

California – Child and Family Services Review Signature Sheet

For submittal of: CSA SIP Progress Report

County	Stanislaus County Community Services Agency
SIP Period Dates	9/28/2010 – 9/28/2014
Outcome Data Period	Quarter Ending October 2013

County Child Welfare Agency Director

Name	Kathryn M. Harwell
Signature*	
Phone Number	209-558-2500
Mailing Address	PO Box 42 Modesto CA 95353

County Chief Probation Officer

Name	Jill Silva
Signature*	
Phone Number	209-525-5400
Mailing Address	2215 Blue Gum Avenue Modesto CA 95353

Public Agency Designated to Administer CAPIT and CBCAP

Name	Jan Viss
Signature*	
Phone Number	209-558-2500
Mailing Address	Po Box 42 Modesto CA 95353

Logged: 5/21/14 JK
RECEIVED MAY 21 2014

Board of Supervisors (BOS) Signature

BOS Approval Date	N/A
Name	

Mail the original Signature Sheet to:

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

*Signatures must be in blue ink

Signature*

Contact Information

Child Welfare Agency	Name	Julian Wren
	Agency	Stanislaus County Community Services Agency
	Phone & E-mail	209-558-2186 wrenj@stancounty.com
	Mailing Address	Po Box 42 Modesto CA 95353
Probation Agency	Name	Melissa Marley
	Agency	Stanislaus County Probation Department
	Phone & E-mail	209-525-5400
	Mailing Address	2215 Blue Gum Avenue Modesto CA 95353
Public Agency Administering CAPIT and CBCAP <small>(If other than Child Welfare)</small>	Name	N/A
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	
CAPIT Liaison	Name	Jeff Davis
	Agency	Stanislaus County Community Services Agency
	Phone & E-mail	209-558-3905 DavisJi@stancounty.com
	Mailing Address	Po Box 42 Modesto CA 95353
CBCAP Liaison	Name	Jeff Davis
	Agency	Stanislaus County Community Services Agency
	Phone & E-mail	209-558-3905 DavisJi@stancounty.com
	Mailing Address	Po Box 42 Modesto CA 95353
PSSF Liaison	Name	Jeff Davis
	Agency	Stanislaus County Community Services Agency
	Phone & E-mail	209-558-3905 DavisJi@stancounty.com
	Mailing Address	Po Box 42 Modesto CA 95353

Logged: 5/21/14
RECEIVED MAY 21 2014

Stanislaus County
SIP Progress Report
1-30-14

I. **Stakeholder Participation**

Stanislaus County partners work closely with all of its stakeholders to ensure a collaborative approach to system improvement. Outcomes and progress are communicated via the Child Abuse Prevention Council and Self Evaluation meetings. Due to the significant budget cuts and staffing reductions the Self Evaluation team was suspended in 2010. Stanislaus County's goal is to re-introduce the Self Evaluation Team and increase monitoring of outcomes. During this past fiscal year, the Self Evaluation team began to reform and participation will continue to be sought from partners and stakeholders.

II. **Outcome Measures, Goals, Strategies, Action Steps**

For *each* Outcome Measure and/or Systemic Factor included in the SIP, please discuss the following:

CHILD WELFARE:

NO RECURRENCE OF MALTREATMENT

A. **County's current performance**

Stanislaus County's performance on No Recurrence of Maltreatment at the time the System Improvement Plan (SIP) was created in 2010 was 94.2% (Quarter 4 2009, 1/1/09 – 12/31/09). Between April 2011 and July 2012, Stanislaus' performance has remained at or near the National Standard of 94.6%; however, our most recent outcome report indicated that our performance has dropped to 90.3% (October 2013, data extract Q2 2013, 10/01/12 – 03/31/2013). Of the 1,135 children examined during that six month interval, 1,083 children avoided a further substantiated allegation of abuse or neglect in the subsequent 6 months. The current performance is nearly a 2% percentage change increase in performance over the last reported quarter (7/1/12-12/31/2012). The SIP focused on younger children because fewer children between 1 – 2 years avoided recurrence of maltreatment (87.2%) than older children (89.3%). During the most recent time period (10/01/12 – 03/31/2013), 84.7% of 1 - 2 year olds avoided a subsequent substantiated allegation in the following six months. This is a percentage change decrease of 3% and is currently the group with the lowest rate of no recurrence of maltreatment. The age group with the highest rate of no recurrence was for youth 6-10 years of age, with 92.5% avoiding a new substantiated allegation.

Since the last approved System improvement plan in 2010, Stanislaus County has seen a change in the Child Welfare Caseload Population. There was an 8.4% increase in the number of allegations reported to the Emergency Response Hotline. First time foster care entries have increased 59% while the foster care exits decreased by 16%. Further evidence of this change is a shift upwards of 38% in the Family Maintenance caseload and a percentage change in the Supervised Foster caseload of 29% since 2011. (http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/CaseServiceComponents.aspx).

B. Strategies and action steps:

1. Review of repeat Maltreatment cases:

A review of repeat maltreatment cases by the Systems Improvement and Emergency Response Manager occurs regularly to identify any new trends and/or issues for training. As this SIP progress update is being written, we are working on a systematic qualitative review of all cases that have experienced recurrence with a more in depth review of cases that have experienced recurrence with the identified child being between 0 and 2 years of age since this is the group that has been identified as being the most adversely effected.

In January of 2011, Stanislaus County initiated a new intervention strategy in response to the observation of a decrease in the No Maltreatment of Recurrence Outcome. If a family had an assigned referral in Emergency Response and was re-referred for an open referral, the family was assigned to the same social worker that had assessed the family previously.

The Stanislaus County policy of SDM and local protocol, high and very high risk substantiated referrals are opened for services. For referrals closed between October 2012 and October 2013 (Safe Measures extract 11/06/2013), 72.3% of high risk substantiated (an increase of 22% since the last update) and 87.4% (an increase of 23.2%) of very high risk substantiated referrals were promoted to a case. During that same time period only 8 high or very high risk inconclusive referrals were promoted (9%) an increase of 5 referrals.

A qualitative review of children experiencing recurrence of maltreatment (10/01/12 to 03/31/13) was conducted in Stanislaus County. The cohort population was stratified by age and 0-2 year olds are less likely to experience recurrence of maltreatment avoidance (86.2%) than older children (91.6%). The descriptive statistics for the 0-2 population are: Average number of days to recurrence is 93 days, 45.5% were under 1 year old, 70.5% were male, 45.5% were already in an open case, 68% had an SDM level of high/very high risk, 32% were located within the 95351 zip code, 34% were referrals of positive toxicity screens at birth, 13.6% lack of supervision and 11.4% were for drugs affecting parenting and domestic violence respectively.

A qualitative review of children experiencing recurrence of maltreatment (10/01/12 to 03/31/13) was concurrently conducted in Stanislaus County. The descriptive statistics for the total population (0-17) are: Average number of days to recurrence is 87 days, 38% of the population is between the ages of 0-2 years old, 33% were 11-15 years old, 21% were between the ages of 6-10 years

old, and 8% were 16-17 years old, 8% were female, only 4% were already in an open case, and 74% had an SDM level of high/very high risk, and 25% were within the 95351 zip code.

The results of the qualitative analysis revealed the following: there was no one clear area highlighted for improvement. The cases that were reviewed revealed that in the overwhelming majority of referrals, the staff was following the administrative practices and policies set forth by the Stanislaus County policy on Structured Decision Making. As part of our QA process, supervisors are monitoring the completion and accuracy of SDM tools. The Team Assessment Planning staffing meeting or a staffing with manager need to be universally applied to all referrals with a high and very high risk levels that are being closed. Lastly, in regards to Family Maintenance cases where the family has moved to another county and we cross report to the aforementioned county-we need more consistency in our request to electronically transfer the case to the next county. Otherwise, we may be counted for a recurrence when the subsequent county opens and substantiates a new referral in order to offer services.

The high proportion of recurrence in the 95351 zip code indicates that children in that area will benefit from more attention from Child Welfare Services. The high proportion of children with recurrence involving positive toxicity will benefit from more attention from Child Welfare Services through opening a Family Maintenance case or with being connected with a Family Resource Center through a joint visit with Emergency Response.

2. Structured Decision Making (SDM):

Stanislaus County began implementing SDM in April 2011. During the fall of 2011, we provided advanced training to our on-going social workers. New staff is trained in SDM usage via the academy. As a result, many of these staff have yet to receive advanced SDM training. Our goal for SDM was to use the tools to guide our safety and risk decision-making 90% of the time by September 2013. We monitor progress via Safe Measures and periodically discuss our current performance in Supervisor meetings. Our overall current usage of Safe Measures, as of September 2013, (extract date 11/06/13) was: 80.5%

The use of the required use of SDM tools are as follows:

- The Hotline tool (extract date 11/06/2012) used by the Social Workers receiving telephone calls on child abuse and neglect are being completed at a rate of 98.4%.
- The Safety Assessment (July – Sept 2013) is used by the assigned Emergency Response worker to help determine the safety of the child(ren) in the home. According to October 2013 data, (extracted on 11/06/13), shows a 89.5% Safety Assessment Completion rate (a decrease of 9.8% over last year at this time). As further data showed, 57.2% of those Safety Assessments were completed on-time (an increase of 8%). An on-time Safety Assessment is an assessment which is completed within 48 hours of the first child contact.

