

California - Child and Family Services Review

Annual SIP Progress Report

NOVEMBER 2011 – MAY 2014



CDSS
CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF
SOCIAL SERVICES

Table of Contents

Introduction.....Page 2

Sip NarrativePage 2

State and Federally Mandated Child welfare/Probation InitiativesPage 15

Attachments

Five-Year SIP ChartAttachment 1

California - Child and Family Services Review Signature Sheet

For submittal of: CSA SIP Progress Report

County

Lassen

SIP Period Dates

Outcome Data Period

County Child Welfare Agency Director

Name

Eric Nielson

Signature*

Eric Nielson

Phone Number

(530) 251-9336

Mailing Address

PO Box 1359
Susanville CA 96130

County Chief Probation Officer

Name

Jennifer Branning

Signature*

J Branning

Phone Number

530-251-2689 jbranning@co.lassenca.us

Mailing Address

107 S. Reed St
Susanville CA, 96130

Public Agency Designated to Administer CAPT and CBCAP

Name

Signature*

Phone Number

Mailing Address

Board of Supervisors (BOS) Signature

BOS Approval Date

Name

Signature*

Mail the original Signature Sheet to:

Children's Services, Outcomes and Accountability Bureau
Attention: Program Chief
Children and Family Services Division
California Department of Social Services
442 Street View, #131
Sacramento, CA 95834

*Signatures must be in blue ink

Contact Information

Child Welfare Agency	Name	Lisa Chandler
	Agency	Child Welfare Agency
	Phone & E-mail	530-251-8166
	Mailing Address	P.O. Box 1359 Susanville, CA 96130
Probation Agency	Name	Sara Gould
	Agency	Probation
	Phone & E-mail	530-251-8412 sgould@ca.lesser.ca.us
	Mailing Address	107 S. Roop St, Susanville CA 96130
Public Agency Administering CAPIT and CBCAP (Other than Child Welfare)	Name	
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	
CAPIT Liaison	Name	
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	
CBCAP Liaison	Name	
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	
PSSF Liaison	Name	
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	

Introduction

This report combines Lassen County's 2012 and 2013 annual Systems Improvement Plan (SIP) progress reports. The SIP is part of the California-Child and Family Service Review (C-CFSR) process. The SIP is an agreement between the County and State outlining how the County will improve its systems of care for children and youth and includes annual reports on progress toward meeting agreed upon improvement goals using the C-CFSR outcomes and indicators. Although the latest SIP reporting cycle began in November 2011 due date of the first annual SIP progress report was moved to May 2013 with the implementation of 5 year C-CFSR cycle, with the second annual SIP progress report coming due in May 2014. Lassen County sought and received approval from the California Children's Services Outcomes and Accountability Bureau to combine the two annual reports and requested an extension for the completion of the report due the recent change in leadership at Lassen County Child and Family Services.

SIP Progress Narrative

Stakeholders Participation

Lassen County

Lassen County continues to hold bi-weekly meetings with key stakeholders in its Children's Systems of Care. These meetings are convened and facilitated under direction of the Lassen County Health and Social Services Agency (HSS) and include the following core members:

- Lassen County Child and Family Services (CFS)
- Lassen County Probation
- Lassen County Behavioral Health
- Lassen County Eligibility and Employment Services (LassenWORKs)
- Lassen County Public Health
- Family Solutions – the wraparound program
- Lassen County Office of Education
- Lassen Community College Independent Living Program (ILP)
- Banner Lassen Hospital
- Lassen County 0-5 Commission
- Pathways Home Visiting – community based organization
- Lassen Family Services – community based organization
- Patient's Rights Advocate

The Children's System of Care meetings are comprised of an Administrative Review Team (ART) and Service Allocation Team (SAT).

The Administrative Review Team includes Executives and Managers from the stakeholder organizations and addresses systemic concerns and the implementation of policy.

The Service Allocation Team includes Supervisors and Managers from the stakeholder organizations who coordinate services to meet youth's needs in the least restrictive setting. The team works to ensure that youth receive locally based services whenever appropriate, outside placement is considered after all local options have been considered. All referrals to the Wraparound program are approved through SAT and status updates on Wraparound cases are presented there. Should a youth need a higher level of care and/or out of county placement these cases are reviewed and approved by SAT.

Child and Family Services

During the report period Child and Family Services Department has also reached out and strengthened its relationships with other key partners in an effort to address concerns improve systems for children and youth including:

- Environmental Alternatives – Foster Family Agency
- Mountain Circle – Foster Family Agency
- Lassen County Superior Court
- Susanville Police Department
- Lassen County's Sheriff's office

One example of these relationships is that as the result of an increased focus on relative and NREFM placements the local Foster Family Agencies (Environmental Alternatives and Mountain Circle) and Child and Family services have worked together to address needs for emergency, respite, and high levels of care for children and youth.

Probation

Probation participates weekly in the Wraparound Team Meeting which includes Probation, Wraparound Facilitators and Parent Partners, and Behavioral Health.

In support of SIP strategies identified, Probation has maintained contact with Wraparound Parent Partner as reunification has occurred within timeframe of SIP submission to progress report. Feedback was received from this individual specific to her reunification participation and expanded to systemic lessons learned to be shared with other juvenile probationers and their parents/guardians. This feedback was incorporated by probation into process improvement resulting in improved outcomes.

Dialogue with local Foster Care Agencies has been redirected to focus on SIP strategies implementation and improved outcomes. Foster Care Agencies and placement of older youth has been redirected to measure appropriate funding and placement utilization towards maximizing the most appropriate placement that achieves the unique goals and life attributes of each youth placed.

In 2013, the Probation Department presented a specific training for local foster family agencies in which addressed the placement needs of Lassen County Juvenile Probation Department youth. The training was also presented through the Lassen Community College Kinship Care. Ongoing training will be provided yearly with Foster Family Agencies.

