

RTN.
DATE. 3/2/11

Henderson, Donald@DSS

From: Candyce Skinner [CSkinner@placer.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2011 11:23 AM
To: Henderson, Donald@DSS
Cc: David Coughran; Lynn R. DeLapp; Richard Knecht
Subject: SIP update report
Attachments: SIP update DRAFT 1-28-11 .doc

Hello Donald

Attached please find Placer County's draft for the annual SIP update report.

Can you also let me know who needs to sign this document? Does it need to go before our BOS for signature? If so, is there a signature page I am to use for this report?

I hope you are well. Look forward to hearing from you soon.

Candyce Skinner
CSOC Program Manager
Placer County
(530) 889-6785
CSkinner@Placer.ca.gov

The SIP Narrative – 2011 Update

Introduction

This document presents Placer County's System Improvement Plan (SIP) for its Child Welfare System. Unique among California counties, Placer County administers child welfare services as an integral part of the Systems Management, Advocacy and Resource Team (SMART), Children's System of Care (CSOC). The system is governed by the multi-agency SMART Policy Board, consisting of the Chief Probation Officer, the Director of Health and Human Services, the Public Health Officer, and the Deputy Superintendent of Schools, and chaired by the Presiding Juvenile Court Judge. Within the traditional county departmental structure, child welfare services are located within the Health and Human Services (HHS) Department.

CSOC is a fully integrated, full-scale system which has provided a continuum of services including Child Welfare Services, Adoptions Services, Foster Care Licensing, Mental Health, Substance Abuse, Foster Care Eligibility, portions of Probation, Foster Youth Services, Alternative Education and elements of Community Health programs since 1988. It operates under the vision, "All children, adults and families in Placer County will be self-sufficient in keeping themselves, their children and their families safe, healthy, at home, in school/employed, out of trouble and economically stable." Its mission is to "ensure that all public programs for children and families will provide services in a comprehensive and integrated manner, regardless of the agency door by which families enter." All services are administered through integrated CSOC teams.

The Accountability Process: Self-Assessment, System Improvement Plan, Peer Quality Case Review

The System Improvement Plan is the third of three county activities required by the federal government as implemented in California by AB 636 (2004). Every three years, all California counties are required to conduct a California Child and Family Services Review (C-CFSR) of all child welfare services administered by both CSOC and Probation. The 2009-2010 Placer C-CFSR includes a Peer Quality Case Review of agency practice (completed in March 2009); the County Self-Assessment (CSA), a comprehensive assessment of agency systems and review of progress on state and federal child welfare outcomes (completed in November 2009); and a System Improvement Plan (SIP).

The guiding principles of the SIP, enumerated by the California Department of Social Services and embraced by Placer County CSOC, are:

1. The goal of the child welfare system is to improve outcomes for children and families in the areas of safety, permanency, and well-being.
2. The entire community is responsible for child, youth, and family welfare, not just the child welfare agency. The child welfare agency has the primary responsibility to intervene when a child's safety is endangered.
3. To be effective, the child welfare system must embrace the entire continuum of child welfare services, from prevention through after care services.
4. Engagement with consumers and the community is vital to promoting safety, permanency and well-being.
5. Fiscal strategies must be considered that meet the needs identified in the Self Assessment.
6. Transforming the child welfare system is a process that involves removing traditional barriers within programs, within the child welfare system, and within other systems.¹

¹ County Self-Assessment (CSA) process Guide, Version 3.0, 2009

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

Methodology

Since 2004, Placer County CSOC and Probation have engaged in intensive efforts to implement a range of strategies to improve performance on state and federal child welfare system outcomes. In August 2008, the third round of the triennial California Child and Family Services Review C-CFSR commenced with planning for the March 2009 Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR). The county focused on two outcomes where performance was relatively weak. Child Welfare Services took a hard look at placement stability – reducing the number of placements for children in care between eight days and a year. Probation addressed reunification within twelve months for youth in out-of-home placement, particularly focusing on family engagement. The findings and recommendations from the Peer Quality Case Review are included in Appendix A. Between March and November 2009, the Accountability Work Group composed of CSOC, probation and court staff, and representatives of community collaboratives, parents, providers, family resource centers and others started work on the County Self-Assessment. The Summary of the CSA is included in Appendix B. The chart on pages 14 and 15 shows how the strategies included in the SIP address findings of the PQCR and CSA.

Composition of SIP Planning Team

The Accountability Work Group also developed the SIP. Table 1 shows its membership and which group each member represents.

**Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report
Table 1**

Name	Agency	Representation
Landyce Skinner	Placer County Children's System of Care, Department of Health and Human Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CWS administrators, managers, and social workers (includes CAPIT/CBCAP /PSSF Liaisons) • County Board of Supervisors designated agency to administer CAPIT/ CBCAP/PSSF Programs • County mental health
William (Chuck) Parcher	Placer County Probation Department	Probation administrators, supervisors, and officers
DeAnne Thornton	KidsFirst (formerly Child Abuse Prevention Council of Placer County)	Child Abuse Prevention Council/Children's Trust Fund Commission
Christi Meng	United Advocates for Children/CSOC	Parents/consumers
Kathryn Hart	CASA	Court Appointed Special Advocates
Sandra Boyd	Sierra Forever Families	Provider – Adoptions
Christy Simpson	CSOC	CWS Social Worker
Miranda Long	CSOC	CWS Supervisor
Kristin Siles	CSOC	CWS Senior Practitioner
Laurie Antuzzi	CSOC	Foster Care Licensing
Renee Verdugo	CSOC	County Mental health
Steve Martinson	CSOC	Supervisor, Program Evaluator, Data Expert
Julie Cockerton	CDSS	CDSS representative, technical assistance
Lynn DeLapp	Consultant to CSOC	Davis Consultant Network
Denise Taylor	CSOC	CWS Social Worker
Barbara Powell	CSOC	CWS Supervisor
Anno Nakai	Sierra Native Alliance	Native American Tribes
Tami Brodnik	Unity Care	Independent Living Skills provider
Julie Clavin	CSOC	CWS Adoptions Staff
Theresa Sanchez	CDSS	Office of Child Abuse Prevention

Other Core Representatives

- Resource Families and Caregivers - A resource parent initially joined the group, but then other commitments required her withdrawal.
- Juvenile Court Bench Officer - Bench officers are part of the SMART policy board. At this time the Bench is currently operating 2.5 bench officers short of recommended staffing levels.
- County Health Department – Invited, chose not to participate.
- PSSF Collaborative – Placer County is currently re-evaluating its PSSF planning process.
- Youth representative - Although a youth representative did not sit on the workgroup, they were represented by the supervisor of our Independent Living Skills community provider. Youth input was gathered in a focus group conducted during the Peer Quality Case Review process, and through a list of problems gathered by the Youth Transitional Action Team (page 99 of CSA). Youth input will continue to be sought throughout the implementation and monitoring of the SIP.

