Our Kids QA plan includes quarterly review samples selected by the DCF Office of Child Welfare in Tallahassee. The reviews are entered into the QA portal and available to DCF for reporting. For further information, see the Windows in Practice document published by DCF. Our Kids QA Plan outlines that OK is responsible for ten (10) Special/topical reviews per quarter for a total of 40; two (2) QSR reviews per quarter for a total of 8 and 21 CM “QPS” reviews per quarter for a total of 84. Our Kids leads the reviews and has the assistance of trained and qualified QA staff from the case management organizations. All four quarters are completed at this time. (QA departments from the region do not participate in these reviews however, complete reviews of Child Protection Investigations on the same QA Portal mentioned above.)

Quality Service Reviews

The Case Management reviews that focus on interviews are “QSRs” and had two sets of indicators. This year the amount of the Quality Service Reviews (QSR) was lowered from eight per quarter (Fiscal Year 2011-12) to two per quarter this fiscal year (2012-13). Recall that that Fiscal Year 2011-12 all Case Management reviews using the CM tool ceased in favor of the QSR protocol, but this year the CM tool was reinstated statewide. Also note that the QSR reviews are less focused on the file and more focused on the interviews and “Big Picture” results. For example there are questions related to the Child and Family Status Indicators and other questions related to Practice Performance Indicators. The choice to utilize this format was to mimic more closely the CFSR reviews that occur nationwide that have traditionally focused on interviews with stakeholders combined with file reviews. The CFSR methods are being reviewed by the Children’s Bureau nationwide and Florida is a pilot site to determine if the QA system of Florida can replace the traditional site visits conducted in prior years. In fact the National Resource Center, the Children’s Bureau, Florida Department of Children and Families and the CBCs of Florida will continue meeting on this pilot project in August 2013. QSR reviews are also entered into a specific tool provided by the Family Safety Office of Florida Department of Children and Families (DCF) on the DCF QA Portal. Tools for the
eight cases reviewed using this protocol were very positive. As in Fiscal Year 2011-12, there was an abundance of high scores that rate in the ACCEPTABLE RANGE of 4-5-6. In fact only 11 ratings of Fair (4) were entered by reviewers summarizing their findings. There were no ratings in the UNACCEPTABLE RANGE OF 1-2-3.

**Child and Family Status Indicators:** The QSR protocol has eleven indicators or categories to evaluate status of the child and family being reviewed: 1. Safety, 1. Vulnerability, 3. Stability, 4. Living Arrangement, 5. Permanency, 6. Physical Health, 7. Emotional Well-being, 8. Early Learning Status, 9. Academic Status, 10. Pathways to Independence, and 11. Parent or Caregiver Functioning). Three cases had “Fair” rather than good ratings in this area. One child was at risk in school, however the mother in this in-home case and the agencies working with the mother were engaged in the school, therapy and tutoring to increase success. Another child had just made a positive move from a temporary foster home to a relative placement and was reunifying with one of his siblings who had lived in a different foster home to meet her needs. Overall with this family the reviewers were pleased to see that the three siblings were together and the caregiver was committed and related to them biologically. Prognosis for this child was also rather positive, yet depending on the work of parents to achieve ultimate reunification of their family. The third child reviewed that showed fair progress had taken some time to achieve permanency but had just been adopted by a relative and lived with several siblings and other members of his biological family. The delays were largely due to some other permanency options that did not come to fruition but were explored at great length. As always when you speak to people and visit them, what is not always evident in the file and documents becomes more vivid and understandable. Though a crystal ball does not exist in child welfare, the positives far outweighed any of the setbacks. They were safer and healthier for the involvement of the agencies and the oversight of the courts.

**QSR Practice Performance Indicators:** According to the QSR protocol there are ten practice performance indicators also considered for each child’s review: 20- Engagement; 21-Voice and Choice; 22-Teaming or Partnering; 23- Assessment and
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Understanding; 24- Planning Process; 25-Transition Planning; 26-Implementation; 27-Maintaining Quality Connections; 28-Monitoring and Adjusting; 29-Psychotropic Medication. There were five children in the review that had mostly ratings of 5 (Good) and 6 (optimal) however their overall review was peppered with ratings of 4 (Fair) in the practice performance. There were no UNACCEPTABLE ratings of 1-2 or 3. The lessons learned for these performance indicators were simply that establishing trust up front is crucial, timely discussions with other stakeholders (GAL, relatives, service providers, Children’s Legal Services) as well as monitoring progress in a fair way for all partners will improve family and agency success. The stories were sent each quarter to the Family Safety Office.

