

California – Child and Family Services Review Signature Sheet

For submittal of: CSA SIP Progress Report

County	Mono
SIP Period Dates	October 11, 2014 – October 11, 2015
Outcome Data Period	Q1 2015

County Child Welfare Agency Director

Name	Kathryn Peterson, MPH
Signature*	
Phone Number	760-924-1763
Mailing Address	PO Box 2969, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

County Chief Probation Officer

Name	Karin Humiston, PhD, MC
Signature*	
Phone Number	760-924-1732
Mailing Address	PO Box 596, Bridgeport, CA 93517

Public Agency Designated to Administer CAPIT and CBCAP

Name	Kathryn Peterson, MPH
Signature*	
Phone Number	760-924-1763
Mailing Address	PO Box 2969, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Board of Supervisors (BOS) Signature

BOS Approval Date	N/A
Name	
Signature*	

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

Contact Information

Child Welfare Agency	Name	Kathryn Peterson, MPH
	Agency	Mono County Social Services
	Phone & E-mail	760-924-1763
	Mailing Address	PO Box 2969, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
Probation Agency	Name	Karin Humiston, PhD, MC
	Agency	Mono County Probation
	Phone & E-mail	760-924-1732
Public Agency Administering CAPIT and CBCAP (if other than Child Welfare)	Mailing Address	PO Box 596, Bridgeport, CA 93517
	Name	Kathryn Peterson, MPH
	Agency	Mono County Social Services
CAPIT Liaison	Phone & E-mail	760-924-1763
	Mailing Address	PO Box 2969, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
	Name	Kathryn Peterson, MPH
CBCAP Liaison	Agency	Mono County Social Services
	Phone & E-mail	760-924-1763
	Mailing Address	PO Box 2969, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
PSSF Liaison	Name	Kathryn Peterson, MPH
	Agency	Mono County Social Services
	Phone & E-mail	760-924-1763
	Mailing Address	PO Box 2969, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

California - Child and Family Services Review

Annual SIP Progress Report

OCTOBER 11, 2014 – OCTOBER 11, 2015



Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	PAGE 2
SIP NARRATIVE	PAGE 2
STATE AND FEDERALLY MANDATED CHILD WELFARE/PROBATION INITIATIVES.....	PAGE 16
ATTACHMENTS	
FIVE-YEAR SIP CHART UPDATE	ATTACHMENT 1
PRIORITY OUTCOME MEASURES CWS 2015 Q1 EXTRACT TABLE.....	ATTACHMENT 2
FOSTER HOME OUTREACH.....	ATTACHMENT 3

Introduction

This Mono County System Improvement Plan (SIP) Annual Progress Report is the second annual review of our 2013-2018 SIP and will provide an update on the status and effectiveness of our chosen strategies, and improvement towards the identified outcome measures. The 2013-2018 SIP was approved by the Board of Supervisors on March 11, 2014 and outlines strategies that the Mono County Child Welfare Services (CWS) and Mono County Juvenile Probation (JPD) Departments plan to implement over this five year period. Since the approval of the SIP, Mono County Probation and Child Welfare Services Departments have been working on implementing the strategies to improve outcomes for children in our county. The departments have also been reviewing the effectiveness of our SIP by monitoring quarterly outcome data along with actively engaging in the action steps of the strategies.

Baseline data was taken from UC Berkeley's Quarter 1 2013 data extract to create the county's SIP and improvement strategies. This baseline data will be compared in this progress report with the most recent UC Berkeley data for 2015 Quarter 1 extract. For CWS, the current data shows that there have been no children who fit the criteria for the outcome measures focused on in this reporting period.

In the last year, the Probation Department has continued the implementation of the SIP. The Probation Department continues to work on the action steps outlined for the 2015 strategies timeline. In an effort to identify viable research there has been a delay in acquiring data, however the upcoming quarter will be dedicated to academic research. Due to this variable the Probation Department is slightly behind the timeline. A few dates will be modified, but the overall timeline will be accomplished. The Probation Department continues to collaborate with the community and partner agencies to ensure services are improved in the specific area of youth exit to permanency and transition to adulthood.

SIP Progress Narrative

STAKEHOLDERS PARTICIPATION

CWS:

In the second year of implementation, Mono County CWS and JPD, have collaborated with CDSS to monitor the SIP strategies and action steps on a quarterly basis. Informal consultations with important partners who are invested in the wellbeing of youth in our county

occur on a continuous basis. Those partners include: Mono County Behavioral Health, CWS Social Workers, JPD Probation Officers, Community Partners (Wild Iris, IMACA, Foster Parents, Mono County Office of Education, Mammoth Unified School District, First 5 Mono County, and parent partners). Discussions focus on the progress of the implementation of the SIP. The Department incorporates stakeholder participation into existing meetings such as Multi Disciplinary Team Meetings (bi-weekly), Katie A Collaborative Meetings (quarterly), and Child Abuse and Prevention Council (CAPC) Meetings (quarterly) and Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC). Discussions focus on the progress of the implementation of the SIP. These meetings are attended by some of the various stakeholder groups named above that participated in our County Self Assessment. Information-sharing and feedback for improvement takes place within these meetings with the various stakeholders, with a focus on our performance measures, outcomes, and our strategies progress. The next stakeholder meeting will be with the Mono County CAPC in September 2015.

Probation:

As described in the SIP, the Probation Department continues to have stakeholder participation and collaboration with various community organizations including tribes, social workers, schools, legal counsel, behavioral health, public health, and alcohol and drug counselors, law enforcement, and youth. Probation Officers engage in community meetings on a regular basis. These include Student Attendance Review Board (SARB), Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT), Child Abuse Prevention Council (CAPC) and Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC). The JJCC continues to be the committee identified in strategy 8.

CURRENT PERFORMANCE TOWARDS SIP IMPROVEMENT GOALS

CWS Focus Outcome Measures:

According to the data from the Berkeley Dynamic Reporting System from 2015 Quarter 1 extract, Mono County has had only 2 children who met the criteria for any of the C1 measures. According to the CWS Supervisor, however, there were 6 children detained and in foster care during the first quarter period. The reason for the discrepancy between the Department's internal data and the UC Berkeley data is most likely the result of delays in data entry. During this review period, the CWS unit suffered several losses in social worker staff creating a situation for the CWS Supervisor in which she was required to cover routine emergency response, write Court reports, and train new inexperienced staff. In July, 2015, the Department hired a Program Manager who is presently taking responsibility for review of Safe Measures data and supporting the CWS Supervisor in this aspect of her job; ensuring that Safe Measures data matches actual caseloads reflected in CWS-CMS. By December 30, 2015, the Department expects to be caught up on data-entry. In the SIP baseline data from Quarter 1 2013, there were zero children in any of the C1 measures.

Mono County performance rates do not always provide an accurate picture of the services provided, due to the very small number of children in care in Mono County. Such small sample sizes (e.g. only two foster children in care) yield insufficient data to predict true changes in trends.

CFSR C1.1 Reunification Within 12 Months (Exit Cohort).

Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification during the year who had been in foster care for 8 days or longer, what percent were reunified in less than 12 months from the date of the latest removal from home?

The denominator is the total number of children who exited foster care to reunification during the specified year; the numerator is the count of exiting children who were reunified in less than 12 months.

As reflected in the Attachment #2 table there were no children who met the criteria in the denominator for this measure.

CFSR C1.2 Median Time to Reunification (Exit Cohort).

Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification during the year who had been in foster care for 8 days or longer, what was the median length of stay (in months) from the date of latest removal from home until the date of discharge to reunification?

As reflected in the Attachment #2 table there were no children who met the criteria in the denominator for this measure.

CFSR C1.3 Reunification Within 12 Months (Entry Cohort).

Of all children entering foster care for the first time in the 6-month period who remained in foster care for 8 days or longer, what percent were discharged from foster care to reunification in less than 12 months from the date of latest removal from home?

As reflected in the Attachment #2 table there was one child who met the criteria in the denominator for this measure. This child had been removed and placed in a NREFM home. Upon successful completion of services on the part of the parents, the child was returned home and WRAP services were put in place. At present, the child remains in Family Maintenance. ~~This data does not match the caseload information available to the Department.~~

CFSR C1.4 Reentry Following Reunification (Exit Cohort).

Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification during the year, what percent reentered foster care in less than 12 months from the date of the earliest discharge to reunification during the year?

