Quality Assurance Review Report
FY 2010

Our Kids completes quarterly quality reviews with the Department of Children and Families with the assistance of trained staff from the case management organizations. The reviews cover four areas – Safety, Permanency, Well-Being and Child & Family Services Review (CFSR). The QA review tool measures compliance in each of these areas. There are two Safety measures, two Permanency measures, three Well-Being measures and one CFSR measure. This report provides information on the results of the QA reviews completed during FY 2010 (July, 2009 thru June, 2010.)

No reviews were completed during the first quarter of the fiscal year due to a specialized review of all cases involving children receiving psychotropic medication. The reviews began again in the second quarter. All of the agencies had cases reviewed in each quarter except for Wesley House which did not have any cases in the sample for the third quarter. There were a total of 67 cases reviewed over the course of the fiscal year.

The report is broken down by each of the measures (Safety 1, Safety 2, Performance 1, Performance 2, etc.) and covers the entire fiscal year. Each agency will also be provided graphs for their performance on each of the measures over the course of the fiscal year separately.

Safety Measure 1:

The items that address this measure are questions 1 – 3 of the Quality Practice Standards for Case Management review tool. These questions focus on whether children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect. Four out of the seven agencies achieved 90% or better for the year with three agencies achieving 100% on this measure.

The graphs below illustrate how the individual agencies and Our Kids as a whole did for the year and how Our Kids did for each of the three quarters reviewed:
Our Kids improved in the fourth quarter and was able to raise the performance level to above the Child and Family Services Review standard of 90% for the fiscal year.

The specific questions on the tool that pertain to this item are (the numbers in parentheses relate to the totals for each answer for all three quarters reviewed with the percentage score for each item):

1. No child living in the home was re-abused or neglected. (Y-24, N-5, NA-38 – 83%)
2. The focus child was not re-abused or neglected. (Y-55, N-2, NA-10 – 96%)
3. If a child was re-abused or re-neglected, immediate and ameliorative interventions were initiated on behalf of the child. (Y-4, N-0, NA-63 – 100%)

There were 29 in home case reviewed during the year and of those 29, 5 had an abuse report with a finding of “some indicators” or “verified” during the period under review. This was the only item under Safety Outcome 1 that was below the CFSR standard.

No items under this measure are included in the Florida QIP.

**Safety Measure 2:**

The items that address this measure are questions 4-10 of the review tool. These questions focus on whether children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

The graphs below illustrate how the individual agencies and Our Kids as a whole did for the year and how Our Kids did for each of the three quarters reviewed:
While Our Kids performed above the standard for two out of the three quarters reviewed, the low performance during the second quarter prevented us from achieving the CFSR standard for the year. Only one agency achieved 90% or better for the year as well.

The specific questions on the tool that pertain to this item are:

4. Concerted efforts were made to provide or arrange for appropriate services for the family to protect the child and prevent the child’s entry into out-of-home care. (Y-19, N-1, NA-47 – 95%)

5. A thorough initial family assessment was conducted following the investigative safety assessment that sufficiently addressed child safety factors and emerging risks. (Y-21, N-1, NA-45 – 95%)

6. Completed service referrals were consistent with the needs identified through investigative assessment(s), and other assessments related to safety. (Y-54, N-4, NA-9 – 93%)

7. The six-month family assessment was focused on the immediate and prospective safety of the child, as well as any changes and implications in the family’s situation related to emerging concerns and service needs. (Y-1, N-21, NA-45 – 5%)
8. All immediate and emerging safety concerns were addressed and additional needed interventions were provided to protect the child. (Y-41, N-1, NA-25 – 98%)

9. A thorough safety assessment of the home was completed prior to reunification or placement of the child in an unlicensed out-of-home care setting. (Y-18, N-5, NA-44 – 78%)

10. Concerted efforts were made during post-placement supervision to manage the risks following reunification and prevent re-entry into out-of-home care. (Y-7, N-2, NA-60 – 100%)

The agencies as a whole were below the standard on items 7 and 9. These are areas that had been struggles for us but will hopefully be addressed through the implementation of the Structured Decision Making tools by all the agencies.

Items 4, 6 and 10 are included in the Florida Quality Improvement Plan (QIP). The agencies as a whole performed above 90% on all three of the items over the year. On only one case reviewed, was a determination made that the agency did not make efforts to provide appropriate services to the family to keep the child safe in the home and prevent removal (#4). There were also 4 cases in which the reviewers determined that the service worker did not appropriately address, or only addressed some of, the needs of the family (#6). Finally, the reviews determined that the case management organizations appropriately managed risks to children following reunification in all 7 cases reviewed during the year (#10).