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

Developing the SIP

Step 1: Data Gathering - For data report information, see footnote on page 7

The 2009 PQCR and Self Assessment were used as the basis for this 2010 System Improvement Plan, supplemented by data gathered from several sources. Major sources of data include:

- **Research on Outcomes and Systemic Factors.** Accountability Work Group sub-committees comprised of CSOC and Probation staff and community members were assigned to research and analyze the data (including PQCR results) included in the CSA as well as other sources of information from CSOC and Probation. Each sub-committee examined priority outcomes and systemic factors, reviewed the literature, developed logic models and recommended activities to be included in the SIP. Sub-committee recommendations were presented and discussed by the entire Accountability Work Group. Decisions on strategies and milestones were made by consensus of the entire work group.
- **Peer Quality Case Review.** Two Accountability Work Group sub-committees addressed the outcomes examined during the PQCR. The sub-committees were charged with incorporating PQCR recommendations, where appropriate, into the SIP.
- **Focus Groups.** Data from seven focus groups conducted as part of the PQCR and two focus groups conducted as part of the CSA were integrated into the Self-Assessment, and informed many of the strategies included in the SIP. Focus groups included:
 - **Probation Senior:** The sole Placer Probation Senior overseeing placement was requested to participate in a one-on-one interview.
 - **Group home staff:** The Probation placement officers invited group home administrators and staff to attend a special meeting. They provided insight on reunification within 12 months. (See SIP Strategy 5.2)
 - **Court staff:** Probation managers invited all Court staff working on probation cases to attend a focus group. The discussion informed strategies on reunification within twelve months.
 - **Parents of youth in probation placement:** The Probation placement officer invited the parents of youth currently in care to attend a special meeting. These parents provided insight into family engagement with Probation. (See SIP strategy 5.1)
 - **CWS Youth:** CWS social workers, the Transitional Housing Program and the Placer Youth Advocate recruited young people who were either currently or formerly in foster care to attend a special dinner meeting. The youth provided personal data on factors related to placement stability. In addition, a separate list of recommendations developed by youth was included in the Self-Assessment.
 - **Child Welfare Services supervisors:** The focus group was held during a regularly scheduled staff meeting, and provided insight on numerous systemic factors.
 - **Foster Parents:** The foster parent work group provided numerous suggestions related to placement stability. (See SIP strategy 1.5)
 - **Staff and Community Partners:** The Accountability Workgroup invited all CSOC staff and community partners to participate in two CSA focus groups to discuss the four outcomes. The community partners offered numerous suggestions on cultural sensitivity and new strategies for working with ethnic populations. (See Outcome 4 SIP Strategies.)

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

Step 2: Selection of Outcomes²

The Accountability Work Group selected priority outcomes to be addressed in the SIP based on several criteria:

Need for Improvement - Placement stability (CWS), no recurrence of maltreatment (CWS) and reunification within 12 months (Probation) were selected to address outcomes where the county falls below the national standard or state average. Other outcomes where Placer falls beneath the state or national standard were not included in the SIP.

- C1.2 (median time to reunification) was not included for CWS because Placer performs well on the other measures in the reunification composite. In addition, the county has already implemented significant ongoing system changes in the previous SIP context of re-entry to foster care. Probation also struggles to meet this goal, however it was not selected as the majority of the programs that probation staff use for youth are a year in length due to specific treatment issues such as sexual abuse and addiction issues.

2011 Update: Although Placer CWS continues to fall below the national standard on the reunification composite, the county is moving in the right directions. Moreover, since implementation of systems changes following a previous SIP, the rates of re-entry continue to be lower (better than) than the national standard.

- Adoption Composite. Although Placer does well on most measures of the adoption composite in most time periods, between 4/08 and 3/09, it fell below the national goal for adoption within 24 months (C2.1), median time for adoption (C2.2) and legally free within six months (C2.4). Since there are fairly small numbers for children adopted in Placer County, very small shifts can result in dramatic changes in the percentages. This effect can be seen between FY07 and FY08 for C2.1 in which we increased by 1 child adopted within 24 months, but went from 33.3% and not achieving the federal goal to 54.5%, well above the goal.

2011 Update: Placer continues to do well on adoptions, substantially exceeding the federal standard for the adoption composite.

² Placer County data is analyzed and reported based upon a fiscal year. This decision helped to avoid changing the appearance of results just by changing the presentation from a calendar year to a fiscal year. Subsequently, for the self-assessment, data was analyzed based upon comparison of fiscal years for all data that was available by fiscal year. Data used for fiscal year comparison was the most recent data available from the University of California, Berkeley website at the beginning of the data analysis process for the self-assessment. Data that was not available by fiscal year was analyzed using the most recent data time period available from the University of California, Berkeley, again, at the time of the download of data.

It should be noted that Placer County began this round of updates in January 2011. In order to complete the self-analysis, Placer County had to generate 72 graphs showing state and federal performance measures for Child Welfare Services and Probation. Graphs and analysis of data was completed by one person. The process used in the data reporting for the CSA, which is also used for the SIP included downloading the most available data from the University of California, Berkeley web site, generating the graphs, analyzing the data and designing a presentation of the information for the participants in the self-assessment process. Completion of this process cannot be accomplished overnight. Data had to be downloaded December 2010 in order for the data presentation to be ready in time for the update. New data became available as of 1 January 2011 and became the most recent posting of data on the University of California, Berkeley website. Data from the *CWS Outcomes System Summary for Placer County - 12.22.10, Report Publication: Jan2011. Data Extract: Q2 2010. Agency: Child Welfare* is included in the body of the report.

All performance data for graphs used for analysis in the CSA and SIP was downloaded from from Needell, B., Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Williams, D., Simon, V., Hamilton, D., Yu, C., Peng, C., Moore, M., Jacobs, L., & King, B. (2011). *Child Welfare Services Reports for California*. Retrieved December 2010 from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research website. URL: http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

For C3.2, (exits to permanency) Placer just barely missed the national goal by 1.2%. Placer exceeded the goals on the other two measures included in the long term care composite. Although Placer CWS had a low start in FY1998-99, we quickly shot up to 100% for the next 3 years and have remained fairly stable in the 96 to 98% range. 98% or greater is the federal standard for this measure. Placer met the federal goal in 2007 and narrowly missed the goal in 2006 and in 2008.

2011 Update: Placer is also doing very well on the Long Term Care Composite, and exceeds the federal standard on all C3 measures except for youth in care for 3 years or longer (emancipated at age 18); for C3.3, we miss the standard by only 1.3 percentage points and continue to move in the right direction.

- 2B and 2C Timely response to 10 day investigations and monthly social worker contacts. Data indicates that Placer has struggled to meet the state goal, but has shown much improvement in recent months. This was focus in the prior SIP. As to monthly social worker contacts, Placer has historically done well and only recently faltered at 88.7%. This was not an outcome that was selected for focus as the current budget climate indicates that staffing challenges will continue to impair Placer's ability to meet this goal. In the current fiscal year CSOC has lost 3 of 12 investigators and 2 of 11 on-going social workers and will not hire replacement staff.

2011 Update: Placer County consistently meets or exceeds state standards on 2C, timely social worker visits but continues to struggle with 2B, timely response. The County has recently assigned additional social workers to the emergency response team (Family and Children's Services) to better address the issue. We expect results to improve during the upcoming year.