As reflected in the Attachment #2 table there was one child who met the criteria in the denominator for this measure. This child reentered foster care within 12 months of being

discharged from foster care during the period under review. In this scenario, the parent had successfully completed her CWS case plan with Mono County. The Juvenile Court and the Agency assessed the parent to have adequately resolved the problems which had caused the detention of the child. Approximately one year, however, after the Department terminated dependency, the child was re-detained by another county CWS agency in California.

Probation Focus Outcome Measures:

Implement Exit to Permanency and Transition to Adulthood Strategies

Improve services in the transitional plan for every youth exiting placement to permanency and transitioning into adulthood.

There is no National Standard for this outcome measure.

PROBATION DATA ANALYSIS

80% of all cases will be provided consistent services leading to successful transitions of youth to adulthood. The department will build strategies and action steps to include education, employment, housing services, permanent connections, and medical insurance.

Baseline Data: According to the Quarter 1 – 2013 data extract (January 2013 – March 2013), the most recent performance for the 8A measures are 0% of cases. It is important to note that denominator for this measure is zero, which indicates there were no youth for this measure period, and thus the zero percent on the performance measure.

Current Performance: According to the Quarter 1 – 2015 data extract (January 2015 – March 2015) the most recent performance for the 8A measures are 0% of cases. Again, it is important to note that the denominator for this measure is zero, which indicates there were no youth for this measure period. This is the reason for a zero on the performance measure.

Comparing the current performance and baseline data accurately shows there is a very low number of foster youth placed by the Mono County Probation Department. As such, there were no juveniles that qualified for this measure category both in the baseline and current performance.

STATUS OF STRATEGIES

For all action steps under Strategy 1-4 and 6-7, the person responsible has been updated to “Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor”. As of July 2015, Mono County hired a new Program Manager to oversee both Child Welfare and Adult Protective services programs. The Program Manager will therefore be directly responsible along with the Social Worker Supervisor for action items rather than the CWS Director.

Strategy 1: CWS

Strengthen administrative and Social Worker practices.

Action Step Status:

- A. **Conduct quarterly reviews of CWS data, using reports generated from the SafeMeasures program:** Reviews of CWS data- through SafeMeasures- are generated monthly by the Staff Services Analyst for the Department of Social Services and given to the CWS Supervisor and DSS Director for review. Due to staffing issues during this review period, SafeMeasures data was not utilized to its potential, in so far as integrating the data into day-to-day practice issues or improving case management.

As of July 2015, Mono County hired a Program Manager to oversee both Child Welfare Services and Adult Protective Services programs. The Program Manager will be responsible for thoroughly analyzing quarterly SafeMeasures data during the next review period. The Program Manager will use this data to set goals towards improving overall social work practice, supervision of social workers, and timely data-entry into CMS.

- B. **Use findings from quarterly SafeMeasures reviews to identify and address CWS/CMS system training needs:** Upon review of the quarterly SafeMeasures data and through ongoing discussions with the CWS staff, it was determined that training continues to be needed for all new social workers in SafeMeasures and CWS/CMS in order to monitor caseload outcome measures through improving data input and caseload management. This will remain a priority during the next review period as the input of data into CMS continues to be a challenge.
- C. **Use findings from quarterly SafeMeasures reviews to identify and address training needs related to SW monthly contacts with children in family reunification, family maintenance, emergency response, and permanency placement:** A broad range of SafeMeasures and CWS/CMS training topics were provided in the training provided in April 2014: New SafeMeasures Version 5, monthly contacts, family maintenance, emergency response and permanency placement. Quarterly SafeMeasures data reviews will continue to assist in identifying and addressing training needs.
- D. **Conduct yearly Social Worker staff needs assessment to determine gaps in knowledge and practice. Use SafeMeasures 12 month data report to help assess these needs:** Annual social worker staff needs assessment was accomplished by way of daily supervision between the Supervisor and staff and also during weekly staff meetings. Due to the low supervisor to staff ratio (1:3 as of the time of writing this report), the Supervisor has a high level of awareness regarding the gaps in knowledge and/or practice that exist.

During the next review period, the Program Manager will arrange for a more formalized annual needs assessment in collaboration with the CWS Supervisor to ensure training needs get met through weekly supervision and training provided by UC Davis.

E. Mono County Social Services Training Coordinator will arrange training to address needs identified in Action Step D above: A DSS Staff Services Analyst serves as the Training Coordinator for CWS staff in Mono County. The Staff Services Analyst works closely with the CWS supervisor- and more recently the Program Manager- to determine training needs and to schedule trainings accordingly. The majority of training needs are met through the UC Davis Training Academy. The following trainings are scheduled and/or in the process of being scheduled for the 2015-2016 review period: Advocacy in Education, Psychiatry and Psychiatric Medication, Motivational Interviewing, Sexual abuse interviewing, Trauma-Informed Practices, and Striving for a Work-Life Balance.

F. Evaluate effectiveness of SafeMeasures Quarterly Reviews Strategy. Determine whether this method allows for the identification of gaps in Social Worker knowledge, practice, and training needs, and whether the appropriate follow through is initiated and completed.

With the hiring of a Program Manager for CWS, SafeMeasures Quarterly Reviews will become more frequent and thorough. Due to staffing issues, the CWS Supervisor has been unable to conduct formal quarterly reviews on a regular basis. The Supervisor uses monthly data to assist the staff in reminding them to enter data.

In August, 2015, the Program Manager reviewed the most current SafeMeasures data for Mono County which revealed the following three areas which are in need of improvement in terms of timely data-entry:

- 1- Time to Investigation (as to Emergency Response referrals)
- 2- Time of First Actual/Attempted Contact (as to Emergency Response referrals)
- 3- Monthly Face-to-Face Contacts

Timely investigations and monthly contacts take place by and large in Mono County, however, the data and information is not consistently getting entered for various reasons.

Mono County's CWS staff consists of 3 social workers and 1 supervisor who carry a mixed caseload that includes all aspects of child welfare work along with APS, IHHS and Conservatorship cases. Each of these programs have separate databases and data-input requirements. In other words, even though the CWS caseload is relatively smaller than larger counties, social workers in Mono County must have an expertise in many more areas of social work (compared to social workers in larger counties where work duties are more specialized).

As a result, the technical aspects of the job take longer to master, such as learning protocol and data systems for each program.

With a Program Manager in place, the office will have more support and oversight managing the technical aspect of the CWS data input requirements. Internal Policies and Procedures will be updated into order to assure that expectations related to timely data entry are clearly defined.

Additionally, a more thorough analysis of SafeMeasures data will occur during the next review period to gather more information about other areas in need of attention.

H. Explore the creation of a Program Integrity staff position within CWS staffing structure responsible for quality assurance, in an effort to strengthen administrative practices and data reporting. A Staff Services Analyst has successfully completed the certification training to conduct Federal Case Reviews for Mono County CWS. A MOU is being created to provide case review services to Alpine County CWS as well.

I. Independent Living Program Social Worker to create resource manual to help ensure youth receive an array of support services (life skills training, advocacy, mentoring, education and career development, health and safety and financial resources). CWS Supervisor and CDSS Children and Family Services Division representative Carolyn Caton had some initial discussions regarding the creation of an Independent Living Program resource manual. This action step is in the initial stages of development. Presently, there are a few ILP clients on Mono County's caseload. Needs Assessments have been completed with each client. Development of an ILP resource manual will remain a goal for the next review period. A DSS Staff Analyst may be asked to help with this project.

Strategy 2: CWS

Improve Family Finding methods.

Research available Family Finding Tools to be used to locate and connect with family members of foster children. CWS Supervisor has worked in collaboration with the Mono County District Attorney's Office in researching a family finding tool. Additionally, the CWS Supervisor has discussed this issue with neighboring county, Inyo County, which has a larger CWS department and who apparently has access to a Family Findings tool. During the next review period, the Program Manager will set this as a goal to join efforts with both Inyo County CWS and District Attorney's office to see how they can either assist Mono County CWS in Family Findings efforts, or share access to their tools.

Evaluate the effects of tool on creating permanency for out-of-home placements. While an actual tool was not secured or purchased, the Agency had good success during this review period with Family Findings efforts following the detention of 3 siblings in January, 2015. Through persistent, focused efforts on the part of the Department's lead social worker, 22 relatives were located. According to the social worker, this process was "very exciting and the process was very time consuming." In addition to letters and phone calls, she used Nevada state files and some Facebook searches. Facebook has been identified as a useful Family Findings tool and may be explored in the next review period as a more regular option for staff to use.

If applicable, purchase Family Finding Tool and provide training for Child Welfare Services staff. To be determined in the next review period.

Strategy 3: CWS

Enhance reunification system factors through collaboration with county and community partners.