Supplemental reviews of 10 per Quarter

Quarters 1 and 4 focused on evaluating twenty children for compliance and practice in the area of psychotropic medication. The data from the first quarter showed only the information regarding Question 67 (Children prescribed a psychotropic medication are closely monitored by the case manager to ensure his/her safety and well-being). Responses from reviewers showed that eight out of ten (8 of 10) were closely monitored for a score of 80%. More details were visible for Quarter 4 and details were sent to the state office. The compliance as to documenting that the client was closely monitored fell to 50% as half of the selected sample did not show adequate documentation during the last quarter. The documentation about the medications for question #72.2 was entered into all ten cases properly into FSFN: (name of medication, purpose, dosages, dates of express and informed consent, name of prescribing physician) and notes concerning treatment and monitoring of the medication are documented in the notes section of the psychotropic medication tab. Each Agency complied and received a 100% on this measure. Our Kids agencies, Clinical and QA continue to have this important topic for training and review.

Special reviews held in Quarter 2 centered on the children with goals of Independent living. Questions 45, 46, 47, 58 & 59 from the Case Management tool were reviewed. All five questions focus on well-being. Question 45 asks if “the case management
agency provided guidance and assistance in providing an educational and career path based on the child’s individual abilities and interests.” Of the 10 cases, 8 cases received a yes giving Our Kids 80% achievement on this measure. Of the two that has negative answers on this question, one is a habitual “runner” and was not available at the time the plan was due. Question 46 asks if “the child was encouraged and supported to be an active participant in shaping decisions pertaining to their life skills, educational, medical and behavioral health needs.” All 10 cases received a Yes giving a perfect score (100%) in for this measurement. Question 47 requires that “the case management agency regularly evaluated the youth's progress in developing independent living skills, ensuring needed services were in place to effectively prepare the youth for the future.” Our Kids had a 90% rating to this measure. Question 58 focuses on “the child’s educational needs are assessed on an on-going basis during out-of-home placement.” All 10 cases received a Yes giving a perfect score (100%). Finally, Question 59 asks if “services are engaged as needed to reduce or resolve issues interfering with the child’s education.” Of the 10 cases reviewed 6 of them received an N/A as there were no services needed, 2 were given a yes and the remaining 2 were giving a no. Overall, Our Kids a rating of 50% for the four children who needed services. This is certainly an area that could use some more attention.

In Quarter 3 Our Kids and the rest of the state conducted the required special review for 10 children with the goal of adoption. Our Kids score was perfect for the questions on an individual basis as well as a combined average for questions 42 & 43. Question 42 inquires if appropriate steps were taken to identify and recruit an adoptive family that matched the child’s needs. This question received N/A on nine of the ten cases reviewed. This showed that the placement was appropriate for permanency to begin with and recruitment was not necessary. The tenth child had severe medical issues to care for and a family was identified by the agency. The score for this area would be 100% in efforts to find permanent homes.

Questions 43 asked if appropriate steps were taken to process and approve an adoptive family that matched the child's needs. This question is applicable to out-of-home cases
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were TPR has occurred. Of the ten cases reviewed, one was marked inapplicable as the child with complicated medical needs had just begun overnights with the identified family. Another child’s situation was not applicable for the questions, as the signed Final Judgment was delayed. The remaining 8 children received yes given the overall score of 100%.

**Traditional Case Management File Reviews**

The Case Management reviews that focus on files cover five areas:

1. Safety
2. Permanency
3. Well Being
4. Quality Supervisory Reviews, Direction & Follow-up (to Case Managers)

The QA review tool measures compliance in each of these areas. This report provides information on the results of the QA reviews completed during the first two quarters of Fiscal Year 2012-13 with some comparison to Fiscal Year 2010-11, as the same general tool was used. It should be noted that the QA tool used which is accessed by QA reviewers around the state via the QA Portal managed by the DCF Office of Child Welfare.

**Safety Outcome:**

The questions from the Quality Practice Standards for Case Management review tool that address this area are the first ten (10) questions. These questions focus on services provided to address re-abuse/re-neglect, to prevent child's entry into out-of-home care, and needs identified through safety assessments. Our Kids scored 84% during Quarters 1 and 2. Our Kids scored 83% during Quarter 3 and 4.
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The individual agencies scores were – CFCE was 79% during Quarters 3 and 4 compared to 81% during Quarters 1 and 2. CHARLEE scored 95% during Quarters 3 and 4 compared to 95% during Quarters 1 and 2. CHS was at 83% during Quarters 3 and 4 and 70% during Quarters 1 and 2. FRC had 83% during Quarters 3 and 4 compared to 88% during Quarters 1 and 2. His House scored 79% during Quarters 3 and 4 compared to 91% during Quarters 1 and 2. In Monroe County Wesley House scored 81% during Quarters 3 and 4 compared to 84% during Quarters 1 and 2.

