



Pennsylvania Office of Children, Youth, and Families

Child and Family Services Review

Program Improvement Plan Semi-Annual Report

June 30, 2010 – December 30, 2010

I. PIP General Information												
CB Region:	<input type="checkbox"/> I	<input type="checkbox"/> II	<input type="checkbox"/> III	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/> IV	<input type="checkbox"/> V	<input type="checkbox"/> VI	<input type="checkbox"/> VII	<input type="checkbox"/> VIII	<input type="checkbox"/> IX	<input type="checkbox"/> X	<input type="checkbox"/>
State: Pennsylvania												
Lead Children's Bureau Regional Office Contact Person: Jesse Wolovoy						Telephone Number: (215) 861-4014						
						E-mail Address: jesse.wolovoy@acf.hhs.gov						
State Agency Name: Department of Public Welfare – Office of Children, Youth and Families						Address: Health and Welfare Building, Room 105, 625 Forster Street Harrisburg, PA 17120						
						Telephone Number: (717) 787-3985						
Lead State Agency Contact Person for the CFSR: Cathy Utz						Telephone Number: (717) 705-2912						
						E-mail Address: cutz@state.pa.us						
Lead State Agency PIP Contact Person (if different): Stephanie Maldonado						Telephone Number: (717)783-7376						
						E-mail Address: smaldonado@state.pa.us						
Lead State Agency Data Contact Person: Susan Stockwell						Telephone Number: (717)772-6902						
						E-mail Address: sstockwell@state.pa.us						

III. PIP Semi- Annual Report Narrative for PIP Quarters One and Two

PIP Implementation

This PIP is highlighted by several themes, which will frame our work as we move forward with implementation. These foundational strategies include:

- Quality Practice;
- Sustaining Change;
- Child, Youth and Family Engagement;
- Collaboration;
- Enhancing Assessments;
- Timely Permanence;
- Role of Supervisors as Practice Change Agents; and
- Statewide Information System Solution

We developed the PIP matrix utilizing a logic model to help ensure strong connections between findings and desired outcomes. Pennsylvania used the seven CFSR outcomes related to Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being, as well as the Systemic Factors to center our strategies and link them to the findings. We have a full array of strategies and action steps related to each theme. The PIP matrix lists strategies related to each outcome, section by section, to better allow for measurement of how each strategy impacts the improvement of the corresponding outcome; yet, the strategies and action steps are interconnected and often build upon one another in an effort to lead to sustainable change. Therefore, many of the action steps included within one particular strategy, impact strategies within other sections of the PIP matrix. It is important to acknowledge the interconnectivity of these strategies, as one strategy's effectiveness can impact the effectiveness of other strategies. Our approach to improving outcomes through sustainable efforts should better assure our ability in improving outcomes for children, youth and families.

This semi-annual report organizes the strategies outlined in the PIP matrix by theme. A summary of the applicable strategies and action steps accomplished during the first two PIP quarters is included to support the evidence of completion which has been provided to the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) on the CD-ROM.

Quality Practice

Our foundational strategy for quality practice is implementation of the PA practice model. The practice model establishes the foundation for our continuous quality improvement efforts which are outlined within the sustaining change theme. Pennsylvania's values and practice principles will provide the framework that supports quality practice in PA; and, therefore will be the foundation of how we evaluate our ability to improve outcomes for children, youth, families and communities through our Quality Service Reviews (QSRs) as part of our continuous quality improvement process. We believe that skilled child welfare professionals who exhibit the values outlined in our practice model will be better equipped and therefore better able to work with families.

Sustaining Change

The Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process continues to be foundationally based on our practice model and standards which define quality practice. A great deal of progress has been made over the first two PIP quarters regarding the establishment of a CQI process within Pennsylvania. The focus has largely been on the development of tools, processes, training and guides to help support counties as they learn more about CQI. A crosswalk of the current compliance based licensing tools and the PA specific QSR protocol has been completed and a more streamlined approach is being used in Phase One counties, the results of which will help inform how these processes will best connect moving forward.

The following outline provides more detailed information regarding the progress made for the applicable PIP quarter one and two strategies.

PIP Strategy:

8.1 Utilize a phased-in approach to the implementation of a statewide CQI process that builds capacity for local (county) CQI processes that are foundationally built upon the PA Practice Model

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

8.1a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i

The planning and development of Pennsylvania's statewide and local CQI process has been the charge of the Sustaining Change workgroup that was convened in August 2009 and continues to meet to this date. Pennsylvania has received technical assistance from the National Resource Center on Organizational Improvement (NRCOI), as well as support from organizations including the Child Welfare Policy and Practice Group (CWPPG), Human Systems and Outcomes (HSO) and the American Public Human Services Association (APHSA) to establish a framework for our CQI process. Technical assistance has included guidance surrounding the development of a Pennsylvania-specific Quality Service Review (QSR) protocol; case sample selection; review team composition; frequency of reviews and practice model development.

A need for staff development specific to CQI was identified during this process and, as a result, the Office of Children, Youth and Families (OCYF) began to collaborate with APHSA to support these efforts including the development of an overarching "desired future state" for quality improvement efforts in Pennsylvania's child welfare system. In addition, OCYF state and regional staff, and staff from the training and technical assistance providers have been introduced to the APHSA model for continuous improvement, DAPIM™. The DAPIM™ model is a systematic approach within which team members learn continuous improvement strategies for solving problems and improving the effectiveness of the organization. An OCYF Leadership team was built to serve as the sponsor team for OCYF's internal CQI efforts. Focus groups were held with OCYF staff to gather their input about improving our internal systems to support

them in continuous improvement efforts and to identify resources staff will need to ensure success. APHSA then summarized the focus group results and the findings were shared with all staff and used to develop a plan that will coordinate all policy and program support toward achieving desired outcomes for children, youth, and families. Four priority gap areas were identified as areas of focus: communication, workload capacity, role clarification, and teamwork. These four areas will be further explored through the development of implementation teams who will identify strategies to improve each area.

Technical assistance has also been provided by APHSA to support the Pennsylvania Child Welfare Training Program (CWTP) in continuing their efforts to build the Organizational Effectiveness (OE) capacity of their supervisors and staff. The work effort will reinforce the approach to OE, the DAPIM™ model that was initially launched in 2004 and continued in 2009. The effort has impacted performance and staff capacity at CWTP based on “learning by doing,” continuous improvement, strategic alignment and empowerment. By engaging contracted consultants, CWTP will be continuing to expand its capacity to deliver quality OE services to county agencies.

In addition to this technical assistance, Pennsylvania also gathered information and lessons learned from other states that have established their own CQI process in conjunction with their state’s practice model. In September 2009, several key stakeholders went to Utah to experience their QSR process and become familiar with the review tool that is used to evaluate practice and the implementation of Utah’s practice model. We then piloted the state of Indiana’s QSR protocol in three different counties (Philadelphia, Washington and York) by reviewing 12 cases at each site. Based on the feedback from this pilot, a design team was formed and a draft PA QSR protocol was developed. This draft PA QSR protocol was piloted in two counties (Allegheny and Venango) and then edited. The PA QSR protocol was finalized as of November 2010 and is going to be utilized in a phased-in approach across the state over the course of the next several years. The first QSR was held in December 2010 in Philadelphia County. A total of 25 cases were reviewed and the preliminary findings were reported. QSRs are also scheduled for February in Allegheny and Lackawanna Counties, March in Venango County, and April in York and Butler Counties. A subcommittee of the Sustaining Change workgroup will be chartered to establish a roll-out plan for the CQI effort across the state.

