

California – Child and Family Services Review Signature Sheet

County	Yolo County
CSA Period Dates	December 2010 – August 2013
SIP Period Plan Dates	March 29, 2011- August 3, 2015
Outcome Data Period	April 2013: Q4 2012
County Child Welfare Agency Director	
Name	Joan Planell, Director
Signature*	
Phone Number	530-661-2757
Mailing Address	25 N. Cottonwood Street Woodland, CA 95695
County Chief Probation Officer	
Name	Brent Cardall, Chief
Signature*	
Phone Number	530-406-5345
Mailing Address	2780 E. Gibson Road Woodland, CA 95776

*Signatures must be in blue ink

Mail the original Signature Sheet to:

Outcomes and Accountability Bureau
Children and Family Services Division
California Department of Social Services
744 P Street, MS 8-12-91
Sacramento, CA 95814

Contact Information

Child Welfare Agency	Name	Patti Larsen
	E-mail address	Patti.larsen@yolocounty.org
	Phone Number	(530) 666-8242

	Mailing address	25 N. Cottonwood St Woodland, CA 95695
Probation Agency	Name	Cynthia Anenson
	E-mail address	Cynthia.Anenson@yolocounty.org
	Phone Number	(530) 406-5364
	Mailing address	2780 E. Gibson Rd. Woodland, CA 95776
CAPIT Liaison	Name	Patti Larsen
	E-mail address	Same as above
	Phone Number	
	Mailing address	
CBCAP Liaison	Name	Patti Larsen
	E-mail address	Same as above
	Phone Number	
	Mailing address	
PSSF Liaison	Name	Patti Larsen
	E-mail address	Same as above
	Phone Number	
	Mailing address	

CALIFORNIA CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES REVIEW

2013 ANNUAL SIP PROGRESS REPORT



Yolo County Department of Employment and Social Services
Joan Planell Director

Probation Department
Brent Cardall, Chief

Table of Contents

SIP Progress Narrative.....	Page 1
State and Federally Mandated Child Welfare/Probation Initiatives	Page 14
Five-Year SIP Chart/CWS.....	Page 15
Five-Year SIP Chart/PROBATION.....	Page 18

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

Introduction

The Child Welfare System Improvement and Accountability Act (AB 636) of 2001 provides a framework for measuring and monitoring each county's child welfare services and probation performance in ensuring the safety, permanence and well-being of children. The system established by AB 636 builds upon standards established by the federal government and adds outcome and accountability measures developed by California, the California Child and Family Services Review (C-CSFR). One component of the C-CSFR is the County System Improvement Plan (SIP). The County SIP outlines how the County will improve its system of care for children and youth and provides a method for reporting on progress toward meeting improvement goals using the C-CSFR outcomes and indicators.

This is Yolo County's second annual update to its SIP and is a report of the progress the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Division and Juvenile Probation Department have made since the implementation of the three year SIP in April 2011. As a result of increased federal emphasis on outcomes and accountability, in 2012, the CDSS revised the C-CSFR process and our SIP has been extended to a five year SIP that will carry us through August 2015 with another progress report due in August 2014.

To determine the effectiveness of the SIP, CWS is monitoring the following focus outcomes;

- S1.1: No Recurrence of Maltreatment,
- C1.3 and C1.4 Reunification and Re-entry, and
- Quality Assurance/Improvement as it relates to referrals and time to investigation and Social Worker contacts.

The focus outcomes for Juvenile Probation are;

- Educational stability, and
- Advancement for youth transitioning to adulthood.

For each of the focus outcomes, the CWS and Probation Department have established specific goals and strategies for achieving those goals. This SIP progress report describes the steps each department is taking, how well the strategies have been implemented, and the status of our progress toward the established goals.

Stakeholders Participation

CWS

There have been some transitions in the past year in CWS and involvement of our stakeholders hasn't been as regular or widespread as we planned. In the past our Assistant Director or Division Manager regularly attended Yolo County's Child Abuse Prevention Council meetings and reviewed outcome performance data and our progress toward our SIP goals. Those meetings included a wide variety of community partners and local agencies. In the future we plan to schedule SIP updates with this group on a regular basis. Additionally, we have shared our SIP with staff in the division and have discussed our outcomes at division meetings and in unit meetings. In the future we plan

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

to have regular updates with staff about the progress of our SIP and the status of our outcome measures.

Juvenile Probation

Juvenile probation is engaging and informing the community about the progress of our SIP in a variety of ways. The Division Manager, Probation Supervisor and Placement Officers are involved in numerous collaborations that foster positive community connections and partnerships and offer opportunities to discuss our SIP and the steps we are taking to improve our performance outcomes. Those include the AB12 Committee, Placement Advisory Committee, Northern California Placement Committee, Foster Youth Advisory Committee, Youth Advisory Committee, ILP Community Partners, Blue Ribbon Commission, Wrap Leadership, and Multi-Disciplinary Assessment Review Team. We plan to engage our collaborative partners in SIP updates and discussions over the coming year.

While SIP progress and outcome data is reviewed with staff directly involved with our placement program, we plan to expand this information sharing with staff within the division. Further, as outcome data becomes available, we plan to disseminate at all levels within our organization in order to support the SIP process and drive our decision-making.

Current Performance Towards SIP Improvement Goals

Our current SIP is keeping with the themes that emerged from our latest Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR) from March 2010 and the corresponding County Self Assessment (CSA) from November 2010. As you will see in both the CWS and Probation Narrative portions of this report we have achieved significant improvement in a number of outcomes and have maintained in others. Conversely, you will see in the Outcome Measures Not Meeting State/National Standards narrative portion we continue to strive to improve outcomes in other areas that will be discussed further.

CWS

Effective October 7, 2013 the Department of Employment and Social Services has a new Director, Joan Planell. Joan was most recently the Deputy Director of the Arlington County (Virginia) Department of Human Services and has over 30 years of experience in social service programs and brings national experience in serving clients in need and integrating services. She replaces Edmund Smith who was the interim director for the department since November 2012. Additionally, Rebecca Nelson, Division Manager for CWS resigned her position in September 2013 and Alissa Sykes is interim Division Manager while recruitment is underway. Alissa has been with CWS since 1999 as a Social Worker and a Supervising Social Worker II for the last seven years.

