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Our Kids completes quarterly quality reviews with the Department of Children and Families with the assistance of trained staff from the case management organizations. We are seeing some positive trends in areas that we expect to continue improve the next year.

The quarterly reviews cover five areas – Assessment; Family Engagement; Service Planning and Provision; Promoting Case Progress; and Quality Supervisory Reviews, Direction, and Follow-up. 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 three quarters of fiscal year 2011. The fourth quarter is not included as only 5 cases were reviewed and the tool was modified for those cases. Additionally there were two Quality Service Reviews done for fourth quarter and submitted to Tallahassee separately. There were two other prominent reviews during the fourth quarter that took precedence statewide (CBC/DCF Peer Review of Our Kids Cases and a full 100% Medical/Dental Review) necessary after the tragic death of Nubia Barahona. The peer review is complete but findings are pending Tallahassee’s report and the Medical/Dental Review is still underway.

Reported here is data from the 75 cases reviewed during the fiscal year using the tool on the DCF Portal. The cases were distributed among the full case management agencies with CFCE having 13 cases reviewed, CHARLEE – 14, CHS – 14, FRC – 11, His House – 11, and Wesley House – 11. One Hope United transitioned out of case management in Miami-Dade during the first quarter of the fiscal year and had one case reviewed during the first quarter. This case is included in the Our Kids totals but will not be reported for the agency.

The report is separated by each of the five areas. Outcomes will be provided for each agency individually as well as for Our Kids overall. The charts after each area show the scores for each agency and Our Kids in that area overall. The score for each quarter is shown for the region as a whole.

Assessment:

The questions from the Quality Practice Standards for Case Management review tool that address this area are numbers 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 17, 44, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 58, 61, 63, and 65. These questions focus on assessments (such as family, safety, needs, and Independent Living); placement planning; exit interviews; and children’s medical, dental and mental health assessments.

Our Kids scored an 80% in this area overall for the year. The region increased in our score in this area over each of the quarters (score of 73% in Q1, 80% in Q2, and 86% in Q3.) The individual agencies scores were – CFCE was 78%, Charlee scored 82%, CHS was at 74%, FRC had 88%, His House scored 65%, and Wesley House was at 85%.
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Overall, the agencies performed well on 10 of the 16 items related to assessment achieving a score of 80% or higher. These 10 items were – managing risks following reunification and preventing re-entry (18/18 – 100%); youth age 13 but not yet 15 living in licensed care had a pre-IL assessment completed that identified services and services were provided (5/6 – 83%); ongoing assessment of the child’s needs (66/75 – 88%); an assessment for residential group care was completed when required (3/3 – 100%), ongoing assessment of mother’s needs (44/45 – 98%); ongoing assessment of the out-of-home caregivers’ or pre-adoptive parents’ needs (51/52 – 98%); assessing child’s educational needs (45/49 – 92%); assessing physical health care needs (55/57 – 96%); assessing dental health care needs (39/48 – 81%); and mental health care needs (55/57 – 96%).

The remaining six items fell below 80% for the year. These items were initial family assessment (14/18 – 78%); updated family assessments (25/75 – 33%); thorough safety assessment completed prior to reunification or placement in unlicensed care (20/27 – 74%); multidisciplinary team staffing prior to placement move (10/26 – 38%); an exit interview was conducted and appropriate action taken to address concerns raised (8/14 – 57%); and ongoing assessment of father’s needs (27/36 – 75%). Two of the items were not consistent in their score over the course of the year (initial assessment and exit interviews) with the score fluctuating between quarters. However, the scores on the other items did show an increase in each quarter or a marked improvement by the third quarter. These items and there quarterly scores are updated assessments (Q1 – 20%, Q2 – 36%, and Q3 – 44%); safety assessment (Q1 – 75%, Q2 – 70%, and Q3 – 89%); multidisciplinary team staffing (Q1 – 30%, Q2 – 22%, and Q3 – 71%); exit interviews (Q1- 60%, Q2 – 33%, and Q3 – 100%); and ongoing assessment of father’s needs (Q1- 62%, Q2 – 82%, and Q3 – 83%).
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Family Engagement:

The questions from the Quality Practice Standards for Case Management review tool that address this area are numbers 18, 30, 31, 32, 36, 37, 51, 53, 55, and 67. 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, and informed consent for the use of psychotropic medication.