Permanency Measure 1:

The items that address this measure are questions 11-17, 22, 40-43, 47 and 71 of the review tool. These questions focus on whether children have permanency and stability in their living situations. Question 71 was added to the fourth quarter reviews and did not appear in the calculations for the other quarters.

The graphs below illustrate how the individual agencies and Our Kids as a whole did for the year and how Our Kids did for each of the three quarters reviewed:
While the agencies as a whole performed above the standard for two out of the three quarters reviewed, the low performance during the fourth quarter prevented us from achieving the standard for the year. Also, no agency achieved 90% or better on this measure for the year.

The specific questions on the tool that pertain to this item are:

11. The child remained safe in his/her home after being discharged from out-of-home care and did not re-enter out-of-home care at least 12 months following discharge. (Y-6, N-0, NA-61 – 100%)
12. A multi-disciplinary staffing/assessment for placement planning was conducted before each placement to ensure the placement or move was unavoidable. (Y-12, N-16, NA-39 – 43%)
13. The child’s current placement is stable and appropriate to meet the child’s needs with no apparent or significant risks or projections of disruption. (Y-52, N-1, NA-14 – 98%)
14. Concerted efforts were made to identify, locate and evaluate other potential relatives and possible permanent placements for the child. (Y-42, N-5, NA-20 – 89%)
15. The child experienced no more than two out-of-home placement settings during the period under review. (Y-47, N-8, NA-12 – 85%)
16. If No was entered for #15, all placement changes were planned in an effort to achieve the child’s case goals or to meet the needs of the child. (Y-11, N-4, NA-52 – 73%)
17. In cases involving a child in a licensed placement setting, an exit interview was conducted with the child when moved from one placement to another and appropriate action was taken if the exit interview documented a concern. (Y-13, N-5, NA-49 – 72%)
22. The current case plan goal was appropriate based upon the child’s and family’s circumstances. (Y-60, N-2, NA-5 – 97%)
40. If the child was in out-of-home care for at least 12 of the most recent 22 months or met other ASFA criteria for TPR, a TPR petition was filed or joined. (Y-23, N-9, NA-35 – 72%)
41. If a Termination of Parental Rights petition was not filed, there were compelling reasons and an exception for not filing the petition was documented. (Y-9, N-1, NA-57 – 90%)
42. Appropriate steps were taken to identify and recruit and adoptive family that matched the child’s needs. (Y-12, N-1, NA-54 – 92%)
43. Appropriate steps were taken to process and approve an adoptive family that matched the child’s needs. (Y-10, N-2, NA-55 – 83%)
47. For youth 15 years of age but not yet 18, the agency appropriately monitored his/her progress towards successful transitioning from foster care to independence through regular informative staffings. (Y-12, N-6, NA-49 – 67%)
71. For children with the goal of “Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement” (APPLA), the agency made concerted efforts to provide the needed services that would adequately prepare the child for transition to adulthood. (Y-5, N-0, NA-20 – 100%)

The agencies performed well in assuring that compelling reasons and an exception to filing are documented (#41); taking the appropriate steps to process and approve adoptive families (#43); and in completing staffing to monitor the progress of youth age 15 and older as they move toward independence (#47). However, the review indicated that, as a circuit, we have room to improve in the area of staffing, identifying, and stabilizing placements (items #12, 14, 15 and 16), completing exit interviews when children leave licensed placement (#17); and filing a TPR petition when a child meets ASFA criteria (#40)

Items #22 and #71 are included in the Florida QIP. Our Kids performed above standard on both of these items. The current case plan goals for the cases reviewed were appropriate in 60 out of 62 cases (#22). In all cases reviewed, the agencies were making efforts to provide appropriate services to prepare children with a goal of APPLA for transition (#71). However, only 5 cases were reviewed for this item as it was added to the review tool just prior to the fourth quarter review.

**Permanency Measure 2:**

The items that address this measure are questions 18-19 and 26-39 of the review tool. These questions focus on whether the continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

The graphs below illustrate how the individual agencies and Our Kids as a whole did for the year and how Our Kids did for each of the three quarters reviewed:
Neither Our Kids nor any of the agencies achieved the standard of 90% or better on this measure for the fiscal year.