CWS has achieved significant improvements in numerous areas since our last SIP update. According to the most recent U. C. Berkeley Center for Social Services Research¹ quarterly report (April 2013, Data extract: Q4 2012) we have improved our outcomes in each of the following SIP goals;

¹ http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

- **S1.1 No Recurrence of Maltreatment.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 91.1%. In our last SIP update we had fluctuated between a low of 90.3% and a high of 95.2%. Since then we have improved our performance to our current rate of 95.6% which exceeds the national standard/goal of 94.6%.
- **C1.3 Reunification Within 12 Months.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 45.5%. In our last SIP we had fluctuated between a high of 45.5% and a low of 31.3% at the time of writing of the SIP. Since then we have improved our performance to our current rate of 48.9% which is down slightly from the high of 56% for the previous quarter.
- **C1.4 Re-entry Following Reunification.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 7.7%. We have shown dramatic improvement in this area in the last year. At the time of writing of our last SIP our performance was at 12.2% which at that time was an improvement from previous years. Our current rate of 1.2% is lower than the national standard of 9.9%. And of significant note is we have had rates below the national standard since Q4 2011.
- **Quality Assurance/Improvement Process.** Our baseline data for outcome measure 2C from Q2 of 2010 was 93.6%. In our last SIP we identified outcome measure 2C – Timely Social Worker Visits as needing improvement and were looking at methods to improve our outcomes through Quality Assurance and Improvement processes and have increased our outcomes in this area. Our most current rate is 96.2% and we have been in this range or higher for most of the last year.

According to that same Berkeley data we need to improve our SIP outcomes in the following areas;

- **Quality Assurance/Improvement Process.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 97.1%. In our last SIP we identified outcome measure 2B – Timely Response (10 day) Compliance as needing improvement and were looking at methods to improve our outcomes through Quality Assurance and Improvement processes. We have continued to struggle over the last year with timely response to 10-Day Investigations and our most current rate is 76.3%.

Juvenile Probation

In 2010, the Probation Department began utilizing the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System in order to collect more comprehensive information about the foster care youth we serve, their families, and the work of the Placement Officer. Despite exhaustive training, the CWS/CMS application continues to prove difficult to navigate. Additional training is being scheduled for staff.

According to UC Berkeley data, the Probation Department's rate of Reunification within 12 Months (exit cohort) was 100%, which was 24.8% above the federal standard of 75.2%.

The Department's Median Time to Reunification (exit cohort) was 12 months which was double the national goal of 5.4 months.

The Probation Department's rate of Reunification within 12 Months (entry cohort) was 20%, which was 28.4% below the federal standard of 48.4%.

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

The Department's rate of Reentry Following Reunification (exit cohort) increased to 20%, which was 10.1% above the national goal of 9.9%.

The Probation Department's Placement Stability rate for children in care 8 days to 12 months was 83.3%, which was just 2.7 below the federal standard of 86%.

The Department's Placement Stability rate for children in care 12 to 24 months was 50%, which was 15.4% below the federal goal of 65.4%.

The Placement Stability rate for children in care at least 24 months was 50%, which was 8.2% above the federal standard of 41.8%.

Strategies Status

CWS

As mentioned earlier, the Child Welfare Services Division has had some significant improvements in our outcomes during the last year. We attribute the successes we have achieved to some of the strategies that we have implemented over the last year. Those strategies are;

- In 2012 the division made the decision to implement Safety-organized practice (SOP). SOP puts the primary mission of child safety at the forefront of every decision and intervention made with a family. SOP are both practice strategies and concrete tools for "on-the-ground" child welfare workers, supervisors and managers to enhance family participation and foster equitable decision making and are child welfare approaches focused on the safety of the child within the family system. The SOP methodology is informed by a variety of best- and evidence-informed practices, including group supervision, Signs of Safety, Motivational Interviewing, and solution-focused treatment. SOP brings a common language and framework for enhanced critical thinking and judgment on the part of all involved with a family in the pursuit of a balanced, complete picture of child welfare issues. SOP was being implemented in CWS when we wrote our 2012 SIP Update. UC Davis Northern Training Academy began training staff in September 2011. All staff has been trained to use some of the SOP tools and we continue to train staff and we expect that all staff will be trained on all tools over the course of the next year. We continue to incorporate SOP updates and sharing at our twice monthly all staff meeting. This will include an opportunity for staff to share their own experiences and what is working, what may have been a challenge as well as success stories (S1.1: No Recurrence of Maltreatment – Strategy 3).
- We continue to use PSSF/CAPIT funding to contract with one of our community partners to provide Differential Response (DR) services to Path 2 families. Services include parent education, family counseling and substance abuse treatment services. We continue to work with our provider to better track services provided and outcomes (S1.1: No Recurrence of Maltreatment – Strategy 2).
- Continued focus of our efforts on the use of the full spectrum of SDM tools including Risk and Safety, Strengths and Needs as well as the Reunification tool.

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

Further efforts will focus on supporting consistent use throughout the life of the case and monitoring the entire spectrum of tool use in individual staff supervision. Additionally, Supervisors are using staff meetings to train and reinforce the use of SMD tools (C1.3 and C1.4: Reunification and Re-entry – Strategy 1).

- CWS had planned to introduce a team decision making model during the 2011-12 fiscal year as a strategy to engage families and community partners in placement related decisions. CWS has since made the decision to implement Safety Organized Practice (SOP) as our model of team decision making (TDM). Our decision was made after researching TDM and finding that the practice was rigid and prescribed and not the best practice model that we were looking for. Additionally, we found that there were no trainings being offered (C1.3 and C1.4: Reunification and Re-entry – Strategy 2).

Juvenile Probation

The Probation Department has a new Chief Probation Officer. Effective July 1, 2013, Brent D. Cardall assumed leadership duties. Marlon Yarber, who had been Interim Chief Probation Officer, resumed his position as Assistant Chief. There have been no changes to the Division Manager of Probation Supervisor.

The Probation Department now has two fully trained Placement Officers. The principal Placement Officer supervises youth in group home placement, foster care placement, NREFM placement, wraparound services and extended foster care. The secondary Placement Officer supports the primary Placement Officer as needed. Both Officers are bi-lingual and fluent in the English-Spanish languages.

