

**Minnesota Department of Human Services  
Child and Family Service Review  
White Earth Band  
Self Assessment Update  
September 2009**

**Minnesota Child and Family Service Review  
Instructions for Conducting the  
County Self Assessment Update**

**Purpose of the County Self Assessment Update**

The purpose of this document is to provide agencies a framework for conducting a self assessment of their child welfare system, and to provide a format for documenting the self assessment process and findings.

The guidance is organized as follows:

- Purpose of the self assessment
- Process for conducting the self assessment
- Instructions for completing the self assessment

**I. Purpose of the Self Assessment**

The self assessment is the first phase of the Minnesota Child and Family Service Review. The self assessment process provides the agency with an opportunity to evaluate strengths and areas needing improvement across eight systemic factors. These systemic factors provide a framework for the delivery of child welfare services and achievement of safety, permanency and well-being outcomes. The agency also examines child welfare data to assess the effectiveness of the child welfare system and evaluates performance on federal data indicators.

The self assessment process serves two primary functions. First, the self assessment process allows agencies to begin identifying systemic strengths and areas needing improvement. The self assessment also provides agencies with a method to examine and interpret data related to safety, permanency and well-being performance. These activities provide a basis for carrying out continuous quality improvement efforts.

Second, DHS Quality Assurance staff review the self assessment and use the information to prepare for the second phase of the review process, the onsite review. Issues raised in the self assessment are further evaluated through case reviews or through targeted questions for community stakeholders.

In addition, information from the self assessment is shared with other program areas at DHS to inform plans for statewide training, technical assistance, practice guidance and policy development.

The evaluation and subsequent ratings of strength or area needing improvement on each exploratory issue and overall systemic factor are determined by the agency and reviewed by DHS Quality Assurance staff. Any questions regarding ratings or descriptions will be discussed with the agency. The ratings are included in the self assessment process for the following reasons: they assist the agency in targeting future policy or program development efforts and they provide the state's quality assurance process with quantitative data on systemic strengths and areas needing improvement.

Development of the Program Improvement Plan is the last phase of the review process. During the onsite phase of the review, some systemic factors may be identified as contributing reasons for rating specific performance items as areas needing improvement. The agency will be asked to address these systemic factors in their Program Improvement Plan. The agency will not be asked to address systemic factors based solely on the self assessment ratings.

**II. Process for Conducting the Self assessment**

Quality Assurance staff provide the self assessment document and offer guidance on completion of the process at the first coordination meeting held with the agency. The self assessment document includes specific data on federal data indicators performance along with safety and permanency data. The self assessment is completed and submitted to the Quality Assurance staff approximately two weeks prior to the onsite review.

Quality Assurance staff will give the agency examples of self assessment documents completed by other agencies and provide additional technical assistance as requested.

Agencies are strongly encouraged to convene a team of representatives of agency staff and community stakeholders to complete the self assessment process. Children’s Justice Initiative Teams, Child Protection Teams or Citizen Review Panels are examples of community stakeholders who play a key role in the overall child welfare delivery system. These community stakeholders bring a broad and meaningful perspective to the evaluation of systemic factors and performance related to safety, permanency and well-being. Staff members and community stakeholders who participate in the self assessment process also provide a valuable resource to the development of the Program Improvement Plan.

The agency may also consider options such as focus groups with community stakeholders or consumer groups, or consumer surveys as ways to gather information for the self assessment. Connecting the self assessment process to other agency needs assessment or planning requirements, such as CCSA, maximizes the use of time and resources to conduct the self assessment.

Self assessment documents are classified as public information and are posted on the child welfare supervisor’s website.

### III. Instructions for Completing the Self assessment Document

#### Part I. General Information

DHS Quality Assurance staff will identify the period under review. The agency is requested to designate a person who will be primarily responsible for completing the self assessment and provide contact information.

#### Part II. Systemic Factors

Instructions and guidance for completing the assessment of each exploratory issue and systemic factor are contained in this section of the self assessment document.

#### Systemic Factor Matrix

##### Description of Agency Practice

Use the exploratory issues to assess and describe the capacity and quality of the child welfare system. Describe how the system works, including strengths and promising practices. Each exploratory issue has specific guidance and instructions provided.

##### Exploratory Issue Rating

Each exploratory issue is rated on a numeric scale from 1 to 4. Ratings of 1 and 2 are considered areas needing improvement. Ratings of 3 and 4 are considered strengths.

Determine a rating for each exploratory issue according to the following scale:

Area Needing Improvement		Strength	
1	2	3	4
None of the exploratory issue practices or requirements are in place.	Some, but not all, of the exploratory issue practices or requirements are in place and some function at a lower than adequate level.	Most, but not all, of the exploratory issue practices or requirements are in place and most function at an adequate or higher level.	All of the exploratory issue practices or requirements are in place and all are functioning at an adequate or higher level.

##### Barriers Identified/Initial Plans

Identify barriers to meeting the practices or requirements for each exploratory issue. Include gaps in services, resource issues or other factors that contribute to the rating of area needing improvement. Where applicable describe initial plans the agency has for addressing the identified barriers or making systemic improvements.

#### Overall Systemic Factor Rating

Each systemic factor is rated on a numeric scale from 1 to 4. Ratings of 1 and 2 are considered areas needing improvement. Ratings of 3 and 4 are considered strengths.

The overall systemic factor rating for each of the eight systemic factors is determined by computing the average of the ratings for the exploratory issues. Using the “information system” as an example, an overall systemic factor rating of strength or area needing improvement would occur as follows:

In this example, “information system” has four exploratory issues to review. The self assessment indicates that exploratory issue A1 is rated a 2 (area needing improvement), exploratory issue A2 is rated a 3 (strength), exploratory issue A3 is rated a 3 (strength) and exploratory issue A4 is rated a 4 (strength).

The total of the ratings for all exploratory issues is 12. When the total rating is divided by four the overall systemic factor rating is 3.00, a strength.

