



SUTTER COUNTY
SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PLAN
TWO-YEAR PLAN

02/13/2008 – 02/12/2010

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	4
I. SIP Narrative	5
Systemic Factors	7
A. Discussion of System Strengths and Areas Needing Improvements	10
B. PQCR	
Summary of Data	11
Summary of Practice	12
Recommendations	12
II. <u>SIP Plan Components</u>	
Outcome 2A (old measure), New Measure S1.1: No Recurrence of Maltreatment	14
Outcome 3A (old measure), New Measure C1.4: Reentry Following Reunification (Exit Cohort)	16
Placement Stability, New Measure C4.1-C4.3	18
Outcome 3A (old measure), New Measure C2.3 and C2.4 – Adoption	20
Outcome 8A (old measure) Transition to Self- Sufficient Adulthood	23
New Measure C3.1, C3.2 and C3.3 Exit to Permanency	26
Attachments	
1. List of Community Stakeholders involved in Self-Assessment Process	29
2. Section V – Self-Assessment Summary	37

California's Child and Family Services Review System Improvement Plan

County:	Sutter
Responsible County Child Welfare Agency:	Sutter County Department of Human Services
Period of Plan:	2/13/08-2/13/09
Period of Outcome Data:	Quarter ending – April 2007
Date Submitted:	2/13/08

County Contact Person for County System Improvement Plan

Name:	Lisa Soto
Title:	Program Manager
Address:	1965 Live Oak Blvd., Yuba City, CA 95991
Phone/Email	(530) 822-7227 ext 139 lsoto@co.sutter.ca.us

Submitted by each agency for the children under its care

Submitted by:	Asst. Director Human Services – Director of Welfare and Social Services
Name:	Lori Harrah
Signature:	
Submitted by:	County Chief Probation Officer
Name:	Christine D. Odom
Signature:	

Acknowledgments for 2007

Project Management

Paula Kearns, MSW, Social Worker IV – Project Manager
Lisa Soto, MFT, Program Manager – Social Services

Child Welfare Services (CWS) Outcome & California-Child and Family Services Review (C-CFSR) Data Review Teams

Outcome 1B/2A (old measures) – New Measure SI.1 – No Recurrence of Maltreatment

Jennifer Ramirez, MSW, Social Worker IV – Team Lead
Jana Woodard, Social Worker Supervisor II
David Patrick, Social Worker III
Louise Graham, Social Worker III
Alison Kristunas, Social Worker I

Outcome 3G (old measure) – New Measure C1.4 – Reentry Following Reunification (Exit Cohort) and Placement Stability – New Measure C4.1-C4.3

Jennifer Allen, Social Worker III – Team Lead
Peggy Breaux, Social Worker III
Brenda Haugen, Social Worker II
Susan Hewitt, Social Worker II
Tia Davis, Social Worker I
Michelle Godwin, Peer Empowerment Provider

Outcome 3A (old measure) – New Measure C2.3 and C2.4 – Adoption

Roberto Garcia, MSW, Social Worker Supervisor II – Team Lead
Shannon Royston, MSW, Social Worker IV
Ellen Williams, Social Worker III
Josh Thomas, MSW, Social Worker IV
David Lara, Social Worker, II

Outcome 8A (old/current measure) Transition to Self-Sufficient Adulthood

Paul Reiner, MSW, Social Worker IV – Team Lead
Nicole Guerra, Social Worker III
Sarah Powell, Social Worker III
Greg Knox, Social Worker II
Kelly Hopkins, Social Worker I

Outcome C3.1 – C3.3 (New Measures) Exits to Permanency

Greg Knox, Social Worker II – Team Lead
Jennifer Allen, Social Worker III
Tony Kildare, MSW, Social Worker IV
Paul Reiner, MSW, Social Worker IV

Probation – Transition to Self-Sufficient Adulthood

Debra DeAngelis Campbell – Deputy Chief Probation Officer (Juvenile)
Anthony Chillemi – Supervising Probation Officer (Juvenile)
Sam Leach – Supervising Probation Officer (Juvenile)

Systemic Factors

Tony Kildare, MSW, Social Worker IV

I. SIP NARRATIVE

1. Identify Local Planning Bodies

Sutter County Child Protective Services (CPS) engaged several community partners for the Self-Assessment and System Improvement Plan (SIP). Work groups were formed to look at the County's demographic profile, public agency characteristics, outcome indicators and systemic factors. On August 30, 2007, the information was shared with community partners and their feedback was incorporated into the final report. See Attachment #1 List of Specific Attendees.

The following outlines some of the existing collaborations invited to the Sutter County Child Protective Services Self-Assessment Project meeting.

- ***Family Intervention Team (FIT)*** Which consist of individuals from local schools, Probation, CPS, Superior Court, Sheriff/Police, Mental Health, Public Health, District Attorney's Office, Children's System Of Care, Employment Services, Human Services and a Parent Partner. This group meets regarding families involved in Probation and Family Court to prevent or reduce the family's level of involvement with the Juvenile Justice System.
- ***Family Assistance Service Team (FAST)*** consists of manager, supervisor and line staff of the above list of agency. This group also meets weekly to consider the referrals on behalf of the Sutter County children who are at risk of out-of-home care. They screen internally those cases that may be appropriate for Sutter County's Children's System of Care.
- ***Yuba/Sutter Mental Health-*** Sutter County CPS works with a variety of partners within the Yuba/Sutter Mental Health Division. Mental Health Therapists, Children's System of Care, Adult Outpatient Clinical Services, First Steps and Psychiatrists are consulted to coordinate services to both adults and children who are involved with CPS and Probation.
- ***Multi-Disciplinary Interview Team*** Which is collaboration between CPS, Law Enforcement, the District Attorney's Office and when appropriate, Casa de Esperanza, a local woman's shelter. Forensic interviews are held with other trained team members observe from another room in an attempt to keep victims of sexual and physical assault/abuse from being interviewed multiple times by different individuals.
- ***Other Partners*** included local city and county schools, Salvation Army, Children's Hope, Sutter County Parent Network, Board of Supervisors, local parent partners, Employment Services, Children's Home Society, Peach Tree Clinic, Friday Night Live, UC Davis Department of Pediatrics, California Department of Social Services, local foster parents, California State adoptions, Yuba College, Church of Glad tidings, Casa de Esperanza, Sutter County

Counsel, Youth Partners, Foster Youth and Former Foster Youth now emancipated, California Rural Legal Assistance, Faith Based Services, Civic/ service Clubs, County Administrator’s Office., Transitional Housing Plus Providers, Family Law Facilitator, Sutter County Domestic Violence/Child Abuse Prevention Council, Sutter County One-Stop and business association.