Enhancing probation staff's knowledge of educational rights, responsibilities and opportunities remains a priority for the Probation Department. The Probation Supervisor and Placement Officers maintain regular contact with the UCD Family Resource Center for Family-Focused Practice and consult with them frequently regarding training opportunities. Utilization of the internet has also proven beneficial in locating relevant trainings and courses. The Probation Department remains committed to ensuring that Placement Staff receive advanced training as it becomes available. (Strategy 1, A & B)

The Probation Supervisor and Placement Officers also continue to attend regular meetings of the Placement Advisory Committee, Northern California Placement Committee, Foster Youth Advisory Committee and ILP Community Partners. Collaboration has been essential in identifying gaps in training as well as available resources. (Strategy 3, A)

Consultation with the UCD Family Resource Center and collaboration with our community partners suggests that the evolution of AB12 remains one of the most significant issues facing both Child Welfare and Probation. As such, ongoing and relevant training remains critical to successful implementation of extended foster care. (Strategy 1, B & C)

Early engagement and advocacy is essential in the educational planning process. Placement Officers support youth and families by providing them with a brochure outlining their educational rights and opportunities, as well as assisting them with

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

referrals to state and local resources such as California Youth Connection, Casey Family Program and California Department of Education. (Strategy 2, E)

Placement Officers encourage family members to become active participants in the youth's education and notice parents/guardians of all school meetings and activities. Placement Officers also ensure that family members are aware of the youth's educational barriers and their successes. The Probation Department is able to support family participation by providing transportation or arranging for transportation to school meetings, conferences and events. (Strategy 2, E)

The Division Manager, Probation Supervisor and Placement Officers are involved in numerous collaborations that foster positive community connections and partnerships. Those include the AB12 Committee; Placement Advisory Committee; Northern California Placement Committee; Foster Youth Advisory Committee; ILP Community Partners; Blue Ribbon Commission; Wrap Leadership; and Multi-Disciplinary Assessment Review Team.

Strategy 1: Enhance probation staff's knowledge of educational rights, responsibilities, and opportunities for foster care youth.

- A. Training needs were identified through consultation with Youth Law Center, local ILP Coordinator, and county Foster Care Educational Liaison during the time from of March 2011 to present. This task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is the Division Manager, the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officer. Update: AB12 remains a training priority, as does family finding and relative foster care.
- B. Meet with UCD Resource Center for Family Focused Practice and other recommended training providers to arrange probation staff training during the time from April 2011 to present. This task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is the Division Manager, the Placement Supervisor, the Placement Probation Officers and the Probation Training Coordinator. Update: The Placement Supervisor and Placement Officers maintain regular contact with Resource Center for Family-Focused Practice for the purpose of identifying training needs and opportunities.
- C. Probation staff shall attend a minimum of 16-hours of advanced training as identified through consultation during the timeframe of March 2012 to present. This task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. Update: The Placement Supervisor and Placement Officers attend a minimum of 40 hours of training per year with the majority of that training focused on foster care youth and emerging trends in foster care.
- D. Review training progress and assess further needs during the time of June 2012 to present. This task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is the Division Manager, the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. Update: Formal training evaluations are completed on an annual basis. Additionally, Placement Officers meet with the Placement Supervisor every 90 days to identify potential gaps in training as well as to ensure that established goals and objectives are being met.

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

Strategy 2: Begin educational engagement and planning process at the time youth enters foster care.

- A. Form an internal workgroup to review current process for early engagement of youth and parent during the timeframe of February 2011 to present. This task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is Division Manager, Placement Supervisor, Court Supervisor and Placement Probation Officers. Update: The work group meets as needed to discuss any procedural changes.
- B. Conduct parent-youth focus group to obtain understanding of their needs and past experiences in the educational engagement and planning process during the time of June 1, 2013 to July 1, 2014. The person responsible is the Division Manager, the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. Update: There has not been a sufficient number of youth and parents/guardians available to assemble a focus group.
- C. Finalize plan and integrate into Juvenile Division Policies and Procedures Manual during the timeframe of June 1, 2013 to July 1, 2014. The person responsible is the Division Manager, the Placement Supervisor, the Court Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. Update: Final processes cannot be integrated into the Juvenile Division Policies and Procedures Manual until all barriers have been overcome.
- D. Develop an internal youth education assessment form and research career exploration tool to be used in conjunction with the TILP and case planning process. The timeframe is June 1, 2013 to July 1, 2014. The person responsible is the Juvenile Division Manager, the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. Update: Probation Department is currently reviewing three potential resources: (1) Career Planning Begins with Assessment: A Guide for Professionals Serving Youth with Educational and Career Development Challenges; (2) Focused Futures Youth Development System Builder; and (3) Age Appropriate Transition Assessment Toolkit.
- E. Ensure youth and parents are aware of foster care educational rights and opportunities by developing a brochure outlining education rights and opportunities and create a link to the brochure on Probation Department website. The timeframe is August 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013. The person responsible is the Division Manager, Placement Supervisor, Court Supervisor, Placement Probation Officers and Probation IT. Update: The brochure has been completed and is being provided to youth and parents. A link to the brochure has not yet been placed on the Probation Department website.

3. Strategy 3: Continue to build new community connections and partnerships.

- A. Attend monthly Regional Placement Committee meetings, ILP meetings, and Placement Advisory Committee meetings during the timeframe of February 2011 to present. This task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. Update: The Placement Supervisor and Placement Officers continue to attend NCPC, PAC, ILP and AB12 meetings as scheduled.
- B. Create a work group with ILP Coordinator and Foster Care Liaison to examine feasibility of establishing a foster care educational advocacy consortium during

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

the timeframe of April 30, 2013 to present. This task is completed. The person responsible is the Division Manager, the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. Update: The ILP Community Partners Group continues to meet on a monthly basis. Members include: Yolo County Office of Education; Court Approved Special Advocate (CASA); Probation; CWS; Woodland Community College Foster & Kinship Care Education; and California Youth Connection.

- ~~C. Convene a stakeholders meeting to discuss implementation and set meetings. This item was stricken as this is a duplication of services as the community ILP partners attending this meeting would be the same members attending the other meeting, thus being a duplication of services.~~
- D. Review progress and reassess feasibility of establishing an educational consortium during the timeframe of July 1, 2013 to present. The task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is the Division Manager, the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. Update: The ILP Community Partners Group has fulfilled the need for a county-wide educational consortium.

Barriers to Implementation

CWS

While we have made some significant improvements in some of our outcomes we continue to struggle in other areas. We will continue to focus our efforts improving those outcomes that are below the national standard. Some of our challenges during this last year have been in the following areas;

- While we are a Linkages county and partner with the CalWORKs side of our department to coordinate services to crossover families with open child welfare and CalWORKs cases we struggle to use CalWORKs funding for mental health treatment and services. We have developed a number of contracts for substance abuse treatment services in partnership with CalWORKs and identify crossover clients in order to coordinate services and utilize the best funding streams for those services. In 2013/14 we will work with CalWORKs to add funding for mental health treatment and services for those crossover clients.
- Implementation of a vertical case management model began in 2013. The intent of this practice model is to provide relationship based child welfare services as a best practice model. Vertical case management promotes continuity of services with a single caseworker handling cases as they enter the system, family maintenance, family reunification and permanency planning. This model will reduce the number of social worker changes that a family experiences, lessen service gaps, and create a more streamlined process. Practice of this case management model has been difficult for many staff that have specialized in one service component and are now required to learn new service components and the varied work associated with that service component. For example, a social worker that has worked in family maintenance (FM) for years is now taking new cases after the detention hearing and learning the court processes in addition to carrying his/her existing FM cases.