To support this CQI effort and create a more unified approach to the technical assistance provided to the county child welfare agencies across the state, a Technical Assistance (TA) Collaborative Steering Committee convened in July 2010 and continues to meet. The purpose of this team is to develop a cohesive group of TA providers who work in collaboration with child welfare agencies to improve outcomes for children, youth, and families as well as to improve communication, increase knowledge, and enhance coordination of TA and other support services provided to the counties. The goal is for individual regional or county-specific TA collaborative groups to be

established to support the improvement work that is being done within the counties as they participate in the phased-in CQI effort.

Child, Youth and Family Engagement

Pennsylvania believes meaningful child, youth and family engagement throughout the time of involvement with the family is vital to improving child, youth and family outcomes. More significant family involvement through increased frequency and quality visitation, targeted assessments of strengths and needs, and improved identification of underlying issues should result in more effective service planning that is driven by the families and youth. This approach will be applied throughout the life of the case, but concerted efforts on the front end should result in fewer children entering care. When placement is necessary, permanency will be achieved in a timelier manner because there will be an improved identification of the underlying issues and root causes of maltreatment. There will also be specific efforts to maintain cultural and community ties, as well as, efforts to locate relatives and permanent connections through family finding techniques which will be beneficial for all children, not just those children that are in placement. A variety of family engagement strategies will be implemented, but there will be a specific focus on the engagement of fathers throughout the life of a family's case as well as the transition to independence for older youth involved in the Child Welfare System. In addition to the engagement of children/youth and families at the practice level, Pennsylvania will also look to foster the engagement of youth and families at the system level through a variety of means.

The following outline provides more detailed information regarding the progress made for the applicable PIP quarter one and two strategies.

PIP Strategy:

3.16 Provide guidance and support regarding services to older youth to assist in their transition to independence

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

3.16 a, b, c

The OCYF Youth Independent Living Services Guidelines Bulletin, Appendix, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), Recommendations for Implementation, Sample Transition Assessment and 90 Day Transition Plan are in the final phase of the review and signature process. This comprehensive bulletin and supporting documents have undergone an extensive development process. The Appendix is rich in resources and sample information. The FAQs are presented from the specific user or stakeholder perspective, such as youth, resource family, Judges, etc., providing questions and answers that are relevant to each particular stakeholder in language that they will understand. Both the Sample Transition Assessment and 90 Day Transition Plan tools were developed by stakeholders, including youth, and are intended to provide additional reassurance that youth are afforded the appropriate services and information in a timely manner and in conjunction with the youth's final court hearing.

Additionally, the draft bulletin and supporting documents were presented and discussed at the Independent Living (IL)/Statewide Adoption and Permanency Network (SWAN) Summer Statewide Meeting in June 2010, the IL Retreat in August 2010, six regional IL/SWAN Regional Trainings in the fall of 2010, and to youth during periodic Youth Advisory Board (YAB) meetings. The draft bulletin was widely distributed for review and comment on October 5, 2010 and over 60 comments were received which were addressed through the Child, Youth and Family Engagement workgroup which led the charge for the development of the bulletin.

PIP Strategy:

4.3 Ensure children and youth's cultural and community ties are maintained

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

4.3b

The PA QSR protocol evaluates the quality of practice surrounding maintaining family relationships to include whether or not interventions are building and maintaining positive interactions and providing emotional support between the child/youth and his/her parents, siblings, relatives and other important people in the child/youth's life when they are temporarily living away from one another. Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of PA's PIP baseline as it relates to maintaining cultural and community ties.

PIP Strategy:

5.1 Implementation of family engagement strategies to ensure child, youth and family involvement throughout the life of a case

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

5.1a

An important part of Pennsylvania's family engagement effort is the development of a parent advisory board, Families and Communities United (FCU). FCU was formed in August of 2010 to bring together parents formerly involved in the child welfare system with youth, child welfare practitioners and policy makers to advocate, educate, support and empower individuals involved with family service systems to be resources for themselves and their communities.

From August 2010 through December 2010, FCU held four meetings to define the purpose and structure of the board. A strategic plan is being finalized and will be implemented to support parent engagement across Pennsylvania. While significant progress has been made in forming FCU and involving parents at the systems level in this effort, more work will continue to occur in order for us to measure and achieve our intended impacts of meaningful parent participation at their individual case level, as well as at the community and policy levels.

Another important component of Pennsylvania's engagement strategy is the employment of Youth and Parent Ambassadors at CWTP. Youth and Parent

Ambassadors have prior experience in the child welfare system and assist Pennsylvania in developing policies and practices. CWTP employs up to two Parent Ambassadors on a full time basis and up to five Youth Ambassadors on a full or part time basis depending on the academic calendar. Youth and Parent Ambassadors lead training and technical assistance efforts across the Commonwealth. They also support statewide committees and policy development. Additionally, they support internal CWTP operations including interviewing new staff, curriculum development and revisions, and strategic planning.

There are a variety of means by which County Children and Youth Agencies (CCYAs) receive support surrounding the enhancement of their family engagement practice performance. These include training and technical assistance to support child welfare professionals with the implementation of family engagement processes (i.e. Family Group Decision Making; engagement of families from a strength-based, solution-focused perspective; the Safety Assessment Management Process, etc.). Specific evidence provided includes training sign-in sheets (also known as ENCOMPASS reports) as well as technical assistance reports (also known as Agency Service Reports). There also continue to be statewide forums surrounding family engagement efforts, particularly around Family Group Decision Making (FGDM). Minutes from FGDM Leadership meetings and minutes from the FGDM evaluation subcommittee have been submitted as evidence of the statewide efforts/supports of this family engagement strategy.

5.1b

Pennsylvania launched a discussion board on the topic of FGDM and other family engagement strategies in February 2009. The marketing of the discussion board followed and members now include individuals from the public child welfare community, private provider community, legal representatives, etc. Members have been joining the discussion board since October 2009. There are 72 members of the discussion board as of December 31, 2010. The discussion board has several forums including:

- Implementation – topics may include how to implement FGDM within a county child welfare organization and how an agency might broaden the scope of their FGDM within their organization.
- Facilitators/Coordinators – topics may include discussions amongst facilitators and coordinators about what has worked well in their practice as well as those areas in which facilitators and coordinators might struggle.
- Practice Applications – topics may include discussions on specific practice applications (i.e. youth in transition).
- Evaluation – topics center on the fidelity of FGDM practice and the surveys that are being conducted across the state to assure fidelity of the practice model.
- Miscellaneous – offers an opportunity for a variety of topic discussions, not just about FGDM, but also other family engagement strategies.

5.1c

Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of our PIP baseline as it relates to child and family involvement in case

planning. There are three data sources from the QSR protocol surrounding a child/family's involvement in case planning. These indicators include:

- Engagement Efforts – This indicator looks at whether the team is receptive, dynamic, and willing to make adjustments in scheduling and meeting locations to accommodate family participation in the service process, including case planning as well as offering transportation and child case supports, where necessary to increase family participation in planning and support efforts.
- Role and Voice – This indicator looks at whether the child/youth, parents, family members, and caregivers are active, ongoing participants (e.g. having a significant role, voice, choice, and influence) in shaping decisions made about the child/youth and family strengths and needs, goals, supports and services.
- Child/Youth and Family Planning Process – This indicator looks at whether the planning process is individualized and matched to the child/youth's and family's present situation, preferences, near-term needs and long-term view for safe case closure. Furthermore, it assures that planning provides a combination and sequence of strategies, interventions, and supports that are organized into a holistic and coherent service process providing a mix of services that fits the child/youth's and family's evolving situation so as to maximize potential results and minimize conflicts and inconveniences.