### Part III. Safety and Permanency Data

Assess the performance on federal data indicators. The agency will address performance that does not meet national standards in a Program Improvement Plan, so it is helpful to use the self assessment process to identify and analyze factors affecting performance.

Review and analyze the data tables related to child safety and permanency measures. Compare the agency's data to statewide data and examine areas that show significant variation. Where appropriate, note when the data does not appear to adequately reflect the agency's performance.

Use any other data available to the agency that will contribute to a thorough evaluation of performance related to safety, permanency and well-being.

### Part IV. Assessment of Safety, Permanency and Well-being Performance

Based on examination of safety and permanency data provided in Part III, respond to each of the safety, permanency and/or well-being questions. Most questions include recommendations for using SSIS reports and SSIS charting and analysis to aid in the evaluation of safety, permanency and well-being performance.

### Part V. Assessment of Strengths and Needs

The first two questions in Part V ask for a brief summary of findings from the self assessment. Summarize systemic and practice strengths as well as areas needing improvement. Identify specific issues that warrant further examination in the onsite review.

The final item in the document is a series of questions used to evaluate the self assessment process. Feedback received in this evaluation is used to make improvement to the self assessment process.

## PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of Agency
White Earth Band of Ojibwe
Period Under Review
For Onsite Review Sample: September 1, 2008 – current Period for Provided Data: Data not available for tables. SSIS reports and Charting and Analysis reports were provided to the Band for review when completing the Self Assessment. Other: _____
Agency Contact Person for the Self Assessment
Name: Jeri Jasken Title: ICW Director Address: PO Box 358 White Earth, MN 56591  Phone: ( 218 ) 983-4647 Fax: ( 218 ) 983-3712
E-Mail: jerij@whiteearth.com

## PART II: SYSTEMIC FACTORS

### A. Information System (SSIS)

Use the following exploratory issues to assess and describe the capacity and quality of the agency's use of the Social Service Information System (SSIS). Describe how the system works, including strengths and promising practices. Identify barriers to an effective system and initial plans to address barriers.

A 1. Exploratory Issue: Has the agency developed policies or protocols regarding the use of SSIS?

Examples might include policies related to maintaining an electronic or paper file, requirements regarding

content of case notes, timing of client and collateral contact documentation, or development of "naming conventions" as a method of monitoring activity.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Paper file docs, edocs, weekly documentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Time constraints, office days for sta

A 2. Exploratory Issue: How does the agency plan and provide for resources to support the use and effectiveness of SSIS? Describe agency resources available for operation of SSIS such as: process for training new social workers and providing ongoing training; does the agency have an SSIS mentor and how does that role support utilization of SSIS; how does supervisory and management staff support SSIS use; and, is there a plan for ongoing replacement/upgrade of software and/or equipment?

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
SSIS mentor, new worker training, IT personnel	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

A 3. Exploratory Issue: How does supervisory staff utilize SSIS as a management tool? Consider the following in your response: Has the supervisor received SSIS training for managers; does the supervisor use SSIS for case oversight, to access individual cases, general reports and outcome charts to aid in supervision; has the supervisor established clear expectations for social service staff use and competencies related to SSIS; does the supervisor consider use of SSIS in the evaluation of social worker staff performance?

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Case oversight, reports, charting/analysis, feedback directly to workers individually	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Delayed training supervisory tools

A 4. Exploratory Issue: Assess and describe any current practice or program issues related to SSIS. Consider specific needs for training or technical assistance.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Overall Systemic Factor Rating for Information System  
(Determine the overall systemic factor rating based on ratings of the preceding exploratory issues)

Area Needing Improvement	Strength
1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/>

## B. Case Review System

Use the following exploratory issues to assess and describe the capacity and quality of the agency's case review system.

Describe how the system works, including strengths and promising practices. Identify barriers to an effective system and initial plans to address barriers.

B 1. Exploratory Issue: How does the agency ensure that each child in foster care has a current written case plan with all the required content elements? Include consideration of how the case plan reflects a family centered approach, system for measuring compliance with case planning requirements, and quality and effectiveness of case planning. Minnesota Statutes, section 260C.212, subdivision 1.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	

Case manager has to complete w/in 30 days w/supervisor signature of approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

B 2. Exploratory Issue: How does the agency ensure that parents and children in foster care participate in developing the child's case plan? Consider participation in activities such as identifying strengths and needs, determining goals, requesting specific services and evaluating progress related to their children. Discuss policies and practices to engage families in case planning and methods for engaging both parents, custodial and non-custodial, in case planning. Minnesota Statutes, section 260C.212, subdivision 1, (b) (3).

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Case manager has to meet w/parents within 30 days of case assignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Absent parents or find ext. family

B 3. Exploratory Issue: How does the agency meet the requirement to develop an independent living plan for every child age 16 or older who is in placement as a result of a permanency disposition? Describe how the agency ensures that the independent living plan is developed with input of the child and includes all required components. Discuss methods used by the agency to monitor compliance with this requirement. Minnesota Statutes, section 260C. 212, subdivision 1, b (8) (i-vii).

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Required to be in court reports & court orders - supervisor reviews every court report before it's submitted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

B 4. Exploratory Issue: How does the agency provide for the requirement that the status of each child in foster care is reviewed at least every 6 months, by a court or by administrative review? Discuss policies and practice for conducting reviews and methods for ensuring that reviews are held within required timeframes. Minnesota Statutes, section 260C.212, subdivision 7 (a).

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Court schedules hearings every 90 days	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

B 5. Exploratory Issue: How does the agency meet the requirement that permanency hearings for children in care occur within prescribed timeframes? Discuss the effectiveness of these hearings in promoting timely and appropriate achievement of permanency goals for children. Minnesota Statutes, section 260C.201, subdivision 11 (a) and subdivision 11a (a).