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

- The juvenile dependency court continues to present barriers for staff and negatively impacts our outcomes in the composite areas of reunification, adoption and long term care. Social workers are required to spend numerous hours in the court room for special interim reports and continuances which then equates into additional court reports and time away from case management and best practice social work.

Juvenile Probation

There were barriers encountered by the Probation Department. There were a limited number of minors in placement, which was a roadblock to gathering meaningful statistical data. Additionally, the minors who were transitioned from Dependency status to Delinquency status were a hindrance due to the fact that their parents were uncooperative and unwilling to participate in the focus groups.

The Probation Department has yet to convene parent-youth focus groups (Strategy 2). It remains our belief that these groups can prove beneficial by providing a better understanding of how we can best serve youth and families during the educational engagement and planning process.

During this reporting period there has not been a sufficient number of youth and parents/guardians available to assemble a focus group. The Probation Department is now in the process of determining whether it would be advantageous to incentivize this strategy in hopes of increasing participation. It is the hope that the incentives will motivate participation.

There has also been delay in developing an internal youth education assessment form (Strategy 2), the basis for which was the underestimation of the complexity of the task. The Probation Department is currently reviewing three potential resources: (1) Career Planning Begins with Assessment: A Guide for Professionals Serving Youth with Educational and Career Development Challenges; (2) Focused Futures Youth Development System Builder; and (3) Age Appropriate Transition Assessment Toolkit.

Until the above barriers can be addressed, final processes cannot be integrated into the Juvenile Division Policies and Procedures Manual (Strategy 2).

Other Successes/Promising Practices

CWS

Child welfare's primary mission is to ensure that children are safe, and that their family and systems of care provide a safe environment free from abuse and neglect.

- In 2012 the CWS division implemented weekly case staffing meetings where the Division Manager and Social Worker Supervisors are available to meet with staff to review cases and provide a team recommendation on complex case-specific issues. These staffings are now held twice weekly and include staffing cases for services such as Wraparound, Therapeutic Behavioral Services (TBS), Community Based Services (CBS), and Katie A appropriateness and referral.

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

- We continue to be a Linkages county and partner with the CalWORKs side of our department to coordinate services to families with open CalWORKs and child welfare cases. We have developed a number of contracts for substance abuse treatment services in partnership with CalWORKs and identify crossover clients in order to coordinate services and utilize the best funding streams for those services. In 2013 we will work with CalWORKs to add funding for mental health treatment and services for those crossover clients.
- We continue to use the Family Life Skills Partnership (FLSP) program: We contract with 2 community partners to provide services. CommuniCare Health Centers, Inc. provides the parenting program and EMQ Families First provides the independent living skills program. This two-pronged service supports families to develop;
 - Independent living skills in areas they've identified needing assistance (for example; cleaning house, nutrition, job searching, budgeting, social skills, family planning, problem solving, accessing community resources, developing goals, etc.) and
 - Parenting skills specific to the needs of the child(ren) in their care (for example; appropriate discipline, age appropriate development, and developing specific skills to meet the specific needs of a child).
- We continue to provide the Voluntary Family Maintenance (VFM) program: the social worker sees each participant in the case at least three times each month, and maintains an equally high level of contact with all service providers. When appropriate, SOP is used as a strategy to help the family create natural supports and facilitate safety for the child.

In July 2012 we implemented a Court Officer position. This social worker attends court hearings for FM, FR and PP staff and the intent is to reduce the amount of time individual staff spend in court thus freeing up time for best practice social work. Due to staffing shortages one of the Social Worker Supervisor's has been filling this role for most of 2013. With the implementation of the Court Officer position in 2012, the division has been able to present a consistent face and message in court with the desire to move the court process along more quickly and decrease the number of court continuances which in turn delays termination of parental rights and the ability to move kids into permanency. Even with the court officer the juvenile dependency court continues to present barriers for staff and negatively impacts our outcomes in the composite areas of reunification, adoption and long term care.

- Beginning in calendar year 2011 the CWS Division began taking a new approach to substance abuse treatment. In the past, authorization for substance abuse treatment would be authorized for 30 days and in some cases 60 days. The outcomes that we achieved had been less than expected with the individuals participating in these short term treatment programs. We are now authorizing treatment in 30 day increments up to 90 and in some cases 120 days for individuals who are in need of such treatment. We are seeing improved success for individuals participating in these longer treatment programs which in turn have translate into improved success in our reunification efforts and re-entry rates.

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

- We will hire and train new social work staff this year for a placement unit and an older youth/young adult unit. One Social Worker Practitioner and four Child Welfare Services workers will be hired in Fiscal Year 2013/14. These new staff will;
 - Staff a placement unit with clerical support to conduct relative home studies, family finding and placement activities
 - Provide appropriate services and supports to better prepare young adults for the transition to adulthood.

In addition to providing better assessments and placement choices for foster children and improved services and supports for transitioning foster children this change will reduce the on-going caseworker caseload thus freeing up time for best practice social work.

Juvenile Probation

The Probation Department is very proud of the partnership that it maintains with the Yolo county Department of Social Services Children and Family Services Division. This relationship has improved over the years, beginning with California Child and Family Services Review (C-CFSR) and the implementation of the Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR) process. The networking among both departments became even more productive during the County Self-Assessment (CSA) process, the ongoing development of the System Improvement Plan (SIP), and the implementation of AB12. Both departments work together closely to meet the needs of our clients and the community.

The Probation Department has weekly case staffing meetings where the Division Manager, Probation Supervisors and Probation Officers meet to review cases and provide a team recommendation on complex case-specific issues. These meetings are used to staff cases for services such as Foster Care Placement, Wraparound, Therapeutic Behavioral Services (TBS), and Community Based Services (CBS).

Since the inception of AB12, the Probation Department has seen an increase in youth who want to remain under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court as Non-Minor Dependents. Placement Officers are identifying potential AB12 youth earlier in the delinquency process and ensuring that they receive information and guidance to program enrollment and participation. Placement Officers also work diligently with youth to keep them qualified and engaged in extended foster care services.