- **2011 Update: 8A: These measures have recently been completely changed. Although Placer has always shown positive results with youth receiving ILP services, the new measures focus on only those youth who have emancipated from care. With a total sample of 3 youth fitting the new criteria, the measure is not meaningful. We will continue to review this measure in the future.**
- **Areas requiring new thinking and new solutions.** Placer selected outcomes which had not been addressed in previous SIPs. The group felt that strategies supporting outcomes included in previous SIPs were underway and headed in the right direction.
- **New initiatives to address key outcomes underway but need additional attention and resources.** Placement of American Indian Children was selected because other special projects within CSOC had discovered significant needs in that area. Based on preliminary research conducted by the Native Child Welfare Workgroup for a SAMHSA grant, it appears that placement data, particularly for multi-cultural American Indian children was unreliable and probably inaccurate due to misidentification of these children, and that American Indian children were likely frequently placed outside their community, often with caregivers who had little knowledge of American Indian culture. Further, a task group including members of the American Indian community had already been formed to address these issues.

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

Step 3: Selection of Improvement Goals³

Once outcomes were selected, Improvement Goals were selected. All trend data and charts are described in detail in Placer County's most recent CSA.

- **Placement Stability - Children in care 8 days to one year (CWS).** The Placement Stability subcommittee reviewed recent trends, the number of children involved, available resources and the likely impact of their recommended strategies. The team determined that the goal of increasing the rate of placement stability by 3.3% over two years from 82.7% (4/04-3/09 data) to meet the federal standard of 86% was feasible.

2011 Update: During review of the original SIP, the data used was updated to reflect a more recent quarterly report. The improvement goals, however, did not reflect this change. Although we have not changed the 3-year goal of meeting the national standard, we have changed annual goals as follows: Year 1: Increase by 2 percentage points to 81.3%. Year 2: Increase 2 percentage points to 85.2%. Year 3: Increase by 0.8 points to national standard/goal of 86%.

- **No Recurrence of Maltreatment – 6 months (CWS).** The No Recurrence of Maltreatment subcommittee examined the number of children who had formerly been reported using a substantial risk allegation and the impact to date of the change in county policy for reporting allegations. They also assessed the likely impact of recommended strategies. The team determined that these changes in policy and practice will permit the county to reach the national standard of 94.6% from the 91.0% which was reported in June of 2008.

2011 Update: No change in Improvement Goals – We recognize that we have recently lost ground on this measure. With the proposed changes outlined in our SIP, however, we believe we will substantially improve this measure. We plan to re-visit this goal in our next update.

- **Placement of American Indian Children (CWS).** The Placement of American Indian Children subcommittee struggled with the selection of target goals for this outcome. Based on preliminary research conducted by the Native Child Welfare Workgroup for a SAMHSA grant, they believe that there are more children with American Indian heritage in the child welfare system than are entered into the data base. (In April 2009, only seven ICWA-eligible and 21 multi-ethnic American Indian children were included in the data collected by Placer County and provided by U.C. Berkeley.) They estimate, however, that with proper training, accuracy of data entry will improve to 98%. Because they believe they do not have an accurate number of American Indian children, they remain unclear about how many will need to be placed in culturally supportive placement. They estimate, however, that the likely impact of the proposed strategies will enable CSOC to place 75% of children with American Indian heritage in culturally supportive placements within three years.

2011 Update: As noted on the University of California, Berkeley website (http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/CDSS_4E.aspx) beginning Quarter 1, 2009, data reporting changed for these measures “using a point in time (PIT) count of children in care at the end of the quarter. In the past, all children served during the quarter were counted. This change results in a smaller number of children in the count, and some shift in proportions.” As a result of this modification, previous baseline data is no longer valid. In response to the change in data, we

All outcome data in the CSA and SIP is drawn from Needell, B., Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Williams, D., Simon, V., Hamilton, D., Lou, C., Peng, C., Moore, M., Jacobs, L., & King, B. (2011). *Child Welfare Services Reports for California*. Retrieved December 2010 from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research website. URL: http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

have changed the goals related to the measure. Goal 3 is now, “75% of native children will be correctly identified in CWS/CMS , as measured by an annual cross-reference of the counts of children served by the Native Children Alliance and children in CWS/CMS.” In recognition that the counts of Native and multi-cultural Native children will increase as Goal 3 is attained, Goal 4 has been changed to “75% of children will be in the least-restrictive placement by the end of Year One, reaching 80% by the end of Year 2, and remaining at that level (80%) for Year 3.

- **Reunification within 12 months (Probation).** The Reunification sub-committee reviewed recent trends, the number of youth involved, the difficulties involved with addressing substance abuse or sexual abuse among youth in placement and the likely impact of their recommended strategies. They determined that the goal of increasing the rate of reunification within 12 months for probation youth from 37.5% (7/07-6/08 data) to 46.5% over 3 years, while not meeting the federal standard, was feasible.

2011 Update: Prior to 2011, Probation data in CWS/CMS was entered in batch from hand written reports. Subsequently, the reliability of the data cannot be verified. Although it is anticipated that direct entry of Probation data will result in valid information in future reports, the reliability of the baseline measure will remain questionable. However, review of foster care eligibility data indicates that the denominator (total number of children reunified) used for this outcome will remain relatively small resulting in dramatic shifts in the percentage reports of achievement toward the Federal goal. For example, past history shows us that a four (4) in the numerator results in a range of 26% to 40% for this outcome measure. Placer County’s overall goal will be the Federal target of 75.2% reunification in less than 12 months, but a more stable and correct measure of toward achievement of that target will be a new focus on increasing the *number* of children, rather than percentage, who are reunited in less than 12 months. Thus, we are changing our goals to reflect the increased number as well as % of children reunified in less than 12 months.

Our goals then change to increasing the number of children reunited within 12 months by one for each of the three years of the SIP plan, equating to That would mean a 30.4%, 38.5% and then 46.2% in the yearly percentage goals.

A breakdown of ethnicity was performed related to the selected outcomes for the following ethnic groups: African American, Caucasian, Asian, and American Indian. Regarding recurrence of maltreatment; Placer County performed better on behalf of Latino (90%), American Indian (100%) and Asian children (100%) than Caucasian (90%) and African American children (81%). Regarding Placement Stability; Placer County performed better on behalf of African American (90%) and Asian children (100%), than Caucasian, (79%) Hispanic (77%) and American Indian children (50%). Regarding Probation wards of the Court and placement stability; Placer County performed on behalf of all ethnic groups. Given the fact that Placer appears to be successful in meeting the outcomes when working on behalf of Hispanic and Asian children, no strategies specific to this group will be developed. The number of African American children in Placer County is very small, and given the fact that there is minimal difference in the outcomes for this group, compared to other groups, no specific strategies will be developed for African American families. Placer County is actively working to improve outcomes and services for American Indian children and families and specific strategies will be developed for this group. Please see charts on pages 40 - 59. For data reference, please see footnote on page 7.

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

Step 4: Developing a Rationale: Review of Current Research

As part of the logic model described below, each work group subcommittee reviewed the research on evidence-based practices to improve the priority outcomes. Below we briefly summarize key research findings relevant to the outcomes and strategies selected. These findings underpin the Rationale for each of the selected strategies.