Action Step Status:

- A. Explore and determine desired outcomes of implementing Differential Response Paths.**
- B. Identify Community Partner to participate in Differential Response with CWS.**
- C. Determine whether partnering to implement Differential Response is feasible and has likely potential to achieve desired outcomes.**

The Agency has had good results partnering with community agencies, primarily Wild Iris. Wild Iris is a community-based organization which typically serves victims of Domestic Violence and their families, however, through the development of three separate contracts, Wild Iris is now providing the Agency with a range of services designed to help DSS clients who are in need of supportive and/or preventative services, but who do not rise to the level of a child welfare intervention. This version of differential response (locally referred to as an “alternative response”) has yielded successful results for families and has in some cases prevented the need for a CWS intervention. The alternative response is being utilized by social workers enthusiastically.

Strategy 4: CWS

Improve and enhance Social Worker practices and community resources regarding parent-child interaction/visitation by developing new resources and supports.

Action Step Status:

A-D. The Social Workers already have a good understanding of how visitation works, and due to the detention of several children this year, have become more familiar with the Court issues surrounding visitation for parents in Court Family Reunification services. The data shows two children in foster care during this reporting period. In actuality, there were 6 children in foster care, and now 7 at the time of writing this report.

Visitation efforts have been abundant with social workers coordinating weekly, supervised visitation schedules for both Court and non-Court cases. In the absence of a social worker assistant (SWA) position, social workers often supervise visitation for their own caseloads.

Improvements have been made in this area. First, a new Vocational Trainee has begun to support the visitation process by way of transportation or assisting the social worker to monitor low-risk visitation. Secondly, the Agency developed contracts with Wild Iris to provide the service of supervision for visitation for some CWS clients. These two changes have decreased the burden of supervising visits for the social workers. The CWS Supervisor has years of experience as a social worker and understands the

concepts of graduated visitation (decreasing supervision as cases progress). Visitation policies and procedures are not often referred to by social workers as a point of reference. This is an area that could be improved upon. The Program Manager hired in July, 2015 is being tasked with updating and revising the current Policies and Procedures for child welfare. During the next review period, attention will be given to Visitation, specifically. It appears that social workers have a good understanding of graduated supervision, however, less of an understanding as to how visitation should progress when the Department is moving towards the recommendation of reunification services being terminated.

Strategy 5: CWS

Improve and enhance Social Worker practices and community resources regarding parent-child interaction/visitation by increasing the number of professional supervised visitation providers in the county.

Action Step Status:

All action steps for this strategy were completed in May of 2014. As noted above, the Agency entered into a contract with Wild Iris to provide professional services for the monitoring and supervision of visitation for CWS clients and also clients who are at-risk of entering the child welfare system. This change has enhanced the Department's capacity to ensure quality interaction between children and parents who are in the reunification process and for other families in the community who are at risk of a child welfare intervention and may be experiencing family law/custody issues.

Strategy 6: CWS

Improve and enhance Social Worker practices and community resources regarding parent-child interaction/visitation by implementing Safety-Organized Practice (SOP) within CWS Practice.

Action Step Status:

- A. CWS staff completed the full Safety Organized Practice (SOP) training with UC Davis in July 2014. This included all 12 modules.
- B. CWS continued to have SOP Coaching sessions throughout the early part of 2015 with a UC Davis in house trainer. CWS staff were pleased with the level of training and expertise. These coaching sessions have been successful in assisting the staff with their caseload management. The UC Davis in house trainer conducted a training with CWS, Mono County Behavioral Health and other County Departments staff in October of 2014. The training agenda covered utilizing SOP as tool for working with WRAP families and in the implementation of Katie A.

Method of Evaluation and/or Monitoring:

Feedback on the effectiveness of SOP as a tool for working with Mono County families is collected from staff via staff meetings and electronic communications. Feedback received shows that SOP concepts are useful when working with families that continue to blame others and are resistant to working collaboratively. SOP mappings are facilitated by social workers. According to the CWS Supervisor, more in-house SOP coaching would be useful during the next review period to maintain and advance the practice amongst social workers.

Strategy 7: CWS

Increase the number of Foster Family Homes in Mono County.

Action Step Status:

- A. CWS collaborated with Mono County CAPC and community partner Wild Iris in its recruitment efforts for Foster Parents. Attachment #3 outlines the efforts and outreach which includes ongoing quarterly Orientation Meetings for Foster Parents and advertising through radio, newspaper, flyers and a banner. Attachment #3 is utilized to inform stakeholders such as the County Board of Supervisors and the CAPC of the outreach efforts for foster parents.
- B. Community partners Wild Iris and Mono County CAPC have collaborated with CWS to do foster parent outreach to communities in Mono County.

As of January 2015, two family homes have completed applications and have gone through the initial home inspection by the Fresno Community Care Licensing office. They are both completing the final requirements of becoming licensed homes. Both homes are located in Mammoth Lakes.
- C. Ongoing efforts are being made to coordinate quarterly conference calls with Fresno Community Care Licensing regarding foster/adoption recruitment strategies. This strategy is not a high priority for the office given other, higher priority needs. This strategy will be reevaluated over the next reporting period.

STRATEGY 8: PROBATION

PROBATION STRATEGY 8

Develop a measurable transition and permanency process.

ACTION STEP STATUS

The following includes an update on the action steps taken to date with an emphasis on those outlined in the SIP Matrix completed during the report period. Please refer to the attached SIP Matrix for future timeframes.

C. Committee researches and publishes a report identifying evidence-based best practices and viability in our county.

Research has identified numerous evidence-based practices for youth from other areas of their lives such as the transition of school. However, it appears that there is little to no research

specifically on foster youth transitioning out of foster care. In hopes of finding more research, the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) committee has delayed finalizing a report of evidence-based practices and viability in our county. The committee plans to publish a report of evidence based practices regarding youth transitioning in settings other than foster care that could be extrapolated to be promising practices for youth transitioning out of foster care. This report should be completed by December of 2015.

ANALYSIS

Upon review there appears to be little research specifically of foster youth transitioning into adulthood in evidence-based practices that work best for youth. The most useful resources the committee found that The National Resource Center for Permanency and Family Connections and The National Criminal Justice Reference Service appear to be the most informative for evidence-based practices in transitioning youth out of foster care.

METHOD OF EVALUATION AND/OR MONITORING

Once the JJCC has published the report regarding evidence-based best practices on transition and permanency for probation youth. Policies will need to be developed that will include the method of evaluation, ensuring all actions and measurable dates of compliance.

ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES (WHEN APPLICABLE)

None at this time.

PROGRAM REDUCTION

None at this time.

STRATEGY 9: PROBATION

Development of policy and procedure for transitioning youth and permanency.

ACTION STEP STATUS

The following includes an update on the action steps taken to date with an emphasis on those outlined in the SIP Matrix completed during the report period. Please refer to the attached SIP Matrix for future timeframes.

A. Research similar counties' written Officer's doctrine and pattern and practices.

A state wide county evaluation has been requested through the State Coalition of Probation Organizations (SCOPO) for assistance in further research in policies and procedures. Policies and procedures are being collected from as many counties as possible to assist the development of policies and procedures for the Mono County Probation Department.

B. Prepare draft policy and procedure incorporating collected information and best practices.

The goal for the next quarter is to develop a draft best practices and procedures of current process to be amended by best practices as discovered. The projected date of preparing a draft of policy and procedures will be January of 2016.

ANALYSIS

The committee decided more time is necessary to research evidence-based practices of transitioning youth care. Therefore, preparing the draft policy and procedures has been delayed to incorporate the committee's findings. Both the committee's findings and the policies and

procedures of other counties will be used to guide the policy and procedures that will be developed for Mono County.

METHOD OF EVALUATION AND/OR MONITORING

Policies and procedures will be developed and implemented so that all foster youth transitioning receive consistent services.

ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES (WHEN APPLICABLE)

None at this time.

PROGRAM REDUCTION

None at this time.

OBSTACLES AND BARRIERS TO FUTURE IMPLEMENTATION

Child Welfare Services One of the strategies (#3) identified in the SIP was to improve reunification for children in the CWS system through collaboration of county and community partners in developing a formal Differential Response program. Good progress has been made in this area, however, implementation of this strategy does not directly impact Mono County's Target Improvement Goal of improving and enhancing systemic factors related to *reunification* of children with their families. Thus for the next SIP year, CWS will focus their efforts on those strategies that have a direct impact on our Target Improvement Goal.