Current Performance towards SIP Improvement Goals

For Lassen County 2012-2014 SIP Progress Report Update, the UC Berkeley data report that was used was the Q4 2013 Outcomes Spreadsheet compiled by UC Berkeley and made available in April 2014. The baseline data for comparison is Q4 2011.

Child Welfare

C1.1 – Reunification within 12 months (exit cohort)

This measures the percent all children discharged from foster care to reunification during the year who had been in foster care for 8 days or longer and were reunified in less than 12 months from the date of the latest removal from home. The federal goal for this measure is 75.2%

January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 19 youth that exited foster care between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2011. Of those 19 youth, 11 youth reunified with a parent within 12 months and the other 8 youth reunified longer than 12 months. Lassen County Child Welfare did not meet the federal goal with 57.9% of children returned in less than 12 months.

An analysis of the eight children who did not reunify in 12 months shows that: one child came from a home where both parents had substantial drug addiction and were incarcerated; a sibling set of three children came from a home with significant domestic violence and time was taken to ensure that non-protecting parent had maintained separation from the perpetrator; two sibling were transfers in from other counties with extensive family law complications; and the final two children from separate cases represent children who received mental health and sexual-offender treatment in group homes.

January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 21 youth that exited foster care between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012. Of those 21 youth, 19 youth reunified with a parent within 12 months and the other 2 youth reunified longer than 12 months. Lassen County Child Welfare met the federal goal with 90.5% of children returned in less than 12 months.

The two children who took longer than 12 months to reunify represent a sibling set that transferred in from another county after nearly five years in a group home.

January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 25 youth that exited foster care between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013. Of those 25 youth, 19 youth reunified with a parent within 12 months and the other 6 youth reunified longer than 12 months. Lassen County Child Welfare did not meet the federal goal with 76.0% of children returned in less than 12 months.

An analysis of the six children who took more than 12 months to reunify shows that: two are a sibling set that transferred in from another county who took nearly 12 months to reach disposition; three are a sibling set who's parent had substantial drug abuse and was incarcerated and on probation in three counties; the final child came from a

family with significant drug abuse with incarcerated parents, additional time was given to one of these parents to complete a successful reunification upon completion of incarceration after the other parent failed to complete services leading to reunification.

Analysis and Conclusions

Over the last three years gradual improvement in successful reunification in 12 months has been achieved, we see three factors that have contributed to this success:

- The first is that the department has recommended and the courts have ordered Family Maintenance at disposition as well as using interim hearings to monitor the capacity of the parents to reunify outside of the statutory six month timeframes.
- The second is the use of relative and NREFM to provide placements that are generally supportive of reunification.
- Finally, the department has increased success in locating non-offending non-custodial parents and reunifying them with their children.

While timely reunification has been significantly impacted by the transfer in of children from other counties with significant time in placement we have identified local barriers as:

- Drug addiction
- Incarcerations that lack treatment programs
- Homelessness and under-employment

C1.2 - Median Time to Reunification

This measures the median length of stay (in months) for all children discharged from foster care to reunification during the year who had been in foster care for 8 days or longer, from the date of latest removal from home until the date of discharge to reunification. The Federal Goal for this measure is 5.4 months.

January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 19 youth that exited foster care between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2011. Of those 19 youth the median number of months from removal to reunification was 11.3. Lassen County Child Welfare did not meet the federal goal.

The mean time to reunification was narrowly missed and also met (11-13 month range) in eight of the 19 reunifications. Beyond this time frame two of the children who received mental health or sexual offender treatment in group homes reunified at longer times, 16 and 24 months respectively.

January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 21 youth that exited foster care between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012. Of those 21 youth the median number of months from removal to reunification was 3.7. Lassen County Child Welfare met the federal goal.

A significant contributor to the successful meeting of this goal was the reunification of 5 children in fewer than 2 months and an additional 10 children in the 3-4 month timeframe, because the department monitored the family progress and recommended reunification outside of the statutory timeframes. On the other extreme a sibling set of two were reunified after nearly 5 five years in a group home.

January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 25 youth that exited foster care between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013. Of those 25 youth, the median number of months from removal to reunification was 6.7. Lassen County Child Welfare did not meet the federal goal.

Where the department was successful in meeting the federal goal family maintenance was offered with through well-developed safety plans in place or the children were re-unified with non-offending parents. Where re-unification took longer than 5.4 months but less than 12 months significant factors were time needed for recovery from drug abuse or the successful completion of domestic violence treatment. Where reunification took longer than 12 months incarceration of the parents played a role in each case that was not a transfer in from another county.

Analysis and Conclusions

While the department did not consistently meet the federal standard there is a trend of improvement toward timelier reunification of children. Again, as with measure C1.1 we see three factors that have contributed to this success:

- The first is that the department has recommended and the courts have ordered Family Maintenance at disposition as well as using interim hearings to monitor the capacity of the parents to reunify outside of the statutory six month timeframes.
- The second is the use of relative and NREFM to provide placements that are generally supportive of reunification.
- Finally, the department has increased success in locating non-offending non-custodial parents and reunifying them with their children.

While timely reunification has been significantly impacted by the transfer in of children from other counties with significant time in placement we have identified local barriers as:

- Drug addiction
- Incarcerations that lack treatment programs
- Homelessness and under-employment

C4.1 - Placement Stability (8days to 12 months)

This measures the percentage of all children in foster care at least 8 days and less than 12 months who had two or fewer placement. The federal goal 86%

January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 32 youth in foster care between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2011 with placements longer than 8 days but less than 12 months. Of those 32 youth, 27 youth had two or fewer placements and 5 having three or more placements. Lassen County Child Welfare did not meet the federal goal with 84.4% of these children having two or fewer placements.