Our Kids scored an 80% in this area overall. The score for the region fluctuated throughout the year with Q1 having a score of 75%, Q2 was 85%, and Q3 had a score of 80%. The individual agencies scores were CFCE – 91%, Charlee – 86%, CHS – 77%, FRC – 89%, His House – 73%, and Wesley House – 73%.

The agencies scored over 80% on three items of the 10 items related to family engagement. The items on which the agencies performed over 80% were: concerted efforts were made to ensure visitation between child and parents were sufficient to promote continuity of the relationship (32/35 – 91%), concerted efforts made to maintain the child’s important connections (52/55 – 95%), and concerted efforts made to support mother’s engagement in services (42/45 – 93%). The items on which the region performed above 80% were consistent in score over the course of the year. The scores for parent-child visitation were Q1 – 92%, Q2 – 92%, and Q3 – 91%; scores for efforts to maintain important connections were Q1 – 89%, Q2 – 100%, and Q3 – 94%; and scores for efforts to support mother’s engagement in services were Q1 – 88%, Q2 – 100%, and Q3 – 94%.

The seven items on which the agencies did not perform as well, with the overall score below 80% were: parents were notified of all placement changes (12/17 – 71%), concerted efforts were made to ensure visitation between siblings (11/15 – 73%); mother was encouraged and supported in making decisions about her child’s needs (28/36 – 78%), father was encouraged and supported in making decision about his child’s needs (18/31 – 58%), concerted efforts made to support the father’s engagement in services (23/31 – 74%), concerted efforts to actively involve all case participants in the case planning process (48/66 – 73%), and informed consent or court approval was obtained for the use of psychotropic medications (6/8 – 75%).

While the scores for the remaining items did not achieve 80% for the year, many of these items saw increases in each quarter, particularly those related to engagement of fathers. This is a positive trend and is reflective of the practice enhancement and changes that the region has implemented over the last few years. Those items which increased in score each quarter are: father encouraged and supported in making decisions about his child’s needs (Q1 – 38%, Q2 – 64%, Q3 – 67%, and YTD – 58%); concerted efforts made to support father’s engagement in
services (Q1 – 71%, Q2 – 75%, Q3 – 78%, and YTD – 74%); concerted efforts made to involve all case participants in the case planning process (Q1 – 64%, Q2 – 76%, Q3 – 78%, and YTD – 73%); and informed consent or court approval obtained for psychotropic medication (Q1 – 50%, Q2 – 67%, Q3 – 100%, and YTD – 75%).

Service Planning and Provision:

The questions from the Quality Practice Standards for Case Management review tool that address this area are numbers 3, 4, 6, 8, 14, 16, 19, 46, 47, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 64, and 66. 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; identification and evaluation of potential relative placements; placement changes (planned and made according to the child’s needs as well as informing the court of the move); life skills; services worker contact (frequency and quality); and services to address identified educational, physical health care, dental health care, and/or mental health care needs.

Our Kids scored 89% in this area overall. The individual agencies scores were – CFCE – 91%, CHARLEE – 92%, CHS – 87%, FRC – 95%, His House – 80%, and Wesley House – 86%. The region score on this item steadily increased over the course of the year with Q1 having a score of 87%, Q2 – 88%, and Q3 at 91%. This item was one of the consistently good scores with all of the individual agencies scoring over 80% in at least 2 out of 3 quarters.
The agencies performed above 80% on 12 out of the 16 items related to this standard. The twelve items were immediate and ameliorative interventions were initiated on behalf of a child if they were re-abused (7/8 – 88%); concerted efforts were made to provide for appropriate services to prevent child’s entry into OHC (23/24 – 96%); service referrals were consistent with needs identified through assessments (56/60 – 93%); all immediate and emerging safety concerns were addressed and interventions provided to protect the child (44/46 – 96%); concerted efforts were made to identify and evaluate potential relative placements (41/47 – 87%); placement changes were planned in an effort to achieve child’s case goals or meet the needs of the child if the child experienced more than 2 OHC placements (10/12 – 83%); the frequency of the service workers visits were sufficient to address issues (67/75 – 89%); the quality of service workers visits were sufficient to address issues (70/75 – 93%); if educational needs identified services were engaged (27/31 – 87%); concerted efforts were made to provide services to address physical health needs (38/40 – 95%); appropriate services provided to address identified dental health needs (14/17 – 82%); and appropriate services were provided to address child’s mental health needs (38/44 – 86%).