PIP Strategy:

5.3 Mothers, fathers (including noncustodial caregivers), paternal and maternal formal and informal kin will be identified early and located throughout the life of a case

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

5.3 a, b and c

Pennsylvania developed a draft curriculum based on Kevin Campbell's Family Finding Training which was piloted in the central and western regions of the state. Final revisions were made to the draft curriculum based on the feedback from both pilots, and the Training on Content (TOC) was held on October 27-28, 2010. The full Family Finding curriculum is 24 hours in length and is comprised of five separate parts. Days one and two, although offered as one curriculum, are truly two separate parts. Day one is an overview of Pennsylvania's interpretation of Kevin Campbell's (Seneca Center) Family Finding model. Day two reveals information and practice associated with steps one and two (respectively Discovery and Engagement). Day three offers information and consultation associated with step three of the model – Planning. Day four offers information and consultation associated with step four of the model – Decision Making. Day five offers information and consultation associated with step five of the model – Evaluation. Finally, day six offers information and consultation associated with step six of the model – Follow up on Supports. Discussions are already taking place to assure that we are preparing for statewide roll-out of Family Finding training. There will be continued trainer recruitment, transfer of learning sessions (a.k.a. Super-User), coordination of resources and efforts for statewide roll-out to include marketing to key stakeholders and panel participants and the establishment of a training schedule.

5.3e

Measurement of the effectiveness of available resources to locate noncustodial caregivers initially and ongoing throughout the life of a case is monitored through the ongoing licensure of CCYAs. A summary of the findings specific to outreach to kin for during licensure inspections that occurred within the first two PIP quarters has been submitted as evidence of completion.

5.3f

The Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Court's (AOPC) Permanency Practice Initiative (PPI) and the SWAN Legal Services Initiative continue to support the implementation of strategies to locate kin/non-kin resources for children and youth.

According to the 20 PPI counties who reported results between July 1 and September 30, 2010, there were 1,185 children served by Accurint searches, 397 life long connections were established as a result of Family Finding efforts and 52 placements were a result of Family Finding efforts.

At the end of December 2010, SWAN Legal Services paralegals had performed 5,752 Diligent Searches, compared to 2,428 Diligent Searches that were done by the end of December 2009, representing a 140% increase in the number of searches performed over that year.

PIP Strategy:**5.5 Increase engagement efforts to include fathers at all stages of the case****PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:****5.5 b, c, d and e**

During quarter two, a Father Engagement work group was convened and led by the Honorable Kim Berkeley-Clark, Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas to explore best practices regarding engaging fathers. The workgroup includes parent advocates, child welfare and legal professionals, and national experts. The group developed a preliminary report and set of recommendations, which was provided to the State Roundtable in May 2010. After considerable discussion at the State Roundtable, the report was adopted in part. State Roundtable members requested the workgroup continue their efforts and provided additional guidance/direction for further study. As such, the workgroup continues to meet and is set to provide an amended report to the State Roundtable in May 2011.

In addition, the State Roundtable members were provided a presentation regarding father involvement. The presenters included a father who had successfully regained custody of his daughter from the dependency court, his attorney, the caseworker and the hearing master. Finally, State Roundtable members unanimously agreed to have the issue of engaging fathers (and their extended family members) as a topic for the 2010 Children's Summit.

At the 2010 Children's Summit Ron Clark, Director of the National Fatherhood Initiative and Jessica Kendall, Assistant Staff Director of the American Bar Association Center on Children and the Law, conducted a plenary session highlighting the importance of father involvement and promising practices to promote such. Each of the 52 county teams in attendance was asked to complete a father engagement section for their local team-planning document which would include possible strategies to consider to improve local engagement efforts.

5.5h

The CFSR results revealed that visits were more likely to occur with siblings and mothers than with fathers. Absent parents, particularly fathers, were not assessed for or provided services. The exclusion of fathers from case planning occurred even when whereabouts of the fathers were known and they were involved with or even living with the child/youth. QSRs will monitor the engagement efforts of all key members involved in the child/youth/family team, including the engagement of fathers throughout the life of a case. There are three data sources in the QSR protocol that will provide data and measurement about the practice performance related to this area needing improvement. These QSR indicators include:

- Engagement efforts;
- Role and voice; and
- Child/Youth and Family Planning Process.

Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of our PIP baseline as it relates to the engagement of fathers throughout the life of a case.

PIP Strategy:

6.1 Improve the quality of visitation between the caseworker and child/youth to include a focus on visits needing to be purposeful in discussing assessed needs and reviewing FSP/ CPP goals

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

6.1 a, b, c, and e

Quality visits between a caseworker and the families and children they work with are essential to resolving the concerns that brought the family to the attention of the agency and also expedites permanency when children have to be removed from their home. Pennsylvania has included a quality visitation component in the Safety Assessment and Management Process (SAMP), both for in-home and out-of-home care. The inclusion of this information has been made possible through the consultation received from the National Resource Center (NRC) for Child Protective Services, and the NRC for Permanency and Family Connections, as well as a survey that was conducted with CCYAs regarding quality visitation. The information obtained from this work led to the issuance of a field guide entitled "Field Guide for the Practice of Quality Visitation with Children and Families". This field guide is being distributed to CCYAs, as well as private providers, during the roll-out of Out-of-Home SAMP.

6.1g

During the QSRs, reviewers will gather information surrounding the quality of visitation that a worker has with the child/youth, mother and father during the last 12 months of the case. QSR reviewers will also be gathering information about whether the frequency of visits were sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child/youth to promote achievement of case goals. Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of our PIP baseline as it relates to the quality of visitation between caseworkers and children, youth and families.

PIP Strategy:**6.2 Improve frequency of caseworker visits with children and youth****PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:****6.2 a, b, c, d**

Pennsylvania has been submitting data on the number of visits with children in federally defined foster care in accordance with the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006. These federal submissions occur in December of every year, with 2011 being the final year for submission. Pennsylvania recognizes the value of quality visitation with children in out-of-home care and will be conducting our own tracking of these visits in addition to the federal reporting requirements in December of 2010, as well as 2011. Pennsylvania was approved to conduct a random sampling methodology and as such, not all of the 67 counties are represented in the federal sample. Counties who were not part of the federal submission will be required to submit their visitation data in March 2011, as well as March 2012 to align with PIP quarters three and seven. We will then require all 67 counties to submit their visitation data in June 2011, as well as June 2012 to align with PIP quarters four and eight. Following the March 2011 submission, which will be added to our federal submission from December 2010, any county whose visitation percentage was not at 90% will be required to submit a county improvement plan to their respective OCYF Regional Office. These improvement plans will address the reasons why children are not being seen on a regular basis and the efforts the county plans to undertake to address the root causes and assure their children are seen. These improvement plans will be monitored by the OCYF Regional Offices.

6.2e

During the QSRs, reviewers will gather information surrounding visitation that a worker has with the child/youth, mother and father during the last 12 months of the case. Reviewers will be gathering information about whether the frequency of visits was sufficient to address issues pertaining to the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child/youth to promote achievement of case goals. Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of our PIP baseline as it relates to the frequency of visitation between caseworkers and children, youth and families.