Outcome Measures not meeting State/National Standards

CWS

Over the last year CWS has struggled with several measures that are not meeting the national standard. They are;

- **C2.1 Adoption Within 24 Months.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 10.0%. In Q1 2012 we were close to the standard of 36.6% with our rate of 34.6%. Since then we have gone up and down and are currently at 18.2% which is an increase from our baseline data. We attribute some of this to;

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

- Yolo County does not do its own adoptions. We have historically contracted with CDSS-Adoptions to do this function for us. Even after 2011 Realignment we continue to contract with CDSS-Adoptions for this function. CDSS-Adoptions has been short staffed for the last year which has resulted in delays in finalizing adoptions.
- In a majority of cases where the Social Worker has recommended ceasing services at the six and twelve month hearings the court has ordered further services. This practice by the court negatively impacts our outcomes in this area as well as several other areas.
- We are seeing more adopted children coming back into the CWS system due to significant mental health needs that adoptive parents are not willing/able to handle. This has impacted our outcomes in this area.
- **C2.5 Adoption Within 12 Months.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 41.7%. Over the last year we have steadily climbed from a rate of 55.9% in Q1 2012, which was close to the national standard of 53.7%, to our current rate of 75%. We attribute our performance to the same reasons as cited for measure C2.1 above.
- **C3.3 In Care 3 Years or Longer.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 64.7%. The national standard for this measure is 37.5% and we are currently at 63.2% and have been in this range for the last year.

Because of the number of youth in the measure it will take a long time for our practice to impact our numbers in a significant way. Utilizing SOP we are doing a better job working with families and increasing the likelihood of successful case closure via reunification or placement with relatives.

We are finding that more youth are opting into the AB12 program to take advantage of the benefits of the program and because of this it is a disincentive to youth to reunify with parents. We expect this to continue to negatively impact this outcome measure.

- **C4.3 Placement Stability.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 28%. The national standard for this measure is 41.8% and our current rate is 24.1%. While we have shown some progress from our baseline we are still short of the national standard.

The division is in the process of implementing several strategies to improve outcomes in C3.3 and C4.3. They are;

- School Connect – A web-based system to assist placement workers in finding the best homes for kids in foster care. It will allow placement workers to search and locate long term and appropriate placements for kids that will best match kids with caregivers in their school of origin thus improving placement stability.
- The division is implementing a placement unit in November 2013 which will provide more consistency in our placements efforts and outcomes.

2013 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

- The Katie A. v Bonta lawsuit is prompting the division to develop a screening and assessment tool for children that will allow staff to make better decisions and locate more suitable placements for children.

Juvenile Probation

Over the last year Probation has struggled with several measures that are not meeting the national standard. They are;

C1.2 Median Time To Reunification. The Department's Median Time to Reunification (exit cohort) was 12 months which was double the national goal of 5.4 months.

C1.3 Reunification Within 12 Months. The Probation Department's rate of Reunification within 12 Months (entry cohort) was 20%, which was 28.4% below the federal standard of 48.4%.

C1.3 Reentry Following Reunification. The Department's rate of Reentry Following Reunification (exit cohort) increased to 20%, which was 10.1% above the national goal of 9.9%.

2013 State and Federally Mandated Child Welfare/Probation Initiatives

CWS

Yolo County is currently meeting regularly with staff from the Yolo County Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Department to assess our county for readiness and barriers to implementation of the Core Practice Model for the Katie A. v Bonta lawsuit. Our two departments jointly completed the Readiness Assessment Tool and the Service Delivery Plan which was sent to the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) on May 15, 2013. The two Departments utilized the Mental Health Services Act stakeholders group, family partner, youth and family interviews and surveys to solicit community feedback. We are continuing the implementation process and are reviewing screening tools and developing local practices that meet the requirements of the Core Practice Model.

Juvenile Probation

Yolo County is currently meeting with the Probation Advisory Committee every six weeks to discuss placement issues within the state. The Community Partners ILP also meets once every six weeks. At this time Probation has not been directed by CDSS to participate in the Katie A. v Bonta lawsuit. If so directed we will gladly partner with CWS and ADMH to best meet the needs of our children and families.

5 YEAR SIP CHART CWS

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: S1.1 – No Recurrence of Maltreatment

Of all children who were the victims of a substantiated maltreatment allegation during the selected six-month period, what percent were not victims of another substantiated allegation within the following six months?

National Standard: 94.6%

Baseline Data: Q2 2010 - 91.1%

Current Performance: Yolo County's performance on this measure for the time period January 1, 2012 through June 30, 2012 was 95.6% according to the data extracted from Berkeley quarterly report (April 2013-Q4). From a total of 225 children, 215 had no recurrence and 10 experienced a recurrence of maltreatment.

Target Improvement Goal 1: Maintain our performance at or above the national standard for the remainder of the 5 year SIP.

Target Improvement Goal 2: Utilize Safety Organized Practice (SOP) at the earliest possible moment in the case to improve outcomes for all children and families.

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: C1.3 – Reunification Within 12 Months

Of all children who entered foster care for the first time in the selected six-month period, what percent were discharged to reunification within 12 months of their removal from the home?

National Standard: 48.4%

Baseline Data: Q2 2010 - 45.5%

Current Performance: Yolo County's performance on this measure for the time period July 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011 was 48.9% according to the data extracted from Berkeley quarterly report (April 2013-Q4). From a total of 45 children, 22 were reunified within 12 months.

Target Improvement Goal 1: Maintain our current performance for the remainder of the 5 year SIP.

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: C1.4 – Reentry Following Reunification

Of all children exiting foster care to reunification during the selected 12-month period, what percent reentered foster care less than 12 months from the date of discharge?

National Standard: 9.9%

Baseline Data: Q2 2010 – 7.7%

Current Performance: Yolo County's performance on this measure for the time period January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011 was 1.2% according to the data extracted from Berkeley quarterly report (April 2013-Q4). From a total of 82 children, 1 reentered foster care within 12 months.

5 YEAR SIP CHART CWS

Target Improvement Goal 1: Maintain our current performance for the remainder of the 5 year SIP.

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: Quality Assurance/Improvement Process

Yolo County has identified an area where a Quality Assurance/Improvement Process will assist in improving outcomes.

2B – 10 Day Response Compliance

National Standard: N/A

Baseline Data: Q2 2010 – 97.1%

Current Performance: 76.3%

Target Improvement Goal 1: Improve our outcomes in this area by 10% over the next year.

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor:

C2.1 – Adoption Within 24 Months

Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption during the selected 12-month period, what percent were discharged in less than 24 months from the date of the latest removal from home?