Probation

One of the obstacles and barriers to future implementation is the fact that there are no licensed group homes in Mono County for probation foster youth. When a youth requires the services of a group home, the youth must be placed out of county at some distance. This means that youth would need to receive transitional planning services while at a distance. When exploring the best practices, the probation department will need to investigate partnering with resources within the community which youth are placed. In addition, the lack of evidence-based research for transitioning youth from foster care has made it difficult to develop evidence-based practices. In order to create evidence based practices the probation department has to rely on research on youth transitioning from areas other than foster care where there is more research available.

PROMISING PRACTICES/ OTHER SUCCESSES

Child Welfare Services

Katie A implementation over the past year has been successful in improving mental health services to Katie A. subclass members and improving collaborations between the Behavioral Health and CWS departments. WRAP team continues to meet on a regular basis. Social Services and Behavioral Health Departments conducted a cross training for CWS and WRAP

member Agencies on Safety Organized Practice on October 18, 2014. Through this training, WRAP members explored the basic foundational skills of Safety Organized Practice and how to practice it across WRAP agencies to support understanding, collaboration and family growth and development. Specifically, WRAP members learned the elements of conducting a rigorous, balanced assessment; use of interactive relationship building strategies to empower the family to discover and act on their own change; utilize “the voice of the child” with The Three Houses and Safety House; understand the tenant “No Safety Network, No Safety Plan” with Interactive and complex genogramming and building safety networks. Members also learned the definitions and elements of the Consultation and Information Sharing Framework and practiced using it along with fellow agencies for critical thinking and decision making.

As of February 2014, Mono County now has two licensed foster homes and there are two applications filed with the Fresno Community Care Licensing office which are close to being approved. The two new potential homes are also located in Mammoth Lakes. CWS has completed the twelve SOP training modules and this practice is being implemented. Supervised Visitation training has been completed and services are being utilized by families. CWS Department now has assistance from one Staff Services Analyst in quality assurance and CWS is fully staffed with Social Workers at this time. Mono County also benefits from the high level of involvement by our CWS Supervisor and a recently hired Program Manager. Lastly, UC Davis recently met with the DSS Director and CWS Program Manager to outline priorities for coaching needs for this next review period. Families in Mono County’s CWS system receive cohesive support from the beginning to end of their case or involvement with CWS.

Another promising practice for Mono County is that due to our limited resources of foster homes, the CWS department strives do everything possible to support families in keeping children safely at home. Family maintenance as well as doing everything possible to keep children safe and at home is of the utmost importance.

Probation

The Probation Department is actively participating in several multi-agency teams and committees, including JJCC, MDT, SARB, and CAPC. These multi-agency teams and committees help ensure probation foster youth receive the best services available through collaboration. The JJCC will be critical in the further implantation of the SIP, and its members appear ready and willing to assist in identifying and recommending evidence-based best practices and reviewing the viability for Mono County. An additional resource being used is SCOPO to obtain policy and procedures from other counties. The committee has spent a significant amount of time researching evidence-based practices for foster youth. Research and best practices will be imperative when developing police and procedures.

OUTCOME MEASURES NOT MEETING STATE/NATIONAL STANDARDS –

CWS

C2.1, C2.3, C2.4, C2.5 Adoptions

With the small data set available (3 children total), it is difficult to determine a pattern. No children were adopted during this review period. Two children, however, were returned to the care of relatives in a guardianship.

C3.1 Long Term Care

The data set increased from 1 to 3 children during this review period. In review of the caseload information available to the CWS Supervisor and Program Manager, however, only one child fit this criteria for the review period given. This child entered foster care at the age of 11 and remained in long-term foster care until he turned 18. The child was assessed to be not adoptable by State Adoptions. Due to the child's behavioral issues, none of the child's caregivers were willing or able to adopt this child. While permanency was not achieved, the Agency maintained connections between the child and his family members until he turned 18 years old and assisted him to be eligible for AB-12.

C4.1 Placement Stability

Children in placement increased from 1 to 5 during this review period. Of the 5 children reflected in the data, only one child did not meet the criteria for placement stability, therefore decreasing the compliance by 20% in this measure (down from 100% compliance last review period). This is due to the limited options of foster homes in Mono County.

2B Timely Response (Imm, Response Compliance)

According to the Quarter 1 2015 data extract, CWS was 92.3% compliant (up from 76.9% compliant last year). This is the result of the CWS Supervisor giving heightened attention to the importance of assigning referrals right away and monitoring the social workers response times.

2B Timely Response (10 Day Response Compliance)

According to the Quarter 1 2015 data extract, CWS was 75% compliant (slightly down from 82.4% compliance last review period). Upon internal review of caseload, however, the cause for this decrease is due to delays in data entry. It appears that the level of compliance is closer to 90%.

5B (1) Rate of Timely Health Exams

According the Quarter 1-2015 data extract dental exam compliance was 100%, as was true in the previous reporting period. During this review period, however, data entry was up-to-date in reflecting the compliance rate, which was not the case in the previous review.

5B (2) Rate of Timely Dental Exams

According the Quarter 1-2015 data extract dental exam compliance was 0%. In one of these cases, the child is actually an adult- a Non-Minor Dependent (NMD). The NMD is struggling to follow-up on several basic life-skill issues. The social worker recently sent the NMD a letter informing her of the importance of dental care, in terms of staying in compliance with her AB-12 case plan. The social worker has further counseled the NMD during monthly FTF contacts. The other child is in a foster care placement. At the time of writing this report, the dental exam has taken place, according to the social worker.

2B-5B: CWS made efforts to address data entry errors by having the CWS Supervisor review the SafeMeasures reports on a monthly basis instead of a quarterly basis. The CWS Social Workers were also provided with a CWS/CMS three day personalized training that we also hope will help with accurate data entry. During the next review period, the Program Manager will offer added oversight to data entry issues and review SafeMeasures data routinely along with the Supervisor.

Probation

There were no measures that were below State or National standards from the first quarter data extract of 2015. There were no placements during this time period and therefore no data.

State and Federally Mandated Child Welfare/Probation Initiatives

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

KATIE A.

CWS continues to make diligent efforts to implement the Katie A. Settlement Agreement. Planning and implementation has been collaborated through interdepartmental meetings on a regular basis. Presently, cases are reviewed during bi-weekly MDT meetings. The Department currently has two Katie A eligible children who are receiving services. The social worker reports positive feedback about the services being provided and collaboration with BHRS has been strong. Coordination of services has improved greatly between CWS, Mono County Behavioral Health, JPD, WRAP team and community partners in regards to Katie A. subclass members.

CWS social workers refer all new children for Katie assessments within the first 30 days of opening either a voluntary or a Court CWS case. A log is kept internally to track outcomes by the CWS Supervisor. During this review period, one new Court case resulted in 2 siblings being assessed as eligible for Katie A services. An ICC is in place and the social worker reports that a higher level of services is being offered to these children than may have been otherwise.

Katie A. Planning and Update meetings are held ongoing in conjunction with monthly MDT meetings.

Progress Reports have been completed, staff listens in on the bi-monthly Katie A. Technical Calls and ongoing discussions regarding referrals, services and assessments continue. This process has proven to be a learning experience for everyone and one that will continue to have a positive impact on children receiving mental health services.

C.S.E.C.

Inter-agency discussions were initiated by the Department of Social Services with other agencies, including local Law Enforcement during this review period to assess the local circumstances surrounding the commercial trafficking of children for sexual exploitation.

C.F.S.R.

A Staff Services Analyst has successfully completed the certification training to conduct Federal Case Reviews for Mono County CWS. A MOU is being created to provide case review services to Alpine County CWS as well.

APPROVED RELATIVE CAREGIVER (ARC)

Mono County has opted in to the Approved Relative Caregiver program and has evaluated our current caseload for ARC eligibility of which there are none at this time.

PROBATION

Fostering Connections After 18

California Fostering Connections to Success Act (AB 12)

AB 12 took effect on January 1, 2012, making it possible for eligible 18 year olds in placement to have access to federal funding which will provide them with the support they need to become fully independent adults. As of August 2015, Probation has had several AB 12 case. The Probation Department has successfully implemented AB 12 in which foster youth receive funds and services to transition into independent living.

5 – Year SIP Chart

CWS

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: Reunification Composite Measure C1.1-C1.4

National Standard: N/A

Current Performance:

2014: Current performance discussed in the progress report narrative (no children who reunified during this SIP year).

Target Improvement Goal: Improve and enhance systemic factors related to reunification of children with their families.

Probation

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: Implement Exit to Permanency and Transition to Adulthood Strategies.