- **Placement Stability.** The Northern California Training Academy, The University of California, Davis, Extension Center for Human Services conducted a literature search on placement stability⁴ for the 2009 PQCR. The review identified effective ways to reduce placement instability, including support and training for foster parents; concurrent planning, placement-specific services such as transportation assistance, respite care and foster-family counseling; child specific services such as mental health and recreational services; increasing caseworker retention; allowing children to participate and represent their decisions; recognizing the importance of the children's possessions; early intervention; screening and recruitment of foster parents, and including the family in the decision-making process for finding placements.
- **No Recurrence of Maltreatment.** The development of a Case Review Tool is consistent with the research in that the primary purposes of the tool are to formally review attendance in services outlined in the case plan on a monthly basis and address any issues that are interfering in the parent(s) ability to meet the case plan goals. The research in this area suggests that actively engaging families by helping them attend their services may reduce the likelihood of future maltreatment. In one study (DePanfilis & Zuravin) families who attended the services in their service plans were 33% less likely to experience a recurrence of child maltreatment while their case was active⁵.

The After Care Plan Tool is designed to develop natural and community supports for families that are exiting the Child Welfare System. Research in this area indicates that "social service organizations, places of belonging in the community, friends, and family are critical factors in mitigating the difficult life circumstances of parents involved with CPS"⁶.

Placement of American Indian Children. The goals and strategies outlined in the Placer CSOC SIP Plan for Outcome 4E: Placement of American Indian Children, are designed to implement the requirements of the Indian Child Welfare Act (25 U.S.C. Section 1901 et seq.; and the Multi-ethnic Placement Act and Amendments (PL 103-82 and PL 104-188). Specifically addressed in this plan are best practice standards for 1) implementing the affirmative and ongoing Duty to Inquire; 2) demonstrating Active Efforts to provide culturally-appropriate services in order to prevent the breakup of the Indian family; 3) consideration of Prevailing Social and Cultural Standards for culturally appropriate case planning; and 4) following the Placement Preferences as outlined in the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA). In addition to the federal minimum standards of ICWA, this plan incorporates the best practices guidelines as outlined in Senate Bill 678- California Indian Law.

As proper identification is important for appropriate placement of American Indian children, this plan will provide training and protocols for appropriately identifying American Indian children in the Placer County child welfare system. By utilizing the Native Family Liaison as a cultural broker and advocate, and the Native Family Services Team as a resource for care planning and referrals; this plan utilizes best

⁴ UC Davis Extension Center for Human Services, Placement Stability in Child Welfare Services: A Review of the Literature, August 2008/

DePanfilis & Zuravin, The Effect of Services on the Recurrence of Child Maltreatment, Child Abuse and Neglect, 26 (2), pp. 187-205

⁶ Manji, Maiter, & Palmer, Community and Informal Social Support for Recipients of Child Protective Services, Children and Youth Services review, 27 (3), pp. 291-308).

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

practices for ensuring active efforts to provide culturally appropriate care planning and service provision (Passports for Native Children: A Best Practice Approach for Tribal Advocates Working with Native Children Who Have Suffered Abuse, Tribal Law and Policy Institute www.tlpi.org 2006; National Resource Center for Foster Care and Permanency Planning- Information Packet: American Indian Children in Foster Care www.hunter.cuny.edu/socwork/nrcfcpp 2003).

By recruiting, certifying and training American Indian foster homes; this plan creates resources for Placer County to more readily comply with the placement preferences as outlined by ICWA which prioritizes placement of AI children in AI homes. The plan also provides for a training program for non-AI foster families to provide culturally supported foster care placements (All My Relations: Best Practices for Placement of American Indian Children Foster Parent Training Video. Washington Department of Social and Human Services http://www.dshs.wa.gov/video/ca/All_My_Relations.asx).

- **Reunification for Probation Youth, Focusing on Family Engagement.** Although no research has been published specifically on the impact of family engagement practices on reunification of youth within the probation system, there have been more general studies related to engaging high risk families. Factors found to affect family engagement include individual/family factors, such as severity of problem behaviors, parent issues, substance abuse, parent perceptions, youth willingness to accept responsibility; and caseworker and agency characteristics, including the process of interaction between caseworkers and youth, and the level of caseworker warmth.⁷

Step 5: Selecting Strategies

The first step in selecting strategies was to review existing and partially implemented strategies which address the outcome, and to assess their impact. The sub-committees identified the following activities. (Partially Implemented activities are designated PI.)

Placement Stability – Strategies and activities include Team Decision-Making (TDM) (PI), the Kinship Support and Services Program, Foster and Kinship Education Program, the Foster Parent Support Group and Concurrent Planning.

No Recurrence of Maltreatment – Strategies and activities include Family Team Meetings, TDM, elimination of substantial risk as an allegation and reducing voluntary cases for moderate/high-risk families prior to opening court cases (PI).

Placement of American Indian Children (CWS) – Strategies and activities include a review of data on American Indian placements (PI), (See CSA summary, Appendix B, page 42) exploring computer narratives on demographics for multi-Cultural Indian Children (Non-ICWA) to permit identity as multi-ethnic or American Indian (non-ICWA) (PI), and collaborating with the Sierra Native Alliance, Native Child Welfare Workgroup, and Native Family Services Team to improve CWS services for American Indian youth (PI)

Reunification in 12 months/family engagement (Probation) – Strategies include expanded, more in-depth, in-person monthly contacts with families, youth and providers.

Next, each subcommittee analyzed potential strategies using a modified logic model based on the following questions:

⁷ UC Davis Extension Center for Human Services, Linking Family Engagement Practices with Timely Reunification: A Review of the Literature.

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

Logic Model Questions

Which outcome are you addressing? _____

Proposed strategy _____

- _____ New Strategy/Program
- _____ Continue existing strategy program
- _____ Expand or change existing strategy/program? How?

Analysis of Strategy

1. What problem(s) does it address? Does it address an important need?
2. What activities are included? Are there varying levels of activity? How much of each activity is provided? How much should be provided?
3. What is its Scale? (What is appropriate – the existing level of effort? More? Less? Who does it serve? Any target populations?)

Resources/Inputs Needed to be Effective (improve outcomes)

4. Are there adequate staff, time, other resources? How many staff are needed? Are staff/partners available to implement the program? Will staff need additional training? If so, what and how much?
5. Is funding available to implement/expand/change it? How much funding is available, needed? Are there sources of additional funding?

Implementation: How are you going to implement the strategy?

6. What must be done to implement/change this strategy? (i.e. develop guidelines or protocols, hire or contract staff, inform or train staff and partners, etc.)
7. What is the timeline to accomplish these steps?

How do you/will you know if it works?

8. Why do you think the strategy will work/does work? (i.e. evidence-based, previous efforts, etc.)
- .. How will you track activities?
10. How will you track impact/effectiveness?
11. Does it appear to be efficient/cost-effective to implement?

Is it worth doing???

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

Outcome:
C4.1 Placement Stability <3 placements - 8 days-12 months in care (CWS Only)
County's Performance:

	Baseline Data 7/02	1/10 data	1/11 data	California Average	National Std/Goal
C4.1: Placement Stability <3 placements - 8 days-12 months in care (CWS Only)	79.7%	79.3%	83.2%	83.3%	86%

Improvement Goals

Improvement Goal 1.0 Placer County will improve placement stability to the federal standard of 86.0%

Year 1: Increase by 2 percentage points to 84.7%-81.3% (Corrected data). Exceeded Year 1 Goal by 1.9 percentage points

Year 2: Increase 4-3 percentage points to 86%--2 percentage points to 85.2%

Year 3: Maintain-increased placement stability rate of 86% Increase by 0.8 points to national standard/goal of 86%

Strategy 1. 1 Youth participation in placement matching.