An analysis of the placement episodes from this period shows two children from sibling set of three where a CWS-CMS data entry error is showing an erroneous additional placement. One of the placement changes represents a movement between houses in a group home. The final two placement changes represent children with significant mental health needs and were moved to higher levels of care.

January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 49 youth in foster care between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012 with placements longer than 8 days but less than 12 months. Of those 49 youth, 49 youth had two or fewer placements and 7 having three or more placements. Lassen County Child Welfare met the federal goal with 87.5% of these children having two or fewer placements.

Again for this period it appears that an additional placement episode for a sibling set of two appear to be a CWS-CMS data entry error. One child moved from a relative placement to an interim FFA home and finally to a NREFM placement as a result of significant family strife. One child was initially placed with a half-sibling in an FFA home and then placed with the half-sibling's father who chose not to assume guardianship of this child and was finally placed separately with another relative. Finally, a sibling set of two with 4 placements appear to have a CWS-CMS data entry error with only 3 settings, initially the children were placed in an FFA home that was supportive of reunification and acted as mentors for the parents but ultimately were unsuccessful due to conflicts there were moved to an interim FFA home, then to a family member, and finally re-unified.

January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 55 youth in foster care between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013 with placements longer than 8 days but less than 12 months. Of those 55 youth, 45 youth had two or fewer placements and 10 having 3 or more placements. Lassen County Child Welfare did not meet the federal goal with 81.8% of these children having two or fewer placements.

Again CWS-CMS data entry errors appear with five of the 10 children with more than 3 placements. Of the remaining 5 children, one child transferred in after 4 placements and has intensive mental health needs and was eventually moved to a group home for treatment. One child moved through 3 NREFM placements in an outlying area in order to keep him in his school of origin and eventually re-unified with a non-offending parent. Two children were moved from FFA placements to an interim placement before ICPC process to a guardianship placement with their grandmother. Finally, one child's criminal behavior and mental health needs escalated through two FFA placements to a group home.

Analysis and Conclusions

A significant factor in all three years is the appearance of data quality errors resulting from problems with the entry of placements in CWS-CMS, additional effort is needed to identify the root cause(es). If these errors are corrected the department would have met the federal goal for placement stability in all three years. The remaining cases with placement instability result from various specific circumstances although the most common theme is the escalation of care from least restrictive placements to higher levels of care for those children with more intensive needs.

The departments increasing use of relative and to a lesser extent NREFM placement has significantly positively impacted placement stability.

8A - Youth Receiving ILP Services

This measures the youth who received ILP Services prior to aging out or legally emancipating from Foster Care.

January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) CDSS Data ILP Summary there were a total of 11 youth who aged out or legally emancipated from foster care between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2011. Of those 11 youth, Lassen County Child Welfare delivered ILP services to 5 youth which represents a 45.4% rate of service.

January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) CDSS Data ILP Summary there were a total of 8 youth who aged out or legally emancipated from foster care between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012. Of those 8 youth, Lassen County Child Welfare delivered ILP services to 6 youth which represents a 75% rate of service.

January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) CDSS Data ILP Summary there were a total of 3 youth who aged out or legally emancipated from foster care between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013. Of those 3 youth, Lassen County Child Welfare delivered ILP services to 3 youth which represents a 100% rate of service.

Analysis and Conclusions

The CDDSS Data Summary for ILP does not appear to reflect the delivery of ILP services and it appears that the quality of data pulled for the report or entered into CWS/CMS is the root cause for the discrepancies.

Probation

C1.1 - Reunification within 12 months

This measures the percent all children discharged from foster care to reunification during the year who had been in foster care for 8 days or longer and were reunified in less than 12 months from the date of the latest removal from home. The federal goal for this measure is 75.2%

January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

According to the April 2012 (Q4 2011) UC Berkeley Data Report, there were a total of 3 youth that exited foster care between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2011. Of those 3 youth, 1 youth reunified with a parent within 12 months and the other 2 youth reunified longer than 12 months. The federal Goal for this measure is 75.2 and Lassen County Probation is at 50.0%.

January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012

According to the April 2013 (Q4 2012) UC Berkeley Data Report, there were a total of 3 youth that exited foster care between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012. Of those 3 youth, 0 youth reunified with a parent within 12 months and the other 3 youth reunified longer than 12 months. The federal Goal for this measure is 75.2 and Lassen County Probation is at 19.6%.

January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report, there were a total of 5 youth that exited foster care between January 1, 2013 and December 31, 2013. Of those 5 youth, 1 youth reunified with a parent within 12

months and the other 4 youth reunified longer than 12 months. The federal Goal for this measure is 75.2 and Lassen County Probation is at 20%.

Analysis and Conclusions

The Probation Department has struggled with the implementation of the CWS/CMS system. This has been a long and much delayed process. The lack of training, administrative and staffing changes, token functioning and IT issues have created difficulties in recording timely and accurate data, which in turn cause discrepancies in recorded data. The youth placed by the Probation Department are criminally sophisticated, have risks based on criminogenic needs and are at a greater risk to re-offend. There is also a lack of local programs to address and place Juvenile Sex Offenders. Youth placed in these programs can sometimes be in placement for two to three years. The Probation population also consists of juveniles who have a need for intensive substance abuse treatment which is a resource lacking in Lassen County. Youth in these placements typically spend 12-18 months in care, based on their risk to relapse. All of these facets factor in to the timelines for Probation, which can be unrealistic to reunify in 12 months in most cases.

4B - Group Home placements

January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

According to the April 2012 (Q4 2011) UC Berkeley Data Report, there were a total of 20 youth in placement. Of those 20, 11 youth were placed in group home and 9 were placed in other placements such as FFA or NEFREM. There is no National Goal for this measure.