National Standard: N/A

Current Performance:

2014: 0% of cases. Currently there are inconsistencies within this area.

Target Improvement Goal: Improve services in the transitional plan for every youth exiting placement to permanency and transitioning into adulthood. 80% of all cases will be provided consistent services leading to successful transitions of youth to adulthood.

- The department will then build strategies and action steps to include education, employment, housing services, permanent connections, medical insurance.

A. Action Steps Chart

<p>Strategy 1: CWS Strengthen Administrative and Social Worker Practices.</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): Reunification Composite Measure C1. Timely Social Worker Visits with Child 2C.</p>
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
<p>A. Conduct quarterly reviews of CWS data, using reports generated from the SafeMeasures program. UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>February 2014 – October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/GWS Director/Social Worker Supervisor</p>
<p>B. Use findings from quarterly SafeMeasures reviews to identify and address CWS/CMS system training needs. UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>March 2014 and on-going</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor</p>
<p>C. Use findings from quarterly SafeMeasures reviews to identify and address training needs related to SW monthly contacts with children in family reunification, family maintenance, emergency response, and permanency placement. UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>March 2014 and on-going through October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor</p>

<p>D. Conduct yearly Social Worker staff needs assessment to determine gaps in knowledge and practice. Use SafeMeasures 12 month data report to help assess these needs.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 6 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>July 30, 2014 March 2014 and annually thereafter, through 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor</p>
<p>E. Mono County Social Services Training Coordinator will arrange training to address needs identified in Action Step D above.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 6 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>August 2014 March 2014 and annually thereafter through 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/CWS Director/Social Worker Supervisor /Training Coordinator</p>
<p>F. Evaluate effectiveness of SafeMeasures Quarterly Reviews Strategy. Determine whether this method allows for the identification of gaps in Social Worker knowledge, practice, and training needs, and whether the appropriate follow through is initiated and completed.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>July 2015 – October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/CWS Director/Social Worker Supervisor /Training Coordinator</p>
<p>G. If Strategy is determined to not meet stated goals, research and identify an</p>	<p>August 30, 2016 – September 30, 2017</p>	<p>Program Manager/CWS Director/Social Worker Supervisor /Training Coordinator</p>

<p>alternative strategy to achieve goal and implement.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>		
<p>H. Explore the creation of a Program Integrity staff position within CWS staffing structure responsible for quality assurance, in an effort to strengthen administrative practices and data reporting.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>July 2015 – July 2016</p>	<p>Program Manager/CWS Director/Social Worker Supervisor</p>
<p>I. Independent Living Program Social Worker to create resource manual to help ensure youth receive an array of support services (life skills training, advocacy, mentoring, education and career development, health and safety and financial resources).</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>March 2014 - October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor</p>

Strategy 2: CWS Improve Family Finding methods.	<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): Reunification Composite Measure C1.
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Research available Family Finding Tools to be used to locate and connect with family members of foster children. UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.	October 2014 - March 2015	Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor
B. Evaluate the effects of tool on creating permanency for out-of-home placements. UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.	March 2015 – May 2015	Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor
C. If applicable, purchase Family Finding Tool and provide training for Child Welfare Services staff. UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.	August 2015 – September 2016	Program Manager/CWS Director/ Social Worker Supervisor
D. Implement fully the Family Finding and Engagement Program. UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.	October 2016 – October 2018	Program Manager/CWS Director/ Social Worker Supervisor

<p>E. Assess effectiveness of Family Finding and Engagement Program, and make programmatic adjustments as needed.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>July 2018 – October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/CWS Director/ Social Worker Supervisor</p>
--	---------------------------------	--

<p>Strategy 3: CWS</p> <p>Enhance Reunification System Factors through Collaboration with County and Community Partners.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAPIT: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CBCAP: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PSSF: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A:	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>Reunification Composite Measure C1.</p>
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
<p>A. Explore and determine desired outcomes of implementing Differential Response Paths.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 6 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>March 2014 — June 2014 March 2015 – June 2015</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor /CWS Director/Staff Services Analyst</p>
<p>B. Identify Community Partner to participate in Differential Response with CWS.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 6 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>March 2014 — June 2014 March 2015 – June 2015</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor /CWS Director</p>
<p>C. Determine whether partnering to implement Differential Response is feasible and has likely potential to achieve desired outcomes.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 6 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>June 2014 — February 2015 June 2015 – February 2016</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor /CWS Director/CWS Staff/Community Partner</p>

<p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>		
<p>D. Create a Differential Response Implementation Plan, based on results of Action Step C. UPDATE: See pg. 6 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update. UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>December 2014 – May 2015 December 2015 – May 2016</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor /CWS Director/Community Partner</p>
<p>E. Create an Agreement between Agencies and forward to Board of Supervisors for approval, based on results of Action Step C. UPDATE: See pg. 6 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update. UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>June 2015 – December 2015 June 2016 – December 2016</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor /CWS Director/Community Partner</p>
<p>F. Phase in full implementation of Differential Response, based on results of Action Step C. UPDATE: See pg. 6 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update. UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>December 2015 – September 2018 December 2016 – September 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor /CWS Director/Community Partner</p>

<p>Strategy 4: CWS</p> <p>Improve and Enhance Social Worker practices and Community Resources regarding parent-child interaction/visitation by developing new resources and supports.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT: <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP: <input type="checkbox"/> PSSF: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A:	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>Reunification Composite Measure C1.</p>
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
<p>A. Social Worker Supervisor will demonstrate to Social Workers the effectiveness of graduated visitation (decreasing supervision as case progresses).</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 7 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>July 2014—October 2015 July 2015 - October 2016</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor</p>
<p>B. Review Visitation policy and procedures to ensure they reflect best practices and make recommendations to revise.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 7 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>July 2014—October 2015 July 2015 - October 2016</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor</p>

<p>C. Research and implement nationwide best practices for implementation of parent-child interaction/ visitation in Mono County.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 7 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>October 2016 – October 2017 October 2017 – October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/CWS Director/ Social Worker Supervisor</p>
<p>D. Evaluate effectiveness of other family team meetings, as described in Action Step C, and make programmatic modifications as needed.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>October 2017 – October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/CWS Director/ Social Worker Supervisor</p>
<p>Strategy 5: CWS</p> <p>Improve and Enhance Social Worker practices and Community Resources regarding parent-child interaction/visitation by increasing the number of Professional Supervised Visitation Providers in the County.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAPIT:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CBCAP:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PSSF:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A:</p>	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>Reunification Composite Measure C1.</p>
<p>Action Steps:</p>	<p>Timeframe:</p>	<p>Person Responsible:</p>
<p>A. Explore with prevention partners creation of a Professional Supervised Visitation Provider program for families at-risk, as well as those with open CPS</p>	<p>March 2014 – May 2014 Completed May 2014</p>	<p>CWS Director/ Social Worker Supervisor</p>

<p>cases. Use CAPIT, CBCAP, and PSSF funds to do so.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 7 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>		
<p>B. In partnership with prevention partners, facilitate training on becoming a professional provider of supervised visitation. Make training available to agency staff and community members.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 7 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>March 2014 – July 2014 Completed May 2014</p>	<p>CWS Director/ Social Worker Supervisor</p>
<p>C. Provide support for the creation of a cadre of professional supervised visitation providers in Mono County (currently there are no professional supervised visitation providers in the Mono County).</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 8 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>March 2014 – October 2015 Completed May 2014</p>	<p>CWS Director/ Social Worker Supervisor</p>

<p>Strategy 6: CWS</p> <p>Implement Safety-Organized Practice (SOP) within CWS Practice.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT: <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP: <input type="checkbox"/> PSSF: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A:	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>Reunification Composite Measure C1.</p>
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
<p>A. CWS Staff Complete Safety-Organized Practice (SOP) Twelve Training Modules.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 8 of 2014 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>April 2013 – October 2015 April 2014 - Completed July 2014</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor</p>
<p>B. CWS Staff participate in ongoing Webinar's (overview, key skills, Safety mapping, and Structured Decision Making coaching).</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>October 2014 – October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor</p>
<p>C. Supervisor(s) attend Facilitative Supervision Training.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>October 2015 – March 2016</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor</p>
<p>D. Assess SOP training and make implementation changes as necessary to maximize SOP outcome.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>October 2015 – October 2017</p>	<p>Program Manager/CWS Director/Social Worker Supervisor</p>

<p>E. Transfer Enhance Structured Decision Making and SOP learning strategies to social worker practice, as evidenced by consistent use of SOP tools, language, and supervision.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>October 2015 – October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor</p>
<p>F. Evaluate implementation strategies. Ask: has practice changed? Can the change be correlated to an improved outcome?</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>October 2015 – October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor</p>