There were four questions in this area in which the score was below 80% for the region. Those questions were: court was informed of the child’s placements and reasons for changes in placements (25/32 – 78%); teen aged child was afforded opportunities to participate in normal life skills activities (11/14 – 79%); for youth age 15 but not yet 18, the agency monitored progress towards successful transitioning from FC to independence through regular informative staffings (8/11 – 73%); and services effectively reduced or resolved issues that interfered with child’s education (21/27 – 78%). The first two items (informing the court of placement changes and opportunities to participate in normal life skills activities) steadily increased in score over the course of the year with both having a score of 67% in Q1 but finishing in Q3 at 100%.
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Promoting Case Progress:

The questions from the Quality Practice Standards for Case Management review tool that address this area are numbers 11, 13, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, and 69. These questions focus on child remaining safe in their home for at least 12 months after reunification; stability of the current placement; case plan is current, has an appropriate goal, addresses visitation with case participants, and is designed to achieve permanency or safety and stability; communication with service providers; current placement is in close proximity to the parents to facilitate visitation or, if not, is based upon the child needs and achieving the case plan goal; child is placed with siblings or, if not, the separation was necessary; ICWA eligibility and services; ICPC issues; ASFA requirements; adoptive family recruitment and processing; Independent Living educational and career path; and timeliness of Judicial Reviews.

Our Kids scored 82% in this area overall. The individual agencies scores were – CFCE – 84%, CHARLEE – 80%, CHS – 77%, FRC – 89%, His House – 82%, and Wesley House – 83%. The region score on this item remained consistent over the course of the year with Q1 having a score of 82%, Q2 – 81%, and Q3 at 82%.

The agencies performed well on 14 out of the 22 items related to this standard. This area has the most items included in the score and the region had an overall score of over 90% on 10 of these items. The items on which the agencies performed exceptionally well were child remained safe in home after being discharged from OHC (100% - 5/5); current placement is stable and appropriate to meet the child’s needs with no apparent risk of disruption (96% - 50/52); record contains a current case plan (97% - 73/75); case plan goal was appropriate (100% - 74/74); case plan is designed to achieving permanency or safety and stability (100% - 70/70); if child was not placed in close proximity, the placement was based on child’s needs and goal (100% - 6/6); a complete ICPC packet was submitted within the required timeframe (100% - 1/1); information provided in the ICPC packet was sufficient for the receiving state to make an appropriate decision (1005 – 1/1); appropriate steps were taken to process and approve an adoptive family that matched the child’s needs (100% - 9/9); and Judicial Reviews were held timely and JRSSRs were thorough (96% - 71/74).

There were eight questions in this area in which the agencies did not perform as well, with the overall score below 80% for the region. Two of these questions (34 & 35) are follow up questions regarding ICWA eligibility determination and should have been answered as NA as the answer to the initial ICWA eligibility question was no. However, these questions were answered as no on four of the tools and this was not corrected during the QA process for the tools. The remaining seven questions are: child was placed with siblings who are also in OHC (71% - 27/38); if siblings were not placed together, there was clear evidence separation was necessary to meet the child’s needs (67% - 8/12); an inquiry was made to determine if the child
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was of Native American or Alaskan Native Heritage (22% - 15/69); if child was in OHC for at least 12 of most recent 22 months or met other ASFA criteria, a TPR petition was filed (58% - 18/31); if TPR petition was not filed, compelling reasons and an exception to filing was documented (64% - 7/11); and if child is 13 or older and is in licensed OHC, the agency provided assistance in developing an educational and career path (71% - 10/14). A new process has been put in place to address the issue of the ICWA eligibility determinations. Our Kids staff has included the request for the documentation from the CPI during the case transfer staffing. Our Kids also has a pilot project with the FCMAs to address separated siblings so hopefully these areas will improve for the region.