January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012

According to the April 2013 (Q4 2012) UC Berkeley Data Report, there were a total of 17 youth in placement. Of those 17, 9 youth were placed in group home and 8 were placed in other placements such as FFA or NEFREM. There is no National Goal for this measure.

January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report, there were a total of 28 youth in placement. Of those 28, 16 youth were placed in group home and 12 were placed in other placements such as FFA or NEFREM. There is no National Goal for this measure.

Analysis and Conclusions

According to the data provided in 4B regarding the number of youth in placement and the number placed in group homes, does not accurately reflect true numbers for the Probation Department. Probation only utilizes the CWS/CMS system for placements and not for all youth on Probation. Probation has additionally struggled with having old cases in the CWS/CMS system that have been terminated or removed from placement however the cases have not been closed out properly in the system until recently in April of 2014. It is expected with these cases closed this will create improvement in accuracy of numbers generated from the extracted data. Probation utilizes a separate CASE Management Data Entry System. Placement numbers have been compiled for the past several years and the percentage of youth in placement for Probation in 2012 was recorded at 33% and in 2013 18%.

8A – Children Transitioning to Self-sufficiency

January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

According to the April 2012 (Q4 2011) UC Berkeley Data Report, there were a total of 7 youth who reached the age of majority. Of those 7, 1 Completed High School or Equivalency, 1 obtained employment, 5 maintained stable housing, 6 received ILP services and 7 maintained a Permanency connection with an adult. There is no National Goal for this measure.

January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012

According to the April 2013 (Q4 2012) UC Berkeley Data Report, there were a total of 7 youth who reached the age of majority. Of those 7, 1 Completed High School or Equivalency, 1 obtained employment, 5 maintained stable housing, 6 received ILP services and 7 maintained a Permanency connection with an adult. There is no National Goal for this measure.

January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report, there were a total of 7 youth who reached the age of majority. Of those 7, 1 Completed High School or Equivalency, 1 obtained employment, 5 maintained stable housing, 6 received ILP services and 7 maintained a Permanency connection with an adult. There is no National Goal for this measure.

Analysis and Conclusions

The Probation Department has struggled with the implementation and training of the CWS/CMS system. This has been a long and much delayed process. The lack of training, administrative and staffing changes, token functioning and IT issues have created difficulties in recording timely and accurate data, which in turn cause discrepancies in recorded data. Probation has recently trained all staff in April of 2014 in the CWS/CMS system and are improving data input and accuracy of delivered services.

Status of Strategies

County Wide

1. All eligible youth will be provided with at least one ILP service each month
 - Analysis- Lassen Community College is contracted to provide an ILP class that meets the state requirements and is also open to anyone interested in learning self-sufficiency. Any additional ILP services that a child might engage in are not being captured and or recorded, this is a major defect in our local process to ensure that these youth are ready for adulthood.
 - a. Action Step Status- The Probation Department provides Foster Youth services to all minors in placement, which includes educational needs, supplies, tuition and tutoring. Probation Officers are tactful in reintegrating youth back to their homes after placement beginning with home passes to allow parents and youth to become reacquainted. Probation Officers have regular, monthly, contacts with the minors and encourage them to be successful. Probation Officers will document this work within CWS/CMS to account for the services they provide in this area of focus.

- b. Method of evaluation and/or Monitoring- The current caseloads appear to be lower than average, permitting Probation Officers time to review their cases prior to meeting the minors and families, and dedicate their experience to serving each minor appropriately. The Probation Department has been successful with engaging AB 12 Non-Minor Dependent's in education, employment and sustaining long term relationships with adults in the community.
 - c. Additional strategies-Probation will continue to support and assist with youth transitioning to independence. Probation will have two successful Non-Minor Dependent cases in 2014 achieving full independence.
2. Transitioning youth will acquire safe and stable housing
- a. Analysis – Many Probation youth reach the age of majority and the reunification with parent or guardian does not occur and these youth transition to THP.
 - b. Action Step Status-Utilize additional resources with agencies to locate available THP and Foster Families.
 - c. Method of evaluation and/or Monitoring-Recording and tracking data of youth successful in these placements through the CWS/CMS system.
 - d. Additional strategies-locating additional relatives for the youth to reside with to attend college and remain stable while attending college or maintaining employment.
3. Implement a “Wraparound” style case management strategy for all wards that do not meet criteria for a Wraparound referral.
- a. Analysis-Assessment of risks and needs of the youth and family at initial stages of the delinquency process. Preferred evaluation at disposition when Wardship is declared.
 - b. Action Step Status-Complete assessment and referral if family and youth are appropriate for Wraparound services.
 - c. Method of evaluation and/or Monitoring-Track all cases assessed and referred to Wraparound and record successful completions and encourage feedback from participating families.
 - d. Additional strategies-Support from the Presiding Judge to understand the Wraparound process and creative sanctions before going to immediate removal from the home and increasing placements.

Probation

1. Utilize least restrictive placements as the primary option.
- a. Analysis- The Probation Department will continue to utilize the wraparound program to prevent placements, provide training for family finding to create a connection map to use relative placements more effectively and continue staffing cases with probation officers to use more graduated sanctions prior to placement. Probation is improving in the areas of due diligence, involving family's in placement decision making and improving DPO family contacts, visits and communication. It is important to note there is not an official outcome measure that collects data regarding these issues.
 - b. Action Step Status-Complete risk and needs assessments on youth and families. Complete Wraparound referrals on all youth when Wardship is declared.
 - c. Method of evaluation and/or Monitoring-Reducing out of home placements.
 - d. Additional strategies-Support from Presiding Judge. Involvement from the families and engaging youth on changing behaviors. Community collaboration from other agencies involved in services provided to the youth.