C2.5 – Adoption Within 12 Months

Of all children in foster care who became legally free for adoption during the selected 12-month period, what percent were then discharged to a finalized adoption within the following 12 months?

National Standard: C2.1 - 36.6% and C2.5 - 53.7%

Baseline Data: Q2 2010 – C2.1 - 10% and C2.5 – 41.7%

Current Performance: 18.2% and 75% - This is a small population of children and not finalizing an adoption for just a few kids can cause dramatic changes in outcomes.

Target Improvement Goal 1: Work with County Counsel and the local judicial system to minimize continuances in order to improve our outcomes in this area.

5 YEAR SIP CHART CWS

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: C3.3 – In Care 3 Years or Longer

Of all children in foster care during the selected 12-month period who were either discharged to emancipation or turned 18 in care, what percent were in care for three years or longer?

National Standard: 37.5%

Baseline Data: Q2 2010 – 64.7%

Current Performance: 63.2%

Target Improvement Goal 1: Improve our outcomes in this area by 5% over the next year.

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: C4.3 – Placement Stability

Of all children in foster care during the selected 12-month period who were in care for at least 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placements?

National Standard: 41.8%

Baseline Data: Q2 2010 – 28%

Current Performance: 24.1%

Target Improvement Goal 1: Improve our performance in this outcome by 5% over the next year.

5 YEAR SIP CHART
Probation

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: 8A

National Standard: N/A

Current Performance: unknown

Target Improvement Goal: By enhancing probation staff's knowledge of educational rights, responsibilities and opportunities for foster youth we expect to see more youth complete high school or equivalency, obtain employment, have secure housing arrangements, receive ILP services and have a permanent connection with an adult.

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

S1.1 – No Recurrence of Maltreatment			
Improvement Goal 1: Maintain our performance at or above the national standard for the remainder of the 5 year SIP.			
Strategy 1: Develop resources for drug and alcohol treatment and parenting classes when a case is not opened.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): No Recurrence of Maltreatment	
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP		
2012 Update - Our current contract for DR services includes parent education, counseling and drug treatment services.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PSSF		
	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A		
Action Steps:		Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Assess availability of evidence based child abuse prevention services.	2011 Update: Completed via meetings with staff and will be an ongoing process.	March 2011 Completed	Analyst CWS Supervisors Division Manager
B. Contract with community based service providers to provide evidence-based prevention and intervention services to clients at risk of child abuse or neglect. Services may include parent education, family counseling and drug treatment/sober living services.	2012 Update: We contracted with a local CBO to provide prevention and early intervention services starting on July 1, 2011.	July 2011 completed	Analyst CWS Supervisors
C. Evaluate the effectiveness of contracted services. If effective, should see a reduction in referral and recurrence rates.	2012 Update: Outcome measures were	Ongoing	Analyst Division Manager

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

<p>developed, are included in the contract, and will be monitored on an ongoing basis.</p>						
<p>Strategy 2: Expand and enhance differential response (DR) services. 2012 and 2013 Update - Our current contract for DR services includes parent education, counseling and drug treatment services.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAPIT</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PSSF</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PSSF	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>No Recurrence of Maltreatment</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAPIT						
<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PSSF						
<input type="checkbox"/> N/A						
<p>Action Steps:</p>	<p>Timeframe:</p>	<p>Person Responsible:</p>				
<p>A. Establish a workgroup to review DR policy in order to identify current gaps in services, procedures and/or resources.</p> <p>2011 Update: ER staff provided feedback on past and current services, the unmet need in the community, and procedure changes needed from their perspective.</p>	<p>February 2011 - Completed</p>	<p>CWS Staff Analysts</p>				
<p>B. Assess and monitor the current DR process through observation and discussion via meetings with staff and vendor. Determine policy and procedure changes and identify necessary resources.</p> <p>2012 and 2013 Update: One area that is being considered for change is to conduct a joint home visit between ER staff and our DR service provider staff to introduce the DR staff person and communicate the benefits the services may afford the family.</p>	<p>April-2011—Assessment and Monitoring Completed</p> <p>July 2014 – Further assess ER and DR’s ability to conduct joint home visits</p>	<p>Analysts CWS Supervisors</p>				

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

<p>Strategy 3: Initiate an evidence based prevention program for child abuse referrals.</p> <p>2012 Update: The Division has made the decision to implement Safety Organized Practice (SOP), a model of Signs of Safety (SOS). Initially this was set to begin in ER but due to staff shortages and the difficulty the Division has in covering Hotline and Immediate investigations it was implemented first in FM and FR cases.</p> <p>Action Steps:</p> <p>A. Research and identify an evidence based program that addresses the needs of the targeted children and their families.</p> <p>2012 and 2013 Update: Safety Organized Practice is being implemented. Staff training is continuing.</p> <p>B. Establish a workgroup to assess needs, resources and disproportionally for the county's African-American children and families.</p> <p>2012 Update: Upon further analysis of our outcomes and data disproportionally for this population does not exist in Yolo County. We will continue to look at data in this area and to monitor.</p> <p>C. Develop policy, procedure and contracts as needed to implement program.</p> <p>2012 and 2013 Update: Safety Organized Practice is being implemented. Policies</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAPIT</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> PSSF</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>No Recurrence of Maltreatment</p>
<p>Timeframe:</p>		<p>Person Responsible:</p>
<p>A. Research and identify an evidence based program that addresses the needs of the targeted children and their families.</p> <p>2012 and 2013 Update: Safety Organized Practice is being implemented. Staff training is continuing.</p>	<p>March 2011 – Completed and Ongoing</p>	<p>CWS Supervisors Analysts</p>
<p>B. Establish a workgroup to assess needs, resources and disproportionally for the county's African-American children and families.</p> <p>2012 Update: Upon further analysis of our outcomes and data disproportionally for this population does not exist in Yolo County. We will continue to look at data in this area and to monitor.</p>	<p>April 2011 – Completed and Ongoing</p>	<p>Analysts CWS Staff/Supervisors Division Manager</p>
<p>C. Develop policy, procedure and contracts as needed to implement program.</p> <p>2012 and 2013 Update: Safety Organized Practice is being implemented. Policies</p>	<p>September 2012—Ongoing July 2014</p>	<p>Analysts CWS Staff/Supervisors</p>

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

<p>and procedures to be developed as needed.</p> <p>D. Develop and conduct targeted training to implement program.</p> <p>2012 and 2013 Update: All staff have been trained in some tools. Training continues to further encompass all tools associated with SOP.</p> <p>E. Monitor to ensure compliance by reviewing monthly data at the staff and supervisor's meetings.</p>	<p>July 2011 - Ongoing</p> <p>September 2011 and Ongoing</p>	<p>Analysts CWS Supervisors Division Manager</p> <p>Analysts CWS Supervisors Division Manager</p>
--	--	---