The specific questions on the tool that pertain to this item are:

18. The parents were notified of all the child’s placement changes. (Y-21, N-2, NA-44 – 91%)
19. The court was informed of the child’s placements and reasons for changes in placement. (Y-30, N-2, NA-35 – 94%)
26. The child’s current placement was in close proximity to the parents to facilitate face-to-face contact between the child and parents while the child was in out-of-home care. (Y-29, N-5, NA-33 – 85%)
27. If no was entered for #26, the location of the child’s current placement was based on the child’s needs and achieving the case plan goal. (Y-14, N-1, NA-52 – 93%)
28. The child was placed with siblings who were also in licensed and/or non-licensed out-of-home care. (Y-17, N-17, NA-33 – 50%)
29. If no was entered for #28, there was clear evidence separation was necessary to meet the child’s needs. (Y-16, N-1, NA-50 – 94%)
30. Concerted efforts were made to ensure visitation (or other contact) between the child and parents were sufficient to maintain or promote the continuity of the relationship between them. (Y-33, N-3, NA-31 – 92%)
31. Concerted efforts were made to ensure visitation (or other forms of contact if visitation was not possible) between the child and his or her siblings and it was sufficient frequency to maintain the continuity of the relationship. (Y-16, N-5, NA-46 – 76%)
32. Concerted efforts were made to maintain the child’s important connections. (Y-48, N+, NA-13 – 89%)
33. An inquiry was made to determine if the child was of Native American or Alaskan Native heritage. (Y-9, N-6, NA-52 – 60%)
34. If the child is of Native American or Alaskan Native heritage, the tribe was provided timely notification of its right to intervene in any state court proceedings seeking court ordered supervision, an involuntary out-of-home care placement or termination of parental rights. (Y-1, N-0, NA-66 – 100%)
35. Concerted efforts were made to place the child in out-of-home care in accordance with the Indian Child Welfare Act placement preferences if the child was of Native American or Alaskan Native heritage. (Y-0, N-0, NA-67)
36. The mother was encouraged and supported to participate in making decisions about her child’s needs and activities. (Y-24, N-12, NA-31 – 67%)
37. The father was encouraged and supported to participate in making decisions about his child’s needs and activities. (Y-12, N-7, NA-48 – 63%)
38. For cases in which an out-of-state placement was, or is being, explored for the focus child, a complete Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children (ICPC) packet requesting a non-priority home study was submitted within the required timeframe. (Y-1, N-2, NA-64 – 33%)
39. The information provided in the ICPC packet regarding the focus child was sufficient to enable the receiving state to make an appropriate decision concerning approval of the proposed placement for the focus child. (Y-2, N-1, NA-64 – 67%)

The review results showed that the agencies as a whole do a good job of informing parties about placement moves, making placements based upon the child’s needs and goals, documenting why siblings are not placed together, and assuring visits with parents occur often enough to maintain the relationship. However, there are areas that need improvement. Of the cases reviewed during the year that involved a sibling group, 50% were not placed together and only 76% of those cases had evidence
of visitation between the siblings. We also struggled with encouraging parents to participate in activities with and to make decisions about their children (67% for mothers and 63% for fathers.)

No items under this measure are included in the Florida QIP.

Well Being Measure 1:

The items that address this measure are questions 24-25, 44-46, and 48-57 of the review tool. These questions focus on whether families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs.

The graphs below illustrate how the individual agencies and Our Kids as a whole did for the year and how Our Kids did for each of the three quarters reviewed:
Our Kids was able to achieve the standard of 90% or better in the fourth quarter reviews. However, this was not enough to achieve the standard for the year as a whole and none of the agencies achieved the standard for the fiscal year.

The specific questions on the tool that pertain to this item are:

24. The case plan is designed to achieve permanency (out of home care cases) and safety and stability (in home cases) through appropriate tasks for the case participants. (Y-59, N-2, NA-6 – 97%)
25. The service worker communicated with service providers about the effectiveness of services for involved case participants. (Y-51, N-14, NA-2 – 78%)
44. If the case involves a youth who has reached 13 but not yet 15 years of age and he/she is living in a licensed, out-of-home care placement, a pre-independent living assessment was completed that identified service needs and services were provided. (Y-4, N-4, NA-59 – 50%)
45. If the child is 13 years of age or older and in licensed foster care, the case management agency provided guidance and assistance in developing an education and career path that is based on the child’s individual abilities and interests. (Y-17, N-5, NA-45 – 77%)
46. The teen-aged focus child is afforded opportunities to participate in normal life skills activities in the foster home and community that are reasonable and appropriate for his/her respective age or special needs. (Y-19, N-1, NA-47 – 95%)
48. An ongoing assessment of the child(ren)’s needs was conducted to provide updated information for case planning purposes. (Y-60, N-5, NA-2 – 92%)
49. An assessment for residential group care was completed when required. (Y-2, N-6, NA-59 – 25%)
50. An ongoing assessment of the mother’s needs was conducted to provide updated information for case planning purposes. (Y-37, N-5, NA-25 – 88%)
51. Concerted efforts were made to support the mother’s engagement with services. (Y-36, N-5, NA-26 – 88%)
52. An ongoing assessment of the father’s needs was conducted to provide updated information for case planning purposes. (Y-26, N-3, NA-38 – 90%)
53. Concerted efforts were made to support the father’s engagement with services. (Y-26, N-5, NA-36 – 84%)
54. An ongoing assessment of the out-of-home care providers or pre-adoptive parent’s service needs was conducted to ensure appropriate care for the child. (Y-49, N-2, NA-16 – 96%)
55. Concerted efforts were made to actively involve all case participants in the case planning process. (Y-35, N-22, NA-10 – 74%)
56. The frequency of the services worker’s visits with all case participants was sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency goal, and well-being of the child. (Y-55, N-8, NA-4 – 87%)
57. The quality of the service worker’s visits with case participants was sufficient to address issues pertaining to the child’s safety, permanency, and well-being. (Y-55, N-12, NA-0 – 82%)
The cases reviewed showed that the agencies are doing a good job in assuring that case plans are designed to achieve permanency or safety and stability; documenting that teens are provided opportunities to participate in life skill activities; providing ongoing assessment of children’s and father’s needs for case planning; and assessing out-of-home care and pre-adoptive parents’ service needs to ensure the children are receiving appropriate care. These represent only 5 of the 15 items that constitute this measure. Three of the items on which we performed well are included in the Florida QIP (these all pertain to the ongoing assessment of needs of the children, fathers, and out-of-home and pre-adoptive parents.)

However, the agencies as a whole performed below average on the other 10 items. The areas for improvement include communicating with service workers regarding the effectiveness of services; completing pre-independent living assessments; working with teens in licensed care to develop an educational/career path; completing RGC assessments as required (our score was 25% for this item); assuring that there is an ongoing assessment of mother’s needs; making efforts to engage case participants in services (scored below 90% for mothers and fathers); actively involve all case participants in case planning; and improve the frequency and quality of service worker visits with all case participants. Our Kids and DCF, as part of the innovation site plans, are putting in place new processes that should address most of these areas for improvement.

There are nine items included in this measure that are included in the QIP. These are item numbers 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56 and 57. These items primarily address engagement and participation in case planning activities of parents and caregivers. Of the nine items included in the QIP, we scored 90% or better on three. Another three were 87% or higher.

**Well Being Measure 2:**

The items that address this measure are questions 58-60 of the review tool. These questions focus on whether children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

The graphs below illustrate how the individual agencies and Our Kids as a whole did for the year and how Our Kids did for each of the three quarters reviewed:
The agencies as a whole were not able to achieve the standard of 90% or better during the fiscal year. However, four of the agencies achieved the standard for the fiscal year with three achieving a compliance rate of 100% on this measure.

The specific questions on the tool that pertain to this item are:

58. Concerted efforts were made to assess the child’s educational needs and to maintain the child within the same school during the out-of-home placement. (Y-38, N-6, NA-23 – 86%)
59. If educational needs were identified, necessary educational services were engaged. (Y-27, N-4, NA-36 – 87%)
60. Services effectively reduced or resolved the issues that interfered with the child’s education. (Y-21, N-6, NA-40 – 70%)
We did not achieve compliance on any of the items included in this measure which assesses whether children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

No items under this measure are included in the Florida QIP.