PIP Strategy:**8.3 Systems will be structured to foster youth and family engagement at the system level**

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:**8.3c**

Pennsylvania continues to have a strong Youth Advisory Board (YAB) advocating, educating, and forming partnerships to create positive change in the substitute care system. The YAB continues to have over 200 members participating in statewide and regional meetings, speaking engagements, community service projects, Know Your Rights trainings, peer mentoring, and consultation with child welfare professionals, all toward positive changes.

From July 2010 through December 2010, the YAB held two statewide meetings focused on implementation of their strategic plan which was developed in June 2010 and centers on leadership and committee development, influencing practice to ensure family connections are maintained for youth in foster care, and strengthening the quality of child welfare caseworkers. Six regionally held YAB meetings continue to happen on a bimonthly or quarterly basis sharing the same values and focus as the statewide board complimented by local goals and resources.

During October 2010, YAB members presented on the new Independent Living Bulletin and Frequent Asked Questions, the Transition Packet, and the Know Your Rights manual at five of the six SWAN/IL Fall Quarterly events that occurred across the Commonwealth. In this capacity, youth presented important information to over 600 child welfare professionals about the importance of quality independent living services they need to successfully transition to adulthood.

Youth also continue to be involved in training the Know Your Rights Manual, available at http://www.jlc.org/publications/know_your_rights/, at over twenty different locations since July 2010. During most trainings, youth report that they did not know all of their rights and that they plan to use the Manual to help advocate for themselves. Youth also co-trained a new module of our foundational casework training, Charting the Course and Adolescent issues.

Efforts continue to recruit and train parents to be trainers and consultants. In addition to CWTP's Parent Ambassador, and the statewide Families and Communities United Advisory Board, parents previously involved in the child welfare system are recruited, trained and paid to be trainers and consultants. Last fiscal year, one parent completed the consultant training and worked statewide and in Pennsylvania counties to move parent engagement efforts forward. Efforts will continue to strengthen parents as trainers and consultants.

Collaboration

Collaboration is critical to improving outcomes due to the many cross-systems partners involved in the delivery of services for our children, youth and families. Key components of successful collaboration include clear communication between team members, and working together toward common goals.

The following outline provides more detailed information regarding the progress made for the applicable PIP quarter one and two strategies.

PIP Strategy:

1.3 Improve communication between OCYF Regions and CCYAs regarding CPS investigations

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

1.3 a, b

In Pennsylvania, the OCYF Regional Offices conduct child abuse investigations in cases where a conflict of interest exists for the CCYAs to complete the investigation. To improve communication between OCYF Regional Offices and CCYAs regarding CPS Investigations, OCYF Policy staff, in collaboration with OCYF Regional Office staff, has been developing an Investigation Protocol for OCYF Regional Office use. As part of the 2008 Federal CFSR, one of the areas needing improvement related to the inconsistent communication from the OCYF Regional Offices regarding their investigations of reports of suspected child abuse. The majority of these inconsistencies surrounded the communication between the OCYF Regional Offices and the CCYAs and also OCYF Regional Office follow-up with CCYAs at the conclusion of an investigation.

A protocol for the sharing of the information was developed and utilization of this protocol began with the OCYF Southeast Regional Office. The protocol specifies that a copy of the Child Protective Services Investigation Report (CY 48) be sent to the CCYAs upon the filing of the report. This protocol has been provided to the other OCYF Regional Offices and reports received in the second quarter of the PIP will be sent to the CCYAs upon completion of the investigation process.

OCYF Regional Offices have always utilized a checklist inclusive of all steps to be followed in the investigation. The checklist has been updated to include the sending of the CY 48 to the CCYAs. OCYF Regional Office Supervisors review the entire investigation packet, including the checklist assuring completion of all requirements.

Due to the recent development of the Safety Assessment and Management Process (SAMP) for Out-of-Home Care (OOHC), particularly the Present Danger Assessment within SAMP OOHC, the protocol and corresponding checklist will be updated to include the necessary information. The incorporation of policies related to SAMP OOHC will be completed within quarter three. Draft versions of the Investigation Protocol with the SAMP OOHC information and a corresponding flowchart have been included with the quarter two submission. Both the current protocol and checklists are also included with the quarter two submission.

PIP Strategy:

1.4 Ensure that reports of child maltreatment are initiated timely

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

1.4a

Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of our PIP baseline as it relates to the timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment. Although the QSR protocol indicators do not specify a rating system for the timeliness of investigation, QSR reviewers are gathering information from those involved in case planning about the timeliness of investigations which is captured on the QSR roll-up sheet in section five. Timeliness of investigations is measured over the past 12 months. QSR reviewers examine whether the reports were initiated in accordance with the State and County timeframes, whether face to face contact was made with the subject child/youth within the required timeframes, whether there were reasons for delays due to circumstances beyond the control of the agency and whether the timeliness of investigations was an area of strength or an area needing improvement.

PIP Strategy:**7.5 County Child Welfare Professionals obtain health summaries from child's health care providers following interaction with health care professionals****PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:****7.5a**

OCYF in collaboration with representatives from the Office of Medical Assistance Programs (OMAP), Office of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services (OMHSAS), Office of Income Maintenance (OIM) and a representative from a physical health managed care organization developed a form to gather important medical information needed by child welfare service providers to help track a child's receipt of health care services and ensure coordination and continuity of the child's ongoing physical and behavioral health care needs. The Basic Health Information Form (CY 980) has been developed to provide a quick reference summary of information related to a child's health care providers, a child's specific health care needs, and services received. The CY 980 will serve as a living document and information should be updated as necessary to reflect the current general health status of the child. This form is to be completed by the assigned CCYA caseworker for every child receiving child welfare services, whether receiving in-home services or out-of-home care, and should be placed in the child's case record. The CY 980 will reinforce current regulatory requirements at 55 Pa Code, § 3130.43 (b) (7) (relating to family case records) which provides for the inclusion of appropriate medical information on family members. The form should initially be completed at the time the Family Service Plan and/or the Child's Permanency Plan is developed and updated, at a minimum, on an annual basis.

PIP Strategy:**7.6 Improve cross-systems collaboration regarding access to services to provide behavioral health and drug and alcohol services for children and youth****PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:****7.6b**

The Department of Public Welfare (DPW) seeks to provide a comprehensive approach to serving children/youth through programs that focus on early intervention, long-term prevention, and services that support family stability, safety, community protection and the child's healthy development and permanent connections. An effective system of care recognizes that children with safety, emotional and behavioral needs often require services from more than one child-serving system. When a viable solution that addresses all of a child's needs cannot be reached for a child with multi-system needs who is receiving services from more than one county agency or organization at the local level, DPW will work with counties to address these complex situations either at the regional or state level. On December 28, 2010 DPW issued the Complex Case Planning bulletin which provides guidance for county agencies, family and youth advocacy organizations, managed care organizations and anyone involved in case planning for children/youth with complex issues up to age 21. Included in this guidance is the ability to make a referral to a state level review team to determine and identify strategies to enhance local service delivery for complex cross systems cases. DPW's Complex Case Team includes representatives from OCYF, OMHSAS, and the Office of Developmental Programs (ODP) who work together on solutions if a case meets specific criteria. The cases reviewed are monitored to ensure resolution to identified barriers.

7.6c and d

A draft state-level infrastructure and strategic plan to support the PA System of Care (SOC) Partnership was developed at the September and December 2010 meetings of the SOC Partnership State Leadership Team. It is anticipated that the submitted Strategic Plan/Logic Model will be approved as final at the February 2011 meeting.