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Tribe files perm. petition or good cause language before timelines. Supervisory oversight and Judicial oversight aid in ensuring timelines followed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

B 6. Exploratory Issue: How is the requirement met to provide foster parents, pre-adoptive parents and relative caregivers of children in foster care with notice of and opportunity to be heard in any review or hearing held with respect to the child in their care? Minnesota Rules of Juvenile Protection, Rule 22.02 Subdivisions 1 and 2.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Court sends notices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Better updates to placement

B 7. Exploratory Issue: Does the agency participate in a Children's Justice Initiative Team? Discuss the functions of the team related to improving and monitoring the agency's case review system. Describe the characteristics of the Children's Justice Initiative Team, particularly applicable to agency planning and operations that help achieve safety, permanency and well-being outcomes.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
NA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Overall Systemic Factor Rating for Case Review System</b> (Determine the overall systemic factor rating based on ratings of the preceding exploratory issues)					
<b>Area Needing Improvement</b>		<b>Strength</b>			
<b>1 *</b>	<b>2 *</b>	<b>3 *</b>		<b>4 *</b>	

### C. Quality Assurance System

Use the following exploratory issues to assess and describe the capacity and quality of the agency's quality assurance system.

Describe how the system works, including strengths and promising practices. Describe barriers to an effective system and initial plans to address barriers.

C 1. Exploratory Issue: Describe the agency's process for carrying out reviews of the case record. Discuss the agency's internal case review system including description of any standardized process or tools. Discuss how the process for case record review ensures compliance with child protection rules and statutes.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Director & Assistant Director choose 2 cases each per week to review. Ensure all docs are completed & file up to speed. Direct follow up w/worker afterward, including detailed findings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

C 2. Exploratory Issue: Does the agency have a process for reviewing child maltreatment screening decisions, track assignments (Family Assessment/Investigation) and maltreatment assessments? Describe how the review process is designed to examine agency practices and decisions related to child safety outcomes. Describe how the agency utilizes results of these reviews to improve future practice and decisions.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Morning staffings between assessments & Director. Ongoing daily staffings w/Director. Ongoing daily staffings w/Director & Intake & Assessments. Every Wed. a.m. all open assessments are reviewed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

C 3. Exploratory Issue: Does the supervisor conduct regularly scheduled, structured supervisory conferences with the child protection social workers? Describe how supervisory conferences are designed to examine issues related to safety, permanency and well-being outcomes. How does the agency utilize results of these conferences to improve future practices?

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
1) Informal open door policy by director allows daily supervision and direction. 2) Monthly scheduled case reviews w/case managers on all open cases. 3) SSIS file review by Dir. & Asst. Dir., and follow up w/case managers. 4) Wed. 8-12 a.m., staff meetings/supervision w/ICW team.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

C 4. Exploratory Issue: Does the agency have a pre-placement and/or treatment screening process with the capacity to conduct comprehensive review of children in out-of-home placement or at risk of out-of-home placement? How is this process utilized to improve future practice? Describe the agency's process as it applies to helping achieve safety, permanency and well-being outcomes.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
1) Every family is screened by Director & staff before placement occurs. 2) Treatment goals for family identified early on. Kept to immediate risk issues & long term goals, separately. 3) No cookie-cutter plans - all are individualized. 4) Case managers required to see kids face-to-face @ least 1x/mo. & review with Director.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

C 5. Exploratory Issue: Describe the agency's overall quality assurance system. Include discussion on the capacity of the quality assurance system to evaluate the adequacy and quality of child and family services. Describe the capacity of the quality assurance system to collect and produce information and how the information is used to improve future practices.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Every Wed. a.m. at the beginning of agency meeting, QA is discussed amid the agency - foster care, customary adoption, assessments, intake; substance abuse, ARMHS; supportive housing, child protection, etc...how all work together & topics/suggestions for needed improvement. Team consensus made & follow up occurs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**Overall Systemic Factor Rating for Quality Assurance System**  
 (Determine the overall systemic factor rating based on ratings of the preceding exploratory issues)

Area Needing Improvement	Strength
1 *	3 *

### D. Staff and Provider Training

Use the following exploratory issues to assess and describe the capacity and quality of the agency's staff and provider training system. Describe how the system works, including strengths and promising practices. Identify barriers to an effective system and initial plans to address barriers.

D 1. Exploratory Issue: How does the agency provide for training needs of child protection staff that includes the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions? Describe training offered or required by the agency including how the agency meets requirements for MCWTS Core Training within six months of employment. Minnesota Statutes, section 626.559 and section 626.5591.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
1) Basic Training Manual is given to each new employee (CPSW). Discussed by supervisor & employee. Training is daily and ongoing thereafter. *We are exempt from MCWTS Core (requirements), but do attend	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

D 2. Exploratory Issue: Does the agency work in cooperation with the MCWTS to identify staff training needs? Does the agency develop staff training plans? How does the agency ensure that these training plans are carried out? Include discussion on how the agency supports staff training needs through planning and budget. Minnesota Statutes, section 626.559, subdivision 1 and Minnesota Rules Part 9560.0234, Subpart 3.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	

MCWTS - NA Annual training plans developed between worker & supervisor. Annual reviews held.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

D 3. Exploratory Issue: How does the agency evaluate the quality and effectiveness of staff training? How is staff training linked to the agency's system for quality assurance and continuous quality improvement?

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Staff & supervisor i.d. training needs. Training in those areas sought out. Annual review of training. Every Wed. staff have opportunity to discuss new training requests or needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

D 4. Exploratory Issue: How does the agency provide for the pre-service and in-service training needs of foster and adoptive parents and providers? Discuss specifically the agency's experience with hosting or supporting participation of prospective foster and adoptive families in the MCWTS Foster, Adoptive and Kinship Training. Describe the methods for delivering training, content and type of training. Include discussion on how the agency supports provider training needs through planning and budget. Minnesota Statutes, section 260C.215, subdivision 6 (3).