**Well Being Measure 3:**

The items that address this measure are questions 61-68 of the review tool. These questions focus on whether children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

The graphs below illustrate how the individual agencies and Our Kids as a whole did for the year and how Our Kids did for each of the three quarters reviewed:
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Our Kids was not able to achieve the standard of 90% or better during the fiscal year. However, two of the agencies achieved the standard for the fiscal year on this measure.
The specific questions on the tool that pertain to this item are:

61. Concerted efforts were made to assess the child’s physical health care needs. (Y-49, N-9, NA-9 – 84%)
62. Concerted efforts were made to provide appropriate services to address the child’s identified physical health needs. (Y-36, N-7, NA-24 – 84%)
63. Concerted efforts were made to assess the child’s dental health care needs. (Y-32, N-13, NA-22 – 71%)
64. Appropriate services were provided to address the child’s identified dental health needs. (Y-21, N-12, NA-34 – 64%)
65. An assessment(s) of the child’s mental/behavioral health needs was conducted. (Y-42, N-7, NA-18 – 86%)
66. Appropriate services were provided to address the child’s mental/behavioral health needs. (Y-36, N-7, NA-24 – 84%)
67. Informed consent or court approval was obtained for the use of each psychotropic medication deemed necessary by a physician to address the child’s mental behavioral health needs. (Y-7, N-5, NA-55 – 58%)
68. All data fields in the Florida Safe Families Network related to psychotropic medications appropriate and accurately documented the child’s prescribed medications. (Y-8, N-5, NA-54 – 62%)

The agencies as a whole did not achieve compliance on any of the items included in this measure which assesses whether children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs. There are also two questions which pertain to psychotropic medication. The highest score for this measure was for children receiving mental health assessments (86%). We also scored 84% on three items: assessing children’s physical health needs, making efforts to obtain services for identified physical health care needs, and appropriate services provided for identified mental/behavioral health care needs. The lowest score in this measure was on obtaining informed consent or court approval for psychotropic medications prescribed to the children (58%). The three remaining items included in Well-Being Outcome 3 are: efforts to assess dental health care needs (71%), appropriate services provided for identified dental health care needs (64%), and all FSFN data fields appropriately and accurately document the child’s medications (62%).

No items under this measure are included in the Florida QIP.

**Child and Family Services Review Measure:**

The items that address this measure are questions 20-21, 23 and 69 of the review tool. These questions focus on quality of supervisory review, timeliness of case plans, visitation plans and Judicial Reviews.

The graphs below illustrate how the individual agencies and Our Kids as a whole did for the year and how Our Kids did for each of the three quarters reviewed:
The agencies as a whole were able to achieve the standard of 90% or better in quarters 3 and 4 of the fiscal year and were very close to achieving for the full fiscal year. Also, three of the agencies achieved the standard for the fiscal year on this measure.

The specific questions on the tool that pertain to this item are:

20. Qualitative supervisory reviews and follow through were conducted as needed and required.
21. The case record contained a current (not expired) case plan.
23. The case plan specifically addressed visitation and other contact plans with all case participants.
69. Judicial Reviews were held in a timely manner and Judicial Review Social Study Report’s (JRSSLR’s) provided a thorough investigation and social study concerning all pertinent details relating to the child.

For the CFSR items, we achieved 90% or better on two of the items. Cases had a current case plan in the record in 94% of cases and JR hearings were held timely with thorough JRSSLR’s completed in 95% of
cases. However, the areas for improvement on this measure are with the qualitative supervisory reviews (79% of cases met the criteria) and in assuring that case plans address visitation and contact plans with all case participants (86%).

No items under this measure are included in the Florida QIP.

Summary

Our Kids scored 90% or better on one of the five outcomes (Safety Outcome 1 – 92%). This outcome looks at whether children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect. However, we did score 89% on two other outcomes (Permanency Outcome 1 and Child and Family Services Review). The lowest score for the year was on Well-Being Outcome 3 (78%) which addresses whether children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs. Permanency Outcome 2 was only slightly higher on the year at 80%. This outcome measures our performance on preserving the continuity of family relationships and connections for children.

There were 14 individual questions that address areas on the Florida Quality Improvement Plan (QIP). The questions that relate to the QIP are items #4, 6 and 10 (Safety Outcome 2), #22 and 71 (Permanency Outcome 1), and #48 and 50-57 (Well-Being Outcome #1). Of the 14 items, Our Kids scored 90% or better for the year on 8 of them (#4, 6, 10, 22, 71, 48, 52, and 54). The six items that were below 90% were all included in Well-Being Outcome 1. The items below 90% for this outcome measure were primarily related to family engagement, pre-independent living assessments, and the frequency and quality of service worker visits with all case participants. Our Kids and DCF, as part of the innovation site plans, are putting in place new processes that should address most of these areas for improvement.