In August, 2010 an announcement describing the process for counties interested in becoming SOC Partner counties was sent to all CCYAs on behalf of the PA SOC Partnership State Leadership Team. Youth who may be served by the PA SOC Partnership, within their partner counties must:

- Be between the ages of eight and eighteen inclusive;
- Have behavioral health issues that are not exclusively on the Autism spectrum;
- Have involvement in the juvenile justice system, the child welfare system, or both; and
- Be placed out of home, or be at risk for out of home placement.

Letters of Interest were due on September 28, 2010. An informational session was offered on September 7, 2010 to provide more detailed information for counties and to address any questions. Submissions were reviewed by the SOC Partnership State Leadership Team and county interviews were held in October. These interviews permitted in-depth discussions about the required elements of the SOC and how counties plan to address them. Five counties were chosen as SOC Partner Counties. SOC infrastructure-development began immediately after selection, including development of the governing board and High Fidelity Wraparound (HFW)

implementation readiness. HFW coach training will begin once the coach is hired. Staff training will begin in early 2011, at which time youth and families will begin to be served.

The five selected counties will develop integrated systems that will serve youth with behavioral health challenges and involvement in the child welfare and/or juvenile justice systems. These five counties are committed to transforming services and supports by creating integrated, youth driven and family driven SOC.

This transformation is part of a cooperative agreement with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), which has awarded six years of funding to the Commonwealth to implement sustainable SOC in fifteen counties. Counties will be eligible for funding and be supported by the PA SOC Partnership staff, and the Youth and Family Training Institute. The support will include training, technical assistance, marketing, cultural and linguistic support, support to local youth and family partners/leaders, and guidance on matters related to state and federal regulation and funding throughout the process of SOC development. HFW will be the engagement and planning process for all SOC youth and families. The Youth and Family Training Institute will provide training, credentialing, coaching and ongoing fidelity monitoring of the HFW staff for all SOC counties.

In addition, counties will be supported by the SOC Partnership State Leadership Team, which is comprised of youth and family representatives and top behavioral health, child welfare, and juvenile justice officials. This team is committed to working with counties to address all of the systems change issues faced by counties, including policy, regulatory, and funding options within DPW.

PIP Strategy:

8.2 Increased coordination and collaboration between CCYAs and JPOs

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

8.2 a and b

One way Pennsylvania has worked to increase coordination and collaboration between CCYAs and Juvenile Probation Offices (JPOs) is through the issuance of the Shared Case Responsibility Policies and Procedures Bulletin on May 3, 2010. The purpose of this bulletin is to provide a framework in which CCYA and JPO can work to support the practice of Shared Case Responsibility (SCR), formerly referred to as Shared Case Management. This practice refers to the sharing of the responsibility for care of and services to youth who are under the direct supervision of either CCYA or JPO, or both concurrently, and the families of these youth. The intent is to emphasize issues related to the delivery of services provided to this target population, as well as to clarify accountability issues in the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS).

The issuance of this bulletin required the CCYA and JPO to work collaboratively in developing a local level plan for implementation of the bulletin requirements. This collaboration has led to increased cooperation and communication in working through

local implementation issues which has in turn led to a significant decrease in the need for technical assistance. The only technical assistance needs that have been identified thus far, which are in the process of completion, include a power point for use at the local level to train internal staff and securing ongoing statewide presentation opportunities. Due to the limited technical assistance requests, no regional calls were needed.

Enhancing Assessments

Our foundational strategy for enhancing assessments is to expand upon our state mandated assessments by providing resources and support to improve the quality of our assessment skills so that we can better assess underlying issues that are present with the children, youth and families involved with the child welfare system. The main strategies include: Issuance of guidance regarding response times for General Protective Services (GPS) cases; Implementation of the Safety Assessment Management Process (SAMP) for in-home and out-of-home cases; Evaluation of SAMP; Sharing information with system partners about SAMP; and Assessment of child/youth and family issues (including underlying issues) and connection of these assessments to service provision. Particular focus will lie with safety assessment, educational screening, and assessment and provision of services for physical and behavioral health needs.

The following outline provides more detailed information regarding the progress made for the applicable PIP quarter one and two strategies.

PIP Strategy:

1.1 Provide guidance re: response times for GPS reports, including face to face contacts, and transitioning cases from GPS to CPS

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

1.1a

Pennsylvania does not currently have defined response times for general protective service (GPS) reports, although we do have response times defined for child protective service (CPS) reports. In an effort to create consistent GPS response times, CCYAs were surveyed through an electronic mail requesting information regarding their current GPS response times and the allegations or factors associated with each response time. A compilation of these responses and an analysis of the results are included as evidence of completion. These results, along with the information available nationally from other states in regard to response times for GPS will be used to create guidelines for standard response times in quarter three.

PIP Strategy:

2.1 Implementation of the Safety Assessment and Management Process (SAMP) for In-Home Services Cases

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

2.1a

Since the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) went into effect, the Commonwealth has worked toward prioritizing the tenets set forth by ASFA with safety maintaining its paramount status. When Pennsylvania participated in the Federal CFSR in 2002, safety was determined to be an area that would benefit from further study and improvement. As a result, the Risk Assessment Task Force reconvened and formed a sub-committee dedicated to conducting a local and national review of safety assessment instruments. The sub-committee asked counties to submit their existing policies and procedures including any tools for review. In addition, tools developed by other states were collected and reviewed. The three predominant tools used at that time to identify safety threats were from Maryland, North Carolina, and Illinois, although additional tools from other states were also collected. Based on that review, a safety assessment process was developed and training began in 2006. However, after a brief period of training and implementation, the model was determined to be ineffective in accurately assessing safety and identifying the true underlying causes of the concerns.

To help guide the development of an effective PA specific safety assessment process, DPW requested technical assistance from the National Resource Center on Child Protective Services (NRCCPS). As a result of this technical assistance which occurred in 2007, the NRCCPS provided the Department with recommendations that would enhance the safety assessment and management process. Additional literature, which was developed by Action for Child Protection, Inc. was also reviewed and incorporated and led to the development of the Pennsylvania In Home Safety Assessment and Management process (IHSAMP).

The implementation of IHSAMP began in Philadelphia County. CWTP developed a two day outline curriculum. This curriculum was presented to Philadelphia Department of Human Services (DHS) staff beginning in the spring of 2007. In addition to this training, Philadelphia DHS also sought technical assistance from Action for Child Protection and the NRCCPS to foster implementation of the IHSAMP. As a result, Emily Hutchinson from Action for Child Protection/NRCCPS developed a two and a half day curriculum. Emily Hutchinson and other staff from Action for Child Protection also conducted a Training on Content (TOC) session for the trainers identified to deliver the training to Philadelphia DHS staff. Ultimately, this curriculum was provided to over eight hundred staff at Philadelphia DHS.

During roll out of IHSAMP in Philadelphia County, work continued with DPW OCYF to plan for statewide training and implementation. Action for Child Protection granted DPW OCYF and CWTP written permission to use the curriculum and materials developed for Philadelphia DHS on a statewide basis. During the summer of 2008, revisions were made to the Philadelphia DHS specific training so that it would be applicable to all counties across the Commonwealth.

At the same time, county administrators were introduced to the concept of County Safety Leads (CSLs) and were asked to identify a minimum of one person from each county who would have the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities to become the

county based expert of safety assessment. The expectation was that the CSLs would be able to provide training to staff from their agencies and also become resources to agency staff to guide implementation.