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Pre-service training occurs in foster houses. Ongoing training occurs monthly, held by the agency for foster and adoptive parents. Foster/Adopt parents put in training requests.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

D 5. Exploratory Issue: How does the agency evaluate the quality and effectiveness of provider training? How is provider training linked to the agency's efforts for quality assurance and continuous quality improvement?

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Feedback taken from foster/adoptive parents & staff, following trainings. Linked because if the training is poor quality then it will not be repeated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

D 6. Exploratory Issue: Describe resources/strategies the agency uses to promote stable placements by preparing foster parents and supporting them in meeting the needs of children. Identify efforts to match children to specific foster care providers and enhance their capacity to meet children's needs (e.g. training to address child specific needs).

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
1st, Placements are made predominantly w/relatives or kin, which promotes stability. 2nd, Placements are matched w/providers who can meet their needs. 3rd, Foster care staff & the case manager are each required to be in the home at least 1 x/mo. for 2 (minimum) face-to-face contacts to discuss issues & foster solutions. 4th, Training is provided to foster parents. 5th, Kids are linked to MH services quickly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Overall Systemic Factor Rating for Staff and Provider Training  
(Determine the overall systemic factor rating based on ratings of the preceding exploratory issues)

Area Needing Improvement	Strength
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**E. Service Array and Resource Development for 1) pre-placement prevention, 2) reunification, and 3) permanency services.**

Use the following exploratory issues to assess and describe the capacity and quality of the agency's service array and resource development system. Describe how the system works, including strengths and promising practices. Identify barriers to an effective system, including gaps in services, and initial plans to address barriers.

E 1. Exploratory Issue: Describe the primary service array provided by the agency to prevent removal of children from their homes, ensure safe and timely reunification, and help children achieve permanent plans when reunification is not an option. Include descriptions of practice related to placement prevention, reunification and/or other permanency plans.

Examine the permanency data on foster care population, reasons for entering foster care, foster care re-entries, time to achieve reunification, and time to achieve adoption in assessing the effectiveness of the agency's service array, resources and practices designed to prevent placements, and achieve reunification or other permanency plans.

Specifically assess agency policies and/or practices related to the following programs and service areas, and describe the impact on agency efforts to prevent placements, and achieve reunification or other permanency plans: Family Assessment (formerly Alternative Response), Family Group Decision Making, Concurrent Permanency Planning, relative search, and visitation between parents and children in foster care.

E 1 (a). Describe the primary service array provided by the agency to prevent removal of children from their homes. Include descriptions of practice related to placement prevention.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
1) Traditional wrap around services provided to family to i.d. risk areas & i.d. safety plans to keep kids home. 2) Assessments initiated right away but kept open up to 45 days to mitigate issues w/o opening a CP case. 3) CW cases opened w/immediate services to intervene. 4) Relatives step in to assist & oversee family safety. 5) Locate absent dads to step in.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

E 1 (b). Describe the primary service array provided by the agency to achieve safe and timely reunification. Include descriptions of practice related to achieving reunification, including practices specific to Trial Home Visits (THV).

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
1) Case Plans are specific & individualized & broken out by immediate needs vs. long term goals during hearings. Immediate needs accomplished = reunification w/custody or THVs. 2) UA's 3 x/week in home by ICW staff to monitor parents & keep kids safe @ home. 3) Active efforts required by agency & court 4) Frequent visitation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

E 1 (c). Describe the primary service array provided by the agency to achieve permanency plans when reunification is not an option. Include descriptions of practice related to achieving permanency.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
1) Timely filing of petitions 2) Relative caregivers identified for child 3) Customary adoption or TLC discussed early with caretakers & best option pursued that meets child & family's needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

4) Contact agreements done w/bio parents of "permanent" caregiver				
5) Child is consulted to ensure it's a good match.				

E 2. Exploratory Issue: Describe the agency's implementation of Structured Decision Making and how it is used to support placement prevention, timely and safe reunification, or achievement of other permanent plans. Assess how the application of Structured Decision Making tools is used to guide case planning and assess provision of services. Discuss how Structured Decision Making accomplishes: 1) structure and consistency to critical decision points, 2) increased consistency and validity of decision making, 3) targeted resources to families most at risk, and 4) improved effectiveness of child protection services. Include a discussion of which Structured Decision Making basic components/tools are being utilized and how they are being applied to both Family Assessment and investigation child protection cases.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Assessments (workers) use SDM tools in their decision making. Case managers use decision tools on SSIS to affirm their i.d. of family's needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	They don't always

E 3. Exploratory Issue: Describe the availability and accessibility of services offered. For example, are services community-based and consistent with the language and culture of families being served? Identify barriers to service availability and accessibility such as, geographic location, waiting lists, fees, or transportation.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Predominantly all services provided are tribally operated. ICW meets frequently with other tribal service providers to improve individual outcomes for families & overall quality of services to all families (QA).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Overall Systemic Factor Rating for Service Array and Resource Development (Determine the overall systemic factor rating based on ratings of the preceding exploratory issues)					
Area Needing Improvement		Strength			
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

### F. Agency Responsiveness to the Community

Use the following exploratory issues to assess and describe the capacity and quality of the agency's responsiveness to the community. Describe how the system works, including strengths and promising practices. Identify barriers to an effective system and initial plans to address barriers.