- The Risk Assessment SDM Tool (July – Sept 2013, data, extract 11/06/2013), used to help the Social Worker assess the level of risk was completed at the rate of 67.6%; a decrease of 8.3% over the last year during this time period (data extract on 11/06/2013). Extract on 11/06/2013). A review of Risk Assessment Tools for referrals closed in October 2012 with a finding of substantiated or inconclusive, shows that 90% of risk assessments were completed (an increase of 9.8%).
- The Initial Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (FSNA) (July – Sept 2013) is used by the Social Worker to help identify the highest needs for intervention in ongoing services. The FSNA's were completed at a rate of 76.3% (an increase of 1.9% over last year same time period). Some of the Initial Family Strengths and Needs Assessments that were not completed were pending or not completed due to case closure. Of those not completed, 10 case plans were created without a FSNA.
- The Risk Reassessment Tool (extract 11/06/2013) is used to help guide the Social Worker in assessing the risk at case plan review and/or reunification. This tool was completed at a rate of 45.1% (a decrease of 16.3%). When only Reunification Assessments were reviewed, completion rates dropped to 6.5%.
- The Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (prior to case plan update, extract 11/06/2013) assists the Social Worker to identify service objectives that the family can work on to mitigate the risks to the child(ren) in the home. This tool was completed at a rate of 50%.
- The Child Strengths and Needs Assessment (Permanent Placement, extract 11/06/2013) is the children's version of the FSNA. This tool was completed at a rate of 52.9%.
- The Risk Assessment is expected to be completed within 30 – 60 days before Case Closure (extract 11/06/2013). A review of tool completion timeliness indicated that 62.1% of these Risk Assessments were completed at the appropriate time.
- The Safety Assessment is expected to be completed within 30 – 60 days before Case Closure (extract 11/06/2013). A review of tool completion timeliness showed that 55.5% were completed at the appropriate time.

3. Partner with Faith Based Community:

The faith based community continues to collaborate to provide sober living services via a non-profit community agency, Valley Recovery Resources. They are one of a few sober living providers in Stanislaus County. The Assistant Director continues to be the key contact with the faith community.

4. Directory of Faith and Community Resources:

Social workers have a number of resource directories available to them on the agency intranet, including the United Way 211. These resources are updated regularly and are available for distribution to the community.

5. Differential Response:

Social workers were making referrals at a rate of 35.8% with Family Resource Centers for Path 1 Differential Response, 41.4% for Path 2, and 21.5% for Path 3 responses (Business Objects extract 11/01/12 – 10/31/13). At the time of the 2010 SIP the focus was on 0 – 5 year olds because DR had been eliminated for youth 6-17 year olds. Since our local funding was restored for Differential Response in July 2011, Stanislaus has resumed full implementation for all age groups countywide. A joint Request for Proposal (RFP) with the Children and Families Commission (Prop 10) for an additional 3 years of Family Resource Centers was completed and funding was awarded to the Differential Response for the 2013/2014 fiscal year.

6. Partner with CBCAP/CWS OIP:

Through funding from Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) and Child Welfare Services Outcome Improvement Project (CWS OIP), Haven Women's center is contracted to provide a program called Kids Count! Haven Women's Center provides counseling, advocacy, and shelter for women and children impacted by domestic violence. Kid's Count is a school based group therapy program that focuses on violence prevention. Each week of the eight week program includes instruction and group process of what violence is and how it affects the children, what feelings they have and how to appropriately express those feelings, dealing with anger, and finding out what makes each one of them special. The children in the group also learn about themselves, the good things and the bad things that they would like to change, ways to help create a peaceful and non-violent world, ways of supporting each other in doing so, and creating their own safety plan. Parents are included through information that goes home with the child and once engaged are referred to Haven's main site for additional services. Outcomes are measured by children participation, increased knowledge, and parental interaction and support. Through the groups and parent involvement in the skill building program, Haven Women's Center provides services and treatment to children and their non-abusing caretakers.

The Kids Count! Program is a school based program providing children, grades 1-6, who have experienced any form of violence an opportunity for healing, growth, and a sense of safety in their lives. Children are often overlooked as having felt adverse effects to the violence that they have witnessed, whether the violence took place in the home or in the community. The coordinators of this program believe that the children deserve a chance to work through these issues. They work with this population to identify violence, express their feelings appropriately, how to deal with their anger and to create their own personal safety plan.

The Haven's Women Center Program uses a pre and post-test Likert scale questionnaire. The tool is also used to determine the increase in the amount of knowledge the children have absorbed from the program. A long term questionnaire is also used after the child has graduated the program to measure retention. Additionally, every participating family is given a client satisfactory survey at the end of the 8 week program.

7. Motivational Interviewing:

Motivational Interviewing training was scheduled for Stanislaus County Child Welfare, Public Health Nurses, Children's System of Care, and our Community Family Resource Centers staff on February 13th and 14th 2014 to train staff to use this technique to assist in strengthening a parent's motivation and commitment to change.

8. Community Outreach:

The Child Abuse Prevention Council (CAPC) provided a community awareness campaign known as "The Lisa Project." They contracted with the San Joaquin Child Abuse Prevention Council and raised funds to provide this awareness to Stanislaus County during the month of April 2013. A significant amount of funds was needed and volunteers ensured the successful implementation of this effort. In addition to this project, the CAPC purchased bus advertisements and sponsored the Child Abuse Prevention Calendars with art from local school children. The major project for this year is the Strengthening Families Stanislaus County Outreach project.

C. Obstacles and barriers to *future* implementation of a strategy and action step not currently under implementation. Include a brief explanation of any modifications that will be made to address these obstacles and barriers.

The elimination of Families in Partnership impacted our ability to serve children and families safely at home. Prior to these reductions, we were serving an average 461 children and their families with Family Maintenance services (FY 2009/2010). The number of children served per month declined to an average of 350 over the following the fiscal years (FY 2010/2011 & 2011/2012). Voluntary maintenance services are not a legal mandate and are operating on a "mandates only" service level throughout the county. The budget issues have diminished the availability of substance abuse services available throughout the county, rendering us unable to serve parents with drug addiction while ensuring the safe care of their children. A community partner that ran a sober living program which previously thrived in our community was closed due to our agency's inability to fund these services. Private funding donations have reinstated these services and the impact on observed outcomes is recovering. We are now serving a much higher number than 350 and the clean and sober living program known as Redwoods was able to add 25 beds to cover the previous loss.

TIMELY REUNIFICATION:

A. County's current performance

In 2010, when our System Improvement Plan was developed, 69.2% of children who exited to reunification did so within 12 months. In the most recent data extract, (October 2013, data extract Q2 2013, 10/01/12 – 09/30/13), our performance on the federal measure was 61%. Analysis of the data by age showed that reunification is best for children under 1 year of age who reunify within 12 months was 100%. Our performance is below the National Standard (75.2%) for children 1 – 2 years of age with a performance of 57.1%. We surpass the national standard for children 16 – 17 years of age with a reunification within 12 month rate of 87.5% (an increase of 44.6%). Our greatest area of challenge to timely reunification on this measure is children 3 – 5 years of age (38.7%), 6-10 years of age (65.4%) [a 29% increase however]), and 11 – 15 years of age (63.6%).

Review of the entry cohort measures reunification within 12 months for children who entered foster care for the first time (October 2013, data extract Q2 2013, 04/01/12 – 09/30/12), shows that only 13.6% of these children reunify within 12 months. This is significantly short of the goal of 48.4%. Of all children who entered foster care for the first time during 04/01/12 and 09/30/12 that were discharged to reunification within 12 months were in care, a median of 77 days (2.5 months), before discharging. Of all children who entered foster care for the first time in the selected six-month period, that failed to discharge to reunification within 12 months, were in foster care a median of 425 days (14 months).

Although Stanislaus County is not meeting the national standard of at least 48.4% reunifying, the data shows that children in Stanislaus County who do reunify do so very quickly and those who do not, take 2 months longer than the 12 month period. When one looks deeper at this data-Stanislaus County's re-entry rate during this time period (7.9%) is above the national standard by 2%, one can surmise that those children staying 2 months longer in foster care does not adversely effect the rate of reunification and that the extra 2 months of reunification time provides the parents the ability to complete case plan requirements and possibly solidify natural supports that keep them from re-entering the child welfare system.