Permanency:

The questions from the Quality Practice Standards for Case Management review tool that address this area are numbers 12-14, 17-19, 22, 26-30, 32, 36, 37, 41-43 and 71. These questions focus on visitation between the focus child and their parents and siblings, maintaining the child’s important connections, parental involvement in making decisions about the child’s needs and activities, participants’ involvement in case planning, parents’ engagement in services, stable living arrangements, exit interviews for children when leaving a licensed foster home after residing there for 30 days or more, and informed consent for the use of psychotropic medication.

Our Kids scored an 83% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 87% during Quarters 3 and 4.

The individual agencies scores were CFCE, 88% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 89% during Quarters 3 and 4. CHARLEE scored 74% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 84% for Quarters 3 and 4. CHS scored 86% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 76% during 3 and 4. FRC scored 83% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 94% for Quarters 3 and 4. His House scored 89% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 92% during Quarters 3 and 4. In Monroe County, Wesley House scored 78% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 88% during Quarters 3 and 4.

Well Being:

The questions that address this area are numbers 24, 25, 38, 44-48 and 50-67. These questions focus on agencies developing case plans that are matched to the individual
needs of the family, and whether the team members were informed and involved in planning, facilitation and progress. Also considered is meeting standards related to children having their voices and choices known in planning and participating in normalcy activities; Independent Living (IL) assessments and services, educational plans and life skills preparation. The QA tool also addresses service worker contact (both frequency and quality) with the case participants as well as the services matched to address identified educational, physical health care, dental health care, mental health care needs and the monitoring of any psychotropic medication.

Our Kids overall score for this area during Quarters 1 and 2 was at 80% and scores for Quarters 3 and 4 was 85%. CFCE scored 67% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 79% during Quarters 3 and 4. CHARLEE scored 83% in Quarters 1 and 2 and 93% during Quarters 3 and 4. CHS scored 73% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 84% during Quarters 3 and 4. FRC scored 83% in Quarters 1 and 2 and 87% in Quarters 3 and 4. His House scored 92% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 87% during Quarters 3 and 4. In Monroe, Wesley House scored 78% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 82% in Quarters 3 and 4.

Quality of Supervisory Reviews, Direction and Follow Up:

The Quality Practice Standards for Case Management review tool has one question (Systemic) that addresses this area, number 20. This question focuses on whether a Supervisor conducted a review at least quarterly, did it considered all aspects of the child’s safety, well-being and permanency and ensured follow through on guidance and direction was provided.

Our Kids scored 91% in this area overall for Quarters 1 and 2 (Qtr.1 88% & Qtr. 2 96%). The second half of the year, cases reviewed scored 97% for Quarters 3 and 4.

Three agencies had 100% in all four quarters: Wesley House in Monroe County and His House and CFCE in Miami-Dade. CHARLEE greatly improved from 67% during Quarters 1 and 2 to 100% for Quarters 3 and 4, as did FRC from 78% during Quarters 1 and 2 to 100% for Quarters 3 and 4. CHS scored 100% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 83% for Quarters 3 and 4.
Federal Child and Family Services Review:

The Quality Practice Standards review tool has two questions that are addressed in this area, number 23 & 69. Question 23 on the tool focuses on specifically if the case plan addresses visitation (between the parents and the children as well as the siblings if separated while in OHC) and other contact plans with all case participants. Question 69 focuses on whether or not a Judicial Review (JR) was held timely and whether or not a thorough report provided to the court.

Overall, Our Kids scored 88% on the case plan question #23 during Quarters 1 and 2 and 91% for quarters 3 and 4.

The individual agencies scores were CFCE, 75% for Quarters 1 and 2 and 100% for Quarters 3 and 4. CHARLEE scored 75% for Quarters 1 and 2 and 100% for Quarters 3 and 4. Monroe County scored Wesley House scored 88% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 100% for Quarters 3 and 4. CHS, FRC and His House perfect scores on this question quarters 1 and 2. CHS and FRC also had 100% for Quarters 3 and 4. His House scored 84% the last two quarters of the year.

Overall, Our Kids scored 89%, on the JR question #69 during Quarters 1 and 2 and 88% during Quarters 3 and 4.

The individual agencies scores were CFCE at 75% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 75% during Quarters 3 and 4. CHARLEE scored 75%, during Quarters 1 and 2 and 100% for Quarters 3 and 4. Wesley House in Monroe County scored 88% during Quarters 1 and 2 and 100% in Quarters 3 and 4. The same three Miami agencies (CHS, FRC and His House) also scored 100% during Quarters 1 and 2,. Quarters 3 and 4 were 67% for CHS, 88% for FRC and 100% for His House.

Summary for Case Management reviews:

The region performed at or above 80% on all five case management standards covered by the QA reviews for the first two quarters in fiscal year 12-13. The sample showed improvements in four of the standards and a decline of 1% in one standard.