F 1. Exploratory Issue: Describe the agency's process for consultation and coordination with external partners or community stakeholders in agency planning, operation and evaluation to achieve organizational or systemic improvements? Discuss how actively the community is involved in these activities and how their input is incorporated into agency plans, operation and evaluation.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
ICW Director meets frequently with MH Director, Substance Abuse Director, Housing staff, DV staff, and other stakeholders to discuss systemic improvements. ICW has mutual partnership grants with many of these stakeholders w/improvement goals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

F 2. Exploratory Issue: Describe the agency's process or procedures for seeking consumer/client input and including the input in plans for organizational or systemic improvement? Discuss any current or planned activity.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	

ICW listens to clients & their families as well as foster parents & youth. ICW does incorporate their concerns & ideas into future ways to improve.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

F 3. Exploratory Issue: Describe the agency's Child Protection Team. Include discussion of the characteristics of the Child Protection Team, such as primary functions and membership particularly applicable to helping achieve safety, permanency and well-being outcomes. Minnesota Statutes, section 626.558.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
CPT team comprised of: ICW Tribal court Tribal PD Tribal Mental Health Tribal Home Health Local Schools It's a very open environment for team members to discuss safety concerns they have for specific youth. Assists ICW to i.d. youth at risk.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

F 4. Exploratory Issue: When applicable, describe the membership and activity of the Child Abuse Prevention Council, organized and operating according to state law and policy. Describe how the council meets the statutory requirement to submit a plan for the prevention of child abuse that includes an assessment and rank ordering of needed programs and services. Discuss how this information is incorporated and used in the agency's planning and operations to achieve improved safety, permanency and well-being outcomes. Minnesota Statutes, section 119A.14.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
NA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

F 5. Exploratory Issue: Describe any children's mental health or family services collaboratives that operate according to state law and policy? Briefly describe characteristics of the collaboratives, particularly applicable to agency planning and operations that help achieve safety, permanency and well-being outcomes.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
NA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

F 6. Exploratory Issue: How does the agency ensure compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act, including the requirement for determining if a child is American Indian? Discuss any policy or procedures the agency has developed to implement requirements. Minnesota Statutes, section 260C.215, subdivision 6 (i) (6) (b), Minnesota Statutes, section 260.761, subdivisions 1-7.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
NA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

F 7. Exploratory Issue: Has the agency assessed the need for any specialized or ongoing training relative to cultural diversity? Describe any training that has been offered and/or planned in the agency.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating	Barriers Identified
--------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------

		Issue Rating			
		1	2	3	4
ICW staff undergo ongoing cultural training on Ojibwe language, culture, child rearing practices, ceremonies & traditions		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Overall Systemic Factor Rating for Agency Responsiveness to the Community</b> (Determine the overall systemic factor rating based on ratings of the preceding exploratory issues)					
Area Needing Improvement		Strength			
1 *	2 *	3 *		4 *	

### G. Foster and Adoptive Home Licensing, Approval and Recruitment

Use the following exploratory issues to assess and describe the capacity and quality of the agency's system for foster and adoptive home licensing, approval and recruitment. Describe how the system works, including strengths and promising practices. Identify barriers to an effective system and initial plans to address barriers.

G 1. Exploratory Issue: How does the agency ensure adequacy of foster and adoptive family resources. Describe the foster and adoptive home resources available. Further describe resources, including staff, available to meet the needs of foster and adoptive family licensing, approval and recruitment. Minnesota Statutes, section 260C. 215, subdivision 1.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
1) ICW provides monthly training & asks foster parents what types of training they are seeking. 2) Foster care staff i.d. training areas they see are needed by individual foster care providers. 3) Foster care staff have a library of DVDs, tapes, and books on training topics. 4) There are 3 full time foster care staff for the 65 licensed homes. 5) Staff are on call 24 hrs day/7 days week for foster parents.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

G 2. Exploratory Issue: Does the agency's foster and adoptive home resources reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children who are in need of foster and adoptive homes? Describe the targeted recruitment efforts the agency has developed to address individual needs of children including racial and ethnic disparities between children in care and foster parents. Minnesota Statutes, section 260C.215, subdivision 1 and Minnesota Statutes, section 260C. 215, subdivision 6 (2).

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Cultural training is provided to foster parents. Cultural training is provided to children. Children are matched w/traditional or non-traditional homes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**Overall Systemic Factor Rating for Foster and Adoptive Home Licensing, Approval and Recruitment**  
(Determine the overall systemic factor rating based on ratings of the preceding exploratory issues)

Area Needing Improvement		Strength	
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	

### H. Supervisor and Social Worker Resources

Use the following exploratory issues to assess and describe the capacity and quality of the agency's supervisor and social worker staff. Describe how the system works, including strengths and promising practices. Identify barriers to an effective system and initial plans to address barriers.

H 1. Exploratory Issue: Assess and describe the organizational structure of the agency's children and family services. Discuss how the organizational structure is conducive to the achievement of safety, permanency and well-being outcomes and to the agency's continued quality improvement efforts.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory	Barriers Identified

	Issue Rating				
	1	2	3	4	
1) Director - Asst. Dir. - Sr. Social Worker (36 staff) 2) All are coordinated staff who meet weekly to meet the needs of families.  CPSW's - IV-E Specialist - Foster Care Coord.(2 FC workers) - Customary Adoption Coord. (2 staff) - Ed Neglect CPSW's (2) - Assessments - Intake.  Attorney - Urban office (2 CPSW's) - Office Mgr. - Receptionist - In-home Skills Worker - CD Counselors -  ARMHS Worker - CTSS Worker - Case Aides - Homeless Workers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

H 2. Exploratory Issue: Assess and describe the (1) supervisor to staff ratio, (2) caseload/workload size and composition for social workers and (3) the average number of child protection assessments completed per worker. Include discussion on how caseload size affects social worker practice and delivery of services.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
1) 2 supervisors to 36 staff, 2 coordinators to assist, 1 senior SW to assist. 2) Caseload size of 20 client families per CPSW, 15 CP cases & 5 CW cases. 3) Assessment workers average 8 per week. 4) Caseload size is higher than desired, but dedication of staff results in a good provision of services to clients.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	More staff needed

H 3. Exploratory Issue: Assess and describe the experience and education level of current supervisor and social work staff. Discuss agency requirements for education and/or experience for supervisors and social workers.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Supervisor Requirements: 4 yr. degree, 2 yrs. sup. experience, excellent standing in indian community, etc...(other) CPSW Requirements: 4 yr. degree in SW/HS, good standing in the Indian community, others. Supervisor has 4 yr., 13 years supervisory experience, additional training & certifications, standing in community, recognized by Tribal Council as QEW & QEW trainer for White Earth, cultural practice and knowledge. CPSW's all have 4 year degrees in SW or related field, and are in good standing in community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

H 4. Exploratory Issue: Assess and describe the agency's experience with staff turnover, layoffs or financial concerns that have impacted staff availability and experience.