2. Consistently consider potential family placements and/or guardianship placements as a primary option for least restrictive placement.
 - a. Analysis- Training on the CWS/CMS system was provided to all Probation Officers and clerical staff in April of 2014. Probation is currently implementing data entry steps for all youth in placement which are included in the Department Procedure Manual. Currently staff completed a wraparound referral 120 days prior to a minor returning home so a 90 day transition plan can be put in place. Forward Thinking, an evidenced based program, has been purchased and is currently utilized to address criminogenic factors for youth prior to placement. Better education, support for families, encouragement and participation in treatment at the Juvenile Detention Facility is being used to assist in rehabilitation of the youth. Probation is utilizing local resources and referring to parenting classes provided by Lassen Family Services. Utilization of Safe Measures will also be used to develop an oversight procedure for data documentation. Development will begin on a quick guide for youth on “how to get off probation” and “how to get out of a group home”. Probation will work on implementing an education class for parents, which covers all aspects of the court system and ways to improve communication with families.
All Staff will receive training on the Forward Thinking Model to reduce placements. Re-evaluation of risks and needs will be completed at eight to ten months for juveniles in placement.
 - b. Action Step Status-Better education and support for families. Encouragement and participation in local programs. Communication and creation of family connection map.
 - c. Method of evaluation and/or Monitoring-Ongoing training to Probation and Clerical staff regarding CWS/CMS system.
 - d. Additional strategies-Training to Probation staff on Family Finding. Training to all staff on Forward Thinking Model. Implementation of educational class for parents and youth of “how to get off probation.”

Obstacles and Barriers to Future Implementation

CWS

Administrative changes compounded with turnover in and reduced staffing of Child Welfare Social Worker positions have limited the department’s capacity to focus on the C-CFSR process and implementation of the SIP strategies over the previous two years. At this time the major barrier to implementation is the shortened timeframe facing the department due to the changes of the last year and the need to re-familiarize with the process. As this process occurs future barriers may be identified.

Probation

Probation staffing/Administrative Changes-Within the past two years the Probation Department has experienced a large turnover in Juvenile Staff and limited term assignment within the administration. The previous CWS/CMS training was provided to either staff that are no longer with the Department or at the time did not utilize the system. Training was conducted in April of 2014 to all staff within the Juvenile Division to include clerical, fiscal and the Acting Chief Probation Officer. Staff are diligently utilizing the system in order to ensure accuracy of future data collection.

Availability of Foster Care Placement – Limited availability locally within Lassen County for Probation youth. Recently Probation has reached out to our local agencies to assist in locating additional openings for Foster Families

within their agencies in nearby counties. There is still a stigma on Probation youth and some Foster Care Placements are resistant to Probation youth.

Promising Practices/ Other Successes

Child and Family Services

- Relative Placements – the departments increased use of relative and NREFM placements has shortened time to reunification and decreased the likelihood of redetention
- Implementation of Safety Organized Practice – Safety-organized practice (SOP) is a holistic approach to collaborative teamwork in child welfare that seeks to build and strengthen partnerships within a family, their informal support network, and the agency. SOP uses strategies and techniques based on the belief that a child and his or her family are the central focus, and the partnership exists in an effort to find solutions that ensure safety, permanency, and well-being for children. Model elements include: engagement, assessment, behaviorally based case plans, transition and monitoring/adapting. SOP was first introduced to Lassen County in July of 2012 when training was presented to the Children’s System of Care collaborative and is not yet fully implemented. It is currently utilized by the Child Welfare Emergency Response and Investigations unit when taking reports and in investigations. Lassen County Child Welfare intends to extend SOP implementation to the Family Maintenance, Reunification, and Permanency case planning and management addressing the needs of all children and families with Child Welfare involvement.
- Relationship with the Court – Lassen County Child Welfare in collaboration with County Counsel has worked to improve the department’s performance and relationship with the court and was recently commended in an Administrative Office of the Court review of the department.

Probation

Regional Treatment Facility/ Camp.

Training of Probation Staff on CWS/CMS.

Increase in Data Input into CWS/CMS.

Education Guide for youth and parents on how to successfully complete probation.

Outcome Measures not meeting State/National Standards

CWS

C1.4 Reentry following reunification (exit cohort)

This measures form all children discharged from foster care to reunification during the year, what percent reentered foster care in less than 12 months from the date of the earliest discharge to reunification during the year. The federal goal is less than 9.9%

January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 19 youth that exited foster care between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2011. Of those 19 youth 4 reentered foster care within 12 months and 15 did not. Lassen County Child Welfare did not meet the federal goal with 21.1 % of children reentering foster care in less than 12 months.

Sibling set of two reentered after the parents failed to provide medical care, and one child reentered after the parent relapsed into drug abuse.

January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 19 youth that exited foster care between January 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012. Of those 19 youth 3 reentered foster care within 12 months and 16 did not. Lassen County Child Welfare did not meet the federal goal with 15.8 % of children reentering foster care in less than 12 months.

Sibling set of five reentered after parent relapsed into drug use and one child reentered due to significant mental health needs.

Analysis and Conclusions

Parental drug abuse and children's need for mental health needs are significant factors leading to re-entry. The department has focused on exiting families with safety plans and when new referrals occur for a family responding differentially to engage the family is preservation services.

C3.1 Exits to permanency (24 months in care)

This measures all children in foster care for 24 months or longer on the first day of the year, what percent were discharged to a permanent home by the end of the year and prior to turning 18. The federal goal is more than 29.1%

January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 17 youth who had been in care 24 months or longer on January 1, 2011. Of those 17 youth 7 exited to permanency before December 31, 2011 and prior to turning 18. Lassen County Child Welfare met the federal goal with 41.2 % of children exiting to permanency before turning 18.

January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 8 youth who had been in care 24 months or longer on January 1, 2012. Of those 8 youth 2 exited to permanency before December 31, 2012 and prior to turning 18. Lassen County Child Welfare did not meet the federal goal with 25.0 % of children exiting to permanency before turning 18.