Create an interview tool for placement matching to use with youth in the Children's Emergency Shelter. Interviews will be completed within 3 days of arrival at the shelter. Results will be sent to the worker supervisor and TDM facilitator, and used at the TDM. Implementation will be monitored by internal tracking matching completed tools with the number of youth who arrive at the shelter. In addition, all strategies and milestones are tracked on the internal Accountability tracking sheet in monthly meetings of the Accountability Team.

CAPIT

Strategy Rationale When youth are actively involved in placement and visitation decisions, they will be more likely to remain stable in placement

CBCAP

PSSF

NA

X

Milestone	Timeframe		Assigned to	
	By 12/31/10-Completed			
1.1.1 Tool is created	By 3/30/11		Children's Emergency Shelter staff with youth input	
1.1.2 Policies and procedures on the use of the tool, and tracking mechanism developed.	By 5/31/211		CSOC Management	
1.1.3 Tool and procedures approved	By 6/30/11		CSOC Management	
1.1.4 Staff trained on use of tool	9/30/11		Children's Emergency Shelter supervisor/youth advocate	
1.1.5 Tool implemented for all children over 6 years old placed at the Emergency Shelter			Children's Emergency Shelter staff	

Status:

- Tool has been drafted and tested with youth focus group. All other milestones on track.

Placer County 2011 sIP Progress Report

<p>Strategy 1.2 Parent Participation in placement matching. Create a parent questionnaire for placement matching to be used at the team decision-making meeting. Implementation will be monitored by internal tracking matching completed tools with the number of parents whose children were removed from their care. In addition, all strategies and milestones are tracked on the internal Accountability tracking sheet in monthly meetings of the Accountability Team.</p>		<p>Strategy Rationale Parents have suggestions, insight, knowledge of cultural, religious, educational, medical, behavioral needs of child that are necessary for good placement matching. May help to identify relative/NREFM</p>	
		<p>CAPIT</p>	<p>CBCAP</p>
		<p>PSSF</p>	<p>NA</p>
		<p>X</p>	<p>NA</p>
		<p>By 12/31/10 – Completed in English. Final draft will be translated to Spanish by 3/31/11</p>	
<p>Milestone</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>Sip team, parent advocate, youth advocate</p>	<p>CSOC Management</p>
<p>1.2.1 Questionnaire created in English and Spanish</p>	<p>By 3/31/11</p>	<p>CSOC Management</p>	<p>CSOC Management</p>
<p>1.2.2 Policies and procedures on the use of the questionnaire and tracking mechanism developed.</p>	<p>By 5/31/11</p>	<p>TDM scheduler</p>	<p>TDM scheduler</p>
<p>1.2.3 Questionnaire, policies and procedures approved</p>	<p>By 6/2011</p>	<p>TDM scheduler</p>	<p>TDM scheduler</p>
<p>1.2.4 Staff trained on use of questionnaire</p>	<p>By 9/2011</p>	<p>TDM scheduler</p>	<p>TDM scheduler</p>
<p>1.2.5 Questionnaire implemented countywide.</p>	<p>By 9/2011</p>	<p>TDM scheduler</p>	<p>TDM scheduler</p>
<p>Status: First draft of questionnaire completed, and feedback solicited from parents. All other milestones on track</p>			

<p>Strategy 1.3 Increase staff capacity to improve placement. In addition, all strategies and milestones are tracked on the internal Accountability tracking sheet in monthly meetings of the Accountability Team</p>		<p>Strategy Rationale 1. Having a dedicated person knowledgeable about families, placement availability and their needs alleviates SW workload, freeing time to work on more pressing issues, which facilitates better placements up front leading to more stability in placement. 2. Additional support will enable SW to spend the time on placement crisis, visiting with children/youth, planning and attending TDMs to maintain placement stability</p>	
		<p>CAPIT</p>	<p>CBCAP</p>
		<p>PSSF</p>	<p>NA</p>
		<p>X</p>	<p>NA</p>
		<p>By 12/31/11 – Funding not identified. Strategy tabled until additional funding available</p>	
<p>Milestone</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>CSOC Management</p>	<p>CSOC Management</p>
<p>1.3.1 Additional funds from State allocations identified to hire a full time placement coordinator, 2 additional clerical staff to support social workers and 2 additional social workers</p>	<p>By 12/31/11</p>	<p>CSOC Management</p>	<p>CSOC Management</p>
<p>1.3.2 Staff hired.</p>	<p>By 12/31/11</p>	<p>CSOC Management</p>	<p>CSOC Management</p>
<p>Status: No funding identified. Strategy tabled until additional funding becomes available</p>			

Placer County 2011 sIP Progress Report

1.5.3 Community resources identified for relatives and NREFM homes	12/31/10 - completed	SIP work group, in consultation with KidsFirst
1.5.4 Resource guide for relatives/NREFMS developed and approved	7/31/11	SIP Work group/CSOC management
1.5.5 Form developed and approved to notify relatives/NREFMs of upcoming training	3/31/11	SIP work group/CSOC management
1.5.6 Staff trained on use of form and guide	7/31/11	CSOC supervisors
1.5.7 Training notification form inserted in all placement packets	7/31/11 and ongoing	Clerical staff
1.5.8 Notices regarding trainings sent to all relatives and NREFMs	7/31/11 and ongoing	Clerical staff
1.5.9 Guide implemented and included in all relative/NREFM packets	12/31/11 and ongoing	Social workers
1.5.10 Pilot (one team)- orient each new NREFM and relative	1/31/11 and ongoing	Social workers and 1 Licensing worker
1.5.11 Monitor pilot quarterly to assess effectiveness	4/30/11	1 Licensing worker and program manager
<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All NREFM and relative placements have been identified • Data base created • Community resources have been identified. • Remaining milestones on track. 		

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

<p>Strategy 1.6 Train ongoing and court unit social workers on concurrent planning. Familiarize Family and Children's Services (ER) social workers on the concepts of concurrent planning. All strategies and milestones are tracked on the internal Accountability tracking sheet during monthly meetings of the Accountability Team. For this strategy, trainings will be tracked.</p>		<p>Strategy Rationale</p> <p>1. When social workers understand concurrent planning, they will be more likely to have the first placement be the "only" placement for youth. Social workers will more likely to identify permanent homes for youth</p> <p>2. Concurrent planning begins when a child is removed from the home. If ER social workers understand concurrent planning, they can start the process of concurrent placements for youth</p>
	<p>CAPIT</p>	
	<p>CBCAP</p>	
	<p>PSSF</p>	
	<p>NA</p>	
	<p>X</p>	
	<p>2/25/10.</p>	<p>Assigned to</p> <p>CSOC Management</p>
<p>Milestone</p>	<p>1.6.1 Training on concurrent planning for all ongoing and court unit social workers completed.</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>
	<p>1.6.2 "Mini- training" on concurrent planning for Family and Children's Services workers held.</p>	<p>42/2010 1/31/11</p> <p>CSOC Management</p>
<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for all ongoing and court social workers completed. • Mini-training for Family and Children's Services workers will be completed by 1/31/11. 		
<p>Describe any additional systemic factors needing to be addressed that support the improvement plan goals</p> <p>Case Review: Process for Parent-Child-Youth Participation in Case Planning and Current Planning and Foster/Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment and Retention</p>		
<p>Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals.</p> <p>Placer County will need to educate staff on policies and procedures for all the new tools and questionnaires developed.</p>		
<p>Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals.</p> <p>Family advocates and youth advocates to help assist in the development of tools and questionnaires.</p> <p>Kids First to help identify resources that are available for the resource guide - Foster Kinship Care Education for Relative/NREFM training</p>		
<p>Status: Ongoing participation of community partners</p>		
<p>Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals.</p> <p>Additional state funding will be needed for Placer County to support all the ongoing efforts in the programs.</p>		
<p>Status: To date, no additional state funding has been provided.</p>		