Description of Agency Practice	Exploratory Issue Rating				Barriers Identified
	1	2	3	4	
Staff layover is within normal parameters of a child & family service agency. Heavy support is offered by supervisors and team. Stress & burnout still effects staff. No layoffs have occurred. Financial constraints prevent from hiring additional staff. Agency needs identified through the years & new hires focused on needed positions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Overall Systemic Factor Rating for Supervisor and Social Worker Resources (Determine the overall systemic factor rating based on ratings of the preceding exploratory issues)			
Area Needing Improvement		Strength	
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Community Issues

This is not a rated systemic factor. Response to community issues provides the agency with the opportunity to assess and describe presenting issues in the community that could likely have an impact on child and family service planning and delivery, and on achievement of safety, permanency and well-being outcomes. Discuss such factors as population/demographic characteristics, significant recent change in demographics, poverty indicators, and/or population diversity, for examples.

## Part III: Safety and Permanency Data

### A. Federal Data Indicators

Beginning with the first round of the CFSSR, single data measures were used for establishing national standards. This provided information to states and local social services agencies about their performance; however, did not always reflect the broader, more complex factors that contribute to performance. In 2007 the Administration of Children and Families revised the national standard indicators. Safety data indicators continue to be single data elements. Permanency data was expanded to allow for a closer examination of what particular practices drive the outcomes for children in foster care. Permanency data is now reflected in components, composites and measures as defined below:

**Composites:** Refers to a data indicator that incorporates performance on multiple permanency-related individual measures. There are four permanency composites.

**Component:** Refers to the primary parts of a composite. Components may incorporate only one individual measure or may have two or more individual measures that are closely related to one another. There are seven permanency related components.

**Measures:** Refers to the specific measures that are included in each composite. There are 15 individual permanency measures.

Table 1 includes band performance on the two safety data indicators and 15 permanency measures.

### Safety Data Tables

Tables 2-7 include child welfare data related to the agency's practices in addressing safety. These tables contain information about the agency's use of track assignments, report dispositions, timeliness of initial face-to-face contacts with children who are the subject of a maltreatment report and reasons for out-of-home placements.

### Permanency Data Tables

Tables 8-10 provide demographic information about the children in out-of-home placement (gender and age) and the type of settings in which children are placed.

Federal Data Indicators

Table 1

Data Indicator	National Standard	Band 2007	Minnesota 2007
Safety Indicator 1: Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence. Of all children who were victims of determined maltreatment during the first six months of the reporting period, what percent were not victims of another determined maltreatment allegation within a 6-month period.	94.6% *		95.2%
Safety Indicator 2: Absence of Child Abuse/Neglect in Foster Care. Of all children in foster care during the reporting period, what percent were not victims of determined maltreatment by a foster parent or facility staff member.	99.68% *		99.6%
Permanency Composite 1: Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification.			
Component A: Timeliness of Reunification			

Measure C1.1: Exits to reunification in less than 12 months. Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the year shown, who had been in foster care for 8 days or longer, what percent was reunified in less than 12 months from the date of the latest removal from the home?	75.2% *		84.4%
Measure C1.2: Median stay in foster care to reunification. Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the year shown, who had been in foster care for 8 days or longer, what was the median length of stay (in months) from the date of the latest removal from home until the date of discharge to reunification?	5.4 *		4.30
Measure C1.3: Entry cohort of children who reunify in less than 12 months. Of all children entering foster care for the first time in the 6 month period just prior to the year shown, and who remained in foster care for 8 days or longer, what percent was discharged from foster care to reunification in less than 12 months from the date of the latest removal from home?	48.4% *		58.1%
<b>Component B: Permanency of Reunification</b>			
Measure C1.4: Children who exit and re-enter foster care in less than 12 months. Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the 12-month period prior the year shown, what percent re-entered foster care in less than 12 months from the date of discharge?	9.9% *		25.3%
<b>Data Indicator</b>	<b>National Standard</b>	<b>Band 2007</b>	<b>Minnesota 2007</b>
<b>Permanency Composite 2: Timeliness of Adoptions</b>			
<b>Component A: Timeliness of Adoptions of children Discharged From Foster Care</b>			
Measure C2.1: Adoption in less than 24 months for children exiting to adoption. Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in the year shown, what percent was discharged in less than 24 months from the date of the latest removal from home?	36.6% *		50.1%
Measure C2.2: Median length of stay to adoption. Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in the year shown, what was the median length of stay in foster care (in months) from the date of latest removal from home to the date of discharge to adoption?	27.3 *		23.90
<b>Component B: Adoption for Children Meeting ASFA Time-In-Care Requirements</b>			
Measure C2.3: Children in foster care 17+ months, adopted by the end of the year. Of all children in foster care on the first day of the year shown who were in foster care for 17 continuous months or longer (and who, by the last day of the year shown, were not discharged from foster care with a discharge reason of live with relative, reunify, or guardianship), what percent was discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption by the last day of the year shown?	22.7% *		17.2%
Measure C2.4: Children in foster care 17+ months achieving legal freedom within 6 months. Of all children in foster care on the first day of the year shown who were in foster care for 17 continuous months or longer, and were not legally free for adoption prior to that day, what percent became legally free for adoption during the first 6 months of the year shown?	10.9% *		2.6%
<b>Component C: Progress Toward Adoption of Children who are Legally Free for Adoption</b>			