Once the CSLs from each county were identified, they attended the three day curriculum (204 Introduction to the In Home Safety Assessment and Management Process) as participants to learn IHSAMP. They also attended a one day Development of Trainer Session to learn the knowledge and skills needed to become an effective trainer, and TOC session where they learned the specific requirements for training the three day curriculum. All of these sessions occurred in November and December of 2008.

CSL facilitated training then began in January of 2009 and continued through to June of 2009. CWTP and Regional OCYF staff provided assistance to CSLs through observations, technical assistance, and regional support sessions. Full implementation of the IHSAMP began in July of 2009 for all counties. CWTP and Regional OCYF staff continued to provide technical assistance and to facilitate regional support sessions to aide counties in their implementation efforts. This work continues across the Commonwealth on an ongoing basis and will continue throughout the implementation of the Out of Home Care Safety Assessment and Management Process (OOHC).

Also beginning in July 2009, IHSAMP was incorporated into Charting the Course Towards Permanency for Children in Pennsylvania. As a result, new child welfare professionals must attend Module Six Safety Assessment as part of their direct service worker certification.

2.1b

Monitoring of the implementation of SAMP for in-home service cases occurs during the ongoing licensure of CCYAs. A summary of the findings specific to safety assessment during licensure inspections that occurred within the first two PIP quarters has been submitted as evidence of completion.

PIP Strategy:

2.2 Implementation of the Safety Assessment and Management Process (SAMP) for Out-Of-Home Care Cases

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

2.2a, b, c, d, e, f, g, and h

Work related to phase two of the Safety Assessment and Management Process (SAMP) began in March of 2009. This phase of the process focused on assessing the safety of children and youth in out of home care. To design and develop this process OCYF once collaborated once again with CCYAs, Action for Child Protection, and NRCCPS. Representatives from eight counties (Berks, Bucks, Cambria, Chester, Crawford, Cumberland, Dauphin, Montgomery, and Philadelphia) joined Emily Hutchinson from Action for Child Protection, NRCCPS and representatives from OCYF and CWTP to form the sub-committee that would oversee the identification of safety indicators and

characteristics, design the Out of Home Care Safety Assessment Worksheet, and develop the policies and procedures to guide the completion of the work.

The sub-committee began its task by reviewing the Confirming Safe Environments Model that was developed by Action for Child Protection, NRCCPS based on years of field work with child welfare agencies across the country. Based on this review, the sub-committee worked to make modifications to the Confirming Safe Environments model that would best meet the unique needs of child welfare agencies in Pennsylvania.

OCYF and CWTP then requested the assistance of Emily Hutchinson to develop, in partnership with the Out of Home Care sub-committee, a two day training to teach the Out of Home Care Safety Assessment and Management Process (OHSAMP). Emily Hutchinson delivered three pilot sessions to test the effectiveness of the curriculum. These trainings were offered to the Out of Home Care Sub-Committee members, regional and central OCYF staff, and staff from CWTP. Revisions were then made to the curriculum based on that feedback.

Following the completion of the curriculum pilot, the sub-committee turned its focus to piloting the process. In order to accomplish this, several of the sub-committee counties (Berks, Bucks, Cambria, Chester, Crawford, Montgomery, and Philadelphia) and Elk County agreed to identify children and families that staff could assess using the OHSAMP process. These eight counties became the identified Innovation Zones. Each Innovation Zone County was asked to identify four cases per county staff to be assessed during the pilot. This number was reduced for smaller counties. Two of the cases included children placed in county operated homes and/or informal arrangements and two included children placed in provider operated homes.

The following data was collected from each Innovation Zone County for each case identified:

- The type of case (intake, investigation, ongoing, etc.);
- How long the child (or sibling group) had been in the out of home care setting;
- The age of the child;
- The type of setting (emergency placement, informal, foster care, pre-adoptive, planned respite, etc); and
- Whether it was a county or provider home.

Between May 1, 2010 and June 30, 2010 the OHSAMP Pilot for Innovation Zone Counties occurred. Staff from the Innovation Zone Counties partnered with Provider Agencies using the developed assessment materials and processes to determine the strengths and concerns.

During the pilot, county staff were expected to:

- Conduct a minimum of two visits/contacts with the child and out of home caregivers/family and complete documentation in their case record/structured case note.

- Conduct a minimum of one formal assessment using the Assessing Safety in Out of Home Care Worksheet.
- Collaborate with their private provider partner to share/receive information. It was especially important that the private provider staff knew when they were to complete the formal safety assessment to ensure that all of the available information is used.
- If the assessment resulted in the identification of concerning or negative indicators for either the child placed by the county or other placed children in the home, the Alert Document had to be completed.

During the pilot, private provider staff were expected to:

- Conduct visits based on the identified needs of the family, in keeping with current practice.
- Document the information gathered during the visits using the provided private provider template.
- Share information with county staff. This was to be completed, at a minimum, prior to the county worker completing the formal safety assessment.
- Collaborate with county partner to share/receive information.

In addition, the Out of Home Care Committee Members were asked to capture aggregate data around placements to expand the volume of data around present danger assessments and informed decision making. The Committee members were asked to provide information about the number of new placements within the entire agency that occurred during the pilot. This information included the type of placement, when the placement occurred, etc. The purpose of this data collection was to assess the volume of present danger assessments.

Pilot participants were encouraged to provide open and constructive feedback on what was working and not working and make suggestions and recommendations for change. Pilot participants were strongly encouraged to attend the two planned feedback sessions that were held on May 14, 2010 and June 18, 2010.

Following the pilot, the Out of Home Care Committee reconvened on July 13, 2010 to review the completed assessments/documentation as well as the feedback provided by the Innovation Zone pilot participants to make revisions to the policy and procedures as well as changes to the curriculum. Revisions to the worksheet, intervals and curriculum were made based on this feedback.

The resulting curriculum was then used to train all of the county CSLs following the same model used for training and implementation of IHSAMP (e.g. CSLs as participants at the training, attendance at a DOT if necessary and attendance at a TOC). The sub-committee met following the conclusion of the CSL trainings to review the feedback and questions generated. Once again, revisions were made based upon that feedback. CSLs are scheduled to begin training on the finalized curriculum in February 2011.

The final curriculum was also used as the guide for the development of the private provider version of the training. It was determined that, since private child welfare professionals would not be completing the formal Out of Home Care Safety Assessment Worksheet, they would not need to attend the full two day training. The focus of the one day curriculum was to explore and understand the ten safety indicators and to reinforce the need for collaborative sharing of comprehensive information between county and provider agencies.

Private provider agencies were also asked to identify a minimum of one Private Provider Safety Lead (PSL) who would then become the safety expert for that provider agency and deliver training to all staff and respond to questions as needed. PSLs are currently attending trainings, DOTs and TOCs similar to what the CSLs attended. PSLs will then begin training their staff concurrent to the timeframes that the counties have to train their staff.