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

Milestone	Timeframe	9/30/09 - Completed 10/31/09 - Completed 10/31/09 completed and ongoing ongoing	Assigned to	CSOC Management CSOC Management and Supervisors Family and Children's Services Supervisors CSOC Management and Supervisors
<p>2.2.1 New policy and procedure developed outlining criteria for voluntary cases</p> <p>2.2.2 Memo distributed to FCS staff outlining new policy and procedures regarding voluntary cases</p> <p>2.2.3 New policy and procedure implemented and monitored</p> <p>2.2.4 County to monitor continued compliance with policy and procedure</p> <p>Status: All milestones completed</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>CAPIT</p> <p>CBCAP</p> <p>PSSF</p> <p>NA</p> <p>X</p>	<p>Strategy Rationale: With increased knowledge, understanding of, and investment in their case plan families will be more successful in meeting their case plan goals. This will reduce the number of subsequent referrals and thus both the recurrence of maltreatment and re-entry into foster care rates. It will also reduce the number of contested hearings as client participation will be clearly documented</p>	<p>Workgroup including youth advocate, social workers, parent and community partners</p> <p>CSOC Management</p> <p>Management</p> <p>Training Coordinator</p> <p>CSOC Staff</p> <p>CSOC Supervisors</p>
<p>2.3.1 Case Plan Review tool developed</p> <p>2.3.2 Tool Finalized and approved</p> <p>2.3.3 Policy and Procedure developed regarding use of the tool.</p> <p>2.3.4 Training developed and implemented</p> <p>2.3.5 Tool implemented countywide</p> <p>2.3.6 Tool monitored by social work supervisory staff</p> <p>Status: Draft tool has been revised, and is being piloted; will be finalized and approved by 3/31/11</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>8/31/10-1/31/11</p> <p>4/31/11-3/31/11</p> <p>3/31/11-6/30/11</p> <p>5/31/11 7/31/11</p> <p>6/30/11 8/31/11</p> <p>6/30/11 8/31/11 and ongoing</p>	<p>Assigned to</p>	<p>Workgroup including youth advocate, social workers, parent and community partners</p> <p>CSOC Management</p> <p>Management</p> <p>Training Coordinator</p> <p>CSOC Staff</p> <p>CSOC Supervisors</p>

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

<p>Strategy 2.4 Placer County will develop an After-Care Plan Tool. This tool will be used with families receiving services through an open case. Three months prior to case closure the social worker and family will begin to formulate the after care plan. The after care plan will include continued activities and/or services the family will access independently along with other identified community and natural supports. Both the social worker and each parent will sign the completed plan and each will receive a copy. The social worker will place a copy of the plan in the file and include a copy in the final court report. All strategies and milestones are tracked on the Internal Accountability tracking sheet during monthly meetings of the Accountability Team. Tracking will include periodic spot checks to ensure that after care plans are included in case files and court reports.</p>			<p>Strategy Rationale: With increased knowledge, understanding of, and investment in their after-care plan families will be more successful after case closure. This will reduce the number of subsequent referrals and thus both the recurrence of maltreatment and re-entry into foster care.</p>
	CAPIT		
	CBCAP		
	PSSF		
	X	NA	

Milestone	Timeframe	Assigned to	Workgroup including staff as well as community partners.
2.4.2 Tool finalized and approved	9/30/11		Management
2.4.3 Policy and Procedure developed regarding use of the tool.	11/30/11		Management
2.4.4 Training developed and implemented	1/31/12		Training Coordinator
2.4.5 Tool implemented countywide	3/30/12		CSOC staff
2.4.6 Tool implemented by Court officers	3/30/12 and ongoing		CSOC supervisors

Status:

- After-Care draft tool created and reviewed; currently being piloted.
- All other milestones on track.

Describe any additional systemic factors needing to be addressed that support the improvement plan goals.
 Re-Entry into Care and Placement Stability both impact these improvement goals. Placement Stability is a part of this SIP and Re-Entry was addressed in the last SIP. In addition, Case Review: Process for Parent-Child-Youth Participation in Case Planning will be addressed through these goals.

Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals.
 All staff will partake in mandatory training on the new policies and forms (case plan and after-care plan tools); The forms would need to be developed and approved by the Forms Committee.

Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals.
 Parent and Youth advocates and other community partners would participate in the workgroups to develop the Case Plan and After Care Plan forms.

Status: Partners actively participate at bi-monthly meetings

Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals. None

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

**Outcome/Systemic Factor:
4E Placement of American Indian Children**

County's Current Performance -

	(new) Baseline Data 1/11	Current data 1/11 (July 1, 2010)	California average	National Std/Goal
4E (1): Placement of ICWA-Eligible American Indian Children	71.4%	71.4%	38.6%	N.A.
4E (2) Placement of Multi-Cultural American Indian Children	39.3%	39.3%	31.6%	N.A.

According to 2010 CWS/CMS

- Only 7 ICWA eligible children and 21 multi-ethnic children are identified in our database
- 57.2% placed with relatives
- 0 placements with non-relative Indian SCP
- 14.3% non-relative, non Indian SCP
- 14.3% non-relative, ethnicity mission SCO
- 14.3 % group home.)

With changes in data collection, these data are no longer valid.

Improvement Goal 3:

- ~~98% of children will be correctly identified in CWS/CMS "75% of native children will be correctly identified in CWS/CMS , as measured by an annual cross-reference of the counts of children served by the Native Children Alliance and children in CWS/CMS."~~ 75% will be placed in relative or non-relative Indian SCP Year One
- ~~85% will be placed in relative or non-relative Indian SCP Year Two (80% maintain in Yr 3~~
- ~~95% will be placed in relative or non-relative Indian SCP Year Three Delete~~

Strategy 3. 1 Train social workers to correctly identify children of American Indian heritage. All strategies and milestones are tracked on the internal Accountability tracking sheet during monthly meetings of the Accountability Team. This strategy will be evaluated by ensuring the social workers receive the training.

Strategy Rationale Correct identification of American Indian children is essential for appropriate placement.