Measure C2.5: Children, legally free, adoption in less than 12 months. Of all children who became legally free for adoption in the 12 month period prior to the year shown, what percent was discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in less than 12 months of becoming legally free?	53.7% *		32.6%
Data Indicator	National Standard	Band 2007	Minnesota 2007
Permanency Composite 3: Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care			
Component A: Achieving Permanency for Children in Care for Extended Periods of Time			
Measure C3.1: Exits to permanency prior to 18th birthday for children in care for 24+ months. Of all children in foster care for 24 months or longer on the first day of the year shown, what percent was discharged to a permanency home prior to their 18th birthday and by the end of the fiscal year? A permanent home is defined as having a discharge reason of adoption, guardianship, or reunification (including living with a relative).	29.1% *		15.2%
Measure C3.2: Exits to permanency for children with TPR. Of all children who were discharged from foster care in the year shown, and who were legally free for adoption at the time of discharge, what percent was discharged to a permanent home prior to their 18th birthday? A permanent home is defined as having a discharge reason of adoption, guardianship, or reunification (including living with a relative).	98.0% *		85.6%
Component B: Children Emancipated Who Were in Foster Care for Extended Period of Time			
Measure C3.3: Children emancipated who were in foster care for 3 years or more. Of all children who, during the year shown, either (1) were discharged from foster care prior to age 18 with a discharge reason of emancipation, or (2) reached their 18th birthday while in foster care, what percent were in foster care for 3 years or longer?	37.5% *		41.7%
Permanency Composite 4: Placement Stability			
Measure C4.1: Two or fewer placement settings for children in care for less than 12 months. Of all children served in foster care during the 12 month target period who were in foster care for at least 8 days but less than 12 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings?	86.0% *		84.8%
Measure C4.2: Two or fewer placement settings for children in care for 12 to 24 months. Of all children served in foster care during the 12 months target period who were in foster care for at least 12 months but less than 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings?	65.4% *		55.3%
Measure C4.3: Two or fewer placement settings for children in care for 24+ months. Of all children served in foster care during the 12 months target period who were in foster care for at least 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings?	41.8% *		31.2%

\*The Band met the performance standard.

### Safety Data

Child Maltreatment Reports (Investigation): Alleged, Determined and Need for Service, 5 Year History  
Table 2

Year	Reports Investigated	Reports with Maltreatment Determined	Reports with Child Protection Services Needed Determined
------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	--

		(Number of cases determined/ as % of reports assessed)	(Number of cases determined/ as % of reports assessed)
2003			
2004			
2005			
2006			
2007			

DHS Research, Planning and Evaluation

Statewide rate of reports with maltreatment determined in 2007: 58.9%

Statewide rate of reports with child protection services needed determined in 2007: 4.0%

Child Maltreatment Reports (Family Assessment): History as Available/Applicable Table 3

Year	Number of Family Assessments / as percent of total maltreatment assessments	Number of Family Assessments with Subsequent Case Management Openings / as a percent of total AR assessments
2003		
2004		
2005		
2006		
2007		

Statewide rate of reports assessed with Family Assessments in 2007: 59.6%

Statewide rate of Family Assessments with Case Management Openings in 2007: 17.0%

DHS Research, Planning and Evaluation

Completed Face-to-Face Contact with Alleged Child Victims

Table 4

	Reporting Period	Total all Child Subjects	Percent With Timely Contact*	Percent Without Timely Contact	Statewide Rate of Timely Contact
Family Assessments and Investigations – Not Substantial Child Endangerment	Jan-Mar 2008				61.2%
	Apr-June 2008				64.9%
	July-Sept 2008				70.8%
	Oct-Dec 2008				67.8%
	2008				65.9%
Investigations – Alleged Substantial Child Endangerment	Jan-Mar 2008				52.3%
	Apr-June 2008				47.7%
	July-Sept 2008				52.7%
	Oct-Dec 2008				53%
	2008				51.4%

DHS Child Welfare Data Release Report

\*Timely contact is defined as:

Family Assessments: Within 5 calendar days of receipt of report

Investigation – Not Substantial Child Endangerment: Within 5 calendar days of receipt of report  
 Investigation – Alleged Substantial Child Endangerment: Immediately/within 24 hours of receipt of report  
 Reasons for Entering Out-of-Home-Care, Related to Protection-2007 Table 5

Reason	State %	Band #	Band %
Alleged Physical Abuse	6.7%		
Alleged Sexual Abuse	2.8%		
Alleged Neglect	19.1%		
Parent Alcohol Abuse	5.2%		
Parent Drug Abuse	11.8%		
Abandonment	3.1%		
Relinquishment of Parental Rights	0.9%		
Parent Incarceration	3.5%		
Total Reasons Reported for All Placements	24,139		--
Total Placements	24,873		--
Total Reasons Related to Protection	53.3%		

Reasons for Entering Out-of-Home-Care, Other than Protection-2007 Table 6

Reason	State %	Band #	Band %
Child Alcohol Abuse	1.4%		
Child Drug Abuse	2.6%		
Child Behavior	26.1%		
Child Disability	3.6%		
Parent Death	0.3%		
Caretaker Inability to Cope	9.4%		
Inadequate Housing	3.2%		
Total Reasons Reported for All Placements	24,139		--
Total Placements	24,873		--
Total Reasons Other than Protection	46.7%		

DHS Research, Planning and Evaluation

## Permanency Data

Gender of Children in Care-2007

Table 7

Gender	State %	Band #	Band %
Male	55.5%		
Female	45.5%		
Total Children in Care	14,800		

Age Group of Children in Care – 2007

Table 8

Age Group	State %	Band #	Band %
0-7 Years	32.2%		
8-12 Years	14.4%		
13+ Years	53.5%		
Total Children in Care	14,800		

Children in Out-of-Home Care by Placement Setting-2007

Table 9

(Children may be counted in more than one placement setting)

Placement Setting	State %	Band #	Band %
Foster Family Non-Relative	38.2%		
Foster Family Relative	14.5%		
Foster Home – Corporate/Shift Staff	1.1%		
Group Home	11.3%		
ICF-MR	0.1%		
Juvenile Correctional Facility (locked)	4.3		
Juvenile Correctional Facility (non-secure)	6.2%		
Pre-Adoptive Non-Relative	3.5%		
Pre-Adoptive Relative	1.8%		
Residential Treatment Center	18.7%		
Supervised Independent Living	0.2%		
Total Placement Settings	24,873		

## PART IV: ASSESSMENT OF SAFETY, PERMANENCY AND WELL-BEING PERFORMANCE

Use the data tables provided in Section III, SSIS reports DHS data releases or other data sources to examine the agency's performance and respond to the following safety, permanency and well-being questions.