<p>Strategy 7: CWS</p> <p>Increase the number of Foster Family Homes in Mono County.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CAPIT: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CBCAP: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PSSF: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A:	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>Reunification Composite Measure C1. Adoption Composite Measure C2.</p>
<p>Action Steps:</p>	<p>Timeframe:</p>	<p>Person Responsible:</p>
<p>A. Partner with the Child Abuse Prevention Council and other community partners to recruit foster parents, using the following techniques:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Radio – Informational Interviews 2. Email - to all county and town contacts, churches, schools, tribes and local agencies. 3. Flyers posted in high traffic areas in the town where Foster Parent Orientation meetings are held. 4. Foster Parent Orientation meeting information posted on County website and calendar. 5. Local Newspaper Community Calendars. 6. Before Foster Parent Orientation meetings– Public Service Announcements with local radio stations. 7. Work with local print media to promote foster family recruitment. 	<p>October 2013 – October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/Staff Services Analyst/Social Worker Supervisor</p>

**UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP
Progress Report for complete update.**

--	--	--

<p>B. Partner with Community Partners to recruit foster parents, using the following strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attend Service Club Meetings: i.e. Rotary, Lions Club, Women's Club, etc. 2. Provide information on Foster Parenting and available supports to local religious organizations throughout County. <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>November 2013 – October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/Staff Services Analyst / CWS Director</p>
<p>C. Conduct quarterly conference calls with Fresno Community Care Licensing on foster/adopt recruitment strategies and to ensure identification of both in-county and out-of-county prospective foster/adopt families.</p> <p>UPDATE: See pg. 5 of 2015 SIP Progress Report for complete update.</p>	<p>April 2014 – October 2018</p>	<p>Program Manager/Social Worker Supervisor /Staff Services Analyst / CWS Director</p>

<p>Strategy 8: Probation</p> <p>Develop a measurable transition and permanency process.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT: <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP: <input type="checkbox"/> PSSF: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A:	<p>Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s):</p> <p>Exit to permanency and transition to adulthood</p>
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
<p>A. Identify a committee consisting of probation, child welfare, social services, behavioral health to identify evidence-based best practices for transition and permanency.</p>	<p>Completed by end of December 2014 Update: Completed</p>	<p>Juvenile Lead Probation Officer</p>
<p>B. Placement officer attends placement academy.</p>	<p>Completed by end of January 2014 Update Completed</p>	<p>Placement Officer</p>
<p>C. Committee researches and publishes a report identifying evidence-based best practices and viability in our county.</p>	<p>September 2015 – December 2015</p>	<p>Juvenile Lead Probation Officer</p>
<p>D. A measurement tool is developed ensuring all actions and measurable dates of compliance.</p>	<p>September 2015 – December 2015</p>	<p>Juvenile Lead Probation Officer</p>
<p>E. The measurement tool is incorporated into the policy and procedure (see strategy 9).</p>	<p>November 2015 – February 2016</p>	<p>Chief of Probation</p>
<p>F. Measurement tool will be evaluated for effectiveness using statistical model.</p>	<p>November 2015 – February 2016</p>	<p>Chief of Probation</p>

Strategy 9: Probation Development of policy and procedure for transitioning youth and permanency.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT:	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Exit to permanency and transition to adulthood
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP:	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF:	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A:	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Research similar counties' written Officer doctrine and pattern and practices.	June 2015 - January 2016 In progress	Juvenile Lead Probation Officer
B. Prepare draft policy and procedure incorporating collected information and best practices.	November 2015 – February 2016	Juvenile Lead Probation Officer
C. Draft reviewed by those departments cited in Strategy 8A, page 55.	November 2015 – February 2016	Juvenile Lead Probation Officer
D. Final procedure prepared and submitted to Chief of Probation.	March 2015 – April 2016	Juvenile Lead Probation Officer
E. Procedure signed and implemented.	March 2015 – May 2016	Chief of Probation
F. In-house training for juvenile staff.	November 2016 - December 2016	Juvenile Lead Probation Officer
G. Review of compliance procedure (quarterly).	Continuously Quarterly	Juvenile Lead Probation Officer
H. Report of compliance with procedure completed and submitted to Chief-memo.	January 2017 - April 2017	Juvenile Lead Probation Officer
I. Plan for any corrections or amendments prepared and executed.	January 2017 - April 2017	Juvenile Lead Probation Officer/Chief of Probation

Strategy 10: Probation Implement Wrap around process consistently.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT:	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): Exit to permanency and transition to adulthood
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP:	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF:	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A:	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Wrap around Executive Board reviews both CWS and Probation policy and procedures and/or any other written doctrine or directives.	January 2017 – May 2017	Chief of Probation and Partner Agency Directors
B. An internal measurement tool is designed ensuring compliance with Wrap around philosophy and steps are addressed with elements of AB12 included.	January 2017 – May 2017	Chief of Probation and Partner Agency Directors
C. Wrap Executive Committee meets bi-annually to ensure compliance with procedures.	January 2017 – May 2017 Continuously	Chief of Probation and Partner Agency Directors

**Mono County Department of Social Services
Foster Home Outreach - FY 2014-2015
Updated June 4, 2015**

- Goal:** Provide nurturing and stable environments for children in need of emergency, short-term, and long-term, local foster homes
- Objective:** Increase the number of licensed foster homes in Mono County.
- Strategies:** a) Provide information to the community, using a variety of methods, regarding the need for Foster Homes in Mono County and how they can become a Foster Parent, b) Increase the attendance to the Foster Home Orientation Meetings, c) Assist families through the licensing process, and support them in becoming successful foster families

Outreach Activities:

1. **Fresno Foster Home Licensing provides Orientation Meetings.** Fresno Licensing office continues to provide Orientation meetings to Mono County on a quarterly basis. Location of these meetings is moved around the County to provide access for all county residents throughout the year. Next meeting in Mono County is in September 2015.

Advertising for these meetings are done through:

- Radio – KMMT added this event to their community calendar.
 - Email - to all county and town contacts, churches, schools, tribes and local agencies.
 - Flyers posted in high traffic areas in the town where the meeting will be held.
 - Meeting information posted on County website and calendar and announced to all RPAC's.
 - Local Newspaper Community Calendars.
2. **June 2, 2015 Orientation Meeting held in Crowley Lake:** One person attended and she is thinking about it but is undecided at this time. Our current Foster Parent Carolyn Balliet has offered to talk with her to help answer any questions.
 3. **Coordination with the CAPC (Child Abuse and Prevention Council) Coordinator** on outreach activities:
 - CAPC Coordinator assisted with emailing the flyer for this June meeting to her county and community contacts.
 4. **Collaboration with Wild Iris:** None for this reporting period
 5. **New Applications:**

Two Mammoth Families, one who attended the Crowley orientation meeting in July 2014 and the other who attended the Benton meeting in November 2014, have completed their applications and both submitted their applications in January. These families have been notified by the Fresno Community Care Licensing office that their applications are under review.