Some ancillary information provided by staff that indicates some tertiary factors that can affect timely reunification including contested hearings, continued hearings, the court's and/or social worker's reluctance to terminate reunification, and preference to provide additional services beyond twelve months to ensure reasonable services for parents. A recent meeting with the agency's attorneys indicates that some of the social workers struggle to make the recommendation to terminate services when the parent is visiting and/or has made some measures of effort on their case plan objectives, even if they do not meet the legal standard of significant progress. Additionally, social workers measure significant effort as attending at least some of their case plan services, and without regard to all components and/or actual progress and change in behavior. How widespread or isolated this practice is amongst agency staff is unknown, but given the limited use of SDM tools in reunification reassessments (45.1%), further evaluation of this area, court training, and case reading has commenced.

B. Strategies and Action Steps

1. Enhance Visitation:

Stanislaus County has continued a contract with the Children's Crisis Center to coordinate and monitor visitation between children and their families. Visitation is conducted in accordance with the court ordered case plan and typically scheduled for a minimum of 2 hours per week.

2. Partner with Faith Community:

As indicated previously, the current faith community focus is on the provision of sober living services in Stanislaus County.

3. Motivational Interviewing:

Stanislaus County Adult, Child, and Family Services Division (ACFSD) Management Team has suspended original plan for Safety Oriented Practice (SOP) training and implementation. This was due to the agency being involved in many other system improvement efforts and initiatives; concurrently i.e. Katie A. implementation involves additional training on the Core Practice Model and Trauma Informed Practice and Quality Parent Initiative. This, coupled with a declining human resource to fully implement SOP, influenced the Management Teams decision to hold until such a time that the agency ACFSD's human resources became more stable. Motivational Interviewing training has been scheduled for Stanislaus County Child and Family Services Social Workers on February 13th and 14th 2014 to train staff to use this technique to assist in strengthening a parent's motivation and commitment to change as it is an important component of Safety Organized Practice.

4. Sierra Vista Child and Family Services Counseling (PSSF, CWS/OIP):

Sierra Vista Child and Family Services is an organization that offers many community services including individual, group counseling, family counseling, and psychiatric evaluations regarding issues of anger management, trauma, mental health, and school age issues. Services also include a school for children with special needs who are not successful in a regular day school and an ADHD clinic. Their clients may include children and their families that are being served by County child welfare departments, and other children who are referred for services by legal, medical, or other social services agencies. Individual and group counseling services for adults and children are available to help break the cycle of abuse and neglect. Individual and group counseling for children are available to help heal the damage of past abuse and neglect and increase their personal safety. Domestic violence and anger management treatment as well as co-dependency classes are available. Parent education and support is offered through individual sessions, group sessions, parent labs and activities that strengthen and support timely reunification. Sierra Vista Child and Family Services offer services in Spanish. Priority is given to children who are being served by the county welfare departments for being abused and neglected and to their families who are participating in time limited reunification services.

As indicated in the improvement goals of our System Improvement Plan 2010 through 2015, was to increase the number of children who exit to reunification within 12 months. Timely reunification for families in the Child Welfare System is often contingent on addressing emotional trauma from child abuse and neglect, confronting generational patterns of abuse, and/or receiving treatment in emotional, behavioral and physiological issues. Children and their parents often have to re-learn how they interact with each other, grapple with trust issues, and learn skills such as communication tools, in order to not repeat unhealthy family patterns. Counseling is used to address these issues and facilitate safe and timely reunification.

Sierra Vista Child and Family Services use a pre and post-test process to determine effectiveness of their program. These are given to participants upon entry into the program, and then again when completed with the group portion. The results measure participants increase in knowledge regarding subject matter reviewed in the classes. Customer satisfaction questionnaires are given, also participants respond to a series of questions using a Likert Scale.

5. Pre-placement Visits for youth in County Licensed and FFA placements

County social workers have made strides in arranging pre-placement visits at every opportunity, including with FFA placements. As staffing stabilizes and social workers carry smaller caseloads, it will be more reasonable to address with more than a dozen Foster Family Agencies in operation in Stanislaus County.

C. Obstacles and barriers to future implementation:

1. Icebreaker Meetings:

Stanislaus County has more than a dozen Foster Family Agencies (FFA) and over 100 Stanislaus County licensed foster homes operating in the county. Stanislaus County continues to work with the various FFAs on consistency and implementation of strategies to improve the quality of care for children. CSA has regular quarterly meetings with FFA facilitated by a Permanent Placement Supervisor and Children's System of Care (CSOC) Coordinator. Stanislaus County continues to encourage the county licensed foster parents to communicate with the birth parents. To address the issues related to foster care placement, Stanislaus County began implementing the Quality Parenting Initiative (QPI) with the assistance of the Youth Law Center, in 2013. It is expected that this will be an important aspect of improving our foster care system. Although icebreakers are best practice, there is a time commitment to use the icebreaker process to enhance reunification. As aforementioned, due to staffing levels, Stanislaus County has not been able to implement icebreaker meetings at this time.

PLACEMENT STABILITY:

A. County's current performance

Stanislaus County has shown improvement on measures of placement stability since our System Improvement Plan was developed in 2010. According to Quarter 4 2009 Extract, the percentage of children with 2 or fewer placements throughout their entire time in foster care was 85.9% for those in care 8 days to 12 months, 67.7% for those in care 12 to 24 months, and 25.4% for those in care 24 months or more. Our current performance (October 2013, Q2 extract, 07/01/2012 – 06/30/2013) is 85.8% for children in care 8 days to 12 months, 66.1% for those in care 12 to 24 months, and 35.2% for those in care 24 months or more. We are approaching the National Standard for 8 days to 12 months of 86.0%. While our performance on 12- 24 months declined slightly, we had observed a significant decline as of the 2011 update to 63.9%, and our present performance is again better than the National Standard of 65.4%. For children in care 24 months or more, despite our 10% improvement, we continue to fall short of the National Standard of 41.8%. An examination of this measure by age, shows that we are not meeting the measure with respect to children 11 – 15 years of age (25.4% having 2 or fewer placements; but we have improved that rate by 9.8%) or 16 – 17 years of age (15.4% having 2 or fewer placements; but we have improved by 6.1%). In 2009, our data indicated that only 11.5% of children 11-15 years of age had 2 or fewer placements, thus we have improved significantly on this targeted subgroup. (http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare)

Stanislaus County's performance has continued to improve over the past two years and may be due, in part, to services such as wraparound. We foresee a continuation of the improved performance in this area due to the fact that we are ramping up the implementation of Katie A. deliverables that are ensuring we are systematically assessing the mental health needs of all children in an open child welfare case. When staffing has stabilized, Stanislaus County intends to reinstate Team Decision Making (TDM) meetings to make removal and placement decisions.

Performance for those children/youth that have been in care for 24 months or more continue to present challenges to the agency. These youth have complex emotional, mental health issues, and behavioral problems, thus difficult to find permanency for. Our continued effort with our "3015" program, that pairs mental health clinicians with social workers to stabilize children in or at risk of group home placement, is a tremendous asset to our county.

B. Strategies and Action Steps

1. Wraparound Services:

Wraparound was implemented in January 2011 for Child Welfare and Probation Youth. Services are on-going and the effectiveness of the strategy is under analysis. Children/youth placed in a group home are served in a less restrictive setting with wraparound services intended to stabilize their behavior. A number of the adolescent youth have been able to reunify with a parent as a result.

2. Grief and Loss Training:

All children in foster care have experienced tremendous loss. Even when the plan is reunification, and there is a good possibility that they will be returned home, children experience profound loss while they are separated from their parent (s). Research shows that the child's developmental level, the significance of the people separated from, whether the separation is temporary or permanent, and the degree of familiarity of the new surroundings deeply affect the child's understanding of the situation. This understanding will influence how he or she behaves in foster care. Feedback from our community partners and social workers during our self review was that Social Workers needed to be trained on the effects of grief and loss on children in the Child Welfare System. This training and understanding will help social workers work with foster youth and foster parents address the youth's needs as they arise in regards to grief and loss issues. If Social Workers know how to recognize and address these issues, they can be pro-active and support the placement stability with direct intervention or apply services to maintain the placement, therefore, preventing further trauma of multiple placements.

A new series of Grief and Loss training for FFA social workers has been postponed while we hire and train new staff. The Regional Training Academy works closely with our agency to provide relevant training, some of which is included in the SIP; however, prioritization of various topics and the timing of delivery factors into the decision of when to provide the identified sessions. Until this latest round of hiring, all of our internal staff had participated in grief and loss training, the goal for the SIP was to expand to external partners. Due to CWS hiring so many new workers, that training has been postponed until we have a more stable workforce.

3. Quality Parenting Initiative (QPI):

Stanislaus County had been selected as a member of the latest cohort group to implement the Quality Parenting Initiative (QPI). We have completed our preliminary evaluation, formed our action team, have completed our first site visit to a peer QPI county, and have been meeting monthly as an action team. In addition to meeting monthly, we have been meeting with our QPI representative quarterly to receive training and assistance in implementation. As part of the process, we solidified and completed our branding statement. We have also written and completed our Communication Policy guiding our staff and the expectations in regards to communicating with the public, foster parents, and the families we serve. QPI has sponsored foster parents and social workers to attend trainings. We are currently working on orienting our staff and foster parents about what QPI is and what it means to us and the children we serve. As we improve the recruitment, training and support of quality foster parents, we hope that our placement stability will continue to improve.