Sutter County chose the following six (6) outcome indicators and goals to prioritize and show measured improvement over the next two (2) years:

<i>Outcome(s)</i>	<i>Improvement Goal(s)</i>
A. Outcome S1.1- No Recurrence of Maltreatment	Reduce the rate of Recurrence of Maltreatment by earlier intervention with outside agencies – Differential Response
B. Outcomes C1.1-C1.4- Reunification within 12 months	Increase Family Reunification rates within twelve months by developing County policies for collaborative network meetings with all Family Reunification cases.
C. Outcomes C4.1-C4.3- Placement Stability	Improve foster care placement stability by developing County policies for collaborative network meetings for out-of-home placements
D. Outcome C2.1- C2.5 - Adoptions within 24 months	Increase the percentage of cases where children are adopted within 24 months by working more closely with State Adoptions.
E. Outcome 8A-Children Transitioning to Self-Sufficient Adulthood	To promote a continuum of services and supports for former foster/probation youth and young adults (18-24) in Sutter County by increasing awareness, collaboration, cross-training and implementation of combined resources within Sutter County. To identify eligibility and promote the utilization of ILP for those young adults between the ages of 18 and 24.
F. Outcomes C3.1-C3.3 - Exits to Permanency	To better identify potential permanent homes for children who have been in foster care for 24 months or longer.

The improvement measurement period will begin February 13, 2008 and end February 13, 2010.

The Sutter County Self-Assessment has been posted on the Sutter County website for review and comment by community stakeholders and once approved; the System Improvement Plan will be as well.

2. Share findings that Support Qualitative Change

The following outlines specific areas in which Sutter County plans to implement prioritized areas of improvement based on the Outcomes identified above:

- *Differential Response*

The model of Differential Response involves promoting the development of community resources related to child welfare services that can partner with CPS, as well as improving networking with existing community partners. This is an area that is being explored.

- *Collaborative Network Meetings*

Discussed as a potential strategy to reduce recidivism. This strategy also revolves around the interplay of CPS and local service providers. This is an area that continues to be explored by the County, but has not been included as part of the current SIP. However, increased interaction with service providers is a component of the current SIP, with regards to Time to Reunification and Time in Placement Measures. The current Sutter Links model includes staffing common cases with Employment Services and an expansion is being developed for those CPS cases that will be transferring from FR to FM for earlier staffing in this manner. The proposed approach is regular network meetings involving the family, CPS staff, and service providers.

- *Other Relevant Factors Identified in Self-Assessment*

Timely Contacts By Social Workers: Sutter County is dedicated to monitoring Outcome Measures related to Timely Contacts by Social Workers, both from a view of Immediate and 10-day Investigation Responses and maintaining Timely Monthly Case Contacts. These areas continue to be monitored utilizing Safe Measures by line staff, supervisors, and management. Through concerted social worker effort, Sutter County at this time remains above the National Standard, but is cognizant that ongoing oversight of this area is necessary.

Community Partner's Engagement: The engagement of community partners is paramount to Sutter County addressing issues in the current SIP. Ongoing meetings and the collection of data is integrated in the strategies and goals including milestones, time-frames and assignments for all the outcome measures outlined in the current SIP. An analysis of qualitative practices was incorporated in the overall Self-Assessment process in which there were partners who participated who had previously received services, such as Parent Partners/Peer

Empowerment Providers, Foster Parents, and other stakeholders and community members who were involved in the group discussion efforts and round table discussion held at the Self-Assessment community meeting.

▪ *Collaborative Efforts with State Adoptions*

CDSS Adoptions District Office have been an integral part of the outcome measurement related to time to adoption and have been involved with the development of the strategies, goals and milestones in the SIP.

An analysis of cases was conducted as part of the previous Self Improvement Plan and various tools and questionnaires were developed by the various work groups to ascertain and extract information. For example, an analysis of a number of cases regarding Time to Adoption was completed in conjunction with CDSS Adoptions. This identified a list of barriers and challenges that are being carried forward to this current SIP for the purpose of developing protocols and training to address these issues.

▪ *Transitional Housing for Former Foster Youth*

In establishing the strategies and goals for the Former Foster Youth Transitional Housing Plus Program, the following partners have been/are being actively recruited to become members of The Action Team:

- Youth Partners, foster youth, and former foster youth now emancipated;
- Transitional Housing Plus providers, Children's Hope FFA and Triad Family Services;
- Yuba Community College: Foster / Kinship Care, Independent Living Program, Vista volunteers, Financial Aid/ Extended Opportunity Program and services (EOP&S) and Foster Parent Association;
- Local School Districts, Adult Education and Foster Youth;
- Sutter County Probation;
- Sutter County Mental Health and the Transition Age Youth (TAY);
- Sutter County Health Department;
- Sutter County Social Services;
- Consolidated Area Housing Authority of Sutter County;
- Salvation Army;
- Sutter County One Stop and Business Association;
- California Rural Legal Assistance;
- Faith Based Services;
- Civic and Service Clubs

Many of the above partners were part of the Self-Assessment process and continue to be involved in the development of the SIP.