<p>C1.3 and C1.4 – Reunification and Re-Entry</p> <p>Improvement Goal 1: Maintain our performance at or above the national standard for the remainder of the 5 year SIP.</p>										
<p>Strategy 1: Develop a standard procedure for the use of SDM throughout the life of a case to assure comprehensive assessments of family strengths, risk and safety are completed at all stages of case planning.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CAPIT</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CBCAP</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>PSSF</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAPIT	<input type="checkbox"/>	CBCAP	<input type="checkbox"/>	PSSF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>C1.3 and C1.4 – Reunification and Re-Entry</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAPIT									
<input type="checkbox"/>	CBCAP									
<input type="checkbox"/>	PSSF									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A									
<p>Action Steps:</p> <p>A. Develop and conduct training specific to SDM policy changes as a result of the enhance monitoring.</p> <p>Update: Staff is being trained internally at unit meetings and in one-on-one staffings with their supervisors. If training becomes available outside the Department we will take advantage of any opportunities.</p>	<p>Timeframe:</p> <p>July 2011 and ongoing</p>	<p>Person Responsible:</p> <p>CWS Supervisors</p>								

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

<p>B. Monitor via monthly supervisory staffing and supervisor's meetings. Update: Supervisors are reviewing SafeMeasures with staff at unit meetings and in one-on-one staffings.</p>	<p>July 2011 and ongoing</p>	<p>CWS Supervisors Division Manager</p>
--	------------------------------	---

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PSSF</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): C1.3 and C1.4 – Reunification and Re-Entry</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT						
<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP						
<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A						
<p>Action Steps:</p>	<p>Timeframe:</p>	<p>Person Responsible:</p>				
<p>Strategy 2: DESS plans to introduce a team decision making model during 2011-12 as a strategy to engage families and community partners in placement-related decisions. 2012 Update: The Division has made the decision to implement Safety Organized Practice and not team decision making. 2013 Update: The majority of staff have been trained and are using SOP in their cases.</p>	<p>March 2011- Completed</p>	<p>CWS Supervisors Division Manager</p>				
<p>A. Research team decision making process as practiced in other counties. 2012 Update: Through Safety Organized Practice trainings staff and supervisors have interacted with various counties also attending the training and have discussed what works and what doesn't.</p>						

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

<p>B. Identify target population and needed resources for implementation of a team decision making process.</p> <p>2012 Update: Due to ER staff shortages and difficulty with staff covering unfamiliar ER duties the division made the decision to implement Safety Organized Practice in FM and FR cases initially. We intend to train ER and PP staff in the next series of available trainings. Additionally, as time permits ER/PP staff may participate as scribes in FM/FR cases to begin the learning process.</p> <p>2013 Update: All staff have been trained in some tools such as Safety Mapping. Staff will continue to be trained during this next fiscal year.</p>	<p>June 2011 – Completed and Ongoing</p>	<p>CWS Supervisors Division Manager</p>
<p>C. Develop policies and procedures implementing team decision making including project evaluation and staff training.</p> <p>2013 Update: We are implementing SOP and will develop policies and procedures for staff.</p>	<p>January-2013 July 2014</p>	<p>Analysts CWS Supervisors Division Manager</p>

<p>Quality Assurance/Improvement Process</p> <p>Improvement Goal: Maintain our current performance for the remainder of the 5 year SIP.</p>									
<p>Strategy 1: Analyze data issues affecting compliance in outcome measure 2C Timely Social Worker Visits.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CAPIT</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CBCAP</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>PSSF</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 2C – Timely Social Worker Visits</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CAPIT	<input type="checkbox"/>	CBCAP	<input type="checkbox"/>	PSSF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	CAPIT								
<input type="checkbox"/>	CBCAP								
<input type="checkbox"/>	PSSF								
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A								

5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS

Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
<p>A. Review monthly reports on compliance by unit and worker. 2012 and 2013 Update: Supervisors are reviewing data in SafeMeasures at individual staff meetings on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Analysts CWS Supervisors</p>
<p>B. Analyze barriers to data entry for workers. 2012 Update: In reviewing our 2C data we have discovered that staff must enter contact data in CWS/CMS prior to the end of the month to meet Federal outcome measure standards. Staff has been advised of this and supervisors will monitor compliance. 2013 Update: Our outcomes have improved and we will continue the practices that we started last year.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Analysts CWS Supervisors</p>
<p>C. Report back to supervisors and managers about findings of analysis. Identify structural solutions. 2012 Update: We are in the beginning stages of determining how to implement a case review process. 2013 Update: Monterey County shared their Quality Assurance process and we are in the process of evaluating for our use.</p>	<p>July 2011 and Ongoing</p>	<p>Analysts CWS Supervisors Division Manager</p>

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

<p>D. Train supervisors and social workers on effective ways to use SafeMeasures to track compliance. 2012 Update: As SafeMeasures training becomes available for both staff and supervisors we will participate.</p>	<p>July 2012 and Ongoing</p>	<p>CWS Supervisors</p>
<p>E. Integrate worker compliance into employee Evaluation system.</p>	<p>January 2013 and Ongoing</p>	<p>Division Manager CWS Supervisors</p>

<p>Quality Assurance/Improvement Process</p>						
<p>Improvement Goal: Improve our outcomes in this area by 10% over the next year.</p>						
<p>Strategy 1: Improve accountability system for data entry of investigations and visits.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT</td> <td rowspan="4"> <p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 2B – 10 Day Response Compliance</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PSSF</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 2B – 10 Day Response Compliance</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 2B – 10 Day Response Compliance</p>					
<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP						
<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A						
<p>Action Steps:</p>						
<p>A. Communicate importance of data entry of investigations and visits to staff, emphasizing the relevance to child safety. 2012 Update: Staff have been informed of this requirement at Division meetings and in individual staff conferences with their immediate supervisors. 2013 Update: Staff must enter contact notes within 5 days.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td> <p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p> </td> <td> <p>Person Responsible: Analysts CWS Supervisors</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p>	<p>Person Responsible: Analysts CWS Supervisors</p>			
<p>Timeframe: Ongoing</p>	<p>Person Responsible: Analysts CWS Supervisors</p>					