C. Obstacles and Barriers

1. Youth Orientation to Foster Care

Since our SIP was created, time and energy has been spent on the implementation of AB 12 / Extended Foster Care / After 18. The development and implementation of this action plan will depend in the coming year(s) on the status of current efforts and the vision of the youth permanency team.

2. Training on Culture and Placement

This training remains on the list but is currently on hold while other initiatives and training are implemented, such as Quality Parenting Initiative (QPI).

D. Pre-placement Visits for youth in County Licensed and FFA placements

County social workers have made strides in arranging pre-placement visits at every opportunity, including with FFA placements. As staffing stabilizes and social workers carry smaller caseloads, it will be more reasonable to address with the more than a dozen Foster Family Agencies in operation in Stanislaus County.

PERMANENCY THROUGH ADOPTION, GUARDIANSHIP OR LIFE LONG CONNECTION:

A. County's current performance

Per the Quarter 4 2009 data extract, between 1/1/2009 and 12/31/2009 only 18.2% of children in foster care 24 months or more exited to some form of permanency, less than the National Standard of 29.1%. Presently, 22.1% of children in care 24 months or more exit to permanency (October 2013, Data Extract Q2 2013, 10/01/12-09/30/13). Though we continue to fall short of the National Standard, our performance has improved since our SIP was created in 2010. For those children/youth in foster care 3 years or more, our current performance indicates that 31.8% of those emancipating have been in care this long, as compared to our performance of 48.8% when our SIP was established. That is significant progress toward the National Standard of 37.5% on this measure. Finally, our relative placement rates continue to be low with only 7% percent of children's first placement is with a relative, while our point in time outcome shows that on November 7, 2013, 20.1% of children were with a relative placement (October 2013, Data Extract Q2 , July 2013). However, our first placement kinship care rate has risen 6.7% and our point in time relative care rate has increased 6.6% since the last reporting period, this is a significant increase and shows that our efforts are moving this outcome in the right direction.

Stanislaus County is very consistent in identifying concurrent planning alternatives for children when they first enter foster care. It has become part of our culture to talk to our families and caregivers about permanency and train all of our county licensed foster parents to become concurrent homes as well. Despite our efforts, it can still be a challenge to find families who are willing to make the commitment, especially amongst some of our Foster Family Agency foster homes where sibling groups and older youth are placed.

The fact that 100% of the children are legally free for adoption are discharged to a permanent home prior to their 18th birthday (October 2013, Data Extract Q2 2013, 10/01/12-09/30/13) shows that Stanislaus County does not create legal orphans. This in addition to the fact that Stanislaus County completed 84 adoptions in the fiscal year 2013 is a testament to the work that social workers are doing to place concurrent planning as a priority.

B. Strategies and action steps

1. Monthly Foster Adoption Care Team (FACT) team:

A representative from adoptions attends Monthly FACT meetings. FACT is comprised of all of the adoption agencies working in Stanislaus County. We partner with local Foster Family Association programs such as Koinonia, Sierra Vista Children and Families Center, Families First, and Safe Harbor whose many of their foster parents are also concurrent planning parents that are willing to adopt children placed in their homes. The primary purpose of our partnership and attendance with the FACT team is to share resources around training, events, recruiting forever homes, and to look for homes that are a good match

for some children in our care with special needs. Stanislaus County's foster parent recruiter partners with the FACT group to organize large recruitment events at least twice a year in order to pool resources and coordinate efforts.

2. Relative Placement Review:

Presently our relative placement rates are low, with only 7% percent of children's first placement are with a relative, while our point in time outcome shows that on October 1, 2013 20.1% of children were with a relative placement. However, if one looks at the average predominant placement, that is where a child is placed at least 51% of the time in care, the average kinship placement as predominant placement for years 2010-2012 is 27% (Multistate Foster Care Data Archive, 2013). This indicates that while the first placement may not be relative care, social workers are still working to move a child into a relative placement home whenever they can.

In order to address the continuing low performance on this measure management, met with staff to discuss barriers and factors that contribute to relative placement. There were some concerns about the criminal history of relatives and this was perceived as a potential barrier. Our policy for exemptions was deemed to be unclear and updates are being completed. The greatest barrier to relative placement is the lack of Team Decision Making (TDM) meetings. TDM was eliminated in the 2010-2011 budget year at the time of reductions in force. Staff reported that the court was more supportive of separating sibling groups when they were with relatives and the plan to do so was developed in a TDM by the family. At present, the social workers have to place large sibling groups with FFAs in order to keep the children together. With the growing caseloads, reinstating TDM has not been a priority until caseloads can be stabilized. Management has designated a position to be the TDM facilitator, but our inability to fully staff has prevented us from moving forward with this position over the past several months.

Other efforts that have been in place to improve placement with relatives has been in regards to our youth permanency database. Our Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR) indicated that staff were not universally entering data into the permanency database, nor consulting it when the status of relatives is unknown. There was an assumption that the prior social worker would have found any available relatives and further research at placement disruption over the life of the case did not occur. We have made significant upgrades to the database to make it more user-friendly, have retrained all of our staff on the database, and have co-located our Family Finding worker in the Family Reunification units.

3. Partner with PSSF (AASK and Adoption Support Staff .5 FTE):

AASK has over 40 years of adoption, foster care, and family support experience with over 30 counties in California. On occasion and on an as-needed basis Stanislaus County (PSSF) has contracted with AASK provides Stanislaus County with adoption home studies for families who live outside of the county that are adopting Stanislaus County dependants.

AASK also has partnered with Stanislaus County to provide the opportunity for our families to attend Camp ALWAYS (A Life With Adoption Yields Success), an annual five-day program for families with a child in an adoptive placement or a finalized adoption. AASK facilitates Camp ALWAYS and takes place every June. At the five-day camp, the families are provided with parenting classes covering a range of topics, from attachment issues to parenting teens. Families also participate in bonding activities including arts and crafts, nature walks, dances and relaxation time.

C. Obstacles and Barriers to future goals:

1. The Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors have approved 1 FTE for CFS to hire a Team Decision Meeting (TDM) Facilitator, however the position has not been filled due to the significant turnover experienced at the agency at this time. Stanislaus County continues to explore strategies to fill any open vacancies within Child and Family Services.

PROBATION

PLACEMENT STABILITY:

A. County's current performance

The Probation Department collaborated with Child Welfare Services (CWS) community stakeholders, and internal staff to conduct the Self Improvement Plan. (SIP) This included participation in outcomes meetings with CWS staff and focus groups with staff and community stakeholders. This process started in the fall of 2009 when the Probation Department participated in the Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR) and then the County Self Assessment (CSA) in the spring of 2010. Placement stability has been identified as the Probation Department's focus area due to the number of placement changes experienced by children placed through the Probation Department. A review of the research literature indicates that placement's stability is greatly affected by the type of placement. (i.e. matching the minors needs) and the number of placement settings experienced. Based on the findings of the PQCR and CSA, there is a need to improve upon the methods minor's are being properly, initially and when applicable, subsequently placed. During the PQCR and CSA, it was evident that the probation cases indicated a theme of utilizing case management and documentation of monthly visits, contact with minor's and follow up with mental health and behavioral health professionals. Probation Officers continue to regularly review case plans with youth and receive their feedback. Additionally, low caseloads allowed officers to maintain contact with group homes and provide them with updated health and education information. However, it was also found in the areas of youth assessment and placement matching that a validated assessment tool was not utilized in making initial or subsequent placement decisions. Furthermore, even though case documentation may be up to date, the anecdotal information or experiences probation officers have with minors is sometimes lost when cases are transferred between officers unless they are clearly noted in the file.

From the FY 2010-2011 to the FY 2011-2012 we experienced a 45.83% increase in the number of minors ordered into out-of-home placement. Our average caseload size went from an average of 24 minors per case load to 35 minors per caseload at the end of FY 2012. Although the average case load size has increased, the department has maintained the same number of staffing from FY 2010-2011 to FY 2011-2012, of three placement officers assigned. The increase of minors ordered into out-of-home placement has been identified as being due to a combination of a change in juvenile judges in the Probation Department from one judge to two and their increasing use of out of state placements. The department currently utilizes five out of state placement facilities and has 18 minors placed in these respective facilities. Additionally, the lack of other variable supervision options at a lower level coupled with the limited ability to utilize the Department of Juvenile Justice for a number of high risk supervision cases has resulted in an increase of minors being sent into out-of-state placements.

The increase of numbers of placement minors has had an impact on the placement officer's ability to match minors with available placements and the ability to increase family engagement for reunification. Officers continue their due diligence in attempting to match minors to proper placements; however, as the placement numbers continue to increase this goal can sometimes be at odds with the increasing custody numbers. Officers continue to meet their required monthly contacts and update their health and education information as required which is documented in the Probation Departments web based Integrated Criminal Justice System (ICJIS-PB) program.

