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Overview of Presentation:

• Existing System Responsibilities
• How we measure success
• CCR practice changes and challenges
• Aligning CCR expectations with practice and funding
CWS work is multi-faceted:

1. Prevention
2. Emergency/community response
3. Foster Care
4. After Care
CWS in the CCR World

EXISTING CWS RESPONSIBILITIES

Prevention-Focus:

Federal and state law mandate that pre-placement prevention efforts are made to prevent placement into foster care.

Challenges: Lack of access to services/ supports needed by families, particularly those living in poverty. Lack of prevention-funding for services needed by families.
Emergency Response:

State law requires all county CWS to operate a 24 response system to accept reports of abuse, neglect and exploitation.

- Immediate Response requires in-person response within 24 hours.
- Reports of risk not requiring IR requires an in-person response within 10 calendar days.
Emergency Response (con’t): Both law enforcement and CPS have authority to investigate and detain children for abuse and neglect.

- CPS investigations must be concluded within 30 days
- Services can be provided during investigation.
Allegations & Dispositions (Jan-Dec 2015)

Children with one or more Allegations for Jan 1, 2015 to Dec 31, 2015

- **Substantiated**
  - Sexual Abuse: 8.5%
  - Severe Neglect: 66.9%
  - Exploitation: 6.0%
  - At Risk, Sibling Abused: 6.0%
  - Caretaker Absence/Incapacity: 6.0%
  - Substantial Risk: 6.0%
  - Physical Abuse: 6.0%
  - General Neglect: 6.0%
  - Emotional Abuse: 6.0%
  - Missing: 6.0%

- **Inconclusive**
  - Sexual Abuse: 6.4%
  - Severe Neglect: 20.7%
  - Exploitation: 43.2%
  - At Risk, Sibling Abused: 15.9%
  - Caretaker Absence/Incapacity: 11.2%
  - Substantial Risk: 11.2%
  - Physical Abuse: 11.2%
  - General Neglect: 11.2%
  - Emotional Abuse: 11.2%
  - Missing: 11.2%

- **Unfounded**
  - Sexual Abuse: 7.1%
  - Severe Neglect: 24.3%
  - Exploitation: 39.8%
  - At Risk, Sibling Abused: 6.1%
  - Caretaker Absence/Incapacity: 20.1%
  - Substantial Risk: 20.1%
  - Physical Abuse: 20.1%
  - General Neglect: 20.1%
  - Emotional Abuse: 20.1%
  - Missing: 20.1%

- **Assessment Only/Evaluated Out**
  - Sexual Abuse: 15.3%
  - Severe Neglect: 18.3%
  - Exploitation: 46.4%
  - At Risk, Sibling Abused: 8.5%
  - Caretaker Absence/Incapacity: 10.4%
  - Substantial Risk: 10.4%
  - Physical Abuse: 10.4%
  - General Neglect: 10.4%
  - Emotional Abuse: 10.4%
  - Missing: 10.4%

- **Not Yet Determined**
  - Sexual Abuse: 10.0%
  - Severe Neglect: 21.5%
  - Exploitation: 42.2%
  - At Risk, Sibling Abused: 8.4%
  - Caretaker Absence/Incapacity: 15.2%
  - Substantial Risk: 15.2%
  - Physical Abuse: 15.2%
  - General Neglect: 15.2%
  - Emotional Abuse: 15.2%
  - Missing: 15.2%

A child is counted only once, in the category of highest severity. Percent calculations do not include "Missing".

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 1 Extract.
Program version: 2013.12.06 Database version: 6A12E1DE

California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP)
University of California at Berkeley
Foster Care (ages 0-21):

Upon removal, several activities take place:

- Immediate assessment for placement
- Identify all potential relatives for placement/connection
- Arrange for visitation with parents/siblings
- Ensure child receives medical/dental check up
- Screen and refer to mental health as needed
- Ensure enrollment/timely transfer in school and has educational support in place (eg. IEP)
Case Plan is the guiding tool:

- Developed within 30 days of removal or initial face-to-face visit, whichever is sooner
- Based on an assessment of the child with required elements per Division 31 regulations
- Provided to the court 48 hours prior to the dispositional hearing
- Social worker identifies the services to be brokered to meet the needs of children and families, with support of service providers and foster families
## Foster Care by Placement Type (April 2016)

Foster children under county child welfare-supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kin</th>
<th>FFH</th>
<th>FFA</th>
<th>GH</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>21,782</td>
<td>5,742</td>
<td>15,334</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td>15,290</td>
<td>61,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other includes youth in transitional housing, youth in pre-adoptive homes, SILPs (NMDs), shelter, runaway/missing youth
Efforts towards Permanency:

Concurrent efforts must be made to reunify the child with his/her birth family while identifying and supporting efforts to other permanency (guardianship or adoption) if reunification is unsuccessful.

• Relative caregivers always given preference per federal and state laws.
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EXISTING CWS RESPONSIBILITIES

After Care:

Continued financial assistance provided through Fed-Gap and Kin-GAP for guardians, and Adoption Assistance Payment (AAP) for adoptions.

*Challenge:* Limited post-permanency services due to limited funding resources
CWS has a robust system of Federal and State Oversight and Accountability which is transparent to the public.

1. Federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR)

2. California Outcome and Accountability System (AB 636)
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HOW WE MEASURE SUCCESS

The Federal Review

Reviews to 7 data measures & 7 systemic factors to measure state’s child safety, permanency and well-being through:

1. Statewide Self Assessment
2. Stakeholder Interviews
3. Case reviews using Fed tool
4. Data from CWS/CMS

= Statewide Program Improvement Plan (PIP)
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HOW WE MEASURE SUCCESS

Safety:

• Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse & 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 families.
Family and Child 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.
7 Data Measures (Federal and State)

1. **Maltreatment in foster care**: Of all children in care during the 12-month period, what is the rate of victimization per day?