January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013

According to the April 2014 (Q4 2013) UC Berkeley Data Report there were a total of 4 youth who had been in care 24 months or longer on January 1, 2013. Of those 4 youth 1 exited to permanency before December 31, 2011 and

prior to turning 18. Lassen County Child Welfare did not meet the federal goal with 25.0 % of children exiting to permanency before turning 18.

Analysis and Conclusions

The implementation of AB12 has led to children remaining dependents as they reach the age of 18.

Probation

C1 Reunification

Analysis and Conclusions

When public safety, protection of the victim, the offender's criminogenic needs and the rehabilitation of the minor is successful, the probation department will determine if returning to the community is appropriate. The twelve month timeline for reunification is not feasible in all cases.

C2 Adoption

Lassen County Probation does not have any youth identified for Adoption.

C3 Long Term Care

Analysis and Conclusions

Locating additional relatives to reduce long term care and transitioning youth to AB12. Collaboration and awareness for alternative plans for youth in long term care.

2F – Timely Probation Officer Visits

Analysis and Conclusions

Lassen County Probation Department has monthly face to face visits with all juveniles in foster care. The Probation Department will reflect accurate data with improved data entry into CWS/CMS.

State and Federally Mandated Child Welfare/Probation Initiatives

Katie A

Lassen County Behavioral Health has recently re-organized to support a Youth Services unit and is working on plan to address the behavioral health needs of the 0-5 population and their parents. They report that the Katie A billing codes are now available in their Electronic Health Records (EHR) system, however their department is still working through the implementation of EHR, and is experiencing problems with scheduling and reporting functions.

The County's Children's System of Care is working on moving forward to see the Katie A referral and billing components implemented by end of 2014 to ensure a complete tracking of service delivery to Katie A class and sub-

class members. Many of the children that are identified in the Class and Sub-Class are being served by the county's wraparound program Family Solutions.

Title IV-E Waiver

Lassen County dropped its interest in participating in this round of the IV-E Waiver because we were not confident we could sustain the programs fiscally.

Child and Family Services Corrective Action Plan

Lassen County CFS has been under a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) from the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) since approximately March of 2012. The CAP was directed at six areas of departmental practices and procedures; they are as follows:

- Adherence to CA Code of Regulations Division 31 Social Worker staffing requirements
- Compliance with CA Staff Development and Training Manual Division 14-611 Social Worker Core Training requirement
- Compliance with CDSS policy requirement to ensure consistent usage of Structured Decision Making (SDM) Tools throughout life cycle of local child welfare case
- Compliance with CA Code of Regulations Division 31-201 to ensure consistent practice of participatory case planning with parents/guardians
- Compliance with CA Code of Regulations Division 31-101 to ensure referrals are closed by Social Workers within 30 days of the in-person initial investigation if child welfare services are unnecessary
- Compliance with CDSS policy requirement to ensure consistent, accurate documentation of Social Worker contacts with foster care children and parents/guardians in the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS)

Lassen County continues to recruit for Master's Degreed Social Workers and has established relationships with CalSWEC representatives through the Northern Children's Regional Committee as well as through Lassen County Behavioral Health. The agency currently has one full time employed Social Worker in a Master's Degree program through California State University Chico. Lassen County has a continuous recruitment for SW IV being advertised on the Merit Systems Services web site. Lassen County CFS continues to struggle with the recruitment of quality Social Workers and is working diligently on the "grow your own" philosophy. Lassen County CFS has several Social Workers who are considering entering a graduate program. Financial support is offered by the Lassen County Health & Social Services for some reimbursement of education costs.

Since the implementation of the CAP, all Social Worker employed by CFS have been through the Core I Training within the first year of employment. Currently, CFS has two Social Workers (SW I classification) who are attending Core I Training in three different areas of the North State, Arcata, Ukiah and Davis, to accomplish the goal of obtaining the training within the first 12 months of employment. The Program Manager has completed Supervisor Core, one of the supervisors has completed Supervisor Core and the remaining Supervisor is nearing completion of Supervisor Core. Lassen County provides Core II Trainings in county through the UC Davis Northern Regional Training Academy at least four times a fiscal year.

In regards to SDM tool utilization, Lassen County CFS is compliant in the Emergency Response area of case management. SDM tool utilization remains a struggle in the ongoing case management. Continuous training

regarding the importance of SDM tool utilization occurs and the implementation of Safety Organized Practice has assisted in the application of SDM tools.

Lassen County CFS hosted a training regarding Case Plan development and parent/guardian participation. Participatory case planning is being practiced on a regular basis. Again, the implementation of Safety Organized Practice, particularly the Safety Mapping tool, has assisted in obtaining the family's voice and developing a custom Case Plan for the client(s). Documentation of participation is not reaching CWS/CMS on a consistent basis and is being monitored by the two Supervisors and the Program Manager.

Lassen County CFS is currently, and historically, under staffed. Emergency Response investigations are continuing to remain open longer than 30 days due to this factor. However, the Social Workers who perform ER duties will often be working with the families to provide pre-placement preventative services during this 30 day period.

Monthly contacts are being made but are continuing to be undocumented in CWS/CMS. Staffing shortages has caused a slight increase in actually not seeing all of our foster children but data entry issues continue to plague our outcome numbers.