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

<p>B. Discuss cases out of compliance at every staff supervision meeting. 2012 Update: Supervisors are discussing with staff at unit meetings and individual staff meetings.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>CWS Supervisors</p>
<p>C. Integrate worker compliance into employee Evaluation system.</p>	<p>January 2013 and Ongoing</p>	<p>Division Manager CWS Supervisors</p>
<p>D. Implement requirement to make first contact attempt within 5 days and second attempt within 10 days to ensure 10 day compliance is met.</p>	<p>July 2013 and Ongoing</p>	<p>CWS Supervisors</p>
<p>E. Staff are required to enter contact notes on investigations in 5 days</p>	<p>July 2013 and ongoing</p>	<p>CWS Supervisors</p>

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
PROBATION**

Probation Outcome: Educational stability and advancement for youth transitioning to adulthood.			
Strategy 1: Enhance probation staff's knowledge of educational rights, responsibilities, and opportunities for foster care youth.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):	
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	8A	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:	
<p>A. Identify training needs through consultation with Youth Law Center, local ILP Coordinator, and county Foster Care Educational Liaison.</p> <p>Update: AB12 remains a training priority, as does family finding and relative foster care.</p>	March 2011 – Completed and Ongoing	Division Manager Placement Supervisor Placement Probation Officers	
<p>B. Meet with UCD Resource Center for Family Focused Practice and other recommended training providers to arrange probation staff training.</p> <p>Update: The Placement Supervisor and Placement Officers maintain regular contact with Resource Center for Family-Focused Practice for the purpose of identifying training needs and opportunities.</p>	April 2011 – Completed and Ongoing	Division Manager Placement Supervisor Placement Probation Officers Probation Training Coordinator	
<p>C. Probation staff shall attend a minimum of 16-hours of advanced training as identified through consultation.</p> <p>Update: The Placement Supervisor</p>	March 2012 – Completed and Ongoing	Placement Supervisor Placement Probation Officers	

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
PROBATION**

<p>and Placement Officers attend a minimum of 40 hours of training per year with the majority of that training focused on foster care youth and emerging trends in foster care.</p>		
<p>D. Review training progress and assess further needs Update: Formal training evaluations are completed on an annual basis. Additionally, Placement Officers meet with the Placement Supervisor every 90 days to identify potential gaps in training as well as to ensure that established training goals and objectives are being met.</p>	<p>June 2012 – Completed and Ongoing</p>	<p>Division Manager Placement Supervisor Placement Probation Officers</p>

<p>Strategy 2: Begin educational engagement and planning process at the time youth enters foster care.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CAPIT</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>CBCAP</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>PSSF</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CAPIT	<input type="checkbox"/>	CBCAP	<input type="checkbox"/>	PSSF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 8A</p>
<input type="checkbox"/>	CAPIT									
<input type="checkbox"/>	CBCAP									
<input type="checkbox"/>	PSSF									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A									
<p>Action Steps:</p>		<p>Person Responsible:</p>								
<p>A. Form an internal workgroup to review current process for early engagement of youth and parent. Update: The work group meets as needed to discuss any procedural changes.</p>	<p>February 2011 – Completed and Ongoing</p>	<p>Division Manager Placement Supervisor Court Supervisor Placement Probation Officers</p>								

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
PROBATION**

<p>B. Conduct parent-youth focus group to obtain understanding of their needs and past experiences in the educational engagement and planning process. Update: There has not been a sufficient number of youth and parents/guardians available to assemble a focus group.</p>	<p>June 1, 2013 July 1, 2014</p>	<p>Division Manager Placement Supervisor Placement Probation Officers</p>
<p>C. Finalize plan and integrate into Juvenile Division Policies and Procedures Manual. Update: Final processes cannot be integrated into the Juvenile Division Policies and Procedures Manual until all barriers have been overcome.</p>	<p>June 1, 2013 July 1, 2014</p>	<p>Division Manager Placement Supervisor Court Supervisor Placement Probation Officers</p>
<p>D. Develop an internal youth education assessment form and research career exploration tool to be used in conjunction with the TILP and case planning process. Update: Probation Department is currently reviewing three potential resources: (1) Career Planning Begins with Assessment: A Guide for Professionals Serving Youth with Educational and Career Development Challenges; (2) Focused Futures Youth Development System Builder;</p>	<p>June 1, 2013 July 1, 2014</p>	<p>Division Manager Placement Supervisor Placement Probation Officers</p>

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
PROBATION**

<p>and (3) Age Appropriate Transition Assessment Toolkit.</p>		
<p>E. Ensure youth and parents are aware of foster care educational rights and opportunities by developing a brochure outlining education rights and opportunities and create a link to the brochure on Probation Department website Update: The brochure has been completed and is being provided to youth and parents. A link to the brochure has not yet been placed on the Probation Department website.</p>	<p>August 1, 2013 December 31, 2013</p>	<p>Division Manager Placement Supervisor Court Supervisor Placement Probation Officers Probation IT</p>

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
PROBATION**

Strategy 3: Continue to build new community connections and partnerships.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP <input type="checkbox"/> PSSF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 8A	Person Responsible:
	Timeframe:			
Action Steps: A. Attend monthly Regional Placement Committee meetings, ILP meetings, and Placement Advisory Committee meetings. Update: The Placement Supervisor and Placement Officers continue to attend NCPC, PAC, ILP, and AB 12 meetings as scheduled.	February 2011 – Completed and Ongoing		Placement Supervisor Placement Probation Officers	
B. Create a work group with ILP Coordinator and Foster Care Liaison to examine feasibility of establishing a foster care educational advocacy consortium. Update: The ILP Community Partners Group continues to meet on a monthly basis. Members include: Yolo County Office of Education; Court Approved Special Advocate (CASA); Probation; CWS; Woodland Community College Foster & Kinship Care Education; and California Youth Connection.	April 30, 2013 – Completed and Ongoing		Division Manager Placement Supervisor Placement Probation Officers	

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
PROBATION**

<p>C. Convene a stakeholders meeting to discuss implementation and set meetings. Stakeholders to include: Student Services Directors for each school district in Yolo County, local community colleges, ILP Coordinator, Foster Care Liaison, ROP Coordinator. Update: Members of the ILP Community Partners Group have recommended against convening a separate stakeholders meeting as it would be a duplication of resources.</p>	<p>September 30, 2013 July 1, 2013 – N/A</p>	<p>Division Manager Placement Supervisor Placement Probation Officers</p>
<p>D. Review progress and reassess feasibility of establishing an educational consortium. Update: The ILP Community Partners Group has fulfilled the need for a county-wide educational consortium.</p>	<p>February 1, 2014 July 1, 2013 – Completed and Ongoing</p>	<p>Division Manager Placement Supervisor Placement Probation Officers</p>