CWS Outcomes System Summary for Mono County--07.01.15			Baseline -- Orig. Rpt Date (Data Extract)	Time Period 40 -- Jul 13 (Q1 13) <--Select Baseline		Time Period 48 -- Jul 15 (Q1 15) <--Select Comparison		Baseline perf rel to nat'l std/goal (%) ²		Comparison start date		Comparison end date		Comparison numerator		Comparison denominator		Comparison performance ¹		Comparison perf rel to nat'l std/goal (%) ²		Goal	2-year percent change ³
Measure number	Type (CDSS UCB)	Measure description	National Standard or Goal	Baseline start date	Baseline end date	Baseline numerator	Baseline denominator	Baseline performance ¹	Comparison start date	Comparison end date	Comparison numerator	Comparison denominator	Comparison performance ¹	Comparison perf rel to nat'l std/goal (%) ²	Goal	2-year percent change ³							
PR	U	Participation Rates: Referral Rates	N.A.	01/01/12	12/31/12	150	2,961	50.7	N.A.	01/01/14	12/31/14	209	2,935	71.2	N.A.	v	▲	40.6%					
PR	U	Participation Rates: Substantiation Rates	N.A.	01/01/12	12/31/12	15	2,961	5.1	N.A.	01/01/14	12/31/14	26	2,935	8.9	N.A.	v	▲	74.9%					
PR	U	Participation Rates: Entry Rates	N.A.	01/01/12	12/31/12	1	2,961	0.3	N.A.	01/01/14	12/31/14	2	2,935	0.7	N.A.	v	▲	101.8%					
PR	U	Participation Rates: In Care Rates	N.A.	07/01/12	07/01/12	4	2,961	1.4	N.A.	07/01/14	07/01/14	3	2,935	1.0	N.A.	v	▼	34.3%					
S1.1	U/C	No Recurrence Of Maltreatment	84.6	04/01/12	09/30/12	8	10	80.0	84.6	04/01/14	09/30/14	10	17	58.8	62.2	▲	v	28.5%					
S2.1	U/C	No Maltreatment In Foster Care	99.68	04/01/12	03/31/13	5	5	100.00	100.3	04/01/14	03/31/15	9	9	100.00	100.3	▲	v	0.00%					
Reunification																							
C1.1	U/C	Reunification Within 12 Months (Exit Cohort)	75.2	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
C1.2	U/C	Median Time To Reunification (Exit Cohort)	5.4	04/01/12	03/31/13	N.A.	0	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	N.A.	0	0.0	N.A.	v	▲	N.A.					
C1.3	U/C	Reunification Within 12 Months (Entry Cohort)	48.4	10/01/11	03/31/12	0	0	0.0	N.A.	10/01/13	03/31/14	0	1	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
C1.4	U/C	Reentry Following Reunification (Exit Cohort)	9.9	04/01/11	03/31/12	0	0	0.0	N.A.	04/01/13	03/31/14	1	1	100.0	9.9	▼	v	N.A.					
Adoption																							
C2.1	U/C	Adoption Within 24 Months (Exit Cohort)	36.6	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
C2.2	U/C	Median Time To Adoption (Exit Cohort)	27.3	04/01/12	03/31/13	N.A.	0	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	N.A.	0	0.0	N.A.	v	▲	N.A.					
C2.3	U/C	Adoption Within 12 Months (17 Months In Care)	22.7	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	1	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	3	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
C2.4	U/C	Legally Free Within 6 Months (17 Months In Care)	10.9	04/01/12	09/30/12	0	1	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	09/30/14	0	3	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
C2.5	U/C	Adoption Within 12 Months (Legally Free)	53.7	04/01/11	03/31/12	0	0	0.0	N.A.	04/01/13	03/31/14	0	0	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
Long Term Care																							
C3.1	U/C	Exits To Permanency (24 Months In Care)	29.1	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	1	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	3	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
C3.2	U/C	Exits To Permanency (Legally Free At Exit)	96.0	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
C3.3	U/C	In Care 4 Years Or Longer (Emancipated/Age 18)	37.5	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	1	1	100.0	37.5	▼	v	N.A.					
Placement Stability																							
C4.1	U/C	Placement Stability (8 Days To 12 Months In Care)	86.0	04/01/12	03/31/13	1	1	100.0	116.3	04/01/14	03/31/15	4	5	80.0	93.0	▲	v	-20.0%					
C4.2	U/C	Placement Stability (12 To 24 Months In Care)	65.4	04/01/12	03/31/13	2	2	100.0	152.9	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	-100.0%					
C4.3	U/C	Placement Stability (At Least 24 Months In Care)	41.8	04/01/12	03/31/13	1	2	50.0	119.6	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	1	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	-100.0%					
2B	C	Timely Response (Imm Response Compliance)	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	6	6	100.0	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	12	13	92.3	N.A.	▲	v	-7.7%					
2B	C	Timely Response (10-Day Response Compliance)	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	20	20	100.0	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	15	20	75.0	N.A.	▲	v	-25.0%					
2D	C	Timely Response--Completed (Imm Response Compliance)	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	5	6	83.3	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	10	13	76.9	N.A.	▲	v	-7.7%					
2D	C	Timely Response--Completed (10-Day Response Compliance)	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	19	20	95.0	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	14	20	70.0	N.A.	▲	v	-26.3%					
2F	C	Monthly Visits (Out of Home)	90.0	04/01/12	03/31/13	35	37	94.6	105.1	04/01/14	03/31/15	30	31	96.8	107.5	▲	v	2.3%					
2F	C	Monthly Visits in Residence (Out of Home)	50.0	04/01/12	03/31/13	17	35	48.6	97.1	04/01/14	03/31/15	27	30	90.0	180.0	▲	v	85.3%					
2S	C	Monthly Visits (in Home)	N.A.	04/01/12	03/31/13	131	131	100.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	210	223	94.2	N.A.	▲	v	-5.0%					
2S	C	Monthly Visits in Residence (in Home)	N.A.	04/01/12	03/31/13	66	131	50.4	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	135	210	64.3	N.A.	▲	v	27.0%					
4A	U	Siblings (All)	N.A.	04/01/13	04/01/13	2	4	50.0	N.A.	04/01/15	04/01/15	2	4	50.0	N.A.	▲	v	0.0%					
4A	U	Siblings (Some or All)	N.A.	04/01/13	04/01/13	2	4	50.0	N.A.	04/01/15	04/01/15	2	4	50.0	N.A.	▲	v	0.0%					
4B	U	Least Restrictive (Entries First Pic Relative)	N.A.	04/01/12	03/31/13	1	1	100.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	1	4	25.0	N.A.	▲	v	-75.0%					
4B	U	Least Restrictive (Entries First Pic Foster Home)	N.A.	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	1	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	3	4	75.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
4B	U	Least Restrictive (Entries First Pic FFA)	N.A.	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	1	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	4	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
4B	U	Least Restrictive (Entries First Pic Group/Shelter)	N.A.	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	1	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	4	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
4B	U	Least Restrictive (Entries First Pic Other)	N.A.	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	1	0.0	N.A.	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	4	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
4B	U	Least Restrictive (PIT Placement Relative)	N.A.	04/01/13	04/01/13	1	5	20.0	N.A.	04/01/15	04/01/15	1	6	16.7	N.A.	▲	v	-18.7%					
4B	U	Least Restrictive (PIT Placement Foster Home)	N.A.	04/01/13	04/01/13	0	5	0.0	N.A.	04/01/15	04/01/15	3	6	50.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
4B	U	Least Restrictive (PIT Placement FFA)	N.A.	04/01/13	04/01/13	0	5	0.0	N.A.	04/01/15	04/01/15	0	6	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
4B	U	Least Restrictive (PIT Placement Group/Shelter)	N.A.	04/01/13	04/01/13	2	5	40.0	N.A.	04/01/15	04/01/15	2	6	33.3	N.A.	▲	v	-16.7%					
4B	U	Least Restrictive (PIT Placement Other)	N.A.	04/01/13	04/01/13	2	5	40.0	N.A.	04/01/15	04/01/15	0	6	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	-100.0%					
4E (1)	U/C	ICWA Eligible Placement Status	N.A.						N.A.						N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.					
4E (2)	U/C	Multi-ethnic Placement Status	N.A.						N.A.						N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.					
5B (1)	C	Rate of Timely Health Exams	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	1	3	33.3	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	4	4	100.0	N.A.	▲	v	200.0%					
5B (2)	C	Rate of Timely Dental Exams	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	1	3	33.3	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	0	2	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	-100.0%					
5F	C	Authorized for Psychotropic Medication**	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	***	***	***	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	***	***	***	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
6B	C	Individualized Education Plan	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	1	5	20.0	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	0	3	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	-100.0%					
8A	C	Completed High School or Equivalency**	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
8A	C	Obtained Employment**	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
8A	C	Have Housing Arrangements**	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
8A	C	Received ILP Services**	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					
8A	C	Permanency Connection with an Adult**	N.A.	01/01/13	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N.A.	01/01/15	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N.A.	▲	v	N.A.					

NOTE: ** or #DIV/0! = value not available due to 0 denominator
¹Participation Rates: rate per 1,000. C1.2 and C2.2: median (months). All Others: percent (%)
²Performance relative to national std or goal: (goal/performance)*100 for C1.2, C2.2 (desired decrease), (goal/(num/denom))*100 for other measures with desired decrease, (num/denom)/(standard or goal)*100 for measures with desired increase
³Percent Changes: (comparison perf/baseline perf-1)*100 for C1.2, C2.2, ((comparison n/comparison d)/(baseline n/baseline d)-1)*100 for others
Some items may display as 0.0%, but indicate change not in the desired direction. This is because of small change not displayed at one decimal place.
⁴Estimated as comparison n - (comparison d/(baseline n/baseline d)) Measures 2F and 2S are estimated # of visits affected; all others are estimated number of children and youth
⁵Values of 10 or less and calculations based on values of 10 or less are masked (**)
** 8A data are available from Quarter 4, 2008 onwards

CWS Outcomes System Summary for Mono County--06.26.15

Report publication: Jul2015. Data extract: Q1 2015. Agency: Probation.