<p>Strategy 1:</p> <p>Implement a "Wraparound" style case management strategy for all wards that do not meet criteria for a Wraparound referral.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP <input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>C 1 Reunification within 12 Months (FCPS and Probation)</p> <p>Goal: To reunify youth with their families of origin within 12 months:6 out of 8 or 75% over the next three year SIP will reunify within 12 months (Probation)</p>
<p>Action Steps:</p> <p>A. Train all Juvenile Probation Officers in Wraparound basics.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project
<p>B. Develop procedure to ensure that all cases are assessed for Wraparound services.</p>	<p>Implementation Date:</p> <p>By January 2012</p>	<p>Completion Date:</p> <p>Ongoing since 2012 for all staff, to include legal updates and continuous training for Wraparound process and referrals.</p> <p>Person Responsible:</p> <p>Probation Supervisor, FCPS Supervisor or Manager</p>
<p>C. Assess all new cases for effectiveness of strategy.</p>	<p>By February 2012</p> <p>By February 2012/Ongoing</p>	<p>Completed 2/12- Case staffing during weekly meetings.</p> <p>Completed/Ongoing since 2/12, assessments occur during weekly staff meetings, minors are evaluated with risks and needs tool.</p> <p>Probation Chief/Juvenile Probation Supervisor</p> <p>Senior Juvenile Probation officer/ Juvenile Probation Supervisor</p>

<p>D. All open cases will be assessed for effectiveness of "wraparound" case management strategy and evaluate the effect on reunification/permanency outcomes.</p>	<p>By April 2012 Ongoing</p>	<p>Completed/Ongoing since 4/12, assessments occur during weekly staff meetings, minors are evaluated with risks and needs tool.</p>	<p>Senior Juvenile Probation officer /Juvenile Probation Supervisor</p>
<p>Strategy 2.1: Implement a "Wraparound" style case management strategy for all CPS cases that do not meet criteria for a Wraparound referral.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP <input type="checkbox"/> PSSF</p>	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Decrease the amount of time to reunification.</p> <p>Goal: 18 out of 19 or 94.7% of children will reunify within 12 months and the median time to reunification will decrease from 7.2 to 6 months. (FCPS)</p>	
<p>A. Train all CPS staff in Wraparound Basics.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project</p>	
<p>Action Steps:</p>		<p>Completion Date: _____ Person Responsible: _____</p>	
<p>A. Train all CPS staff in Wraparound Basics.</p>	<p>Implementation Date: January 31, 2012</p>	<p>Not complete, planned for March 2015. SOP Implementation in June 2013 chosen to address this outcome as it mirrors wraparound style case management</p>	<p>A. FCPS Supervisors/Managers</p>

<p>B. Develop Procedure to ensure that families are correctly assessed for wraparound case management services.</p>	<p>January 2012</p>	<p>Completed March 2014, cases are assessed and referred at bi-weekly Children's System of Care Service Allocation Team</p>	<p>B. Supervisors</p>
<p>C. Each SW will have one family involved.</p>	<p>February-2012</p>	<p>Not complete—step is inappropriate, cases are referred to Wraparound Services as appropriate to Family's needs.</p>	<p>C. All Supervisors/Managers</p>
<p>D. All cases either court ordered or voluntary will utilize the Wraparound case management tool.</p>	<p>December 2012/Ongoing</p>	<p>July 2013 & Ongoing, SOP case management addresses wraparound like service delivery.</p>	<p>D. All Supervisors/Managers</p>
<p>E. Evaluate effect on Reunification/permanency outcomes.</p>	<p>June 2012/Ongoing</p>	<p>June 2014 & Ongoing, evaluation occurring as part of SIP status update and development of IV-E Waiver plan.</p>	<p>E. All Supervisors/Managers</p>

<p>Strategy 2.2: System Education Class</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT</p>	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Decrease the amount of time to reunification. Goal: 18 out of 19 or 94.7% of children will reunify within 12</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP</p>	
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> PSSF</p>	

		months and the median time to reunification will decrease from 7.2 to 6 months. (FCPS)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project
Action Steps:	Implementation Date:	Person Responsible:
A. Create curriculum	December 2011	ER-Supervisor Program Manager
B. Create class format	January 2012	ER-Supervisor Program Manager
C. Develop procedure to ensure that families are referred	January 2012	Supervisor Supervisors
D. All parents who are involved in a court ordered/ voluntary CPS case will be enrolled	January 2012/Ongoing	ER-Supervisor Supervisors
E. Evaluate effect on reunification/permanency outcomes	June 2012/Ongoing	ER-Supervisor Program Manager

<p>Strategy 3: Implement a "Wraparound" style case management strategy for all CPS cases that do not meet criteria for a Wraparound referral.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP <input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>C4.1 Placement Stability 8 days to 12 months (FCPS)</p> <p>Goal: 14% of children will have 3 or more placements and 35 of 40 or 86% will have 2 or fewer placements.</p>
<p>Action Steps:</p> <p>A. Train all CPS staff in Wraparound Basics.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A Implementation Date: January 31, 2012	<input type="checkbox"/> Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project Completion Date: Not complete, planned for March 2015. SOP Implementation in June 2013 chosen to address this outcome as it mirrors wraparound style case management Person Responsible: FCPS Supervisors/Managers
<p>B. Develop Procedure to ensure that families are correctly assessed for wraparound case management services.</p>	January 2012	Completed March 2014, cases are assessed and referred at bi-weekly Children's System of Care Service Allocation Team Supervisor

<p>C. Each SW will have one family involved.</p>	<p>February 2012</p>	<p>Not complete—step is inappropriate, cases are referred to Wraparound as appropriate to Family's needs.</p>	<p>All Supervisors/Managers</p>
<p>D. All cases either court ordered or voluntary will utilize the Wraparound case management tool.</p>	<p>December 2012/ Ongoing</p>	<p>July 2013 & Ongoing, SOP case management addresses wraparound like service delivery.</p>	<p>All Supervisors/Managers</p>
<p>E. All open cases will be assessed for effectiveness of "wraparound" case management strategy and evaluate the effect on placement stability outcomes.</p>	<p>June 2012/ Ongoing</p>	<p>June 2014 & Ongoing, evaluation occurring as part of SIP status update and development of IV-E Waiver plan.</p>	<p>All Supervisors/Managers</p>

