1. List of Standards and Data Roll-Up
See Attachment A.

2. Analysis of Case File Review Data

A. Overall Performance in Achieving Safety
The goal for overall Safety Outcome achievement is 100%. ECA's score was 85% and no Request for Action forms were needed for safety reasons. In three of the seventeen base reviews children were subjects of new reports with some indicators or verified findings during the review period, (one in-home case and two out of home cases). For these three children, immediate and ameliorative measures were taken.

Initial family assessments were lacking. Out of seven applicable cases, only one was found. However, the content of six-month family assessments was observed to be a strength. They were thorough and addressed the required areas. Reviewers considered the Judicial Review Social Study Report in the majority of cases in order to satisfy this requirement.

Thorough pre-placement assessment of unlicensed placements occurred on all applicable cases. Two cases experienced reunification during the review period and concerted efforts surrounding post-placement supervision were found on both cases.

B. Practice Trends
It appears that case management's primary focus is on child safety and well-being. Consequently, these were the highest scoring areas, rating 85% and 86% respectively, while this appears to be a positive trend, the goal is to achieve a 100% rating. In contrast, the quality of case management activities with parents, such as visiting the parent, engaging them in services, and involving them in decision-making is an opportunity for improvement. Efforts to locate or communicate with missing, incarcerated and distant parents often fell short of what was needed.

Staffings were held regularly on many cases, but one-on-one supervision between Case Managers and Supervisors was not as consistent. Reviewers did note that the frequency of supervision increased towards the end of the review period, with most units practicing monthly supervision. While the topics of safety, well-being and permanency are usually
covered in supervision as prompted by the supervision form, ensuring follow-through on previously recommended tasks is not a regular component of supervision.

Family Risk Assessments were usually found in conjunction with staffings, as it is part of the staffing packet. Case Managers recently attended FSFN Release 2 training, which addresses the electronic Family Assessment newly added within FSFN. It is expected that the practice of conducting Family Assessments will improve with the advent of this new tool.

**C. Areas of Excellence**
The majority of case plans were current with appropriate goals, tasks and visitation plans. In addition, Judicial Review Social Study Reports (reviewed as six-month family assessments) were thorough and kept current. The court was kept well informed of case happenings.

Children’s placement stability was found to be a strength. Only two of fifteen applicable children experienced more than two moves within the review period, however these moves were not deemed to be in an effort towards achieving the case plan goal. All children, except one, were considered to be in a stable placement at the end of the review period, with no apparent risks for disruption.

Assessment of educational needs and mental health needs was conducted on all applicable cases, and appropriate services were implemented when needed for these children.

Efforts for sibling visitation were seen for all cases where the focus child was separated from his siblings while in out of home care and when visitation was appropriate.

Thorough pre-placement assessment of unlicensed placements occurred on all applicable cases. Two cases experienced reunification during the review period and effort surrounding post-placement supervision was found on both cases.

Supervisor’s monitoring/supervision of safety factors for the primary child was consistent throughout the individual base reviews.

**D. Opportunities for Improvement**
Initial Family Assessments, including a safety plan for all family members, are not being conducted. In addition, six-month Family Assessments/Risk Assessments are not being done regularly. The initiation of FSFN Release 2 is anticipated to help improve this area of need.

There is lack of compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act (accomplished by completing the ICWA Form 1000, now ICWA form CF-FSP 5323), which determines if the child is of Native American heritage by consulting with parents or other family members. The form was not located in any of the review cases.
Sibling separation was significant. Five of eleven applicable cases had siblings placed separately from the focus child. However, of those five cases, three involved siblings that were initially placed together until a need required their separation. All but one showed clear evidence that separation was necessary to meet the children's needs. In spite of this, sibling visitation was held consistently for all separated siblings when appropriate.

Five of the seventeen cases did not have some form of supervision or staffing every quarter of the review period, but supervisory reviews appeared to become more consistent towards the end of the review period. While crucial aspects of the case are covered as prompted by the supervisory review form, supervisors are not ensuring that follow through has occurred on previous directives.

