

Case	Interview	Time

Case	Interview	Time

**Team 3**

Case	Interview	Time

Case	Interview	Time

Case	Interview	Time

**Team 4**

Case	Interview	Time

Case	Interview	Time

Case	Interview	Time

**Team 5**

Case	Interview	Time

Case	Interview	Time

Case	Interview	Time

## Quality Services Review Information at a Glance

### Important phone numbers:

County Office of Children and Youth	
, Agency Team Leader	
, County Team Leader	
, Local Site Coordinator	
, OCY Executive Director	
, JPO Deputy Chief	
Security	
Yellow Cab	

### Important Directions

**Cafeteria** is located ...

**Vending** area is located ...

**Smoking** area is...

There is no smoking in the ...

**Restrooms** are located ...

**Parking** is available ...

See ... for parking vouchers, if needed.

Access **code to office**—

## Guide for De-Briefing Cases in Quality Services Reviews

**Instructions:** Reviewers should come to de-briefings prepared to present the following information on each case that they have completed reviewing. Generally, a de-brief is done with the team members after the case has been through a Level 1 QA. This form is solely for the review team members to make notes on what to use for the de-brief. It is expunged at the end of the week. Each review team needs to be succinct in presenting the case. The information provided should support the ratings. Reviewers will have approximately 10 minutes to present the case and the ratings.

### **Background Information**

→ Type of case (in-home, placement, JPO)

→ Description of target child(ren), If applicable, age, gender, placement type and location, reason for placement, permanency goal, special needs

→ Family Structure (composition, sibs in /out of placement)

## Guide for De-Briefing Cases in Quality Services Reviews

### **Case History**

- Date case opened and reason(s)
  
- History of maltreatment of children (number/timing of prior reports, victims/perpetrators, disposition)
  
- Current status of case (open, closed)
  
- Brief placement history of target child, if applicable
  
- Issues and needs of other involved family members (parents and children in case)
  
- Case goals/permanency goal for child(ren)
  
- Services provided (past and present, identify type of providers)

## Guide for De-Briefing Cases in Quality Services Reviews

### **Who was interviewed in the case?** (explain the absence of any required interviews)

- Child
  
- Parents
  
- Foster parents
  
- Caseworker/supervisor
  
- Service Providers
  
- Others

### **Case Ratings**

List each item rating, very briefly why each item was assigned that rating, and then the outcome rating. Items are rated Strength, Area Needing Improvement (ANI) or Not Applicable (NA). Outcomes are rated Substantially Achieved, Partially Achieved, Not Achieved or NA

**Safety Outcome #1:** Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

Item 1. Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 2. Repeat Maltreatment.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Safety Outcome #1 rating: \_\_\_\_\_

## Guide for De-Briefing Cases in Quality Services Reviews

**Safety Outcome #2:** Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

Item 3. Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 4. Risk of harm to child(ren).

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Safety Outcome #2 rating: \_\_\_\_\_

**Permanency Outcome #1:** Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

Item 5. Substitute care re-entries.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 6. Stability of substitute care placement.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 7. Permanency goal for child.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 8. Reunification, permanent legal custodianship, or permanent placement with relative.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 9. Adoption.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 10. Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Permanency Outcome #1 rating: \_\_\_\_\_

## Guide for De-Briefing Cases in Quality Services Reviews

**Permanency Outcome #2:** Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

Item 11. Proximity of substitute care placement.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 12. Placement with siblings.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 13. Visiting with parents and siblings in substitute care.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 14. Preserving connections.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 15. Relative placement.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 16. Relationship of child in care with parents.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Permanency Outcome #2 rating: \_\_\_\_\_

**Well-being Outcome #1:** Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

Item 17. Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 18. Child and family involvement in case planning.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 19. Worker visits with child.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

## Guide for De-Briefing Cases in Quality Services Reviews

Item 20. Worker visits with parent(s).

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Well-being Outcome #1 rating: \_\_\_\_\_

**Well-being Outcome #2:** Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

Item 21. Educational needs of child

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Well-being Outcome #2 rating: \_\_\_\_\_

**Well-being Outcome #3:** Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

Item 22. Physical health of the child.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Item 23. Mental health of the child.

Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Well-being Outcome #3 rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Preliminary Case Specific Findings

<b>Safety 1 – Children are first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect</b>
<b>Strengths</b>
<b>Areas Needing Improvement</b>
<b>Other Comments (i.e., systemic issues)</b>

Preliminary Case Specific Findings

<b>Safety 2 – Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible</b>
<b>Strengths</b>
<b>Areas Needing Improvement</b>
<b>Other Comments (i.e., systemic issues)</b>

Preliminary Case Specific Findings

<b>Permanency 1 – Children have permanency and stability in their living situations</b>
<b>Strengths</b>
<b>Areas Needing Improvement</b>
<b>Other Comments (i.e., systemic issues)</b>

Preliminary Case Specific Findings

<p><b>Permanency 2 – The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children</b></p>
<p><b>Strengths</b></p>
<p><b>Areas Needing Improvement</b></p>
<p><b>Other Comments (i.e., systemic issues)</b></p>

Preliminary Case Specific Findings

<b>Well-Being 1 – Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs</b>
<b>Strengths</b>
<b>Areas Needing Improvement</b>
<b>Other Comments (i.e., systemic issues)</b>

Preliminary Case Specific Findings

<b>Well-Being 2 – Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.</b>
<b>Strengths</b>
<b>Areas Needing Improvement</b>
<b>Other Comments (i.e., systemic issues)</b>

Preliminary Case Specific Findings

**Well-Being 3 – Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.**

**Strengths**

**Areas Needing Improvement**

**Other Comments (i.e., systemic issues)**

### Quality Assurance Checklist

<b>Case Name/Team</b>	<b>QA Level #1 Completed</b>	<b>Debriefed Date</b>	<b>QA Level #2 Completed</b>	<b>Changes QA'd</b>	<b>Final Tally on Ratings Completed</b>

### Quality Assurance Checklist

<b>Case Name/Team</b>	<b>QA Level #1 Completed</b>	<b>Debriefed Date</b>	<b>QA Level #2 Completed</b>	<b>Changes QA'd</b>	<b>Final Tally on Ratings Completed</b>

### Quality Assurance Checklist

<b>Case Name/Team</b>	<b>QA Level #1 Completed</b>	<b>Debriefed Date</b>	<b>QA Level #2 Completed</b>	<b>Changes QA'd</b>	<b>Final Tally on Ratings Completed</b>

## Case Rating Summary

Check the non-shaded box for each outcome and performance item that corresponds to the rating assigned by the reviewer.

Outcome or Performance Item	Item Ratings			Outcome Ratings			
	Strength	Area Needing Improvement	N/A*	Substantially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved	N/A*
<b>Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.</b>							
Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment							
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment							
<b>Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.</b>							
Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal							
Item 4: Risk of harm to child(ren)							
<b>Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.</b>							
Item 5: Substitute care re-entries							
Item 6: Stability of substitute care placement							
Item 7: Permanency goal for child							
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives							
Item 9: Adoption							
Item 10: Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement							
<b>Outcome P2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.</b>							
Item 11: Proximity of substitute care placement							
Item 12: Placement with siblings							
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in substitute care							
Item 14: Preserving connections							
Item 15: Relative placement							
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents							
<b>Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.</b>							
Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents							
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning							
Item 19: Worker visits with child							
Item 20: Worker visits with parent(s)							
<b>Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.</b>							
Item 21: Educational needs of the child							
<b>Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.</b>							
Item 22: Physical health of the child							
Item 23: Mental health of the child							