Baseline - Orig. Rpt Date

(Data Extract)

Comparison - Orig. Rpt Date

(Data Extract)

Time Period 40 -- Jul 13 (Q1 13)

Time Period 48 -- Jul 15 (Q1 15)

<--Select Baseline

<--Select Comparison

Change
Measure: 2
Year: 15/14

Measure number	Type (CDSS UCB)	Measure description	National Standard or Goal	Baseline start date	Baseline end date	Baseline numerator	Baseline denominator	Baseline performance ¹	Baseline perf rel to nat'l std/goal ²	Comparison start date	Comparison end date	Comparison numerator	Comparison denominator	Comparison performance ¹	Comparison perf rel to nat'l std/goal ²	Goal	2-year percent change ³	Estimated # affected ⁴	
PR	U	Participation Rates: Referral Rates	N/A	01/01/12	12/31/12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	01/01/14	12/31/14	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
PR	U	Participation Rates: Substantiation Rates*	N/A	01/01/12	12/31/12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	01/01/14	12/31/14	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
PR	U	Participation Rates: Entry Rates	N/A	01/01/12	12/31/12	4	2,961	1.4	N/A	01/01/14	12/31/14	0	2,935	0.0	N/A	N/A	-100.0%	-4	
PR	U	Participation Rates: In-Care Rates	N/A	07/01/12	07/01/12	2	2,961	0.7	N/A	07/01/14	07/01/14	0	2,935	0.0	N/A	N/A	100.0%	-2	
S1.1	U/C	No Recurrence Of Maltreatment	94.6	04/01/12	09/30/12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	04/01/14	09/30/14	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
S2.1	U/C	No Maltreatment In Foster Care	99.58	04/01/12	03/31/13	4	4	100.00	100.3	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.00	N/A	N/A	-100.00%	N/A	
Reunification																			
C1.1	U/C	Reunification Within 12 Months (Exit Cohort)	75.2	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	1	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
C1.2	U/C	Median Time To Reunification (Exit Cohort)	5.4	04/01/12	03/31/13	N/A	1	16.2	33.3	04/01/14	03/31/15	N/A	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	-100.0%	N/A	
C1.3	U/C	Reunification Within 12 Months (Entry Cohort)	48.4	10/01/11	03/31/12	0	0	0.0	N/A	10/01/13	03/31/14	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
C1.4	U/C	Reentry Following Reunification (Exit Cohort)	9.9	04/01/11	03/31/12	0	0	0.0	N/A	04/01/13	03/31/14	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Adoption																			
C2.1	U/C	Adoption Within 24 Months (Exit Cohort)	36.6	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
C2.2	U/C	Median Time To Adoption (Exit Cohort)	27.3	04/01/12	03/31/13	N/A	0	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	N/A	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
C2.3	U/C	Adoption Within 12 Months (17 Months In Care)	22.7	03/01/12	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
C2.4	U/C	Legally Free Within 6 Months (17 Months In Care)	10.9	04/01/12	09/30/12	0	0	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	09/30/14	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
C2.5	U/C	Adoption Within 12 Months (Legally Free)	53.7	04/01/11	03/31/12	0	0	0.0	N/A	04/01/13	03/31/14	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Long Term Care																			
C3.1	U/C	Exits To Permanency (24 Months In Care)	29.1	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
C3.2	U/C	Exits To Permanency (Legally Free At Exit)	98.0	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
C3.3	U/C	In Care 3 Years Or Longer (Emancipated/Age 18)	37.5	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Placement Stability																			
C4.1	U/C	Placement Stability (8 Days To 12 Months In Care)	86.0	04/01/12	03/31/13	3	3	100.0	116.3	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	-100.0%	N/A	
C4.2	U/C	Placement Stability (12 To 24 Months In Care)	65.4	04/01/12	03/31/13	1	1	100.0	152.9	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	-100.0%	N/A	
C4.3	U/C	Placement Stability (At Least 24 Months In Care)	41.8	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
2F	C	Timely Monthly Caseworker Visits*	90.0	04/01/12	03/31/13	15	18	83.3	92.6	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	-100.0%	N/A	
2F	C	Timely Monthly Caseworker Visits in Residence**	50.0	04/01/12	03/31/13	12	15	80.0	160.0	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	-100.0%	N/A	
4A	U	Siblings (All)	N/A	04/01/13	04/01/13	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	04/01/15	04/01/15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4A	U	Siblings (Some or All)	N/A	04/01/13	04/01/13	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	04/01/15	04/01/15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4B	U	Least Restrictive (Entries First Pic. Relative)	N/A	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	4	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4B	U	Least Restrictive (Entries First Pic. Foster Home)	N/A	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	4	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4B	U	Least Restrictive (Entries First Pic. FFA)	N/A	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	4	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4B	U	Least Restrictive (Entries First Pic. Group/Shelter)	N/A	04/01/12	03/31/13	4	4	100.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	-100.0%	N/A	
4B	U	Least Restrictive (Entries First Pic. Other)	N/A	04/01/12	03/31/13	0	4	0.0	N/A	04/01/14	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4B	U	Least Restrictive (PIT Placement. Relative)	N/A	04/01/13	04/01/13	0	4	0.0	N/A	04/01/15	04/01/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4B	U	Least Restrictive (PIT Placement. Foster Home)	N/A	04/01/13	04/01/13	0	4	0.0	N/A	04/01/15	04/01/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4B	U	Least Restrictive (PIT Placement. FFA)	N/A	04/01/13	04/01/13	0	4	0.0	N/A	04/01/15	04/01/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4B	U	Least Restrictive (PIT Placement. Group/Shelter)	N/A	04/01/13	04/01/13	2	4	50.0	N/A	04/01/15	04/01/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	-100.0%	N/A	
4B	U	Least Restrictive (PIT Placement. Other)	N/A	04/01/13	04/01/13	2	4	50.0	N/A	04/01/15	04/01/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	-100.0%	N/A	
4E (1)	U/C	ICWA Eligible Placement Status	N/A	Data available online					N/A	Data available online					N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4E (2)	U/C	Multi-Ethnic Placement Status	N/A	Data available online					N/A	Data available online					N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
5B (1)	C	Rate of Timely Health Exams*	N/A	01/01/13	03/31/13	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	01/01/15	03/31/15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
5B (2)	C	Rate of Timely Dental Exams*	N/A	01/01/13	03/31/13	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	01/01/15	03/31/15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
5F	C	Authorized for Psychotropic Medication***	N/A	01/01/13	03/31/13	***	***	***	N/A	01/01/15	03/31/15	***	***	***	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
6B	C	Individualized Education Plan**	N/A	01/01/13	03/31/13	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	01/01/15	03/31/15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
8A	C	Completed High School or Equivalent**	N/A	01/01/13	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N/A	01/01/15	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
8A	C	Obtained Employment**	N/A	01/01/13	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N/A	01/01/15	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
8A	C	Have Housing Arrangements**	N/A	01/01/13	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N/A	01/01/15	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
8A	C	Received ILP Services**	N/A	01/01/13	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N/A	01/01/15	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
8A	C	Permanency Connection with an Adult**	N/A	01/01/13	03/31/13	0	0	0.0	N/A	01/01/15	03/31/15	0	0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

NOTE: ** or #DIV/0! = value not available due to 0 denominator

* Participation Rates: rate per 1,000; C1.2 and C2.2: median (months); All Others: percent (%)

¹ Performance relative to national std or goal: (goal)/(performance)*100 for C1.2, C2.2 (desired decrease); (goal)/(num/denom)*100 for other measures with desired decrease; (num/denom)/(standard or goal)*100 for measures with desired increase

² Percent Change: (comparison perf/baseline perf-1)*100 for C1.2, C2.2; ((comparison n/comparison d)/(baseline n/baseline d)-1)*100 for others

Some items may display as 0.0%, but indicate change not in the desired direction. This is because of small change not displayed at one decimal place

⁴ Estimated as comparison n - (comparison d/(baseline n/baseline d)) * Measure 2F is estimated # of visits affected; all others are estimated number of children and youth

⁵ Under review by CDSS for possible inclusion of probation data

** 2F data are available from Quarter 1, 2012 onwards

*** All data are available from Quarter 4, 2009 onwards

**** SF data are available from Quarter 1, 2012 onwards; values of 10 or less and estimations based on counts of 15 or less are marked (**)