PIP Strategy:

2.5 Evaluate the quality of the Safety Assessment and Management Process

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

2.5f

Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of our PIP baseline as it relates to agency efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns to children in their own homes or while in foster care. Pennsylvania will be monitoring agency efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns of children in their own homes as well children who are in substitute care by evaluating data from five different data sources. Data will be gathered through the QSRs to include gathering of information surrounding:

- Safety from exposure to threats of harm – QSR reviewers will determine whether the child/youth is free of abuse, neglect, and exploitation by others in his/her place of residence, school, and other daily settings. It will also be determined whether the child/youth's parents and/or caregivers provide the attention, actions, and supports and possess the skills and knowledge necessary to protect the child/youth from known and potential threats of harm in the home, school and other daily settings.
- Safety from risk to self/others – QSR reviewers will determine whether the child/youth avoids self-endangerment and refrains from using behaviors that may put others at risk of harm.
- Timeliness of investigations – QSR reviewers will gather information to determine whether response to all accepted child maltreatment reports received during the 12 months prior to the date of the review were initiated, and face-to-face contact with the focus child/youth was made, within the timeframes established by agency policies and state statutes. Reviewers will also determine whether this is an area of strength or an area needing improvement.
- Assessment and understanding – QSR reviewers will rate cases to determine whether essential information has been gathered and shared so that members of

the child/family team have a big picture understanding of the child/youth's and family's strengths and needs based on underlying issues, safety threats/factors, risk factors, and protective capacities. The Assessment and Understanding indicator of the QSR protocol also looks at whether there is an understanding of what things must change in order for the child/youth and family to live safety together, achieve timely permanence and improve the child/family's well-being and functioning and that ongoing assessment occurs to assure that modified planning and intervention strategies are present in order to achieve sustainable safe case closure.

- Intervention adequacy and resource availability – QSR reviewers will rate cases to determine whether the planned interventions, services, and supports being provided to the child, youth and family have sufficient power and beneficial effect to meet near-term needs and achieve the conditions necessary for safe case closure defined in the long term view as well as whether the resources required to implement current child/youth and family plans are available on timely, sufficient, and convenient local basis.

PIP Strategy:

2.6 Improve system partner's knowledge of the Safety Assessment and Management Process (SAMP)

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

2.6a, b, c

Pennsylvania's roll-out of the new SAMP has been shared in a variety of forums within the public child welfare community. In addition, there have been presentations at Pennsylvania's Council of Children, Youth and Families (PCCYFS) as well as the SWAN conference. Summaries from both sessions have been submitted as evidence. Local public child welfare agencies have consistently had communications with members of their local child welfare community about SAMP. Efforts are being undertaken to assure that these communications are submitted as evidence related to this action step. Pennsylvania is gathering information about other forums in which the SAMP has been shared with members of the legal system. Information about the SAMP model of practice has been shared amongst system level partners to include representatives from CWTP and AOPC. In addition, SAMP was on agendas from AOPC Leadership Roundtables that were held in March and April 2009. System partners from the legal system as well as the technical assistance provider network (AOPC, SWAN, ABA, etc.) have been involved in the QSRs and are therefore familiar with the SAMP model of practice as components of the QSR. Moving forward, Pennsylvania will augment our evidence of the efforts of the local community and of the statewide system partners surrounding the information being shared about SAMP.

PIP Strategy:

2.7 Assessments of child/youth/family issues (including safety, permanency, visitation, and educational, physical and behavioral needs) need to be enhanced to identify underlying issues and ensure appropriate services are provided

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:**2.7a**

The Enhancing Assessments Workgroup has been charged with specific tasks aimed at increasing our ability to identify underlying issues and increase our knowledge of what to do once those issues are identified. The workgroup meets monthly and is comprised of members from OCYF, CWTP, CCYAs, Family Centers and other partner agencies.

Our first step was to create and implement a survey to identify the screening tools currently being used in PA in addition to the required tools: Risk Assessment, Safety Assessment, Ages and Stages, and Ages and Stages Social-Emotional. Information was also sought to determine if the respondents felt there were any missing survey tools, i.e. for a specific underlying issue or population. The survey was released on February 26, 2010 and 766 CCYA Caseworkers and Supervisors and Family Center Family Development staff participated. The survey results are reported as part of the quarter two evidence of completion. While it was difficult to determine what assessment and screening tools were used because workers themselves were unsure, there are several domains that workers indicate they need additional support. The workgroup will review these domains and look for tools that will support workers on these issues. As the group moves forward with its revisions to the Compendium of Rapid Assessment Instruments, renamed the Assessment Toolkit, they will focus on the following areas:

- Co-occurring disorders
- Firearm safety
- Substance abuse
- Domestic violence/abuse
- Literacy

2.7i and j

Pennsylvania struggles to ensure that assessments identify underlying issues and are completed on an ongoing basis throughout the life of the case. As a result, there are inconsistencies with providing services to prevent removal as well as a high number of children reunified, but re-entering care within 12 months. The QSR will help monitor services being provided to families to protect children in the home and prevent removal or reentry into foster care. Reviewers will rate cases to determine whether the planned interventions, services, and supports being provided to the child, youth and family have sufficient power and beneficial effect to meet near-term needs and achieve the conditions necessary for safe case closure defined in the long term view. Reviewers will also determine whether or not the resources required to implement current child/youth and family plans are available on a timely, sufficient, and convenient local basis. Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of our PIP baseline as it relates to the assessment of needs and the provision of the appropriate services.

2.7k

CCYAs identified substance abuse, and the coordination of substance abuse treatment, as one of the leading issues affecting families involved in child welfare. To assist with addressing barriers and identifying ways to improve collaboration and information sharing, between drug and alcohol (D&A) services and child welfare, OCYF requested

TA through the National Center on Substance Abuse and Child Welfare (NCSACW), regarding the development of a work plan. The development of this work plan will be a collaborative effort with representatives from the OMAP, OMHSAS, and the Bureau of Drug and Alcohol Programs. Capacity building through the development of this work plan will be achieved through gaining additional skills to effectively identify, remove or lessen barriers, and identify ways to improve collaboration and information sharing, between D&A services and child welfare. The end goal is to help Pennsylvania reduce/prevent removal of children from their home by providing appropriate services that address underlying issues.

PIP Strategy:

7.2 Screen all school age children to assess if their educational needs are being met, and if not, take recommended steps to address any identified needs by referring for and coordinating the appropriate services

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

7.2 a, b, and c

In order to ensure that all school age children are having their educational needs met and in the event they are not, are referred for appropriate services, Pennsylvania developed a screening tool for use by CCYAs for all school age children served by their agency. This screening tool can also be used by private agencies providing services on behalf of the county agency. This education screen was incorporated into the OCYF Bulletin 3130-10-04 entitled Educational Stability and Continuity of Children Receiving Services from a County Children and Youth Agency Including the Use of an Education Screen. This bulletin encourages CCYAs to begin having local level conversations with their local education agencies (schools) regarding the need to communicate and collaborate to assure that children are receiving services appropriate to meet their needs. The Department has also joined with the Pennsylvania Department of Education (DEP) to assist in their communication and collaboration by developing a joint letter which will be issued from the two Departments following the final review and signature process. This letter reinforces the need to work collaboratively to best serve the families and children of the Commonwealth.

7.2i

Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of our PIP baseline as it relates to the assessment of children's educational needs and the coordination of needed services that were identified. There is one indicator within the QSR protocol that provides data regarding children's education needs and coordination of services. This indicator entitled, Academic Status, examines the degree to which the child/youth (consistent with age and/or ability) is regularly attending school, placed in a grade level consistent with age or developmental level, actively engaged in instructional activities, reading at grade level or at IEP expectation level and meeting the requirements for annual promotion and course completion leading to a high school diploma or equivalent.