Quality of Supervisory Reviews, Direction and Follow Up:

The questions from the Quality Practice Standards for Case Management review tool that address this area are 20.0.1, 20.0.2, and 20.0.3. These questions are directed toward the frequency and quality of supervisory reviews.

Our Kids scored a 91% in this area overall for the year. The individual agency scores on this measure for 2010-2011 were: CFCE – 95%, CHARLEE – 93%, CHS – 83%, FRC – 97%, His House – 94%, and Wesley House – 88%.
Quality Assurance Review Annual Report
FY2011

Of the 75 cases reviewed, all but one had Supervisory Reviews completed quarterly. The reviewers determined that nine of the cases did not adequately address child’s safety, well-being and permanency (20.0.2) and on 10 cases the supervisor did not ensure follow through on guidance and direction (20.0.3). Each quarter had at least one case that did not meet the all of the criteria for supervisory reviews. However, all but one agency achieved a score of 100% for at least one quarter during the year and three agencies achieved 100% in two quarters. The one agency that did not achieve a score of 100% missed the mark due to the timeliness of the supervisory review not due to the quality of the reviews.

Summary
The region performed at or above 80% on all five case management standards covered by the QA reviews for the year and for two out of the three quarters included. CHARLEE and FRC also scored at least 80% in all five areas for the year and each had one out of the three quarters where all five areas had a score of 80% or better. CFCE and Wesley House achieved a score of 80% or higher in 4 out the five areas for the year, while His House did in three, and CHS in two. CFCE, while they did not achieve 80% or better in all categories for the year, did achieve this in 2 out of the three quarters.

The following are the agencies who achieved 80% or better in each quarter by category.
Assessment – Wesley House; Family Engagement – CHARLEE; Service Planning and Provision –
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CHARLEE, CHS, FRC and Wesley House; Promoting Case Progress – CFCE and FRC; and Quality Supervisor Reviews – CFCE, FRC, and His House.

The agencies also showed improvement over the course of the year in some categories. CFCE saw an increase in scores for Quality Supervisor Reviews, achieving 100% in both the second and third quarter (up from 87% in Q1.) CHARLEE saw improvement in each quarter in three separate categories – Assessment (Q1 – 68%, Q2 – 73%, and Q3 – 96%); Family Engagement (Q1 – 83%, Q2 – 85%, and Q3 – 87%); and Quality Supervisor Review (Q1 – 78%, Q2 – 93%, and Q3 – 100%). CHS had improvement year in the area of Promoting Case Progress (Q1 – 76%, Q2 – 76%, and Q3 – 79%). FRC had increases in score in the areas of Family Engagement (Q1 – 76%, Q2 – 100%, and Q3 – 100%) and Supervisory Review (Q1 – 92%, Q2 – 100%, and Q3 – 100%).

His House saw improvements in the areas of Assessment (Q1 – 56%, Q2 – 78%, and Q3 – 88%); Service Planning and Provision (Q1 – 69%, Q2 – 82%, and Q3 – 88%); and Quality Supervisor Reviews (Q1 – 83%, Q2 – 100%, and Q3 – 100%). Wesley House saw improved performance in the area of Promoting Case Progress with scores improving from 78% in quarter 1 to 85% in Q2 and 86% in Q3.

While the region did not see the expected improvement in scores for updated assessments, there was improvement overall in the area of assessment. Our Kids is also performing metrics reviews each quarter in regard to the SDM tools completion and quality. This should help to improve the regions performance in the area of assessments. The improvement in assessment is also related to the improvement in the area of family engagement. This improvement is primarily related to the better engagement of fathers across the region. The items related to father engagement saw increases in each quarter this year. This is a positive trend and is reflective of the practice enhancement and changes that the region has implemented over the last few years.

It is Our Kids belief that the pilot projects that have been implemented in the last three years, such as the WIP-IT pilot, separated sibling project, APPLA project and changes to the Independent Living program; will start show even more in our quality reviews in the next year. We also expect that the Quality Service Review format and interview process will be very information as well.

Data compiled and reported by Stephanie Wickers, QA Specialist at Our Kids 8/16/11.