In 2011 the new requirement to enter data into the CWS/CMS system took place requiring placement officers to adjust their workloads and schedules for this increasing demand on their time. This increasing data entry coupled with increased numbers of placement minors and yet same number of placement officers has prevented their ability to maintain an up to date CWS/CMS system. Additionally, for FY 2011-2012, the placement unit has continued to experience staffing changes. While there are still only three placement officers, two officers are new to the unit, one with eight months experience and the other with one month in unit. The unit supervisor is also new to the assignment, having only been in the assignment for four months. The two staff members as well as the unit supervisor are scheduled to attend Placement Officer Core training in early 2013. Due to staff the staffing change over, additional CWS/CMS training was provided in July 2012; however, subsequent training will need to be conducted to train incoming staff.

Continued research throughout the FY 2011-2012 again yielded no validated placement assessment/matching tool that existed to assist in helping officers match minor's with appropriate placements. The website www.cacfs.org was identified as an online matching system allowing the user to select characteristics of a minor (i.e. age, gender, 602/300 WIC, etc.) and type of placement (i.e. RCL, sex offender, arson, drug treatment, etc.) which then generated a list of potential placements for the minor. Officers were then required to follow up with contacting the agency and making the required referral if appropriate.

This site continues to be user driven and the results are based on those placement facilities utilizing their respective vacancies. While this site matches the needs of the minors to the appropriate treatment facility it appears further evaluation of this sites usefulness needs to be conducted.

In July 2011, the Probation Department received training and began implementing the use of the Juvenile Assessment and Intervention System (JAIS). JAIS is a comprehensive risk-and-needs assessment and intervention planning system designed to improve outcomes for juvenile offenders in both institutional and community programs. The JAIS has three components: a risk instrument, a needs assessment and a supervision classification system. JAIS is used to gain insight into each youth's involvement with the juvenile justice system, family history, and interpersonal relationships, outside educational experiences, attitudes, and perceptions through their own voices. Assessment responses are automated into the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) system, which produces a profile of a juvenile's needs, risk of re-offending, and intervention priorities. For each individual, the system identifies the most appropriate treatment interventions. JAIS has been validated for use in probation and juvenile justice facilities and is currently used in several other jurisdictions as an assessment and planning tool. The Probation Officer is able to utilize the assessment reports when developing the minor's case plan and establishing services and the officer can address the identified needs incorporating the strengths when possible. Initially this assessment has been completed on a minor when booked into Juvenile Hall by the department's Intake and Investigations unit comprised of approximately five Probation Officers. The department has recently participated in a JAIS train the trainer program and will be training the entire Juvenile Division Probation Officers on conducting the JAIS assessment.

Upon the completion of training the Probation Officers assigned to the Placement and Special Services Unit will use the JAIS output reports as a guide to identify the minor's basic criminogenic strengths and needs and determine which specific placement program can address those needs. The officer will be able to track successes and unsuccessful placements, evaluate the results and report out.

Additionally, the Probation Officer will be able to utilize the output reports from the JAIS assessment tool, plug in the appropriate needs to the currently identified placement matching website, www.cacfs.org which may provide additional potential placement options.

From FY 2011-2012 caseloads in the placement unit have increased by 45.83%. This continues to impact officer's ability to increase family engagement while meeting the required monthly contacts and data entry into state and local database systems. Last fiscal year we were able to begin utilizing the video conference hardware/software with families to increase family contacts with minors in placements; however, because of placement caseload sizes their ability to fully engage the families with the video conferencing is limited. It is believed continued use and monitoring of this engagement process needs to be conducted to evaluate its impact on placement stability. Additionally in order to determine the benefits to this technology the department will develop a survey on the benefits of the video conferencing ability and provide the survey to families engaging in the service. Families will be encouraged to fill out the survey upon the completion of their video conference. Throughout the fiscal year data from the survey will be gathered, evaluated and reported out.

III. Other Successes/Promising Practices

Please describe any other successes or promising practices encountered during the system improvement process. Describe what's working well within CWS/Probation and briefly discuss any promising practices that have led to consistently positive performance within specific outcome measures.

IV. Other Outcome Measures Not Meeting State and/or National Standards

None.

V. Link to the Program Improvement Plan

Stanislaus County is performing well on 2 of 3 placement stability measures which improve the overall statewide performance on the Performance Improvement Plan.

VI. SIP Chart

Please attach a copy of the SIP Chart. If additional goals and/or strategies and action steps have been added, please include them in revised SIP Chart.

2010 – 2015 SIP Chart

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: No Recurrence of Maltreatment – CWS

National Standard: 94.6%

Current Performance: According to the October 2013 Quarterly Data Report (Quarter 2 of 2013), of the 1200 children who were victims of abuse or neglect between 10/01/12 and 03/31/13, 1083 were not victims of another substantiated allegation of abuse or neglect within the following 6 months. That is a 90.3% rate of no recurrence.

Target Improvement Goal: The county will improve its performance on this measure from 90.3% to 94.6%, resulting in 52 more children who are not victims of additional abuse or neglect.

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor:

Placement Stability (C4.3 At least 24 months in Care) – CWS

National Standard: 41.8%

Current Performance: According to the October 2013 Quarterly Data Report (Quarter 2 of 2013), of the 168 children who were in foster care 24 or more months between 10/01/12 and 03/31/13, 55 experience two or fewer placements during the entire time in care. That is a 32.7% rate of placement stability.

Target Improvement Goal: The county will improve its performance on this measure from 32.7% to 37.7%, resulting in 8 more children who experience placement stability.

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: Timely Reunification – CWS

National Standard: 75.2%

Current Performance: According to the October 2013 Quarterly Data Report (Quarter 2 of 2013), of the 115 children who exited foster care to reunification between 10/01/12 and 03/31/13, 69 reunified within 12 months of entering foster care. That is a 60% rate of timely reunification.

Target Improvement Goal: The county will improve its performance on this measure from 60% to 65%, resulting in 6 more children who exit to reunification within 12 months of entering foster care.

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: Permanency through Adoption, Guardianship or Life Long Connection – Exits to Permanency (24 months in care) CWS

National Standard: 29.1%

Current Performance: According to the October 2013 Quarterly Data Report (Quarter 2 of 2013), of the 86 children who were in foster care 24 months or more between 10/01/12 and 03/31/13, 19 exited to some form of permanency. That is a 22.1% rate of permanency.

Target Improvement Goal: The county will improve its performance on this measure from 22.5% to 27.5%, resulting in 5 more children exited to some form of permanency of those who have been in foster care 24 months or more.

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor:

Placement Stability – PROBATION

National Standard: 41.8%

Current Performance: According to UC Berkeley CWS/CMS 2012 Quarter 2 Extract, 44.4% of youth in foster care 24 months or more have two or fewer placements, which exceed the National Standard.

Target Improvement Goal: Continue at or above National Standard.

Strategy 1 Management review of repeat maltreatment cases for children 1 – 2 years of age. – CWS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): No Recurrence of Maltreatment
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Complete case analysis of specific cases (children 1 – 2 years of age) that are victims of repeat maltreatment.	COMPLETED RECONDUCTING STUDY NOW AFTER REVIEW OF CURREN QUARTER OUTCOME	Management Team
B. Make recommendations regarding training, policies or service gaps that might have prevented these recurrences of maltreatment.	COMPLETED ONGOING	Management Team
C. Update policies and procedures & schedule recommended training.	COMPLETED	Management Team
D. Monitor Outcomes of repeat maltreatment quarterly, including case reading of instances of repeat maltreatment, and high/very high risk SDM cases that are not opened for services.	Quarterly Dec 2011 – 2014	Management & Supervisor Teams
E. Update Policies & Procedures, schedule training and implement other changes as recommended according to the on-going analysis.	Quarterly Dec 2011 – 2014	Management & Supervisors
F. Differential Response for all referrals referred to Child and Family Services for children 0-17.	Ongoing	Emergency Response and CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF Manager
G. Partner with CAPC and CWS/OIP to contract with Haven to provide Kids Count program.	Ongoing	CAPC Coordinator

Strategy 2 Motivational Interviewing	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Recurrence of Maltreatment Timely Reunification
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Schedule Motivational Interviewing Training for Staff	February 2013 February 2014	Management
B. Train Social Workers, Public Health Nurses, and Family Resource Center outreach workers in Motivational Interviewing.	February 2014	Management
C. Update/create agency policies that reflect the value and practice if motivational interviewing.	March 2014	Management/Staff Developer
D. Monitor Outcomes of repeat maltreatment quarterly, including case reading of instances of repeat maltreatment.	Quarterly December 2014	Management and Supervisor Teams
E. Monitor Outcome of timeliness to reunification bi-annually with the use of the CMS Safe Measures and the CA Child Welfare Indicators Project.	Biannually through December 2014	Systems Improvement Manager
F. Partner with PSSF to contract with Sierra Vista Child and Family Services so various services can be provided to decrease support families and reduce time to reunification.	Ongoing	PSSF Manager