- *Systemic Factors*

The Self-Assessment conducted on August 30, 2007, identified key areas related to local systemic factors including the challenge of dealing with a mobile client base that resides in an enmeshed community under the auspices of two jurisdictions (Yuba and Sutter Counties). No quantitative data is currently available regarding clients with bi-County CPS involvement. Other systemic factors addressed in the Self-Assessment include examination of the viability of the court/CPS agency relationship, interagency collaborative efforts, and the local array of social services available to residents of Sutter County.

An understanding regarding the manner in which agency data is collected, analyzed, and processed with relation to Federal ASFA, State AB636, and CFSR efforts was also discussed. This issue has been identified as being problematic. Currently, the agency lacks complete understanding regarding the manner in which CFSR data reported by UC Berkeley is developed.

Establishing an Appropriate Baseline for Evaluating Performance

An obstacle arises when establishing a baseline for evaluating performance on CFSR-2 measures in Sutter County, due to the relatively small size of the County's population base with regards to the demands of the existing national standards. The County has historically managed to remain very close to benchmarks in each of the seventeen current CFSR-2 (and the previous CFSR-1) categories with national standards, although performance on these measures has fluctuated over time. One reason for this variation is that a small number of children, or even a single family, can have a pronounced effect on the statistical data. For example, TP16 data regarding Measure S1.1 demonstrates that the County is currently out of compliance (93.6% vs. National Standard of $\geq 94.6\%$). The number of children out of compliance equates to nine children over the course of one year; the number of children that exceed the standard and create the out-of-compliance status is 1.44.

Proposed Methodology for Establishing Baseline Performance

The solution to this dilemma is to draw from a larger sample when establishing a baseline. This will allow the County to demonstrate overall performance over a longer period. The proposed methodology would utilize a baseline from a three-year period, which corresponds roughly with the implementation of the initial SIP in Sutter County. The County is currently reviewing existing data sources to determine if this is feasible.

- *PQCR*

Sutter County completed its first Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR). During this process, focus groups were an integral part of this process. “The Summary of Data” section of the Summary Assessment (Section V) of the Self-Assessment identifies the focus groups that were formulated for the PQCR. The PQCR focused on Time to Reunification. A number of issues were brought forward by the focus groups; specifically, the interplay between CPS and agency/community partners appears to be an element that is intrinsic to the provision of coordinated services for the safety, permanency and well being of children.

- *Sutter County Projects*

Project	Status
Montana Meth	Implemented
Crime Endangered Children (CEC)	Implemented
Methamphetamine Taskforce	Pre-Planning
School Readiness	Implemented
Peer Empowerment Providers	Implemented
Mediation	Implemented
Car Seat Safety Project	Implemented
SutterLinks (Linkages)	Implemented
Wraparound – Phase 2	Implementation

3. *Summary Assessment (Section V) of the Self-Assessment.*

- See Attachment 2 for Sutter County’s Summary Assessment (Section V) of the Self-Assessment.

II. SIP PLAN COMPONENTS

Outcome/Systemic Factor: No Recurrence of Maltreatment (S1.1)					
County's Current Performance: The County continues to demonstrate a 100% performance level with regards to Measure S2.1. The County is currently out of compliance with regards to Measure S1.1 (performance is 93.6%, National Standard is 94.6%) according to Quarter 1 2007 data. The County has remained in overall compliance with S1.1 over the past two and three year periods (when data is cumulatively analyzed).					
Improvement Goal 1.0 Reduce the rate of Recurrence of Maltreatment by earlier intervention with outside agencies.					
Strategy 1. 1 Assemble a group to assess how to implement Differential Response in Sutter County.			Strategy Rationale¹ Engaging community partners to provide early intervention services to families that do not rise to the level of CPS involvement.		
Milestone	1.1.1 Contact other counties that are currently using Differential Response to determine how this process was implemented in their counties.	Timeframe	Projected completion date – April 30, 2008.	Assigned to	No Recurrence of Maltreatment Workgroup.
	1.1.2 Develop work groups within this Department to determine ways to implement Differential Response.		Projected completion date – September 30, 2008.		No Recurrence of Maltreatment Workgroup.
	1.1.3 Meet with community partners to determine a process to implement Differential Response.		Ongoing		No Recurrence of Maltreatment Workgroup.

¹ Describe how the strategies will build on progress and improve this outcome or systemic factor

Strategy 1. 2		Strategy Rationale			
Assess what funding is available to implement Differential Response.		Assessing available funding for Differential Response will help determine the sustainability of the process.			
Milestone	1.2.1. Develop a work group to obtain information from other counties on potential funding sources.	Timeframe	Projected completion date – May 31, 2008.	Assigned to	No Recurrence of Maltreatment Workgroup.
	1.2.2 Develop a work group to obtain information on potential funding sources from the state.		Projected completion date – July 31, 2008.		No Recurrence of Maltreatment Workgroup.
	1.2.3 Develop a work group to assess what funding, if any, is available to this County.		Projected completion date – September 30, 2008.		No Recurrence of Maltreatment Workgroup.
Discuss changes in identified systemic factors needed to further support the improvement goals.					
Gain support from the various agencies that will be contributing to the differential response team.					
Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals.					
Sutter County CPS will need to educate the community partners and social services staff on the Differential Response Process.					
Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals.					
Other partners will help determine a process to implement Differential Response					
Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals.					
Development of protocols or Memorandums of Understanding.					