The frequency of visitation with children, parents, and caregivers was determined to be an opportunity for improvement. All children were seen monthly, however the majority were not seen within 30 days each month throughout the review period. Parents were often seen at court, staffings, and at visits with the child, but not in their home. Therefore, the quality of the visits with parents was lacking because the circumstances under which they were seen held their focus elsewhere. As a result, parent engagement and involvement in decision-making was also low scoring.

3. Requests for Action
No Requests for Action were needed during this review.

4. Overall Performance Measures Analysis Based on FSFN Data
The overall performance measures during the period under review were analyzed based on FSFN data taken from the Performance Dashboard Application. During the period of review, there was a decrease in the third quarter of the percent of children who were subjects of reports of verified or indicated maltreatment. When compared to the data reviewed from the seventeen base line reviews, three cases meet this standard criterion. Of the three, only one case reflects that the child was abuse or neglected during services. Despite limited access to historical data, it can be reported that there was an increase in the percent during the third quarter for the period under review of the percent of children in active cases required to be seen monthly based on the information retrieved from the dashboard. In comparing, this data to the seventeen base cases only 59% of the visits were completed monthly during the period under review. In conclusion, for the period under review, it is difficult to analyzed overall performance due to limited access to historical data during the period under review.

5. Comparison of Current Findings and Prior Performance Review Findings
This is the first performance review.

6. Summary and Recommendations
This base review of the seventeen random sampled cases indicates that case management activities central focus is to keep children safe and meet their needs. In some instances, the same quality and focus is not afforded to parents if there are internal
or external barriers that may interfere with achieving case management goals. A barrier could be an incarcerated parent, a parent who is not keeping or maintaining contact, or parent who is not willingly engaged in services. The goal of permanency, needs to be attained for the child despite these barriers. In this situation, the goal of permanency is dependent upon how actively the case manager resolves issues surrounding barriers, so they are no longer considered barriers.

Eckerd Community Alternatives is "partnering" with the CMA agencies to improve the quality of supervision for Case Managers. ECA Quality Management department will send a representative to the DCF "Mentoring and Modeling Quality" train the trainer workshop. ECA will then create a new "supervision mentoring" tool based on the format of this workshop and train supervisors in its use. The goal will be to improve the consistency and frequency of quality supervision. Focusing on Family/Risk Assessment and needed safety plan for each member of the case. This includes following through with services recommended for each case/family member, actively eliminating/over coming all barriers, so the goals of safety, well being and permanency can be achieved.

Another strategy for improving the quality of ECA case management will be to encourage all of the CMAs Quality Improvement staff to receive training and certification in the use of the new standards and rating matrix. When this is achieved, ECA Quality Management Department can begin to work with them to achieve rating reliability. This will allow for a larger volume of quality case reviews to be completed, giving CMA leadership real time feed back. Of the four CMAs that fall under the umbrella of ECA as the lead CBC, two (Gulf Coast, YFA) have Q I people who recently received training and certification in DCF’s new quality standards tool and rating matrix. ECA’s quality management department will extend an offer to include the Gulf Coast and YFA Q I people in the 3rd quarter case review process. This will include an assignment to review and rate 1-2 cases from the 17 base reviews and participation in side-by-side review with DCF’s Suncoast Region representatives.

All Case Managers recently attended FSFN Release 2 training. We expect this training to affect the quality and increased frequency of Family Assessments (risk assessment) and safety plans for all family members, in a positive way. In addition, ECA will develop training to help Case Managers recognize the “red flags” associated with the need for developing a safety plan and referral for related services.

ECA Quality Management Department will also develop and implement a training to introduce supervisors to the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) and the use of the amended ICWA tool designed for determining if the child in question is of Native American descent. It will be expected that they (supervisors), in turn, will train their case management staff in the use of the form and the stressing the importance of including it in the case file.