Strategy 3 Structured Decision Making (SDM) tools to make risk and safety decisions at 90% (by Sept 2013). – CWS	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Recurrence of Maltreatment Timely Reunification Exits to Permanency
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Ensure that all staff is trained in SDM, via the training academy and periodic advanced SDM sessions.	On-going 2012 – 2014	Training Academy Management
B. Monitor implementation of SDM via case reading and Safe Measures reports to ensure that safety and risk are driving decision making.	Monthly through January 2015	Supervisors and Management

Strategy 4 Collaborate with faith based and non-profit community to provide supportive services. Maintain directory of services available for families. – CWS	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Recurrence of Maltreatment Timely Reunification
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Create a directory of Faith based and other Community Partners and the resources/supports that they provide.	September 2012 COMPLETED	Management Team
B. Outreach to Family Resource Centers, Health Services Agency and other community partners to gather resource information.	Monthly through January 2015	Management Team
C. Train all new staff on resource & referral information as well as United Ways 211 site.	On-going through January 2015	Supervisors
D. Survey Staff Annually about resource availability and awareness.	2013 & 2014	Data Analyst Researcher

Strategy 5 For children 0 – 5, whose SDM intake assessment indicates that a 10 day referral is appropriate, increase the percentage that are referred for a Path 2 joint response with Family Resource Centers from 20% to 40%. – CWS	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Recurrence of Maltreatment
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Supervisors will monitor for joint visit appropriateness and compliance while reviewing referrals.	Ongoing through January 2015	Emergency Response Supervisors
B. Business Objects reports quarterly to Supervisors and Manager of ER to monitor continued partnership with FRCs via joint visits. Quarterly Safe Measures reports of recurrence of maltreatment results with a subset by age.	Quarterly through January 2015	Data Analyst/Researcher System Improvement Manager

Strategy 6 Child Abuse Prevention Committee (CAPC) will outreach to community regarding abuse and neglect prevention, including Differential Response for 6 – 17 year olds and homeless teens. – CWS	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Recurrence of Maltreatment
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPC	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Child Abuse Prevention Council (CAPC) will identify areas of need to target outreach efforts, eg. “The Lisa Project”	COMPLETED 2012	Assistant Director CAPC Coordinator CAPC chair
B. Organize the community awareness effort, the Lisa Project for April 2013.	Completed April 2013	CAPC Coordinator
C. Partner with CBCAP and CWS/OIP to contract with Haven to provide Kids Count program.	Ongoing	CAPC Coordinator

Strategy 7 Implement Icebreaker meetings between birth and foster parents. – CWS	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Placement Stability Timely Reunification
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Update current Icebreaker Policy	March 2013 July 2013	Court / Reunification Managers & Supervisors
B. Train social workers and FFAs on Icebreaker philosophy and procedure.	April 2013 August 2013	Managers & Supervisors
C. Social workers from CSA and FFAs will implement Icebreaker meetings between birth parents and substitute caregivers.	June 2013 September 2013	Agency & FFA Social Workers
D. Monitor the effectiveness of Icebreaker meetings with surveys of parents, caregivers and social workers.	September 2013 December 2013	System Improvement Manager

Strategy 8 Enhanced parent/child visitation – CWS	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Timely Reunification
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Survey parents at least annually regarding their satisfaction with visitation. Review surveys and recommendations for modification.	January 2013, 2014	Children’s Crisis Center Management (court / FR)

Strategy 9 Wraparound Services – CWS & PROBATION	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Placement Stability
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. The Wraparound Committee will monitor the effectiveness of the services at the regular meetings and recommend changes to policies and procedures as needed.	Ongoing through January 2015	Wraparound Committee

Strategy 10 Grief and Loss Training for New Staff and FFAs – CWS	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Placement Stability
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Provide Training to New County Social Workers & Include FFA social workers in training opportunities	December 2013	Training Academy Management Team

<p>Strategy 11 Explore models of orientation/training for youth entering foster care to facilitate their adjustment / transition to care. – CWS</p> <p>ON HOLD: Due to Extended Foster Care (AB12) implementation and the elimination of ILP Interviewer positions (youth mentors) this has not moved forward. Will be reviewed with Youth Advisory Council for next steps and an appropriate timeline for implementation.</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): Placement Stability</p>	
<p>Action Steps:</p>	<p>Timeframe:</p>		<p>Person Responsible:</p>
<p>A. Research models of youth orientation to foster care</p>	<p>March 2013 June 2014</p>		<p>Youth Advisory Council</p>
<p>B. Review models and make recommendations for implementation including resourcing the effort.</p>	<p>June 2014</p>		<p>Manager Supervisor Youth Advisory Council</p>
<p>C. Test recommended model contingent upon approval and resource availability.</p>	<p>September 2014</p>		<p>Youth Advisory Council</p>

Strategy 12 Training on the impact of culture on placement – CWS	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Placement Stability
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Provide training on culture and the impact on placement.	January 2014	Regional Training Academy
B. Make needed changes to policies & procedures as indicated by this training.	June 2014	Management Team

Strategy 13 Partner with FFAs to coordinate and facilitate pre-placement visits for children/youth prior to a placement change. – CWS	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Placement Stability
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Using the Plan.Do.Study.Act (PDSA) methodology, test out possible strategies of pre-placement visits with FFAs.	June 2013	FFA & County Social Workers Supervisors
B. Develop policies & procedures or suggested practice guides to inform staff of successful strategies for pre-placement visits.	2013	Manager Supervisors FFAs
D. Train social workers on procedures.	January 2014	Manager Supervisors FFAs
E. Survey Social workers on the effectiveness of training as it relates to social work practice.	March 2014	System Improvement Manager

Strategy 14 Permanent homes will be identified for difficult to place children in care through partnership with FFAs through the monthly FACT team meeting. –CWS	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Permanency
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Monitor permanency data at least quarterly, using Berkeley, Safe Measures & Business Objects to ensure that permanent homes are identified for children in foster care.	Quarterly through January 2015	Data Analyst Researcher System Improvement Manager

<p>Strategy 15 Guardianship as a permanent plan.</p> <p>CHANGE: Ensure social workers are educated about permanency options for children of all ages, including adoption, guardianship & life long connections. – CWS</p>	<input 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): Exits to Permanency</p>
<p>Action Steps:</p>	<p>Timeframe:</p>	<p>Person Responsible:</p>
<p>A. Survey social workers annually about practices and values related to permanency.</p>	<p>August 2013 & 2014</p>	<p>Data Analyst / Researcher System Improvement Manager</p>
<p>B. Provide training and education about permanency as indicated from survey information.</p>	<p>Ongoing through January 2015</p>	<p>Management Team</p>
<p>C. Partner with PSSF to AASK and Adoption Support Staff .5 FTE.</p>	<p>Ongoing through January 2015</p>	<p>PSSF Manager</p>

Strategy 16 Relative Placement workgroup – CWS	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Relative Placement Rates
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Review relative placement data & strategies for improvement quarterly in Supervisor and staff meetings.	Quarterly through January 2015	System Improvement Manager Supervisors
B. Brainstorm barriers and provide needed policy modifications/clarifications and/or training.	Quarterly through January 2015	Managers Supervisors

Strategy 17 Quality Parenting Initiative – CWS NEW	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Placement Stability Exits to Permanency Foster Home Licensing
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Complete Self Assessment and request participation in QPI Initiative.	COMPLETED August 2012	Management Team
B. Form a QPI Implementation team and convene monthly	January 2013 Ongoing through January 2015	System Improvement Manager Licensing Supervisor Foster Parent Recruiter
C. Participate in QPI Training & Consultations Sessions with Youth Law Center and QPI experts.	Commencing January 2013 Ongoing through January 2015	System Improvement Manager Licensing Supervisor Foster Parent Recruiter
D. Update policies & procedures, training or agency practices per the recommendations of the QPI implementation team.	Ongoing through January 2015	System Improvement Manager Licensing Supervisor Foster Parent Recruiter
E. Monitor of effectiveness of QPI efforts via data (eg. number of licensed homes) and survey information from foster parents and social workers.	Annually through January 2015	System Improvement Manager Licensing Supervisor Foster Parent Recruiter

Child Welfare Conclusion:

We continue to have strong partnerships between public and private agencies, a strong county culture of community responsibility as evidenced by our successful Differential Response program, and a wealth of services and collaboratives for supporting children and families in Stanislaus County.

Stanislaus County Child Welfare has implemented the Quality Parenting Initiative this year. It is anticipated that this work will improve our recruitment, training and retention of quality foster parents which will lead to improved placement stability and permanency for youth in foster care.

Our continued commitment to monitoring our outcomes in our staff meetings as well as at a management level continues to be a regular part of our continuous quality improvement process so that we can notice changes and implement strategies to improve those areas that become challenges.

The county budget deficit required the division to reduce staffing levels by approximately one-third in the 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 fiscal years. We experienced the elimination of non-mandated services such as Families in Partnership (intensive family maintenance), as well as non-case-carrying positions such as permanency specialists, Team Decision Making (TDM) facilitators, foster parent recruiter trainer, and an innovative perinatal drug treatment program. Although we have experienced attrition challenges, the improvement in many of our outcomes shows the hard work and dedication of the staff that are making it possible for our child welfare system to function.

Since then we have been able to get approval to add back staff positions (TDM facilitator and Permanency Specialist) that we are currently looking to fill as soon as we can. These two positions are important parts of improving our relative placement percentage keeping youth in the lowest level of care, reducing placement changes, and decreasing the level of foster care placements safely.

PROBATION

PLACEMENT STABILITY:

A. County's current performance

The Probation Department collaborated with Child Welfare Services (CWS) community stake holders, and internal staff to conduct the Self Improvement Plan. (SIP) This included participation in outcomes meetings with CWS staff and focus groups with staff and community stakeholders. This process started in the fall of 2009 when the Probation Department participated in the Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR) and then the County Self Assessment (CSA) in the spring of 2010. Placement stability has been identified as the Probation Department's focus area due to the number of placement changes experienced by children placed through the Probation Department. A review of the research literature indicates that placement's stability is greatly affected by the type of placement. (i.e. matching the minors needs) and the number of placement settings experienced. Based on the findings of the PQCR and CSA, there is a need to improve upon the methods in which minors are being properly, initially and when applicable, subsequently placed. During the PQCR and CSA, it was evident that the probation cases indicated a theme of utilizing case management and documentation of monthly visits, contact with minor's and follow up with mental health and behavioral health professionals. Probation Officers continue to regularly review case plans with youth and receive their feedback. Additionally, low caseloads allowed officers to maintain contact with group homes and provide them with updated health and education information. However, it was also found in the areas of youth assessment and placement matching that a validated assessment tool was not utilized in making initial or subsequent placement decisions. Furthermore, even though case documentation may be up to date, the anecdotal information or experiences probation officers have with minors is sometimes lost when cases are transferred between officers unless they are clearly noted in the file.

In FY 2010-2011, the number of minors on probation with out of home placement orders was 134. During this time, the unit Deputy Probation Officer III was not assigned a placement caseload; however, was responsible for supervising and submitting status review reports for minors with placement orders who were on bench warrant status. The three assigned placement officers carried an average caseload size of 25 minors per officer.

In FY 2011-2012, there were 146 minors with out of home placement orders, an 8.9% increase from FY 2010-2011. As a result of the increase, in March 2012, the unit DPO III was assigned a small case load of out of home placement minors, in addition to the daily tasks of the position. Having the DPO III take on the additional role of a placement officer was made in an attempt to maintain case load levels at a manageable work load. By including the DPO III as a placement officer, case load levels for FY 2011-2012 were maintained at an average of 25 minors per officer.

In FY 2012-2013, there were 133 minors with out of home placement orders, a 8.9% decrease from FY 2011-2012; a .7% decrease from FY 2010-2011. Caseload numbers for FY 2012-2013 were maintained at an average of 25 minors per officer. In June 2013, the Probation Department opened the new Juvenile Commitment Facility. It is hopeful this decreasing trend in out of home placement minors continues. The full impact of the facility on the number of out-of-home placement orders will not be gauged until the end of FY 2013-2014.

Although the number of minors ordered into out of home placement has decreased minimally during this progress report period (2012/2013) the department would like to utilize the commitment facility as an alternative to out of home placement. The continued use of out-of-home placement has been identified as being due to a combination of variables including a change in juvenile judges in the Probation Department; from one judge to two, and their increasing use of out of state placements. The department currently utilizes five out-of-state placement facilities. Further possibilities as to the number of out-of-home placement orders was noted to be due to the absence of other viable supervision options at a lower level, coupled with the limited ability to utilize the Department of Juvenile Justice for a number of high risk supervision cases. In an effort to provide services locally, recommendations to the Department of Juvenile Justice have decreased; however, the dependence on out-of-home placement facilities has increased.

The Probation Department utilizes an internal Resource Review Board which encompasses probation officers from various supervision units whose responsibility is to hear cases presented to them at the dispositional hearing stage. The Resource Board considers all aspects of a minor's case and recommends the most appropriate disposition in the matter, which is subsequently recommended to the Court. In FY 2011-2012, the Resource Review Board recommended 73 minors receive a recommendation from the Court of out of home placement. Of the 73, a total of 49 minors were referred from the Probation Department's Juvenile High Risk Supervision Unit, 67% total. For FY 2012-2013, the department's internal Resource Review Board recommended fewer minors into out-of-home placement; however, the majority of the placement recommendations were of High Risk Supervision minors.

In June 2013, the Stanislaus County Probation Department Juvenile Commitment Facility (JCF) was opened for operation. This 60-bed facility houses sentenced youth offenders and offers evidence-based programming to engage youth sentenced to lengthy commitments. The facility provides resources to train, educate, and guide minors who are committed by the Juvenile Court toward a more productive and delinquency-free lifestyle. The JCF represents a collective effort aimed at changing delinquent habits, attitudes, and behaviors. Juvenile Probation Corrections Officers, Probation Officers, mental health personnel and teachers all play a role in making possible a positive lifestyle change. Community service organizations and volunteers also devote much appreciated time and effort toward the realization of our goal.

To support these goals, Evidenced Based Programs (EBPs) will be provided to address each of the minor's top three criminogenic needs. The JCF relies on results of the Juvenile Assessment and Intervention System also known as JAIS to determine appropriate commitment goals. In partnership with the Stanislaus County of Education, minors receive individualized focus toward obtainment of a GED and/or High School diploma. Special Education services are available.

The program concentrates on the confrontation of anti-social/illegal behavior and thinking patterns in an effort to get the residents to take responsibility for their decisions and behavior. The primary goal is the individual development of basic personal, social, academic and vocational skills necessary to survive in modern society, leading toward becoming responsible, productive adults.

For the last progress report period, it was noted when the facility became an available option, the Court would have the opportunity to consider a long term commitment for a high-risk supervision minor who may have otherwise been considered for an out-of-home placement order or a sentence to the Department of Juvenile Justice which could result in the possible decline of out-of-home placement orders and a more suitable caseload size for the Probation Officer. Probation will continue to work with our Superior Court Judges in further educating them on all of the programming being offered within the new facility in an effort to further decrease the out of home placement orders.

Although the number of minors ordered into out of home placement has decreased somewhat, the average caseload size for placement officer has remained a constant, an average of 25. Due to the complexities of placement cases and duties, this caseload average is considered high, as the state suggest a caseload average of 15 to 20 placement minors be supervised by one officer in order to provide the maximum services possible. The high caseload average continues to impact the placement officer's ability to increase family engagement for reunification. Officers make the best attempts at matching minors with proper placements, taking into account the minor's reunification plan; however, with our current placement numbers, this goal has been challenging. With the high caseload size, extensive travel time, increased workload of data entry into the CWS/CMS system and extended foster care programming officers are not available to dedicate as much time as might be necessary with a minor's family members. Officers continue to meet their required monthly contacts and update their health and education information as required, which is documented in the Probation Department's web based Integrated Criminal Justice System (ICJIS-PB) program.

In 2011 the new requirement to enter data into the CWS/CMS system took place requiring placement officers to adjust their workload and schedules for this increasing demand on their time. The increasing data entry coupled with the numbers of placement minors has been another challenge; however, maintaining an up to date CWS/CMS system continues to be a priority.

In January 2013, the Probation Department was able to complete the task of entering a backlog of data into the CWS/CMS system. This required a significant amount of time and the utilization of additional staffing resources to complete the task. CWS/OIP funding was used for the purchase of larger computer screens, which enabled staff to draw data information from the department's Integrated Criminal Justice System (ICJIS-PB) program and input the information into the CWS/CMS system in a timely fashion.

Since January 2013, staff has completed their monthly contact requirements in both the ICJIS and CWS/CMS systems, maintaining their monthly requirements of data entry. The larger screen allows for ease of transferring data and assists with streamlining the documentation process, which is paramount to the officer's time management of their case loads. Although the larger screen at the Probation Officer's desk has been essential, the placement officer travels extensively, so further options to maximize workload output were explored. The department utilized CWS/OIP funding and purchased the Placement Unit new laptop computers, which has assisted the Probation Officer to have immediate access to the department's ICJIS system as well as the ability to input data into both the ICJIS and CWS/CMS systems while traveling, eliminating wasted down time during travel. Furthermore, with internet access, officers will be able to facilitate the engagement and reunification process with the minor and their families, as they will be able to utilize the various web-based programs available such as SKYPE with a minor's family during on-site visits.

For FY 2011-2012, and FY 2012-2013, the placement unit experienced staffing changes. While the unit maintained four placement officers, two officers were fairly new to the unit, one just completing her first year as a Probation Officer and the other with one month of experience in the Placement Unit. The unit supervisor was new to the unit, having only been in the assignment for eight months. In March and April 2013, respectfully, the supervisor and one staff member completed the three month Placement Officer Core Course.

In April and July 2013, the unit again underwent staffing changes with the transfer of one staff member and the subsequent transfer of the unit's lead line officer, the Deputy Probation Officer III. Both of these placement officers are scheduled to attend the Placement Officer Core training in FY 2013-2014. As a result of new staff being assigned to the unit, additional CWS/CMS training was provided in July 2012. Subsequent training was conducted in April 2013, in order to maintain the CMS/CWS database, which proved valuable. Future CMS/CWS training is scheduled for January 2014.

Continued research throughout the 2011-2012 FY again yielded no validated placement assessment/matching tool which existed in helping officers match minor's with appropriate placements. The website www.cacfs.org was identified as an online matching system allowing the user to select characteristics of a minor (i.e. age, gender, 602/300 WIC, etc.) and type of placement (i.e. RCL, sex offender, arson, drug treatment, etc.) which then generated a list of potential placements for the minor. Officers were then required to follow up with contacting the agency and making the required referral if appropriate. This site continues to be user

driven and the results are based on those placement facilities utilizing their respective vacancies. While this site matches the needs of the minors to the appropriate treatment facility, this supervisor attempted use of this site and it was not user friendly. This goal was removed from the System Improvement Plan at the last progress report in lieu of the department transitioning to the utilization of the JAIS assessment tool with full implementation in February 2013.

In July 2011, the Probation Department received training and began implementing the use of the Juvenile Assessment and Intervention System (JAIS). JAIS is a comprehensive risk-and-needs assessment and intervention planning system designed to improve outcomes for juvenile offenders in both institutional and community programs. The JAIS has three components: a risk instrument, a needs assessment and a supervision classification system. JAIS is used to gain insight into each youth's involvement with the juvenile justice system, family history, interpersonal relationships, outside educational experiences, attitudes, and perceptions through their own voices. Assessment responses are automated into the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) system, which produces a profile of a juvenile's needs, risk of re-offending, and intervention priorities. For each individual, the system identifies the most appropriate treatment interventions. JAIS has been validated for use in probation and juvenile justice facilities and is currently used in several other jurisdictions as an assessment and planning tool. The Probation Officer is able to utilize the assessment reports when developing the minor's case plan and establishing services and the officer can address the identified needs incorporating the strengths when possible. Initially this assessment tool was completed by our Juvenile Intake unit upon the minor being referred and/or booked into custody. In November 2012, the department participated in a JAIS train-the-trainer program. In December 2012 and January 2013 the training of Juvenile Division Probation Officers was completed on conducting the JAIS assessment. Beginning February 1, 2013, the Probation Officer supervising the minor was responsible to assess the minor by utilizing the JAIS, to determine the minor's criminogenic needs, and incorporate those needs into the minor's case plan. The Placement and Special Services Unit has been able to utilize the JAIS output report as a guide to identify the minor's basic criminogenic strengths and needs in order to determine which specific placement program can address those needs. Attempts are made to place the minor in a facility capable of addressing a minor's primary risk need as identified by the JAIS. With the implementation of the JAIS assessment tool, coupled with the data analysis from Safe Measures, successful and unsuccessful placements can be tracked and reported out. As the use of this tool was implemented in the middle of the fiscal year, a better gauge of the impact of this tool on placement matching will be in FY 2013-2014.

As previously noted, from FY 2010-2011 to FY 2011-2012, the number of minor's ordered into out of home placement increased by nearly 9%, resulting in the unit's DPO III, to undertake an additional role as a placement officer in order to maintain case load size. In FY 2012/2013 the Placement Unit saw a decrease of placement minors matching 9%. The average caseload size of Placement Officers continues to impact the officer's ability to increase family engagement while meeting the required monthly contacts and data entry into state and local database systems as well as daily duties and tasks. During FY 2011-2012 the

department was able to utilize the video conference hardware/software with families to increase family contacts with minors in placements; however, because of placement caseload sizes staff's ability to fully engage the families with the video conferencing remains limited. It is believed continued use and monitoring of this engagement process will impact placement stability. In order to determine the benefits of this technology the department has developed a survey on the benefits of the video conferencing ability and will provide the survey to families engaging in the service. Families will be encouraged to fill out the survey upon the completion of their video conference, which will allow families to provide their immediate thoughts and comments at the time of engagement rather than waiting for a response. The survey will encompass the family's comments regarding current events with the minor as well as address any additional processes or planning they feel would increase their participation in the minor's case plan and reunification possibilities. This engagement process will continue throughout the fiscal year and will be a topic within the counties next CFSR.

In an effort to increase family engagement and reunification, the Probation Department, in conjunction with the Community Services Agency and various partner agencies, offers a WRAP around program in Stanislaus County. The Wraparound Program has the following ten principles: Family Voice and Choice, Team-Based, Natural Supports, Collaboration, Community-Based, Culturally Competent, Individualized, Strengths-Based, Persistence, and Outcome-Based. The family is fully engaged, has a voice and is an active participant in case/service planning. The family identifies their own needs and is provided with support in accessing an individualized array of informal and formal services and resources to meet these needs. The delivery of services is seamless because the family, youth and providers are working together as a team. Although the WRAP program has been in place since 2010, the Probation Department was utilizing this service prior to minor's removal from the home. Since January 2013, the department has been identifying minors who are approximately three to six months from successful completion of their placement program and refer placement minor's to the WRAP program as a step down option. Staff from the WRAP program begins the early engagement process with the minor, their family, the placement facility and the probation officer while the minor is still in the placement facility and under the jurisdiction of the Probation Officer. This has been seen as an additional service available to the minor for their transition home, as well as with their families, which may result in shorter and fewer placement episodes. Since January 2013, there have been 11 minors who have returned from their respective placement facility and have been referred to the WRAP program. Of the 11 minors, two were successful completions of WRAP with probation supervision services terminated (.18%) and four minors remain in the program. In addition to assist with reunification, WRAP is being utilized in an effort to prevent re-entry. This engagement process will continue throughout the fiscal year as well as be a topic within the counties next CFSR.

Additional efforts at engaging the family with reunification has been identified with the use of CWS/OIP funding toward financial assistance to parents/guardians in order to visit minors who are in placement facilities. In March 2013 the Probation Officer assisted one minor's mother with purchasing a train ticket to see her son while in placement in Santa Rosa, California. The

minor informed the Probation Officer he was appreciative of the visit and the group home indicated the visit went well. In April 2013, the Probation Officer assisted with facilitating a three day trip for the parents of a minor placed at an out of state facility. CWS/OIP funding was utilized to purchase two plane tickets, the hotel stay and re-imbusement of a rental car for the family. Upon their return, the minor's parents contacted the Probation Officer and reported she and her husband had a "wonderful" time visiting with the minor in Pennsylvania. The minor's mother stated, "The hotel room was nice and the flight was good." She further reported she was very impressed with Glen Mills and was able to spend several hours with the minor. She noted observable changes in the minor's behavior, noting his maturity and affection with them, something she indicated the minor has not had before. The placement facility informed the Probation Officer, this minor has had improved behavior since the visit with his family. This practice will continue throughout the fiscal year and into the next CFSR. Use of CWS/OIP funding will continue throughout the next fiscal year in an effort to increase the engagement of families and assist the timely reunification process.

Strategy 18 Placement Matching tool - PROBATION	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Placement Stability
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Key Participants Convene	October 2010-Completed	Juvenile Division Director Placement Supervisor
B. Research and identify tools currently utilized to match minors with placements. Research will continue through remainder of SIP period.	January 2011-Completed Extend to September 2013 Extend to January 2015	Placement Supervisor Placement Unit Deputy Probation Officers
C. Train staff on matching tool and implement. Train staff on JAIS assessment tool and implement.	February 2011-Completed March 2013-Completed	Placement Supervisor Placement
D. Utilize JAIS assessment tool output reports with matching minors needs and appropriate placements	June 2013-Completed May 2013	Placement Supervisor Placement Unit Deputy Probation Officers
E. Compare/track placements in order to gather data and evaluate success/stability of placement	March 2014 June 2014 January 2015-evaluate data from previous months. January 2015-report back on trends, findings for the months of data collected	Placement Supervisor

Strategy 19 Video case conferencing for improved family contact - PROBATION	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Placement Stability Timely Reunification
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Key Participants Convene	October 2010-Completed	Juvenile Division Director Placement
B. Identify ways to increase family participation in the development of case plans and/or in developing a concurrent plan.	November 2010-Completed	Placement Supervisor Unit Deputy
C. Identify baseline engagement data. Implement family engagement plan. We have sent staff to concurrent plan development courses and have created a family video conference room to be used for families to video conference with minors in placement if the family is unable to go to the minor's placement.	Extend to January 2012-Completed	Placement Supervisor Unit Deputy Probation Officers
D. Develop a survey to provide to parents utilizing the video case conferencing technology to determine the needs to increase parental engagement.	June 2013-Completed	Placement Supervisor
E. Gather/evaluate responses from survey	June 2014	Placement Supervisor