Outcome/Systemic Factor: Reunification within twelve months (C1.1 – C1.4)								
County's Current Performance: The County is currently in compliance with all Measures related to Timely Reunification (C1.1-C1.4) and Placement Stability (C4.1-C4.3) according to Quarter 1, 2007 data. Application of cumulative data analysis of the past two and three year periods indicate a lack of overall compliance with regards to Measure C1.1 (Reunification Within 12 Months).								
Improvement Goal 1.0 Increase Family Reunification rates within twelve months by developing a County policy establishing collaborative network meetings in all Family Reunification cases.								
Strategy 1. 1 Establish a work group to develop County policy.			Strategy Rationale² To bring together County social workers to create a new approach in the hopes of increasing successful outcomes in Family Reunification cases.					
Milestone	1.1.1 Determine work group and assign staff to formulate ideas and procedures for the creation of the new County policy.		Timeframe	February 2008		Assigned to	Policy Workgroup	
	1.1.2 Develop the policy.			March 2008			Policy Workgroup	
	1.1.3 Develop recommendations to present to management.			April 2008			Policy Workgroup	
	1.1.4 Present results to management for review and discussion.			April 2008			Policy Workgroup and	

² Describe how the strategies will build on progress and improve this outcome or systemic factor

				Management	
	1.1.5 Formalize and prepare implementation of new policy to Sutter County social workers.		May 2008	Policy Workgroup	
Strategy 1. 2 Disseminate new policy to Sutter County social workers.			Strategy Rationale To present Sutter County Child Protective Service social workers the new policy and rationale for this new approach.		
Milestone	1.2.1. Develop training for new policy.	Timeframe	May 2008	Assigned to	Policy Workgroup
	1.2.2 Present training to management for review and discussion.		June 2008		Policy Workgroup and Management
	1.2.3 Present training to staff to initiate implementation of the new policy.		July 2008		Policy Workgroup
Discuss changes in identified systemic factors needed to further support the improvement goals. None					
Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals. None					
Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals. Stakeholders' collaboration is necessary for successful implementation of this goal.					
Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals. These changes must be accepted by County management.					

Outcome/Systemic Factor: Placement Stability (C4.1- C4.3)					
County's Current Performance:					
The County is currently in compliance with all Measures related to Timely Reunification (C1.1-C1.4) and Placement Stability (C4.1-C4.3) according to Quarter 1, 2007 data. Application of cumulative data analysis of the past two and three year periods indicate a lack of overall compliance with regards to Measure C1.1 (Reunification Within 12 Months).					
Improvement Goal 1.0					
Improve foster care placement stability by developing a County policy establishing collaborative network meetings for out-of-home placements.					
Strategy 1. 1			Strategy Rationale³		
Establish work group to develop County policy.			To bring together County social workers to create a new approach with which to increase the stability in foster care placements.		
Milestone	1.1.1 Determine work group and assign staff to formulate ideas and procedures for the creation of the new County policy.	Timeframe	February 2008	Assigned to	Policy Workgroup
	1.1.2 Develop the policy.		March 2008		Policy Workgroup
	1.1.3 Develop recommendations to present to management.		April 2008		Policy Workgroup
	1.1.4 Present results to management for review and discussion.		April 2008		Policy Workgroup and Management
	1.1.5				

³ Describe how the strategies will build on progress and improve this outcome or systemic factor

	Formalize and prepare implementation of new policy to Sutter County social workers.		May 2008		Policy Workgroup
Strategy 1. 2			Strategy Rationale		
Disseminate new policy to Sutter County social workers.			To present Sutter County Child Protective Service social workers the new policy and rationale for this new approach.		
Milestone	1.2.1. Develop training for new policy.	Timeframe	May 2008	Assigned to	Policy Workgroup
	1.2.2 Present training to management for review and discussion.		June 2008		Policy Workgroup and Management
	1.2.3 Present training to staff to initiate implementation of the new policy.		July 2008		Policy Workgroup
Discuss changes in identified systemic factors needed to further support the improvement goals.					
None					
Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals.					
None					
Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals.					
Stakeholders' collaboration is necessary for successful implementation of this goal.					
Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals.					
These changes must be accepted by County management.					

Outcome/Systemic Factor: Adoption within 24 months (C2.1- C2.5)					
County's Current Performance:					
The County is currently in compliance with all C2 Measures related to Time to Adoption, with the exception of C2.4 (Legally Free Within 6 Months) according to Quarter 1 2007 data (current performance is 2.6%, National Standard is 10.9). Application of cumulative data analysis of the past two and three year periods indicate a lack of overall compliance with regards to Measures C2.1 (Adoption Within 24 Months – over two-year period) and C2.4 (in two and three-year periods).					
Improvement Goal 1.0					
Increase the percentage of cases where children are adopted within 24 months.					
Strategy 1. 1		Strategy Rationale⁴			
Address the issue of untimely referrals from Sutter County CPS to CDSS State Adoptions.		The issue of untimely referrals was identified in the last SIP as a barrier to timely adoptions. The rationale is that the sooner the referral is received by state adoptions, the sooner the process can begin. The sooner the process is started, the more time will be available to finalize the adoption.			
	1.1.1 Involve both the emergency response and ongoing units of CPS in monthly referral meetings with state adoptions.	Timeframe	02/21/08	Assigned to	CPS and CDSS Supervisors and staff
	1.1.2 Insure that state adoptions are systematically notified when FR services are terminated and 366.26 permanency hearing adoption orders are completed.		03/20/08		CPS Supervisors, Program Manager, agency Court Clerks, and Adoptions SIP Workgroup
	1.1.3		04/17/08		CPS Supervisors, Program

⁴ Describe how the strategies will build on progress and improve this outcome or systemic factor

	Insure that a system is in place to insure that concurrent planning referrals are identified and submitted in a timely manner.				Manager, and Adoptions SIP Workgroup
Strategy 1. Address the issue of untimely completion of adoptive home studies by CDSS State Adoptions.			Strategy Rationale The issue of untimely completion of adoptive home studies was identified in the last SIP as a barrier to timely adoptions. The rationale is that faster completion of the home study facilitates a timely adoption.		
Milestone	1.2.1. CPS to meet with State Adoptions to gain more insight into the home study process to determine if CPS can assist in any way in expediting the process.	Timeframe	05/15/08	Assigned to	CDSS and CPS Supervisors, Program Managers, and Adoption SIP Workgroup
	1.2.2 CDSS to explore the possibility of completing more of the home studies “in house” rather than depending on outside contracted agencies such as Liliput to complete them. Such agencies have been found to be slow in their completion.		06/19/08		CDSS Supervisors and Program Manager
	1.2.3 CDSS to examine their home study process to explore ways to expedite the process.		07/17/08		CDSS Supervisors and Program Manager
Strategy 1.3 Address the issue of the Juvenile Court extending FR services to families against the recommendation of the Department, which often results in lost time that could be spent on intensive adoption activities.			Strategy Rationale The issue of over-extending FR services was identified as a barrier to timely adoptions in our last SIP. The rationale is that if services are terminated at the appropriate time, adoptions could more easily be completed within the 24 month period.		
M	1.3.1	T	08/21/08	A	CPS Supervisors, Program

	Arrange for Permanency Training for Juvenile Court staff.				Manager, County Council, and Adoption SIP Workgroup
	1.3.2 Arrange for Permanency Training for CPS staff		09/21/08		CPS Supervisors, Program Manager, and Agency Training Coordinator
	1.3.3 Make court reports advocating adoption more convincing by conducting research to identify sources that could be cited in an effort to allow the Court to follow the adoption recommendations.		10/16/08		CPS Supervisors, County Council, and Support Staff
<p>Discuss changes in identified systemic factors needed to further support the improvement goals.</p> <p>A better system needs to be put into place to more quickly notify CDSS State Adoptions when their services are required. Court clerical staff at CPS should be able to assist in this effort.</p>					
<p>Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals.</p> <p>More permanency training is necessary to alert workers of its importance. Training for CPS workers on writing stronger court reports that advocate for adoption is one area of focus. The other training need is for the Juvenile Court Judge and his staff to be alerted as to the consequences of delaying permanency.</p>					
<p>Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals.</p> <p>CDSS State Adoptions, Juvenile Court, Northern California Training Academy</p>					
<p>Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals.</p> <p>County approval to proceed.</p>					

Outcome/Systemic Factor: Transitioning to Self-Sufficient Adulthood (AB636 Measure 8A)					
County's Current Performance: Transition to Self-Sufficient Adulthood:					
No National Standard is available to evaluate Measure 8A data related to Transition to Self-Sufficient Adulthood; data has also not been analyzed by UC Berkeley or CDSS to determine trends related to 8A.					
Improvement Goal 1.0					
To promote a continuum of services and supports for former foster/probation youth and young adults (18-24) in Sutter County by increasing awareness, collaboration, cross-training, and implementation of combined resources within Sutter County.					
Strategy 1. 1 Assemble Community Action Team, CAT.			Strategy Rationale⁵ To bring community and youth partners together to work towards a common goal of supporting youth as they transition to adulthood. This includes, but is not limited to, supporting the implementation of the Transitional Housing Plus Program in Sutter County.		
Milestone	1.1.1 Draft a statement of purpose.	Timeframe	01/25/2008	Assigned to	CAT lead
	1.1.2 Identify community partners.		01/25/2008		Team members
	1.1.3 Identify youth partners.		01/31/2008		Team members
Strategy 1. 2 Present statement of purpose to Social Services administration.			Strategy Rationale To share vision and allow administration to provide suggestions, including recruiting policy makers to the Action Team.		
Milestone	1.2.1. Set up meeting date and time with Social Services	Timeframe	02/15/2008	Assigned to	CAT lead

	Program Manager, Assistant Director of Social Services, Director of Health and Human Services, Mental Health Program Manager, Children's System of Care Program Manager, and Chief Probation Officer				
	1.2.2 Facilitate Meeting		02/22/2008		Team members
	1.2.3 Record suggestions, feedback, etc. Discuss with Team and make changes to Purpose Statement, and invitee list as needed.		03/07/2008		Team members
Strategy 1.3 Community Action Team Meeting, CAT.		Strategy Rationale To share and collect information regarding resources, establish commitments from partners, improve service delivery.			
Milestone	1.3.1 Select location, date, and time.	Timeframe	03/07/2008	Assigned to	CAT lead
	1.3.2 Invite community and youth partners		03/07/2008		CAT lead
	1.3.3 Facilitate Meeting		03/21/2008		Team members
Improvement Goal 2.0 Establish roles, responsibilities, and commitments with Community Partners that will improve service delivery to transition age youth.					
Strategy 2.1 Discuss and outline needs of youth in Sutter County at Action Team Meeting.			Strategy Rationale Increase awareness to Community Partners.		
Milestone	2.1.1 Meet with youth partners prior to meeting to discuss	Timeframe	03/07/2008	Assigned to	Team members

	his/her role at Action Team Meeting.				
	2.1.2 Community Partners to present their services at the Action Team Meeting. Record information		03/21/2008		Team members
	2.1.3 Problem solve barriers to service delivery or availability of services. Identify gaps.		03/21/2008		Team members
Strategy 2. 2 2 nd Action Team meeting, CAT. Action Team will meet a minimum quarterly to develop strategies that will include action steps to improve delivery of existing services.			Strategy Rationale Team needs to focus on action and the need to improve service delivery immediately. The Community Action Team will continue this process for the remainder of the year.		
Milestone	2.2.1 Identify solutions to increase services.	Timeframe	04/04/2008	Assigned to	Team members
	2.2.2 Solicit commitment from Community Partners to implement solutions. Record commitments in writing.		04/04/2008		Team members
	2.2.3 Share information with transition age youth, THP Plus providers, Social Services staff.		04/18/2008		Team members
Discuss changes in identified systemic factors needed to further support the improvement goals.					
Gain support from policy makers i.e. Board of Supervisors, Department Administrators (Welfare, Mental Health, Probation). Solicit commitment from entities such as One Stop, local colleges, Housing Authority, etc. to invest in transition age youth by incorporating					

specific protocols for service delivery to this population.

Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals.

Sutter County CPS will need to educate community partners and social services staff on the Transitional Housing Plus Program and needs of transition age youth. Power point presentation may be beneficial and will need to be devised by the SIP Team.

Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals.

Action Team to establish and define roles to promote collaboration and young adults' success.

Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals.

Development of protocols or memorandums of understanding.

Outcome/Systemic Factor: Children Transitioning to Self-Sufficient Adulthood – PROBATION					
County's Current Performance: No					
Improvement Goal 1.0 To identify eligibility and promote the utilization of ILP, for those young adults between the ages of 18 and 24.					
Strategy 1. 1 Combine staff efforts to review current juvenile caseloads			Strategy Rationale⁶ To combine efforts in identifying juveniles eligible to receive services through the Independent Living Program.		
Milestone	1.1.1 Arrange Meeting with Juvenile Managers	Timeframe	3/1/08	Assigned to	Deputy Chief Probation Officer
	1.1.2 Arrange staff meeting with probation officers carrying supervision caseloads.		3/12/08		Supervising Probation Officers
	1.1.3 Identify collaborative partners who work with and support the Independent Living Program.		4/1/08		Supervising Probation Officers
Strategy 1. 2 Create tool to utilize for confirming eligibility of those identified youth.			Strategy Rationale Have available tool to utilize when contacting agencies, confirming placement information and eligibility criteria.		
Milestone	1.2.1. Meet with Multidisciplinary Supervision PO's	Timeframe	4/9/08	Assigned to	Deputy Chief and Supervising Probation Officers
	1.2.2				

⁶ Describe how the strategies will build on progress and improve this outcome or systemic factor

	Contact those identified juveniles who have confirmed eligibility.		4/15/08		Multidisciplinary PO's
	1.2.3 Arrange meeting to discuss progress/lack of and responsibility of PO's with the delivery of service.		5/1/08		Juvenile Managers and Multidisciplinary PO's
Improvement Goal 2.0					
Assure that eligible youth are enrolled, participating and being serviced through the ILP Program for their transition into self-sufficient adulthood.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The extent to which the County ensures that eligible foster youth are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identified as eligible ▪ Collaborate w/local agencies 					
Strategy 2.1 Collaborate with community partners			Strategy Rationale Identify roles and responsibilities with regards to sharing ILP responsibilities		
Milestone	2.1.1 Coordinate meeting with collaborating agencies.	Timeframe	5/5/08	Assigned to	Supervising Probation Officers
	2.1.2 Create calendar tool for ILP activities		5/13/08		Supervising Probation Officers
	2.1.3 Collaborate with community partners regarding calendar of events and who will be responsible for event travel.		5/30/08		Supervising Probation Officers and Multidisciplinary PO's

Outcome/Systemic Factor: Exits to Permanency (Measures C3.1-C3.3)

County's Current Performance:						
The County is currently out of compliance with all C3 Measures related to Exits to Permanency. Current performance: C3.1 (Exits to Permanency – 24 Months in Care) 27.3%, National Standard is 29.1%; C3.2 (Exits to Permanency – Legally Free at Exit) 97.1%, National Standard is 98%; C3.3 (In Care 3 Years Or Longer – Emancipated at Age 18) 75%, National Standard is 37.5% (NOTE: C3.3 is a Measure where the goal is a lower number). The annual number of children that are out of compliance for these measures is three or less.						
Improvement Goal 1.0						
To better identify potential permanent homes for children who have been in foster care for 24 months or longer.						
Strategy 1. 1			Strategy Rationale⁷			
Identify other potential permanent opportunities beyond adoption during annual State Adoptions staffings for children who have been in foster care for more than 24 months.			The county currently meets with State Adoptions on an annual basis to determine if children are “adoptable.” The county should make an effort to identify appropriate alternative permanent placement opportunities including Guardianship, Non-Related Extended Family Members (NREFM), and/or returning the children to the biological parents at any time that a child is determined to be “unadoptable.” The strategy is to look at the child’s case with an “objective eye” during the reviews.			
Milestone	1.1.1	CPS Supervisor will access client data in SafeMeasures to determine which children have upcoming reviews that have been in placement or will have been in placement for 24 months or longer at the time of the review.	Timeframe	03/01/2008	Assigned to	CPS Supervisor

<p>1.1.2 CPS Supervisor will meet with the case-carrying social worker prior to the Annual Review to discuss potential placement options.</p>		03/01/2008	CPS Supervisor and Case-Carrying Social Worker
<p>1.1.3 Adapt format of Annual Reviews with State Adoptions to include formal inquiry regarding alternative permanent placement opportunities when adoption is not viable.</p>		03/01/2008	CPS and CDSS Supervisors and staff
<p>Discuss changes in identified systemic factors needed to further support the improvement goals.</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>			
<p>Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals.</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>			
<p>Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals.</p> <p>CDSS State Adoptions, CPS Social Workers, and Supervisors.</p>			
<p>Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals.</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>			

Attachment #1
Community Stakeholders Involved in
Self-Assessment Process

Sutter County Self- Assessment 2007 Community Meeting Group Assignment

Table # 1	Table # 2	Table # 3	Table # 4	Table # 5	Table # 6
Member name	Member name	Member name	Member name	Member name	Member name
Jim A	Jan P	Plaberto	Prabation	Korena Tamy	Paul
RICH Sebo	Joyce Pope	JOSH Thompson	DAVID LARA	SARAH POWELL	Linda Gans
Tia Davis	Paul Wuehler	Susan Webb	Chad Nelewander	Ed SMITH	Kelly (scrib)
Brenda H	Alison	Greg Knox	Debbie D'Angelo	Judy M.	Maria Herrick
Kathy Baker	Brian Bernardis	Ehannon	Jason Bates	Sandra J	Grace Esp
Kathy Messer	Tamus O	Kathy Rolfe	Donna	Tommy prob	Bev S
Michelle Gordon	Jackie St.	HORI Fuller	KRISTIN	Donna prob	Leah E.
Susan H	SUE England	Ellen Williams		DR Byron	Ben
Karen Handy					S.H. rep.

08/30/07 2:30pm-4:00pm

Sutter County Self-Assessment 2007 Community Meeting Attendees Sign-In Roster

Last name	First name	Address	Telephone #	E-mail Address	Signature
Aaberg	Nancy				
Aronson	Brian				
Baker	Edward				
Baker	Kathy				
Balean	Carrie				
Barnum	Gina				
Benninger	Lou				
Bhattal	Amerjit				
Brown	Dustin				
Bumgarner	Gaileen				
Byrd	Robert		916-734-4128	rbyrd@ucdavis.edu	<i>Robert Byrd</i>
Chandler	Cindy				
Chilemi	Tony	<i>Achillemi</i>	822-7320	ACHILLEMI@CO.SUTTER.CA.US	<i>Achillemi Chilemi</i>
Corley	Shawne				
Coulter	Deb				
D'Angeles	Debbie	<i>73595 Bond St</i>	822-7320	ddeangels@co.sutter.ca.us	<i>Debbie D'Angeles</i>
Dandean	Mark				
Denney	Jim				
Doscher	Richard				
Enelx	Leah	<i>2088 N Beale</i>	741-6750	LEENIX@YCDU.EDU	<i>Leah Enelx</i>
Espindola	Grace	<i>1895 Lassen Blvd, UC</i>	822-2418	grace@co.sutter.ca.us	<i>Grace Espindola</i>
Evans	Pat				
Fisher	Carla				

08/30/07 2:30pm-4:00pm

Sutter County Self-Assessment 2007 Community Meeting Attendees Sign-In Roster

Last name	First name	Address	Telephone #	E-mail Address	Signature
Godwin	Michelle				<i>Michelle Godwin</i>
Haley	Genny				
Handy	Karen	<i>Karen Handy</i>	<i>749 4813 822-7226</i>		<i>Karen Handy</i>
Hansen	Kathleen				
Harrah	Lori	<i>Lori Harrah</i>	<i>888-7238</i>		<i>Lori Harrah</i>
Hayman	Ronald				
Heckman	Sarah				
Herdia	Maria	<i>SCHD</i>	<i>822-7215 ext 226</i>		<i>Maria Herdia</i>
Holland	Jeff				
Hopper	Amanda				
Hoss	Joan				
Huett	Donya				
Johl	Sumit				
Kinnison	Michael				
Krouse-Taylor	Marsha				
Lee	Nancy				
Lester	Donna				
MacLeod	Kristen				
Marshall	Dave				
Medina	Lucy				
Mikesell	Judy	<i>SCHD</i>	<i>822-7215</i>		<i>Judy Mikesell</i>
Moe	Kellie				
Munger	Larry				

Last name	First name	Address	Telephone #	E-mail Address	Signature
Nagra	David	531 Camino del Rio N CA 92108	922-7270	dnagra	<i>David Nagra</i>
Odom	Chris		846-4955		
Payne	Benjamin	Benjamin Payne	682-4648		<i>Benjamin Payne</i>
Pope	Joyce	5410	822-7223		<i>Joyce Pope</i>
Quinn	Tammy	First Steps			<i>Tammy Quinn</i>
Ramsaur	Bill				
Robles	Laura		822-3208/359		<i>Laura Robles</i>
Rolfe	Kathy		749-3851	kscheuema@ycd.edu	<i>Kathy Rolfe</i>
Scheumann	Laurie	Laurie Scheumann			
Schies	Rick				
Schroeder	Fred				
Sherry	Tom		822-7130		<i>Tom Sherry</i>
Siemens	Beverly				
Siler	Janet				
Silva	Dan		822-7327		
Smith	Ed	Ed Smith	822-7448		
Stanfill	Jackie	Jackie Stanfill			
Stembridge	Don				
Stout	Richard				
Stratton	Caption				
Tupaz	Pau				
Turnball	Sandra	Sandra Turnball	822-7513		
Valentine	Myrnice				

Attachment #2
Summary Assessment (Section V) of the Self-Assessment

Attachment 2

SECTION V – SELF-ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

A. Discussion of System Strengths and Areas Needing Improvements

Overall, Sutter County's statistical data for each Outcome Area indicates that this County is achieving results which are reflective of providing expeditious and effective child welfare services. There are already many effective tools in place which provide an infrastructure for positive results. An example of particular strengths lies in the implementation of Structured Decision Making (SDM) Tools that aid social workers in identifying Safety and Risk factors in troubled families. However, it is always imperative to strive for improvement, and having looked more closely at the data, there appears to be some gaps in services available in the community.

The areas identified for improvement to be included in the SIP reflect the need for earlier intervention with families because the rates of maltreatment and recurrence of maltreatment are statistically significant. Sutter County is making a strong effort to look at Differential Response as an intervention to impact this area. These areas reflect issues of safety to our children whom we strive to protect from abuse and neglect. Work groups have been formed to strategize and develop goals to form a plan that is measurable and achievable for all the identified SIP goals.

Services that are already being strongly considered to bridge this gap include: Wraparound Services, Family Group Decision Making, comprehensive Intake Services, Intensive Therapeutic Services (ITS), Care and Functional Family Therapy. Further, there is a gap in services in the community to meet the cultural and language needs of Sutter County's increasingly diverse population, especially Punjabi and Spanish language services.

The assistance/resources that would help Sutter County in achieving improvements would be the continuance of full funding for CWS services. It is important to Sutter County that flexible funding be available to improve services to the community.

It appears likely that the following Outcomes will be included in the new three year SIP due on February 13, 2008; further analysis may need to be done in order to prioritize and approach goals and strategies for the Outcome Measures. The Outcome Measures were/are in a state of flux (with regards to the timeframe beginning with the PQCR and Self-Assessment related to the current SIP) with Measures being changed in terms of methodology and with some measures being dropped. Therefore, emerging data will need to be compared to the information and analysis available at the time of the Self-Assessment Community Meeting held on August 30, 2007. Regardless, consideration of the following Outcomes will be made when making the final priority of Outcome measures to be included in the 2007/2008 SIP:

Outcome 2A- Rates of Recurrence of Maltreatment:

A discussion with community partners was based around Differential Response.

Outcome 3A – Time to Family Reunification:

A discussion focused on utilizing the mediation process to provide case planning coordination.

Outcome 3A – Time to Adoption:

A discussion with several CDSS Adoptions workers and social workers took place – with an emphasis on barriers to timeliness of adoptions and issues beyond the County and CDSS’s control.

Outcome 8A – Children Transitioning to Adulthood:

A discuss focused on “housing issues” with community partners.

Systemic Issues – focus on CWS/CMS system issues and local system factors.

PROBATION:

Outcome 8A-Children Transitioning to Adulthood

A discussion focused on what steps need to be taken to assure the eligible youth are enrolled, participating and being serviced through the ILP Program to assist with their transition into self-sufficient adulthood with community partners.

B. Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR)

Sutter County conducted its first PQCR this year during the week of January 16, 2007 to January 19, 2007 and on February 15, 2007.

The PQCR is designed to review a specific area of focus of the County’s social work and probation practice. The goal is to identify strengths and challenges and make recommendations for improvement. CWS and Juvenile Probation conducted the PQCR as a concurrent process with the same area of focus, Reunification.

The area of focus for CWS was the outcome indicator, Length of Time to Exit Foster Care to Reunification. This area of focus parallels the County’s focus in the System Improvement Plan, and by choosing this area it is hoped that this will help guide the County’s improvement efforts.

Juvenile Probation: The area of focus for Juvenile Probation was also Length of Time to Exit Foster Care to Reunification with a focus on Permanency Resources. This area was chosen because probation has been concerned with effectively reunifying their children in care with an appropriate parent/guardian or other relative.

The following is a summary of data, practices and recommendations that resulted from the PQCR.

Summary of Data

The Summary of Data revealed that there are no clear distinctions between timely reunification and cases that did not reunify in a timely manner. There was also no distinction between the types of abuse allegations. All cases reviewed appeared to contain information that was similar in the eyes of the social workers. Although case loads appear to be manageable, the amount of case work related to documentation and paperwork for the purpose of establishing eligibility along with drug testing clients was reported to be a barrier to spending time with the families to coordinate and facilitate the reunification process.

The feedback from the foster parent focus group revealed that there was good rapport between foster parents and the County social worker, but that contact was minimal, and there was some feeling that the foster parents were not supported in their role as part of the reunification process. Foster parents would like to be more involved and have their voice heard. They would like to be included in the transition of the children back to the parents and be able to maintain contact with children and parents after reunification.

Sutter County has considered the feedback from the community partner's focus group which comprised agencies who are both providers and partners in the community: Sutter County District Attorney, Narcotic Enforcement Team, First Steps Perinatal Out Patient Program, County Counsel for Sutter County, Sutter County Probation, Sutter-Yuba Mental Health, Casa de Esperanza, and the Sutter County Superior Court-Juvenile division.

There was concern about the lack of coordination of services for parents having criminal cases and requirements along with a reunification case plan. Collaboration between agencies needs to continue and grow.

Summary of Practice

Utilizing mediation, developing an understanding of the family history, early buy-in from client to case plan, particularly with regard to drug/alcohol issues and mental health issues, were identified as areas which promoted timely family reunification. For both probation and CWS the ability to have frequent contact with the family and collaborative efforts with service providers encouraged timely family reunification. Therefore, continued support in these areas appears to be the key to an ongoing success rate of family reunification.

Recommendations

The purpose of conducting interviews with social workers and having focus groups which involve Social Worker Supervisors, foster parents, community partners and service providers promotes dialogue and input into what people think and feel about the

current system regarding the reunification process and how this impacts their abilities to provide services. The common goal is to reunify families – so what can we recommend to continue to strengthen this goal. Recommendations may relate to training, systemic/policy and/or needed State technical assistance. The recommendations for CWS and Juvenile Probation are set forth below.

Child Welfare Services

The recommendations made by the social workers, Social Worker Supervisors and probation officers are identified in the Summary of Practice (Section III).

The recommendations listed below are those the County intends to prioritize for integration in the County's System Improvement Plan.

Training:

- Explore efforts to coordinate a comprehensive training curriculum for both new and seasoned social workers
- Evaluation of training needs must be on-going and structured to be efficient
- Explore identifying a training expert to coordinate and document procedures

State Technical Assistance:

- None identified

CWS Agency:

- Explore ways to provide support staff/assistance to social workers with placement paperwork.
- Explore potential for identifying a placement worker
- Evaluate current drug testing procedures: contact other counties to compile information regarding the feasibility of outsourcing drug testing
- Maintain and build commitment to strengthen partnerships/collaboration with community partners/agencies

Services/Service Providers/Community Partners/Foster Parents:

- Explore how to increase Spanish/Punjabi speaking providers for parents and children
- Continue to evaluate and strengthen community partnerships/collaborations between agencies
- Evaluate feasibility of a social worker being co-located with Probation
- As part of exploring placement worker – this position could also help with better communication with foster parents regarding reunification issues
- Evaluate early use of mediation on cases before children are detained

Juvenile Court/Attorneys:

- None identified

Systemic/Policy Changes:

- Explore how to decrease continuances in family reunification cases by advocating meetings between Juvenile Judge, attorneys and CWS staff to discuss issues

Juvenile Probation:

The recommendations made by the Probation Officers and Probation Officer Supervisors are listed below. These recommendations will be prioritized for integration in the County's System Improvement Plan.

Training:

- Training needed on State/Federal guidelines regarding placement issues
- Training to clarify court paperwork
- Assessment of training needs for both new and seasoned officers – training on understanding how to work with substance abuse issues, abandonment issues, and gang involved families

Systemic/Policy Changes:

- Explore on-going recruitment of staff who speak other languages such as Spanish and Punjabi
- Explore use of mediation to mitigate need for placement or identify suitable placement alternatives early on

State Technical Assistance:

- Evaluate and explore the availability of State consultation to clarify issues regarding placement regulations

Services/Service Providers/Community Partners:

- Explore/collaborate for need for substance abuse treatment for youth in local area
- Explore issue of providing adequate mental health services for youth out of area – County to County mental health services agreement
- Explore Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), Children's System of Care (CSOC), Functional Family Therapy (FFT), Family Intervention Team (FIT), Teaching Prosocial Skills (TPS) programs for the ability to coordinate better services