CAPIT
CBCAP
PSSF
NA

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

<p>Milestone</p>	<p>3.1.1 Training developed for social workers on proper identification of children of American Indian heritage and accurate data entry.</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>6/30/10 - completed</p>	<p>Native Child Welfare Workgroup</p>
<p>3.1.2 CSOC teams trained</p>	<p>3.1.3 (New) Conduct additional training on identification of ethnicity of all children at multiple points in the child welfare system.</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>9/30/10 - completed 9/30/11</p>	<p>Native Family Services Team CSOC Cultural Competency Committee</p>
<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training has been developed; all social workers and CSOC teams have been trained. 				
<p>Milestone</p>	<p>3.2 Review and improve data entry of American Indian children in CWS/CMS. All strategies and milestones are tracked on the internal Accountability tracking sheet during monthly meetings of the Accountability Team.</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>9/30/10 3/31/11 + ongoing every 6 months 1/31/11 and ongoing</p>	<p>CSOC Data Management/CQI Native Child Welfare Workgroup CSOC Data Management/CQI Native Child Welfare Workgroup CSOC Data Management/CQI Native Child Welfare Workgroup</p>
<p>Strategy Rationale: Monitoring data is necessary to identify problems with identification of American Indian children and data entry</p>				
<p>Milestone</p>	<p>3.2.1 Review and report current data on American Indian children every 6 months</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>9/30/10 3/31/11 + ongoing every 6 months 1/31/11 and ongoing</p>	<p>CSOC Data Management/CQI Native Child Welfare Workgroup CSOC Data Management/CQI Native Child Welfare Workgroup CSOC Data Management/CQI Native Child Welfare Workgroup</p>
<p>Milestone</p>	<p>3.2.2 Data entry and training revised if needed</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>9/30/11 and ongoing every 12 months</p>	<p>CSOC Data Management/CQI Native Child Welfare Workgroup CSOC Data Management/CQI Native Child Welfare Workgroup</p>
<p>Strategy Rationale: Compare data on the counts of Native children served by the Native Children Alliance with the counts of Native and multi-cultural Native children in CWS/CMS.</p>				
<p>Status: Need to expand data workgroup to include foster parents. Added IT staff. Completion delayed to 3/31/11</p>				
<p>Improvement Goal 4 Year 1: 75% of American Indian children will be placed in the least restrictive culturally supportive placements, increasing to 85% 80% by Year 2 and maintained at 80% in Year 3 and 95% by Year 3.</p>				
<p>Milestone</p>	<p>3.3 Ensure all American Indian children receive culturally appropriate services. This strategy will be tracked internally by the native family services team, upon development of the new tracking system. In addition, all strategies and milestones are tracked on the internal Accountability tracking sheet during monthly meetings of the Accountability Team</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>9/30/11 and ongoing every 12 months</p>	<p>CSOC Data Management/CQI Native Child Welfare Workgroup CSOC Data Management/CQI Native Child Welfare Workgroup</p>
<p>Strategy Rationale: Due to incorrect identification and lack of resources most American Indian children find themselves in placements that are not culturally supportive and often are placed in a higher level of care (group homes and residential placements) than their peers.</p>				

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

Milestone	Timeframe	Assigned to	Native Family Services Team and CSOC management.						
4.1.1 Procedures are developed and approved to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that American Indian children are referred to the Native Services Team and the Native Cultural Broker • Ensure that culturally appropriate service plans are developed for these children • Track and monitor American Indian children to determine if they are receiving culturally appropriate services. 	6/30/10 - Completed								
4.1.2 Referrals to Native Services Team and Native Cultural Broker are implemented.	6/30/10 - completed	Family and Children Services and Native Family Services Team							
4.1.3 Culturally appropriate service plans for American Indian children are implemented.	6/30/10 - completed	Native Family Services Team	Native Family Services Team						
4.1.4 System to track services for American Indian children is developed and implemented	9/30/10 5/31/11 + ongoing	Native Child Welfare Workgroup	Native Child Welfare Workgroup CSOC Data Management/CQI						
4.1.5 (New): Monitor develop of service plans and services for American Indian children on an ongoing basis	5/31/11 and ongoing	Native Child Welfare Workgroup	Native Child Welfare Workgroup CSOC Data Management/CQI						
Status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures completed and approved. • Referrals are implemented • Service plans implemented. • Date for tracking system completion delayed until 5/31/11 									
Strategy 4. 2 Recruit, train, and certify new American Indian foster homes and non-American Indian foster homes serving American Indian children. The number of foster homes serving American Indian children will be tracked. All strategies and milestones are tracked on the internal Accountability tracking	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>CAPIT</td> <td>Currently, the number of American Indian foster homes does not meet the placement needs of American Indian children</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CBCAP</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>PSSF</td> <td>X</td> </tr> </table>	CAPIT	Currently, the number of American Indian foster homes does not meet the placement needs of American Indian children	CBCAP		PSSF	X		
CAPIT	Currently, the number of American Indian foster homes does not meet the placement needs of American Indian children								
CBCAP									
PSSF	X								

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

sheet during monthly meetings of the Accountability Team		NA	
Milestone	4.2.1 Develop culturally relevant certification and training for both American Indian foster homes and non-American Indian foster homes serving American Indian children	9/30/11	Sierra Native Alliance CSOC recruitment staff Foster Agency Partner
	4.2.2 Implement recruitment effort for American Indian and non-American Indian foster homes serving American Indian children.	9/30/11	Sierra Native Alliance CSOC recruitment staff Foster Agency Partner
	4.2.3 Implement training and certification of American Indian foster homes and non-American Indian foster homes serving American Indian children.	9/30/12	Sierra Native Alliance CSOC recruitment staff Foster Agency Partner
Timeframe			Assigned to
<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Milestone activities are in early stages, expected to stay on track 			
<p>Describe any additional systemic factors needing to be addressed that support the improvement plan goals. Foster/Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment and Retention.</p>			
<p>Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals. Technical assistance from Urban American Indian Foster Care Agency</p>			
<p>Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sierra Native Alliance – will provide support as a community partner for the implementation of the SIP plan by assisting with training, quality assurance, culturally appropriate service provision, and recruitment, certification and training of appropriate foster homes. Native Child Welfare Workgroup- comprised of CSOC staff and Native community partners, the Workgroup will assist with the development of training materials, and provide quality assurance assistance to monitor outcomes of the SIP plan. Native Family Services Team- comprised of CSOC staff, cultural brokers, and community partners, the services team will assist in the deliver of trainings, facilitate referrals to cultural brokers, and ensure the development of culturally-appropriate service plans. CSOC Data Management and Quality Assurance Team- will monitor data entry, review and provide a bi-annual report of AI children CWS/CMS and provide data to the Native Child Welfare Workgroup to assess level of culturally-appropriate services received. Foster Agency Partners (to be identified)- will partner with CSOC recruitment staff and Sierra Native Alliance to recruit, train, and certify new AI and culturally supported non-AI foster homes. 			
<p>Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals.</p>			