<b>A. Safety</b>	
Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	
Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	
1.	Safety Indicator 1: Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence (Table 1). If the agency met the national standard, identify factors that contribute to strong performance. If the agency did not meet the national standard, identify and discuss barriers.
2.	Safety Indicator 2: Absence of Child Abuse/Neglect in Foster Care (Table 1). If the agency met the national standard, identify factors that contribute to strong performance. If the agency did not meet the national standard, identify and discuss barriers.
3.	Trends in Child Maltreatment (Tables 2-3). Examine the data on reports of child maltreatment. Identify trends and factors that may have contributed to an increase or decrease in the number of maltreatment reports.
4.	Family Assessment (Table 3). Describe protocols or criteria that guide the assignment of child maltreatment reports for a Family Assessment or investigation. Describe the process the agency uses to determine when track changes may be necessary.
5.	Timeliness of Initial Contact in Assessments or Investigations (Tables 4-5). Examine the data on timeliness of initial contacts. Identify factors that contribute to timely face-to-face contacts with children, and factors that contribute to delays.
6.	Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) Issues (Tables 6-7). Describe agency practices for addressing the needs of children and families experiencing difficulties with alcohol or other drugs. Examine worker competencies and training needs related to addiction, treatment, and relapse planning. Identify promising approaches or current barriers to addressing substance use issues.
7.	Other Safety Issues. Discuss any other concerns, not covered above, that affect safety outcomes for children and families served by the agency.
<b>B. Permanency</b>	
Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	
Outcome P2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	
1.	Permanency Composite 1: Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification (Table 1). Identify and comment on overall strengths and barriers to the agency's performance on the four measures included in Permanency Composite 1.
2.	Permanency Composite 2: Timeliness of Adoptions (Table 1). Identify and comment on overall strengths and barriers to the agency's performance on the five measures included in Permanency Composite 2.
3.	Permanency Composite 3: Permanency for Children and Youth in Foster Care for Long Periods of Time (Table 1). Identify and comment on overall strengths and barriers to the agency's performance on the three measures included in Permanency Composite 3.
4.	Permanency Composite 4: Placement Stability (Table 1). Identify and comment on overall strengths and barriers to the agency's performance on the three measures included in Permanency

Composite 4.
5. Relative foster care (Table 9). Describe agency efforts to promote timely relative searches, emergency licenses and relative foster care placements. Include a description of agency efforts to consider both maternal and paternal family members, and outline strategies for supporting stable relative placements.
6. Long-term foster care. Describe the agency's current practices related to the use of long-term foster care as a permanency option for children. Include information regarding the process for identifying and ruling out other, more permanent options, and the process for reassessing the ongoing appropriateness of the long-term foster care goal.
7. Other Permanency Issues. Discuss any other issues of concern, not covered above, that affect permanency outcomes for children and families served by the agency.
<b>C. Well-being</b>
Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.
Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.
Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.
1. Parent involvement. Discuss strategies the agency has implemented to impact performance in the following areas: Engaging fathers in needs assessment, service delivery and case planning. Identify promising approaches or current barriers to involving fathers.  Engaging non-custodial parents in needs assessment, service delivery and case planning. Identify promising approaches or current barriers to involving non-custodial parents.
2. Caseworker visits with children (Charting and Analysis Reports SSIS4 and SSIS5). Describe the agency's process for determining the frequency of face-to-face worker visits with children. Identify promising approaches or current barriers to frequent worker contact. Describe caseworker practices that contribute to quality visits with children.
3. Educational status of children. Describe current agency practices for ensuring that children's educational needs are assessed and addressed through services. Identify promising approaches or current barriers to addressing children's educational needs.
4. Health care for children. Describe current agency practices for ensuring that children's medical and dental needs are assessed and addressed through services. Identify promising approaches or current barriers to addressing children's health care needs.
5. Mental/behavioral health care for children. Describe current agency practices for ensuring that children's mental and behavioral health needs are assessed and addressed through services. Specify practices that support timely completion of Children's Mental Health Screening Tools to inform case planning. Identify promising approaches or current barriers to addressing children's mental health needs.
6. Other Well-being Issues. Discuss any other issues of concern, not covered above, that affect well-being outcomes for children and families served by the agency.

## PART V: SUMMARY OF STRENGTHS AND NEEDS

Based on examination of data and narrative responses provided in early sections of this report, summarize the information in response to the following questions.

What specific strengths of the agency's programs have been identified?

Staff are excellent.

QA happens weekly within agency and with stakeholders.

Supervision is daily & consistent

What specific needs have been identified that warrant further examination in the onsite review? Note which of these needs are the most critical to the outcomes under safety, permanency and well-being for children and families in the community.

Please complete the following evaluation of the self assessment process in terms of its usefulness to the agency and recommendations for revision.

Were the self assessment instructions and assistance from quality assurance staff helpful to you in the completion of the self assessment process? Yes  No

Comments:

Were you allowed adequate time to complete the self assessment process?

Yes  No

Comments:

Did you find the data provided and the references to SSIS reports helpful to your evaluation of safety, permanency and well-being performance? Yes  No

Comments:

Did you engage child welfare staff and/or community stakeholders in the self- assessment process? Yes  No

Comments:

Did you find the self assessment an effective process for evaluating your child welfare system? Yes  No

Comments:

Will you use findings from the self assessment to plan for systemic and/or organizational improvements in your child welfare system? Yes  No

Comments:

g) Any additional comments or recommendations for improving the self assessment process: