

California – Child and Family Services Review Signature Sheet

For submittal of: CSA SIP Progress Report

County	Yolo County
SIP Period Dates	December 2010 – August 2013
Outcome Data Period	April 2014: Q4 2013

County Child Welfare Agency Director

Name	Joan Planell, Director
Signature*	<i>Joan Planell</i>
Phone Number	530-661-2757
Mailing Address	25 N. Cottonwood Street Woodland, CA 95695

County Chief Probation Officer

Name	Brent Cardall, Chief
Signature*	<i>Brent Cardall</i>
Phone Number	530-406-4731
Mailing Address	137 N. Cottonwood Street Woodland, CA 95695

Public Agency Designated to Administer CAPIT and CBCAP

Name	Joan Planell, Director
Signature*	<i>Joan Planell</i>
Phone Number	530-661-2757
Mailing Address	25 N. Cottonwood Street Woodland, CA 95695

Board of Supervisors (BOS) Signature

BOS Approval Date	
Name	
Signature*	

Logged and Rec'd
9-11-14
RECEIVED SEP 11 2014 AR

Contact Information

Mail the original Signature Sheet to:

Children's Services Guidelines and Accountability Bureau
Attention: Bureau Chief
Children and Family Services Division
California Department of Social Services
744 P Street, MS 6-1291
Sacramento, CA 95811

*Signatures must be in blue ink

Child Welfare Agency	Name	Patti Larsen
	Agency	Yolo County Department of Employment and Social Services
	Phone & E-mail	530-666-8242 Patti.larsen@yolocounty.org
	Mailing Address	25 N. Cottonwood Street, Woodland, CA 95695
Probation Agency	Name	Cindy Anenson
	Agency	Probation Department
	Phone & E-mail	530-406-5364 Cynthia.Anenson@yolocounty.org
	Mailing Address	2780 E. Gibson Road Woodland, CA 95776
Public Agency Administering CAPIT and CBCAP (if other than Child Welfare)	Name	
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	
CAPIT Liaison	Name	Patti Larsen
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	
CBCAP Liaison	Name	Patti Larsen
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	
PSSF Liaison	Name	Patti Larsen
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	

Logged and Received
 9-11-14
 RECEIVED SEP 11 2014
 RK

California – Child and Family Services Review Signature Sheet

For submittal of: CSA SIP Progress Report

County: Yolo County
SIP Period Dates: December 2010 – August 2013
Outcome Data Period: April 2014: Q4 2013

County Child Welfare Agency Director

Name: Joan Planell, Director
Signature*: 
Phone Number: 530-661-2757
Mailing Address: 25 N. Cottonwood Street
Woodland, CA 95695

County Chief Probation Officer

Name: Brent Cardall, Chief
Signature*: 
Phone Number: 530-406-4731
Mailing Address: 137 N. Cottonwood Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Public Agency Designated to Administer CAPIT and CBCAP

Name: Joan Planell, Director
Signature*: 
Phone Number: 530-661-2757
Mailing Address: 25 N. Cottonwood Street
Woodland, CA 95695

Board of Supervisors (BOS) Signature

BOS Approval Date:
Name:
Signature*:

Contact Information

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

Child Welfare Agency	Name	Patti Larsen
	Agency	Yolo County Department of Employment and Social Services
	Phone & E-mail	530-666-8242 Patti.larsen@yolocounty.org
	Mailing Address	25 N. Cottonwood Street, Woodland, CA 95695
Probation Agency	Name	Cindy Anenson
	Agency	Probation Department
	Phone & E-mail	530-406-5364 Cynthia.Anenson@yolocounty.org
	Mailing Address	2780 E. Gibson Road Woodland, CA 95776
Public Agency Administering CAPIT and CBCAP (if other than Child Welfare)	Name	
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	
CAPIT Liaison	Name	Patti Larsen
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	
CBCAP Liaison	Name	Patti Larsen
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	
PSSF Liaison	Name	Patti Larsen
	Agency	
	Phone & E-mail	
	Mailing Address	

CALIFORNIA CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES REVIEW

2014 ANNUAL SIP PROGRESS REPORT



Yolo County Department of Employment and Social Services
Joan Planell Director

Probation Department
Brent Cardall, Chief

Table of Contents

SIP Progress Narrative.....	Page 1
State and Federally Mandated Child Welfare/Probation Initiatives.....	Page 20
Five-Year SIP Chart/CWS.....	Page 21
Five-Year SIP Chart/PROBATION.....	Page 23
CWS/PROBATION Matrix.....	Page 24

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

Introduction

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

This is Yolo County's third and final annual update to its 2011 SIP and is a report of the progress the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Division and Juvenile Probation Department have made since the implementation of that SIP in April 2011.

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

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

The focus outcomes for Juvenile Probation are;

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

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

Stakeholders Participation

CWS

With the promotion of Alissa Sykes to the Division Manager position last year we have resumed attendance at Yolo County's Child Abuse Prevention Council meetings and at the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) where we are regularly reviewing outcome performance data and our progress toward our SIP goals. Those meetings included a wide variety of community partners and local agencies. Additionally, we have shared our SIP with staff in the division and have discussed our outcomes at division meetings and in unit meetings.

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARRATIVE

Juvenile Probation

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

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

Current Performance Towards SIP Improvement Goals

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

CWS

Effective October 7, 2013 the Department of Employment and Social Services has a new Director, Joan Planell. Joan was most recently the Deputy Director of the Arlington County (Virginia) Department of Human Services and has over 30 years of experience in social service programs and brings national experience in serving clients in need and integrating services. She replaces Edmund Smith who was the interim director for the department since November 2012.

CWS has achieved significant improvements in numerous areas since our last SIP update. According to the most recent U. C. Berkeley Center for Social Services Research¹ quarterly report (April 2014, Data extract: Q4 2013) we have improved our outcomes in each of the following SIP goals;

- **S1.1 No Recurrence of Maltreatment.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 91.1%. In our last SIP update we were at 95.6%. Since then our rate has slipped to 94.3% which is just slightly less than the national standard/goal of 94.6%. **2014 Update:** During this past year, CWS has had three different intake workers taking child abuse reports and entering them into CWS. Two of the intake workers were experienced social workers who transferred into ER and the other was a social worker who was hired into Adult Protective Services as an

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

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

intake worker who answered both APS and CWS abuse reports. These social workers were new to entering referrals into CWS/CMS and needed to be trained regarding associating referrals so as to not create duplicate referrals. As a result, CWS slipped from 95.6% to 94.3% which is a difference of 1.3% and is likely the result of errors in data entry by intake screeners. CWS will continue to train the intake worker and the on-call social workers to accurately associate referrals if a report is a duplicate report. Additionally, CWS continues to utilize Safety Organized Practice (SOP) to develop safety plans with families. With continued training and experience, CWS expects that the safety plans that are created will be stronger which will result in an increase in no recurrence of maltreatment.

- **C1.3 Reunification Within 12 Months.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 45.5%. In our last SIP update we had fluctuated between a high of 45.5% and a low of 31.3% with the rate at the writing of the last SIP at 48.9%. Since then our performance has slipped to our current rate of 32% which is below the national standard of 48.4%. **2014 Update:** CWS believes that the fluctuation between the high of 45.5% and the low of 31.3% is likely due to the fact that the Court prefers to reunify children with their parents when the children are on break from school (i.e. December/January or June/July/August). This practice negatively impacts reunifications within 12 months.
- **C1.4 Re-entry Following Reunification.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 7.7%. We continue to have dramatic improvement in this area over the course of the last 3 years. At the time of writing of our last SIP our performance was at 12.2% which at that time was an improvement from previous years. **2014 Update:** Our current rate of 9.9% meets the national standard.
- **Quality Assurance/Improvement Process.** Our baseline data for outcome measure 2C from Q2 of 2010 was 93.6%. In our last SIP we identified outcome measure 2C – Timely Social Worker Visits as needing improvement and were looking at methods to improve our outcomes. Since then this outcome measure has been renamed and is now 2F- Timely Monthly Caseworker Visits and 2F- Timely Monthly Caseworker Visits in Residence. **2014 Update:** Our current rates are 93.6% and 71.2% respectively and both of these outcome measures exceed the national standard/goal.

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

- **Quality Assurance/Improvement Process.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 97.1%. In our last SIP we identified outcome measure 2B – Timely Response (10 day) Compliance as needing improvement and were looking at methods to improve our outcomes through Quality Assurance and Improvement processes. We have worked hard over the last year to implement meaningful changes that will impact this measure and our current rate is at 93.8% which is a significant improvement from our last SIP update where the rate was 76.3%. **2014 Update:** During this past year, ER implemented a requirement for all first attempt on the investigations to occur within the first five days. Additionally, CWS continues to train all social workers who are on-call to correctly enter the contacts for referrals as investigate referral versus deliver service to client to correctly document the type of client contact.

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

Juvenile Probation

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

- **C 1.1 Reunification Within 12 Months.** In our last SIP, we reported a rate of 100%. **2014 Update:** Since then our rate has lowered to 80%, which is 4.8% above the federal standard of 75.2%. This shows some minors in placement have taken longer to reunify during this year. However, the rate of reunification within 12 months is still above the national average.
- **C1.2 Median Time to Reunification.** In our last SIP, we reported a rate of 12 months. **2014 Update:** For this SIP, it was 6.8 months, which was 1.4 months above the national goal of 5.4 months. This means the court is reunifying the youth with their families sooner than the prior year.
- **C1.3 Reunification Within 12 Months.** In the prior SIP, a rate of 20% was reported. **2014 Update:** A current rate of 33.3% is reported, which is 15.1% below the federal standard of 48.4%. This number indicates minors are being reunified slower than the national goal.
- **C1.4 Rate of Reentry Following Reunification.** The data from the last SIP was 20%. **2014 Update:** Our current data is 100%, which is 90.1% above the national goal of 9.9%. This would suggest that due to minors being reunified more quickly, they are coming back into custody after reentry. There was one minor who returned to custody following reunification, therefore the one minor who was detained for a technical violation of probation and a brief detention, raised the percentage to 100%.
- **C4.1 Placement Stability for Children in Care 8 days to 12 months.** The data from our prior SIP was 83.3%. **2014 Update:** During the current reporting period, the rate has increased to 100%, which is 14% above the federal standard of 86%. This indicates more stability for minors in placement during the first year of placement.
- **C4.2 Placement Stability for Children in Care 12 to 24 months.** During the prior SIP, the department's rate was 50%. **2014 Update:** The current rate is 100%, which is 34.6% above the federal goal of 65.4%. This indicates more stability for our youth in placement during the timeframe of 12 to 24 months.
- **C4.3 Placement Stability for Children in Care at least 24 months.** For the data reported in the 2013 SIP, we reported 50%. **2014 Update:** However, in this SIP, we reported 0%, which is 41.8% below the federal standard of 41.8%. The reason for this is Yolo County Probation has no minors in placement longer than 24 months during this reporting period.

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

Strategies Status

CWS

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

S1.1 – No Recurrence of Maltreatment

Strategy 1: Develop resources for drug and alcohol treatment and parenting classes when a case is not opened.

Action Steps:

C. Evaluate the effectiveness of contracted services. If effective, should see a reduction in referral and recurrence rates.

- **2014 Update:** Outcome measures were evaluated as part of the FY 2014-2015 contract renewal/extension process. Some providers are not meeting contract requirements. CWS is working with those providers to meet the standards and if performance does not change during this FY, we will utilize alternative providers.

Strategy 2: Expand and enhance differential response (DR) services.

Action Steps:

B. Assess and monitor the current DR process through observation and discussion via meetings with staff and vendor. Determine policy and procedure changes and identify necessary resources.

- **2014 Update:** We continue to use PSSF/CAPIT funding to contract with one of our community partners to provide Differential Response (DR) services to Path 2 families. Services include parent education, family counseling and substance abuse treatment services. We continue to work with our provider to better track services provided and outcomes. Clients have not engaged in DR as anticipated. As a result, CWS has recently implemented joint visits between the DR worker and the ER social worker to facilitate their engagement in DR. Since this is a new practice, CWS will reevaluate the effectiveness of this approach.

Strategy 3: Initiate an evidence based prevention program for child abuse referrals.

Action Steps:

A. Research and identify an evidence based program that addresses the needs of the targeted children and their families.

- **2014 Update:** California is developing fidelity measures and tracking tools to be utilized to monitor and assess the effectiveness of Safety Organized Practice (SOP).

B. Establish a workgroup to assess needs, resources, and disproportionality for the county's African-American children and families.

- **2014 Update:** CWS continually analyzes outcomes and data for this population and has found that disproportionality does not exist. CWS will continue to monitor and analyze this data.

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

- C. Develop policy, procedure and contracts as needed to implement program.
- **2014 Update:** We are recruiting for an analyst to assist in the effort to develop policies and procedures throughout all areas of Child Welfare.
- D. Develop and conduct targeted training to implement program.
- **2014 Update:** Staff continue to be trained and gain experience in utilizing SOP in the field. New staff will be trained as they are hired.
- E. Monitor to ensure compliance by reviewing monthly data at the staff and supervisor's meeting.
- **2014 Update:** We continue to monitor the utilization of SOP tools during staff meetings and individual supervision.

C1.3 and C1.4 – Reunification and Re-Entry

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

Action Steps:

- A. Develop and conduct training specific to Structured Decision Making (SDM) policy changes as a result of the enhanced monitoring.
- **2014 update:** We have continued to focus our efforts on the use of the full spectrum of SDM tools including Risk and Safety, Strengths and Needs as well as the Reunification tool. Further efforts will focus on supporting consistent use throughout the life of the case and monitoring the entire spectrum of tool use in individual staff supervision. Additionally, Supervisors are using staff meetings to train and reinforce the use of SMD tools. Furthermore, of the 30 social workers at CWS, 17 are new employees within the last 26 months. 13 of the 30 social workers have been with CWS six years or longer, yet are new to vertical case management. This translates into a workforce that is largely unfamiliar with parts of SDM. The new staff will receive SDM training as part of CORE and are also being trained during supervision by their supervisors. The remaining staff are also being trained on the parts of SDM that are new to them. CWS is planning to arrange for an SDM training for all staff to occur at the CWS office during the 4th quarter.
- B. Monitor via monthly supervisory staffing and supervisor's meetings.
- **2014 Update:** Supervisors continue to review SafeMeasures data with staff during supervision and at unit meetings which tracks the usage of SDM on each case.

Strategy 2: 2012 Update: The Division has made the decision to implement Safety Organized Practice and not team decision making.

Action Steps:

- B. Identify target population and needed resources for implementation of a team decision making process.
- **2014 Update:** CWS continues to use SOP as the model of team decision making. Social workers are facilitating family meetings with parents, family members, children (as appropriate), friends/support people, and service providers to use a team approach to identify worries, strengths, next steps and safety plans. CWS is working toward the goal of having a family meeting prior to removal, prior to reunification, and prior to case closure on each CWS case.

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARRATIVE

Also, all referrals and cases are transferred with a harm and danger statement and safety goals. Additionally, CWS attended the statewide SOP Convening in July 2014 and two supervisors continue to participate in the Champions of SOP Coaching Model for staff supervision.

- C. Develop policies and procedures for implementing team decision making including project evaluation and staff training.
- **2014 Update.** CWS is currently recruiting for an analyst to assist in developing policy and procedures.

Quality Assurance/Improvement Process: 2C – Timely Social Worker Visits

Strategy 1 Analyze data issues affecting compliance in outcome measure 2C Timely Social Worker Visits.

Action Steps:

- A. Review monthly reports on compliance by unit and worker.
- **2014 Update:** Supervisors continue to review data in SafeMeasures at individual staff meetings on a monthly basis.
- B. Analyze barriers to data entry for workers.
- **2014 Update:** CWS has noticed numerous data entry errors which can impact the accuracy of the data extracted from CWS/CMS for analysis. Supervisors continue to monitor data entry and train staff on accurately documenting their work and outcomes in CWS/CMS.
- C. Report back to supervisors and managers about findings of analysis. Identify structural solutions.
- **2014 Update:** The Monterey County process was not implemented due to a change in Division Managers. However, we now run a report at the end of the month for supervisors to review with staff to ensure that data is entered timely and accurately.
- D. Train supervisors and social workers on effective ways to use SafeMeasures to track compliance.
- **2014 Update:** Staff are required to bring SafeMeasures printouts for their caseload to supervision for review with supervisor for compliance. Additionally, five of our staff are attending the SafeMeasures 5 training in December 2014. They will support cross training with their peers.
- E. Integrate worker compliance into employee evaluation system.
- **2014 Update:** Compliance statistics are consistently addressed in employee evaluations.

Quality Assurance/Improvement Process: 2B – 10 Day Response Compliance

Strategy 1: Improve accountability system for data entry of investigations and visits.

Action Steps:

- A. Communicate importance of data entry of investigations and visits to staff, emphasizing the relevance to child safety.
- **2014 Update:** Due to the newness of staff, we continue to train all staff for after-hours data entry and new ER staff to ensure that "Investigate Referral" is selected as the contact purpose as well as selecting all of the participants that participated in the meeting/interview/conversation.

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

- B. Discuss cases out of compliance at every staff supervision meeting.
- C. Integrate worker compliance into employee evaluation system.
- D. Implement requirement to make first contact attempts within 5 days and second attempt within 10 days to ensure 10 day compliance is met.
- E. Staff are required to enter contact notes on investigations within 5 days.
 - **2014 Update for B, C, D, and E:** These steps have all been implemented and continue to be requirements. Our current performance is 93.8%.

Juvenile Probation

The Probation Department is under the direction of Chief Probation Officer. Brent D. Cardall. Marlon Yarber, resigned his position as Assistant Chief. Ray Simmons was appointed as Interim Assistant Chief Probation Officer and eventually hired for the position. Shaunda Cruz, Program Manager, was rotated out of the position, replaced by Program Manager, Craigus Thompson. Thompson left the department and was followed by two Interim Program Managers. Upon completion of the interim rotations, Jeff Goldman was the Program Manager assigned to the Juvenile Field Supervision Unit and Placement, while Shaunda Cruz was the Program Manager assigned to the Juvenile Court and Intake Unit. Effective July 1, 2014, the Program Manager Positions will be eliminated and the Probation Supervisors will report directly to the Assistant Chief Probation Officer. There have been no changes to the Probation Supervisor, although there was an Interim Probation Supervisor for six weeks.

The Probation Department previously had two fully trained Placement Officers. Due to rotation of staff within the department, one of the trained staff left the Juvenile Division. The principal Placement Officer supervises youth in group home placement, foster care placement, NREFM placement, wraparound services and extended foster care. For the third time in as many years, a Probation Officer has been sent to Placement Officer Core Training. This officer continues to receive training regarding group home placement, foster care placement, and extended foster care. The goal is for the secondary Placement Officer to support the primary Placement Officer as needed. The primary Probation Officer is bi-lingual and fluent in the English-Spanish languages. The Supervising Probation Officer has been sent to Juvenile Probation Placement Supervisor Training.

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

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

Consultation with the UCD Family Resource Center and collaboration with our community partners suggests that the evolution of AB12 remains one of the most

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

significant issues facing both Child Welfare and Probation. As such, ongoing and relevant training remains critical to successful implementation of extended foster care. (Strategy 1, B & C)

Early engagement and advocacy is essential in the educational planning process. Placement Officers support youth and families by providing them with a brochure outlining their educational rights and opportunities, as well as assisting them with referrals to state and local resources such as California Youth Connection, Casey Family Program and California Department of Education. (Strategy 2, E)

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

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

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

- A. Training needs were identified through consultation with Youth Law Center, local ILP Coordinator, and county Foster Care Educational Liaison during the time from of March 2011 to present. This task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is the Assistant Chief, the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officer. **2014 Update:** AB12 remains a training priority, as does family finding and relative foster care. The AB12 Probation Officer meets on a regular basis with the ILP Coordinator and Team to discuss ILP issues regarding county youth. The Placement Officer also receives information from the Placement Advisory Committee regularly and attends the Northern California Placement Committee as the Vice-Chair.
- B. Meet with UCD Resource Center for Family Focused Practice and other recommended training providers to arrange probation staff training during the time from April 2011 to present. This task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is the Assistant Chief, the Placement Supervisor, the Placement Probation Officers and the Probation Training Coordinator. The Placement Supervisor and Placement Officers maintain regular contact with Resource Center for Family-Focused Practice for the purpose of identifying training needs and opportunities. **2014 Update:** During this past year, UCD Resource Center provided updated CWS/CMS training for the Yolo County Probation Department pertaining to the Placement Module of the CWS/CMS system, as this was a need identified by the department.
- C. Probation staff shall attend a minimum of 16-hours of advanced training as identified through consultation during the timeframe of March 2012 to present.

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

This task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. The Placement Supervisor and Placement Officers attend a minimum of 40 hours of training per year with the majority of that training focused on foster care youth and emerging trends in foster care. **2014 Update:** During this past year, UCD Resource Center provided updated CWS/CMS training for the Yolo County Probation Department pertaining to the Placement Module of the CWS/CMS system, as this was a need identified by the department. Additionally, a Probation Officer attended Probation Officer Placement training during this year.

- D. Review training progress and assess further needs during the time of June 2012 to present. This task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is the Assistant Chief, the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. Formal training evaluations are completed on an annual basis. Additionally, Placement Officers meet with the Placement Supervisor every 90 days to identify potential gaps in training as well as to ensure that established goals and objectives are being met. **2014 Update:** These meetings have been useful in discussing issues such as obtaining social security cards for minors as well as obtaining credit checks for minors. The process of obtaining credit checks has been a joint effort with CWS, which is a new requirement this year.

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

- A. Form an internal workgroup to review current process for early engagement of youth and parent during the timeframe of February 2011 to present. This task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is the Assistant Chief, Placement Supervisor, Court Supervisor and Placement Probation Officers. The work group meets as needed to discuss any procedural changes. **2014 Update:** These discussions occur during the Blue Ribbon Commission meeting, WRAP and MDART, and various other collaborative meetings and occur on a monthly basis. The ongoing conversation of early engagement of youth and parents is discussed within the county by the collaborative partners.
- B. Conduct parent-youth focus group to obtain understanding of their needs and past experiences in the educational engagement and planning process during the time of June 1, 2014 to July 1, 2015. The person responsible is the Assistant Chief, the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. There has not been a sufficient number of youth and parents/guardians available to assemble a focus group. **2014 Update:** This continues to be a problem as historically there have not been enough minors in placement to start a focus group. However this year, the problem has been reversed. The number of placements rose so quickly, that there was not time to stop and start a focus group of those youth with only one placement officer. Additionally, due to the continually changes to the division, there was not a stable back up officer to the placement officer to allow for assistance in this area.
- C. Finalize plan and integrate into Juvenile Division Policies and Procedures Manual during the timeframe of June 1, 2014 to July 1, 2015. The person responsible is the Assistant Chief, the Placement Supervisor, the Court Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. Final processes cannot be integrated into the Juvenile Division Policies and Procedures Manual until all barriers have been

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

overcome. **2014 Update:** While a Juvenile Division Policy and Procedures Manual has been in the process for some time, it has been stalled by the changes within the department. It is the hope that during the next year, this project will resume and this goal can be met.

- D. Develop an internal youth education assessment form and research career exploration tool to be used in conjunction with the TILP and case planning process. The timeframe is June 1, 2014 to July 1, 2015. The person responsible is the Assistant Chief, the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. The Probation Department is currently reviewing three potential resources: (1) Career Planning Begins with Assessment: A Guide for Professionals Serving Youth with Educational and Career Development Challenges; (2) Focused Futures Youth Development System Builder; and (3) Age Appropriate Transition Assessment Toolkit. **2014 Update:** Due to the changes within the staffing in the department, this goal has not yet been met. It is a goal to meet this objective in the coming year.
- E. Ensure youth and parents are aware of foster care educational rights and opportunities by developing a brochure outlining education rights and opportunities and create a link to the brochure on Probation Department website. The timeframe is August 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014. The person responsible is the Assistant Chief, Placement Supervisor, Court Supervisor, Placement Probation Officers and Probation IT. A Juvenile Justice Handbook has been completed and is being provided to youth and parents. A link to the handbook has not yet been placed on the Probation Department website. **2014 Update:** There is a link on the Probation Website to the Juvenile Justice Handbook. This discusses the Education Code and the Juvenile Justice System in summary. Although a specific brochure has yet to be made, this does give parents a broad overview of the processes.

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

- A. Attend monthly Regional Placement Committee meetings, ILP meetings, and Placement Advisory Committee meetings during the timeframe of February 2011 to present. This task is completed and ongoing. The person responsible is the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. The Placement Supervisor and Placement Officers continue to attend NCPC, PAC, ILP and AB12 meetings as scheduled. **2014 Update:** The Placement Supervisor partnered with the Program Manager from DESS and presented the progress of the SIP to the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC). During the presentation, the outcomes of the year and the statistics were shared with the BRC. The collaborative partners were inquisitive as to the numbers and how they relate to the juvenile youth in Yolo County. They also provided suggestions on what ideas could work to assist with improvements during the coming year.
- B. Create a work group with ILP Coordinator and Foster Care Liaison to examine feasibility of establishing a foster care educational advocacy consortium during the timeframe of April 30, 2013 to present. This task is completed. The person responsible is the Assistant Chief, the Placement Supervisor and the Placement Probation Officers. The ILP Community Partners Group continues to meet on a monthly basis. Members include: Yolo County Office of Education; Court Approved Special Advocate (CASA); Probation; CWS; Woodland Community

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARRATIVE

College Foster & Kinship Care Education; and California Youth Connection.

2014 Update: The placement probation officer has become a part of the ILP Community Partners group and attends meetings on a regular basis. Ideas for resources and services are gained from attending these meetings.

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

Barriers to Implementation

CWS

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

- While we are a Linkages county and partner with the CalWORKs (CW) side of our department to coordinate services to crossover families with open child welfare and CW cases we struggle to use CW funding for mental health treatment and services. We have developed a number of contracts for substance abuse treatment services in partnership with CW and identify crossover clients in order to coordinate services and utilize the best funding streams for those services. In 2013/14 we will work with CW to add funding for mental health treatment and services for those crossover clients. **2014 Update:** We have added CW funding to numerous contracts for both substance abuse treatment and for mental health services. We are strengthening our collaborative partnership with CW staff and communication has improved.
- Implementation of a vertical case management model began in 2013. The intent of this practice model is to provide relationship based child welfare services as a best practice model. Vertical case management promotes continuity of services with a single caseworker handling cases as they enter the system, family maintenance, family reunification and permanency planning. This model will reduce the number of social worker changes that a family experiences, lessen service gaps, and create a more streamlined process. Practice of this case management model has been difficult for many staff that have specialized in one service component and are now required to learn new service components and the varied work associated with that service component. For example, a social worker that has worked in family maintenance (FM) for years is now taking new cases after the detention hearing and learning the court processes in addition to carrying his/her existing FM cases. **2014 Update:** We continue to work on the process to determine the best time to move cases from the investigative and

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

court unit to an ongoing social worker. Staff training needs continue to be identified and addressed by either individual training with supervisors or mentoring with other social workers who have that particular skill set.

- The juvenile dependency court continues to present barriers for staff and negatively impacts our outcomes in the composite areas of reunification, adoption and long term care. Social workers are required to spend numerous hours in the court room for special interim reports and continuances which then equates into additional court reports and time away from case management and best practice social work. **2014 Update:** By implementing a court social worker we have been able to free case carrying social workers from court responsibilities and increase the amount of time they are able to spend with their families. The number of interim hearings has actually increased, but the court social worker ensures that the court can have frequent updates about the status of the family without impacting the workload of each case carrying social worker. Having a court social worker has also improved communication between our agency and the court, and helped to promote consistency in reports and documentation that we provide to the court.

Juvenile Probation

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

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

During the prior reporting period there had not been a sufficient number of youth and parents/guardians available to assemble a focus group. The Probation Department was in the process of determining whether it would be advantageous to incentivize this strategy in hopes of increasing participation.

However, during the past year, the number of minors in placement rose significantly. This was in part due to a rise in out of home placements resulting from dispositions ordered from the Juvenile Court. The rise of out of home placements coupled with the constant change in staffing has created instability, which has again added a roadblock to assembling a focus group. Now that the numbers are no longer a problem, it will be looked at in the future year.

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

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

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

Other Successes/Promising Practices

CWS

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

- In 2012 the CWS division implemented weekly case staffing meetings where the Division Manager and Social Worker Supervisors are available to meet with staff to review cases and provide a team recommendation on complex case-specific issues. These staffings are now held twice weekly and include staffing cases for services such as Wraparound, Therapeutic Behavioral Services (TBS), Community Based Services (CBS), and Katie A appropriateness and referral. **2014 Update:** These case staffings continue to occur and have benefited staff, supervisors and ultimately our children and families.
- We continue to be a Linkages county and partner with the CalWORKs (CW) side of our department to coordinate services to families with open CW and child welfare cases. We have developed a number of contracts for substance abuse treatment services in partnership with CW and identify crossover clients in order to coordinate services and utilize the best funding streams for those services. In 2013 we worked with CW to add funding for mental health treatment and services for those crossover clients. **2014 Update:** CW funding has been further increased for the 2014/2015 fiscal year to numerous substance abuse treatment and mental health services contracts. Additionally, CW has fully implemented Family Stabilization for Path 1 and Path 2 families. ER social workers send a referral to CW Family Stabilization when a family is identified as Path 1 and Path 2 and is identified as a CW client. This ensures that families receive access to needed services even when they do not have an open CWS case.
- We continue to use the Family Life Skills Partnership (FLSP) program: We contract with 2 community partners to provide services. CommuniCare Health Centers, Inc. provides the parenting program and EMQ Families First provides the independent living skills program. This two-pronged service supports families to develop;
 - Independent living skills in areas they've identified needing assistance (for example; cleaning house, nutrition, job searching, budgeting, social skills, family planning, problem solving, accessing community resources, developing goals, etc.) and
 - Parenting skills specific to the needs of the child(ren) in their care (for example; appropriate discipline, age appropriate development, and developing specific skills to meet the specific needs of a child).

2014 Update: Effective with the 2014/15 fiscal year CommuniCare Health Centers, Inc. is the sole provider for the FLSP program. FLSP continues to be

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

utilized to help parents learn the skills necessary to safely parent and protect their children which lead to improved outcomes in reunification.

- We continue to provide the Voluntary Family Maintenance (VFM) program: the social worker sees each participant in the case at least three times each month, and maintains an equally high level of contact with all service providers. When appropriate, SOP is used as a strategy to help the family create natural supports and facilitate safety for the child. **2014 Update:** CWS has one dedicated FTE for the VFM program who is fully trained in SOP and holds family meetings for every VFM case. CWS would like to expand the VFM program in the future to include an additional FTE.
- In July 2012 we implemented a Court Officer position. This social worker attends court hearings for FM, FR and PP staff and the intent is to reduce the amount of time individual staff spend in court thus freeing up time for best practice social work. Due to staffing shortages one of the Social Worker Supervisor's has been filling this role for most of 2013. With the implementation of the Court Officer position in 2012, the division has been able to present a consistent face and message in court with the desire to move the court process along more quickly and decrease the number of court continuances which in turn delays termination of parental rights and the ability to move kids into permanency. Even with the court officer the juvenile dependency court continues to present barriers for staff and negatively impacts our outcomes in the composite areas of reunification, adoption and long term care.
- Beginning in calendar year 2011 the CWS Division began taking a new approach to substance abuse treatment. In the past, authorization for substance abuse treatment would be authorized for 30 days and in some cases 60 days. The outcomes that we achieved had been less than expected with the individuals participating in these short term treatment programs. We are now authorizing treatment in 30 day increments up to 90 and in some cases 120 days for individuals who are in need of such treatment. We are seeing improved success for individuals participating in these longer treatment programs which in turn have translated into improved success in our reunification efforts and re-entry rates.
- We will hire and train new social work staff this year for a placement unit and an older youth/young adult unit. One Social Worker Practitioner and four Child Welfare Services workers were hired in Fiscal Year 2013/14. These new staff;
 - Staff a placement unit with clerical support to conduct relative home studies, family finding and placement activities
 - Provide appropriate services and supports to better prepare young adults for the transition to adulthood.

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

2014 Update: We currently have two Child Welfare Workers and two social worker practitioners in our Transitional Age Youth unit. We have also moved

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

slightly younger youth (down to age 15, primarily) onto these caseloads if their permanent plan is Planned Permanent Living Arrangements to help them work on self-sufficiency earlier. Of note; about 75% of our youth who could have graduated from high school did so in June 2014, and the state average is 45%. Of our graduates, 90% went on to an academic institution (including several 4 year universities) and 10% were working to obtain employment.

We currently have one Child Welfare Worker assigned to relative assessments, one Office Support Specialist dedicated to placement searches and one Office Support Specialist who is primarily responsible for Family Finding. With the addition of the relative assessment worker this has resulted in an increased in first placements with relatives, an increase in all relative placements, and annual relative reassessments are completed timely. Currently, 20.3% of children in foster care are first placed with a relative which is a 107.6% increase over the 2013-2014 year. Additionally, 25.7% of children are placed with a relative which is an increase of 5.8% over the past year.

We added three social worker positions to the 2014/15 department budget and will be asking for three more in September 2014 when we go back to the Board of Supervisors.

Juvenile Probation

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

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

2014 Update: Since the inception of AB12, the Probation Department has seen an increase in youth who want to remain under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court as Non-Minor Dependents. Placement Officers are identifying potential AB12 youth earlier in the delinquency process and ensuring that they receive information and guidance to program enrollment and participation. Placement Officers also work diligently with youth to keep them qualified and engaged in extended foster care services.

Outcome Measures not meeting State/National Standards

CWS

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

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

- **C2.1 Adoption Within 24 Months.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 10.0%. In Q1 2012 we were close to the standard of 36.6% with our rate of 34.6%. Since then we have gone up and down and are currently at 21.1% which is an increase from our baseline data. We attribute some of this to;
 - Yolo County does not do its own adoptions. We have historically contracted with CDSS-Adoptions to do this function for us. Even after 2011 Realignment we continue to contract with CDSS-Adoptions for this function. CDSS-Adoptions had been short staffed for the last year which has resulted in delays in finalizing adoptions.
 - In a majority of cases where the Social Worker has recommended ceasing services at the six and twelve month hearings the court has ordered further services. This practice by the court negatively impacts our outcomes in this area as well as several other areas.
 - We are seeing more adopted children coming back into the CWS system due to significant mental health needs that adoptive parents are not willing/able to handle. This has impacted our outcomes in this area.
- **C2.2 Median Time to Adoption (Exit Cohort).** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 35.8%. Our current rate is 42% which is significantly lower than the national standard of 27.3%. We attribute our performance to the same reasons as cited for measure C2.1.
- **C2.4 Legally Free Within Six Months (17 Months in Care).** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 6.0%. Our current rate is 5.6% which is significantly lower than the national standard of 10.9%. We attribute our performance to the same reasons as cited for measure C2.1.
- **C2.5 Adoption Within 12 Months.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 41.7%. Our current rate is 50% which is close to the national standard of 53.7%. We attribute our performance to the same reasons as cited for measure C2.1 above.
- **C3.3 In Care 3 Years or Longer.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 64.7%. The national standard for this measure is 37.5% and we are currently at 57.1% and have been in this range for the last year.

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

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

- **C4.3 Placement Stability.** Our baseline data from Q2 of 2010 was 28%. The national standard for this measure is 41.8% and our current rate is 24.2%. While

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

we have shown some progress from the last SIP Update where our rate was 24.1%, we are still short of the national standard.

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

- School Connect – A web-based system to assist placement workers in finding the best homes for kids in foster care. It will allow placement workers to search and locate long term and appropriate placements for kids that will best match kids with caregivers in their school of origin thus improving placement stability. **2014 Update:** Placement and clerical staff received training on School Connect in May 2014 and are using it to find best matches for placements.
- The division is implementing a placement unit in November 2013 which will provide more consistency in our placements efforts and outcomes. **2014 Update:** We currently have one Child Welfare Worker assigned to relative assessments, one Office Support Specialist dedicated to placement searches and one Office Support Specialist who is primarily responsible for Family Finding. With the addition of the relative assessment worker this has resulted in an increased in first placements with relatives, an increase in all relative placements, and annual relative reassessments are completed timely. Currently, 20.3% of children in foster care are first placed with a relative which is a 107.6% increase over the 2013-2014 year. Additionally, 25.7% of children are placed with a relative which is an increase of 5.8% over the past year.
- The Katie A. v Bonta lawsuit is prompting the division to develop a screening and assessment tool for children that will allow staff to make better decisions and locate more suitable placements for children. **2014 Update:** The Katie A screening tool has been developed as a collaborative effort between CWS and Yolo County Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health (YCADMH). The screening tool is being utilized by ER to initially screen all children coming into CWS. The completed screen is then submitted by ER to YCADMH for screening by a mental health clinician who then submits the screen to the appropriate level of mental health service. This ensures that all children coming into the CWS system receive a mental health screen and are then referred to the appropriate level of treatment to meet their identified needs.

Juvenile Probation

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

C1.2 Median Time To Reunification. Our data from the 2013 SIP shows the Department's Median Time to Reunification (exit cohort) was 12 months which was double the national goal of 5.4 months. **2014 Update:** During the current year's SIP, the rate is 6.8 months, which is 1.4 months above the national goal of 5.4 months. While the Yolo County Probation Department has yet to reach the national goal, the rate is decreasing and moving closer to the national median time spent towards reunification. This number was possibly affected this past year by several long term youth who were

2014 SIP PROGRESS NARATIVE

placed in group home placements who were determined to have long term needs or were returnees from DJJ and had re-offended upon release.

C1.3 Reunification Within 12 Months. The Probation Department's rate of Reunification within 12 Months (entry cohort) from the 2013 SIP was 20%. **2014 Update:** During the current reporting year, the Department's rate was 33.3%, which was 15.1 % below the federal standard, an increase of 13.3% from last year. This trend shows that reunification is occurring more frequently within the 12 month period for the minors in Yolo County.

C1.4 Reentry Following Reunification. The SIP from 2013 showed The Department's rate of Reentry Following Reunification (exit cohort) increased to 20%, which was 10.1% above the national goal of 9.9%. **2014 Update:** During the current reporting period, the rate increased to 100%, which is 90.1 above the national goal. There was one minor who returned to custody following reunification, therefore the one minor who was detained for a technical violation of probation and a brief detention, raised the percentage to 100%.

2014 State and Federally Mandated Child Welfare/Probation Initiatives

CWS

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

2014 Update: We have developed and are using an assessment tool to screen for mental health services. We meet regularly with the Yolo County Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Department to review cases and our procedures.

Juvenile Probation

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

2014 Update: Probation is participating in weekly telephone calls with CDSS regarding issues surrounding Title IVE. These telephone calls address issues involving claiming, reasonable candidacy, case planning and collaboration throughout the state. Probation is also participating in webinars and other trainings on a regular basis.

5 YEAR SIP CHART CWS

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

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

National Standard: 94.6%

Baseline Data: Q2 2010 - 91.1%

Current Performance: Yolo County's performance on this measure for the time period January 1, 2013 through June 30, 2013 was 94.3% according to the data extracted from Berkeley quarterly report (April 2014-Q4). From a total of 174 children, 164 had no recurrence of maltreatment.

Target Improvement Goal 1: Maintain our performance at or above the national standard for the remainder of the 5 year SIP. Update 2014: Maintain or improve our performance in this area over the next year.

Target Improvement Goal 2: Utilize Safety Organized Practice (SOP) at the earliest possible moment in the case to improve outcomes for all children and families. 2014 Update: Continue to utilize SOP as indicated above.

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

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

National Standard: 48.4%

Baseline Data: Q2 2010 - 45.5%

Current Performance: Yolo County's performance on this measure for the time period July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012 was 32% according to the data extracted from Berkeley quarterly report (April 2014-Q4). From a total of 50 children, 16 were reunified within 12 months.

Target Improvement Goal 1: Maintain our current performance for the remainder of the 5 year SIP. 2014 Update: Increase our performance over the next year.

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

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

National Standard: 9.9%

Baseline Data: Q2 2010 – 7.7%

Current Performance: Yolo County's performance on this measure for the time period January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012 was 9.9% according to the data extracted from Berkeley quarterly report (April 2014-Q4). From a total of 81 children, 8 reentered foster care within 12

5 YEAR SIP CHART CWS

months.

Target Improvement Goal 1: Maintain our current performance for the remainder of the 5 year SIP. 2014 Update: Maintain or improve our current performance in this area.

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

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

2B – 10 Day Response Compliance

National Standard: N/A

Baseline Data: Q2 2010 – 97.1%

Current Performance: 93.8%

Target Improvement Goal 1: Improve our outcomes in this area by 10% over the next year. 2014 Update: Maintain our current performance in this area.

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

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

2C – Timely Social Worker Visits. This category has been renamed since the SIP was written in 2011 and is now 2F – Timely Monthly Caseworker Visits and 2F – Timely Monthly Caseworker Visits in Residence

National Standard: 90% for Timely Monthly Caseworker Visits and 50% for Timely Monthly Caseworker Visits in Residence

Baseline Data: 93.6%

Current Performance: 93.6% for Timely Monthly Caseworker Visits and 71.2% for Timely Monthly Caseworker Visits in Residence.

Target Improvement Goal 1:

2014 Update: Maintain our current performance in this area.

5 YEAR SIP CHART
Probation

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: 8A

National Standard: N/A

Current Performance: unknown

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

5 YEAR SIP CHART CWS

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

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

--	--	--

Strategy 2: Expand and enhance differential response (DR) services.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAPIT <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PSSF <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): No Recurrence of Maltreatment
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Establish a workgroup to review DR policy in order to identify current gaps in services, procedures and/or resources.	February 2011 - Completed	CWS Staff Analysts
B. Assess and monitor the current DR process through observation and discussion via meetings with staff and vendor. Determine policy and procedure changes and identify necessary resources.	April 2011 — Assessment and Monitoring Completed July 2014 – Further assess ER and DR’s ability to conduct joint home visits	Analysts CWS Supervisors
Strategy 3: Initiate an evidence based prevention program for child abuse referrals.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP <input type="checkbox"/> PSSF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): No Recurrence of Maltreatment
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Research and identify an evidence based program that addresses the needs of the targeted children and their families.	March 2011 – Completed and Ongoing	CWS Supervisors Analysts

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

B. Establish a workgroup to assess needs, resources and disproportionately for the county's African-American children and families.	April 2011 – Completed and Ongoing	Analysts CWS Staff/Supervisors Division Manager
C. Develop policy, procedure and contracts as needed to implement program.	September 2012 — Ongoing July 2014	Analysts CWS Staff/Supervisors
D. Develop and conduct targeted training to implement program.	July 2011 - Ongoing	Analysts CWS Supervisors Division Manager
E. Monitor to ensure compliance by reviewing monthly data at the staff and supervisor's meetings.	September 2011 and Ongoing	Analysts CWS Supervisors Division Manager

C1.3 and C1.4 – Reunification and Re-Entry		
Improvement Goal 1: Maintain our performance at or above the national standard for the remainder of the 5 year SIP.		
Strategy 1: Develop a standard procedure for the use of SDM throughout the life of a case to assure comprehensive assessments of family strengths, risk and safety are completed at all stages of case planning.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): C1.3 and C1.4 – Reunification and Re-Entry
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Develop and conduct training specific to SDM policy changes as a result of the enhance monitoring.	July 2011 and ongoing	CWS Supervisors

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

<p>B. Monitor via monthly supervisory staffing and supervisor's meetings.</p>	<p>July 2011 and ongoing</p>	<p>CWS Supervisors Division Manager</p>
--	------------------------------	---

<p>Strategy 2: DESS plans to introduce a team decision making model during 2011-12 as a strategy to engage families and community partners in placement related decisions.</p> <p>2012 Update: The Division has made the decision to implement Safety Organized Practice and not team decision making.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PSSF</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>C1.3 and C1.4 – Reunification and Re-Entry</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT						
<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP						
<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A						
<p>Action Steps:</p>	<p>Timeframe:</p>	<p>Person Responsible:</p>				
<p>A. Research team decision making process as practiced in other counties.</p>	<p>March 2011- Completed</p>	<p>CWS Supervisors Division Manager</p>				
<p>B. Identify target population and needed resources for implementation of a team decision making process.</p>	<p>June 2011 – Completed and Ongoing</p>	<p>CWS Supervisors Division Manager</p>				

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

<p>C. Develop policies and procedures implementing team decision making including project evaluation and staff training.</p>	<p>January 2013 July 2014</p>	<p>Analysts CWS Supervisors Division Manager</p>
---	-----------------------------------	--

<p>Quality Assurance/Improvement Process</p>		
<p>Improvement Goal: Maintain our current performance for the remainder of the 5 year SIP.</p>		
<p>Strategy 1: Analyze data issues affecting compliance in outcome measure 2C Timely Social Worker Visits.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP <input type="checkbox"/> PSSF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 2C – Timely Social Worker Visits</p>
<p>Action Steps:</p>	<p>Timeframe:</p>	<p>Person Responsible:</p>
<p>A. Review monthly reports on compliance by unit and worker.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Analysts CWS Supervisors</p>
<p>B. Analyze barriers to data entry for workers.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Analysts CWS Supervisors</p>
<p>C. Report back to supervisors and managers about findings of analysis. Identify structural solutions.</p>	<p>July 2011 and Ongoing</p>	<p>Analysts CWS Supervisors Division Manager</p>

5 YEAR SIP CHART CWS

D. Train supervisors and social workers on effective ways to use SafeMeasures to track compliance.	July 2012 and Ongoing	CWS Supervisors
E. Integrate worker compliance into employee Evaluation system.	January 2013 and Ongoing	Division Manager CWS Supervisors

Quality Assurance/Improvement Process		
Improvement Goal: Improve our outcomes in this area by 10% over the next year.		
Strategy 1: Improve accountability system for data entry of investigations and visits.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 2B – 10 Day Response Compliance
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Communicate importance of data entry of investigations and visits to staff, emphasizing the relevance to child safety.	Ongoing	Analysts CWS Supervisors
B. Discuss cases out of compliance at every staff supervision meeting.	Ongoing	CWS Supervisors

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
CWS**

C. Integrate worker compliance into employee Evaluation system.	January 2013 and Ongoing	Division Manager CWS Supervisors
D. Implement requirement to make first contact attempt within 5 days and second attempt within 10 days to ensure 10 day compliance is met.	July 2013 and Ongoing	CWS Supervisors
E. Staff are required to enter contact notes on investigations in 5 days	July 2013 and ongoing	CWS Supervisors

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
PROBATION**

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

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
PROBATION**

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

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

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
PROBATION**

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

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
PROBATION**

<p>Educational and Career Development Challenges; (2) Focused Futures Youth Development System Builder; and (3) Age Appropriate Transition Assessment Toolkit.</p>		
<p>E. Ensure youth and parents are aware of foster care educational rights and opportunities by developing a brochure outlining education rights and opportunities and create a link to the brochure on Probation Department website</p> <p>Update: The brochure has been completed and is being provided to youth and parents. A link to the brochure has not yet been placed on the Probation Department website.</p>	<p>August 1, 2013 December 31, 2013</p>	<p>Division Manager Placement Supervisor Court Supervisor Placement Probation Officers Probation IT</p>

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
PROBATION**

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

**5 YEAR SIP CHART
PROBATION**

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