<p>Strategy 4.1: Utilizing least restrictive placements as the primary option.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP <input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>4B Least Restrictive Placement (Probation)</p> <p>Goal: To utilize the least restrictive placement options for youth as the first priority and decrease the percentage of group home placement for probation youth, from 70% to 50%.</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project
<p>Action Steps:</p> <p>A. Every ward that may require a higher level of care must be reviewed by SAT.</p>	<p>Implementation Date:</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Completion Date:</p> <p>Person Responsible:</p> <p>Senior Juvenile Probation Officer / Juvenile Probation Supervisor All PO</p>
<p>B. Every ward in a group home or at risk of group home will have a referral to Wraparound.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Completed/Ongoing</p> <p>All cases requiring higher level of care are presented at SAT for review and recommendation.</p> <p>Completed/Ongoing</p> <p>All juveniles at risk of placement are referred to wraparound.</p> <p>ALL PO</p>
<p>C. Utilize the Wraparound strategy for all cases that do not meet the formal Wraparound criteria.</p>	<p>April 2012/ Ongoing</p>	<p>Completed/Ongoing</p> <p>4/12, collaboration on each case occurs at SAT.</p> <p>ALL PO</p>

D. Demystify stigma of wards in the community by training foster agencies and foster parents.	January 2012/ Ongoing	Completed 10/12 Presentation and brochure developed and training and community education is ongoing.	Chief Probation Officer
E. Evaluate the effect on least restrictive placement outcomes.	June 2012/ Ongoing	June 2014 & Ongoing, evaluation occurring as part of SIP status update.	Chief Probation Officer/ Juvenile Probation Supervisor

Strategy 4.2: Consistently consider potential family placements and/or guardianship placements as a primary option for least restrictive placements.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	4B Least Restrictive Placement (Probation)
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	Goal: To utilize the least restrictive placement options for youth as the first priority and decrease the percentage of group home placement for probation youth, from 70% to 50%. <input type="checkbox"/> Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project
Action Steps:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Completion Date:
A. Research techniques for finding kin and near kin.	Implementation Date: January 2012	Person Responsible: Placement/Probation Officers

<p>B. Develop procedure to begin concurrent planning for permanency earlier in case.</p>	<p>January 2012</p>	<p>Completed/Ongoing Since 1/12, creating Case Plan involving the minor and the family. Assessing risk and needs of the minor and the family.</p>	<p>Chief Probation Officer</p>
<p>C. Evaluate effect on reunification/permanency outcomes.</p>	<p>January 2013</p>	<p>June 2014 & Ongoing, evaluation occurring as part of SIP status update.</p>	<p>Chief Probation Officer</p>
<p>Strategy 5.1: All children in child welfare that meet the criteria to participate in the Independent Living Program will be provided at least one ILP service each month.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP <input type="checkbox"/> PSSF</p>	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 8(A) Children Transitioning to Sufficient Adulthood (FCPS and Probation)</p>	<p>Goal: All youth will receive at least one ILP service each month.</p>
<p>Action Steps:</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project</p>	<p>Person Responsible:</p>
<p>A. Participate in one ILP eligible service each month will eligible.</p>	<p>January 2012</p>	<p>January 2012 & Ongoing</p>	<p>All PO/SW</p>

<p>B. Enroll and participate in ILP class provided by Lassen College.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing, This SIP Progress report identified ongoing gap in ILP Service data reporting.</p>	<p>FCPS ILP Coordinator/Supervisor</p>
<p>C. Work with foster agencies to better document ILP services that are happening in foster homes.</p>	<p>December 2011</p>	<p>Incomplete, this SIP Progress report shows reporting still incomplete. Planned for Nov 2014</p>	<p>FCPS Supervisors/ Juvenile Probation Supervisor</p>
<p>D. Accurate documentation of ILP services.</p>	<p>November 2011/ Ongoing</p>	<p>Incomplete, this SIP Progress report shows reporting still incomplete. Planned for Nov 2014</p>	<p>FCPS Supervisors/ Juvenile Probation Supervisor, All PO/SW, Lassen College</p>
<p>E. Evaluate effect on transitioning to self-sufficient adulthood outcomes.</p>	<p>June 2012/ Ongoing</p>	<p>Incomplete, this SIP Progress report shows reporting still incomplete. Planned for Nov 2014</p>	<p>FCPS ILP Coordinator</p>

<p>Strategy 5.2: Transitioning youth will acquire safe and stable housing.</p>	<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):</p> <p>8(A) Children Transitioning to Sufficient Adulthood (FCPS and Probation)</p> <p>Goal: All youth will receive at least one ILP service each month.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project
<p>Action Steps:</p>	<p>Implementation Date:</p>	<p>Person Responsible:</p>
<p>A. All eligible youth have completed THP, THP-Plus, or THP-Plus-FC applications.</p>	<p>January 2012/ Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing for appropriate and eligible youth since June 2009</p> <p>Juvenile Probation Supervisor/ FCPS Supervisor</p> <p>All PO/SW</p>
<p>B. All Eligible Youth have ILP / THP housing application packet.</p>	<p>April 2012/ Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing for appropriate youth since June 2009</p> <p>ILP Group/ FCPS ILP Coordinator/Supervisor</p>
<p>C. Assure youth have been in stable housing for at least six months prior to exiting care.</p>	<p>December 2012/ Ongoing</p>	<p>Tracking Stability of Housing placement, not implemented, planned for February 2015 & Ongoing</p> <p>FCPS Supervisors/ Juvenile Probation Supervisor</p>
<p>D. Evaluate effect on transitioning to self-sufficient adulthood outcomes.</p>	<p>June 2012/ Ongoing</p>	<p>June 2014 & Ongoing, evaluation occurring as part of SIP status update.</p> <p>FCPS ILP Coordinator</p>