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

None

<p>Outcome/Systemic Factor: C1.1: Reunification within 12 month (Probation)</p>				
<p>County's Performance</p>				
	1/10 data (New baseline)	1/11 data	California Average	National Std/Goal
C1.1: Reunification within 12 month (Probation)	37.5%	23.1%	64.2%	75.2%
<p>2011 Update: The length of time in out-of-home/Group Home Placement is below the Federal level and the State average. The new baseline reflects implementation of regular data entry to CMS/CWS.</p>				
<p>Improvement Goal 5.0 Probation will increase the rate of reunification within twelve months by 3 children to 46.5%: 46.2% Year 1 – 40.5%–30.4% (reflects one additional child) Year 2 – 43.5%– 38.5% (reflects one additional child over Year 1) Year 3 – 46.5%–46.2% (reflects one additional child over Year 2)</p>				
<p>Strategy 5.1 Train staff and coordinate a CSOC collaborative parent support group for parents of youth in placement. All strategies and milestones are tracked on the internal Accountability tracking sheet during monthly meetings of the Accountability Team, as well as data entry into probation's case load Explorer database.</p>	<p>CAPIT</p>		<p>Strategy Rationale</p>	
	<p>CBCAP</p>		<p>1. Review of PQCR from parents noted a need for more family involvement in placements. Of concern were parents not knowing the treatment plan for their child, not being aware of con current planning, and working of the court, probation and foster care systems.</p>	
	<p>PSSF</p>		<p>2. Youth in placement often seem to be making little or no progress on completing the program which affects timely reunification. Meeting with parents will ensure that everybody is working towards the same goals.</p>	
	<p>X NA</p>		<p>Probation, Community Based Organization (CBO), Treatment and Group Homes</p>	
<p>Milestone</p>		<p>Timeframe</p>		<p>Assigned to</p>
<p>5.1.1 Identify and train staff to facilitate parent support groups.</p>		<p>8/30/10 - completed</p>		<p>Probation, HHS</p>
<p>5.1.2 Identify meeting locations, frequency of meetings and develop agendas.</p>		<p>10/30/10 - completed</p>		<p>Probation, CBO, HHS, Group Homes</p>
<p>5.1.3 Implement parent support group for parents of youth in placement.</p>		<p>1/30/11-completed</p>		

Placer County 2011 sIP Progress Report

<p>5.1.4 Track progress of parental engagement through success of youth in placements</p>	<p>1/30/11 – completed</p>	<p>Probation</p>						
<p>5.1.5 Monitor youth outcomes as well as parental participation in group. Modify curriculum as needed</p>	<p>Ongoing to 2013</p>	<p>Probation</p>						
<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All milestones completed • Support group implemented and ongoing • Tracking system started 9/10; ongoing 								
<p>Strategy 5.2 Develop a collaborative procedure between probation staff, and group home staff employed in group homes housing wards to initiate a “phase: or “level” system of timelines for youth with an emphasis on reunification. This system would be reviewed monthly by probation staff, as well as the accountability workgroup</p>	<p>Strategy Rationale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minors have been identified as not fully participating in completing phase or level, which results in a delay of reunification with parents within 12 months 2. By keeping close track of progress, the PO will be able to positively motivate minor to complete program and return home. 3. Working together with family and group home will allow all parties to direct minor in positive way. 	<p>CAPIT</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>CBCAP</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>PSSF</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>X</td> </tr> </table>	CBCAP		PSSF		NA	X
CBCAP								
PSSF								
NA	X							
<p>Milestone</p> <p>5.2.1 Meetings will be held with program staff of one identified group home to create and implement a phase or level system to include clear timelines which will be implemented on a pilot basis with the group home.</p>	<p>8/30/10 3/31/11</p>	<p>Assigned to</p> <p>Probation, group home staff</p>						
<p>5.2.2 Probation will develop a case plan review tool to be completed and reviewed with the youth, parents and program staff on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>8/30/10 3/31</p>	<p>Assigned to</p> <p>Probation, treatment facilities</p>						
<p>5.2.3 Probation, pilot group home staff and parents will establish clearly defined consequences for youth failure to meet established milestones, and rewards for positive progression. Probation will track outcomes through the accountability work group and data entry into caseload explorer.</p>	<p>10/30/11</p>	<p>Assigned to</p> <p>Probation, pilot group home</p>						

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

<p>5.2.4 Probation will expand pilot, if successful, to one other group home frequently used by Placer County</p>	<p>10/30/12</p>	<p>Probation supervisors, manager and group home staff</p>								
<p>5.2.5 Probation will expand pilot to all group home facilities</p>	<p>10/30/13</p>	<p>Probation supervisors, manager and group home staff</p>								
<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piloted with one youth in one group home. Project delayed by staff re-assignments, now scheduled to fully implement pilot 3/31/11. • Case review tool adapted; completion delayed to 3/31/11 • Other milestones on track 										
<p>Strategy 5.3 Develop reporting system through CaseLoad Explorer to track recidivism of transition age youth</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>CAPIT</td> <td>Strategy Rationale</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CBCAP</td> <td>1. Assess effectiveness of treatment services.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PSSF</td> <td>2. The current lack of information does not allow informed decision making around successful and effective treatment modalities.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	CAPIT	Strategy Rationale	CBCAP	1. Assess effectiveness of treatment services.	PSSF	2. The current lack of information does not allow informed decision making around successful and effective treatment modalities.	NA		<p align="center">Assigned to</p>
CAPIT	Strategy Rationale									
CBCAP	1. Assess effectiveness of treatment services.									
PSSF	2. The current lack of information does not allow informed decision making around successful and effective treatment modalities.									
NA										
<p>5.3.1 Identify data which would track transition aged youth who commit crimes as adults, while still on juvenile probation</p>	<p>7/1/10 and ongoing</p>	<p>Probation</p>								
<p>5.3.2 Analyze computer systems as to effectiveness of data fields for needed data, create new fields if necessary. Formulate data reports on monthly basis.</p>	<p>10/31/10 and ongoing</p>	<p>Probation, Placer County MIS</p>								
<p>5.3.3 Probation leadership meet on quarterly basis to evaluate data report and develop system strategies for improvement of ILP or other services focused on the needs of transitioned aged youth if needed.</p>	<p>3/30/11 and ongoing</p>	<p>Probation managers and supervisors</p>								
<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data system and monthly reports developed. • Monthly meetings implemented and ongoing 										
<p>Describe any additional systemic factors needing to be addressed that support the improvement plan goals. Case Review: Process for Parent-Child-Youth Participation in Case Planning</p>										
<p>Describe educational/training needs (including technical assistance) to achieve the improvement goals. Development of curriculum for education/support for parents with youth in probation placements</p>										
<p>Status: Completed</p>										
<p>Identify roles of the other partners in achieving the improvement goals.</p>										

Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report

Noted above.

Identify any regulatory or statutory changes needed to support the accomplishment of the improvement goals. None

**Placer County 2011 SIP Progress Report
CWSOIP Narrative**

Placer County will not receive CWSOIP funding in fiscal year10/11, but will receive DR, SA and PYS dollars in the amount of \$815,000. A portion of the funds are used for infrastructure, and for staff time completing tasks directly related to system improvement efforts. Over half of the funds are given to community providers. The Community Based Organizations and other outside agencies support and assist the county in implementing different strategies to include: Differential Response, Team Decision Making meetings, and finding permanent connections for youth, Destination Family. The resources will also be utilized to bring in additional trainings to staff related to implementing and continuing Best Practices, focused on improving the AB 636 outcomes.

System Improvement Planning Funds provided to the Placer County Probation Department are used to support efforts to decrease the amount of time youth spend in placement and increase collaboration with parents and group home personnel. Specific expenditures have included staff time and resource required to conduct a monthly Placement Parent group and coordination with Koinonia to work collaboratively at guiding youth through the pre-determined phase/level system.