2. **Recurrence of maltreatment**: Of all children with a substantiated allegation during the 12-month period, what percent had another substantiated allegation within 12 months?

3. **Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care**: Of all children who entered care in the 12-month period, what percent discharged to permanency within 12 months?
7 Data Measures (Federal and State)

4. **Permanency in 12 months for children in FC 12-23 months**: Of all children in care on the first day of the 12-month period who had been in care between 12 and 23 months, what percent discharged to permanency within 12 months?

5. **Permanency in 12 months for children in FC 24 months or more**: Of all children in care on the first day of the 12-month period who had been in care for 24 months or more, what percent discharged to permanency within 12 months?
7 Data Measures (Federal and State)

6. **Re-entry to foster care**: Of all children who enter care in the 12-month period who discharged within 12 months to reunification or guardianship, what percent re-enter foster care within 12 months?

7. **Placement stability**: Of all children who enter care in the 12-month period, what is the rate of placement moves per day?
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HOW WE MEASURE SUCCESS

CA “enhanced” data measures:

2B Referrals by Time to Investigation
2D Referrals by Time to Investigation – Completed Contacts
2F By Year * Timely monthly caseworker visits (out of home)
2F By Month * Timely monthly caseworker visits (out of home)
2S By Year Timely monthly caseworker visits (in home)
2S By Month Timely monthly caseworker visits (in home)
4A Placements with Siblings [static]
4B * Least Restrictive (Entries First Placement)
4B * Least Restrictive (PIT Placement)
4E (1&2) * ICWA placement preferences
5A (1&2) Use of Psychotropic Medications
5B (1&2) Timely Health/Dental Exams
5F * Children Authorized for Psychotropic Medications
6B Individualized Education Plan (IEP)

8A * Outcomes for Youth Exiting Foster Care at Age 18 or Older
Child Population
Child Maltreatment Allegations/Child Count
Recurrence of Allegations
Recurrence of Allegations after Exit
Case Openings *
Point in Time/Case Service Components *
Case Closures *
Entries to Foster Care *
Point in Time/In Care *
Exits from Foster Care *
Placement Stability (Entry Cohort) *
Median Length of Stay [static]
Home/Placement Distances [static]
Placement Days *
Disparity Indices
Maps - Zips/Tracts Data
Fed Review of 7 systemic factors:

1. CWS information (data) system
2. Case review system
3. Quality assurance system
4. Staff and provider training
5. Service array and resource development
6. Agency responsiveness to the community
7. Foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment and retention
CA “enhanced” CFSR under AB 636

Every county must implement a community-driven process that includes:

1. Conducting and preparing a County Self Assessment
2. Preparing and Implementing a System Improvement Plan
   • identifies targets for improvement
   • approved by the local Board of Supervisors and CDSS
3. Conduct continuous case reviews – Cases provided by CDSS & uses federal tool.
New CCR elements impacting CWS:

1. Team-based assessments and case planning
2. Resource Family Approval
3. Higher oversight of STRTP placements
4. Limitations on use of Shelter Care
1. Team-based assessments and case planning will include:

(a) Child and Family Teams (CFTs) to inform case plans and placement decisions:

- Convened by placing agencies
- Must include child’s caregiver, caseworker, FFA/STRTC rep, county MH rep, and (as applicable) Regional Center/Tribal representative. If in an STRTP or TFC, MH rep must be a licensed clinician.
- May also include extended family, informal supports.
1. Team-based assessments and case planning will include:

(b) Levels of Care Process and Assessment Tools – to support matching of children to placements per SB 1013

Pro’s: Promotes collaboration, family voice/choice, consistent with the Core Practice Model, supports desired outcomes.

Challenges: Expansion of CFTs, timeliness to current processes, training to tools/process, courts.
2. Resource Family Approval

- Streamlines the relative approval, foster parent licensing, and guardianship/adoption processes into a single, unified process that occurs up-front.

- Began in 2013 – goes statewide in 2017

**Pro’s:** Eliminates duplication, enhances child safety, better matching and support to relatives and other caregivers, prepares caregivers, promotes permanency.

**Challenges:** Reducing time to approval for relatives, transition to new process for counties and FFAs.
3. Higher Oversight of STRTP Placements:

- AB 403 requires any stays in an STRTP beyond 6-month to be reviewed by staff and approved by CWD Director or CWS deputy
- This is in addition to existing law requiring CWS to review youth in GH placements over a year and document efforts to step down to lower care.

**Pro’s:** Consistent with intent of CCR

**Challenges:** Recruitment/retention of foster homes, adequate support to family caregivers, higher quality and availability of behavioral supports and services.
4. Limitations on the use of Shelter Care:

- For counties currently using shelters, stays in these shelters are limited to no more than 10 calendar days.

**Pro’s:** Consistent with intent of CCR and research

**Challenges:** Reduced time to assess and match to homes; lack of adequate foster homes, especially for high-needs youth.
County Child Welfare activities in preparation for CCR Work:

- **Staffing and local implementation** – Dependent upon State allocations and State policy decisions.

- **Funding** – State/CWDA discussions resulted in funding for major components but True Up process needs to be finalized.
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ALIGNING CCR EXPECTATIONS WITH PRACTICE AND FUNDING

Significant policy decisions are pending from the State:

• Rates
• Assessment Tool (CANS or TOP)
• Assessment Process
• Performance and Accountability System
• Mental Health (eg. medical-necessity & certification process)
County Child Welfare activities in preparation for CCR Work:

- Collaboration and strategic planning at the local level are KEY in preparing for CCR implementation.
- Need to assess local provider capacity, local services capacity, and match to the needs of children and families served by CWS.
Questions?