PIP Strategy:

7.3 Improve the assessment and provision of services provided to meet children's physical and behavioral health needs

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

7.3a

Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of our PIP baseline as it relates to the provision of services to meet the children/youths identified physical and behavioral health needs. There are two indicators in the QSR protocol that provides data regarding the provision of services to meet the child/youth's identified physical and behavioral health needs. These indicators are:

- Physical Health – This indicator examines the degree to which the child/youth is achieving and maintaining his/her optimum health status by assuring that if the child/youth has a serious or chronic physical illness, the child/youth is achieving his/her best attainable health status given the disease diagnosis and prognosis.
- Emotional Well-Being – This indicator examines the degree to which the child/youth (consistent with age and/or ability) is displaying an adequate pattern of attachment and positive social relationships, possesses coping and adapting skills and has appropriate self-management of emotions and behaviors.

Monitoring the provision of services to meet identified physical and behavioral health needs of children/youth also occurs through the ongoing licensure of CCYAs. A summary of the findings specific to this item during inspections that occurred within the first two PIP quarters has been submitted as evidence of completion.

Timely Permanence

Our approach to improving the timeliness of permanence relies on the engagement of all stakeholders within the Legal and Child Welfare Systems. A great deal of effort has been placed on enhancing the services that support the achievement of timely permanence.

The following outline provides more detailed information regarding the progress made for the applicable PIP quarter one and two strategies.

PIP Strategy:

3.1 Provide additional support to members of the Legal System

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

3.1a, b and c

Timely permanence is one of the Guiding Principles for the Office of Children and Families in the Courts (OCFC). During quarter one, a request was made by OCFC to the PA Juvenile Court Rules Committee to develop guidelines for the establishment of timely and appropriate goals for children/youth in the rules that govern Juvenile Court proceedings but the Committee chose not to pursue the development of these particular guidelines at this time.

During quarter two, the Pennsylvania Dependency Bench Book, a comprehensive tool for judges and hearing masters, was completed. A presentation of the document was provided on July 23, 2010 at the Pennsylvania State Conference of Trial Judges. Presenters explained the process used to create the document to ensure the flavor, feel and practice shift envisioned by the State Roundtable was fully incorporated. To do this Pennsylvania judges rather than national experts wrote the document. Presenters also highlighted best practices and overarching themes woven throughout the document.

These themes include:

- Active/ongoing Court Oversight
- One Judge-One Family
- Early appointment of competent, well-trained legal counsel
- Safety
- Timeliness
- Concurrent Planning
- Front-loading of the System
- Maintaining Family Connections
- Keeping Siblings Together
- Engaging Fathers
- Use of Kin care and Least Restrictive Placements
- Early Implementation of Services and Visitation Schedule
- Tailoring Services to Meet Specific Needs of Each Child and Each Family
- Creating Culture/Expectation of Non-Adversarial Process
- Recognizing and Reducing Trauma for Children and Families

A hard copy of the document was provided to every judge and hearing master overseeing dependency proceedings. In addition, judges were provided with four CD copies of the document to distribute in their jurisdictions. Judges were encouraged to provide at least one CD to the child welfare administrator. Finally, the document was posted on the OCFC website to facilitate full disclosure and easy access.

PIP Strategy:

3.2 Develop a workgroup which will provide recommendations regarding training for GALs in PA

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

3.2 a, b, c, d, e, and f

The development and provision of training for attorneys for children and parents (GALs and PAs) is an important priority for OCFC. With a strong commitment to high quality representation and uniformity in practice across the Commonwealth, the Pennsylvania State Roundtable commissioned the Legal Representation Work Group (LRWG) to develop training for attorneys for children and parents. The workgroup started meeting in January 2010 and began their task by surveying the state about their needs for such training. Through that survey it became clear that there is very little turnover in GALs in

Pennsylvania and that most counties offer no training prior to appointment of those GALs. In the best interest of children and families, and to comply with CAPTA requirements, it was decided that it was imperative that attorneys be trained prior to their first appointment. However, since there is much to learn to function optimally in the complex world of dependency, the LRWG felt that pre-service training would not be enough. To fully meet the need, it was determined that there needed to be an abbreviated pre-service training that could be accessed and completed quickly to meet the emergent need but also a more intensive “core” training offered for GALs and PAs during their first year of working in dependency. The State Roundtable agreed with this direction and gave permission for the workgroup to develop a curriculum and host a pilot of the core training.

Through a year of intensive work, the LRWG developed several guidelines for training GALs and PAs. First and foremost, training should include attorneys for parents and children together as there is great benefit to having them hear the same information at the same time. Secondly, training should be done in-person and, as such, needs to be regionalized to minimize travel time. Thirdly, training should be mandatory. Core training became the focus of the workgroup as it was decided that pre-service training would be pulled from the core training, thereby making the best use of the time available. Pre-service training will consist of recorded information from day one of the core training, provided to counties on DVD, along with instructions to read the Juvenile Act, the Juvenile Procedural Rules and the Fostering Connections Act. Attorneys will have to sign an affidavit that they have reviewed the material and provide copies of this to the court and CCYA, if they are receiving funding through them.

The content of the core training itself will be practical and support the practice of the legal professional. The group reached consensus that the training should not be a recitation of the law and legal concepts but include those items that an efficient and knowledgeable attorney would need to possess. To supplement this with more traditional information, attorneys participating in the training will be required to do pre-work consisting of reading the Juvenile Act, Foster Connections Act and the Juvenile Procedural Rules and will receive a DVD of resource materials that can be used for supplemental information as the need arises. The in-person portion of the training will be broken into two main areas of focus. The first half-day session will develop a foundation for the attorneys and increase their understanding of the dependency system and what is expected of them to practice in this arena. Topics to be covered include: the mission and guiding principles of dependency; the duties, roles, and responsibilities of the attorneys in representing their clients; and information about separation, loss and grief from both a parent and child perspective. It is anticipated that attorneys will hear first hand from parents and children about the important role they play and how their representation affects them.

Day two of the training will be broken down into four hearing types: shelter, adjudication, initial disposition, and permanency review. Each of these hearing types will be presented with recommended best practice for each stage of the judicial proceeding. In addition, the work group planned to address the most relevant legal and human service

topics for that hearing. For example, under the heading of shelter care, the issues that will be addressed include: hearsay, probable cause, frontloading services, safety assessment and plan, visitation planning, Family Finding, Family Group Decision Making and kinship care. In addition to these relevant topics, there will also be more foundational information presented during the day about understanding children and families and a practice time focusing on communicating with children and parents.

PIP Strategy:

3.5 CCYAs will examine and address barriers to establishing timely and appropriate goals

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

3.5a and b

Pennsylvania, which began the National Governor's Association (NGA) Policy Academy on Safely Reducing the Number of Children in Foster Care efforts in fall 2008, deployed a diverse state team comprised of representatives from OCYF, OMHSAS, CCYAs, JPOs, the Juvenile Court Judges Commission (JCJC), AOPC, DEP, and private child welfare providers. As a participant in the policy academy, OCYF set a bold three year goal of safely reducing the number of Pennsylvania children in foster care by 15 to 20 percent, or approximately 2,000 to 3,000 children and youth by 2010. We saw significant movement in terms of achieving our reduction goal; as of June 2010 we had a 16% reduction in our NGA counties.

Pennsylvania's plan called for OCYF and its NGA partners to work with sixteen counties to develop county specific reduction plans that focused on four key strategies: increasing safety, reducing reliance on out of home care, improving permanency and reducing re-entry into the system. The lessons learned from the sixteen counties will then be modeled throughout the Commonwealth. The county-specific work was accomplished by county NGA teams who are comprised of members from the NGA core team and/or representatives from their agencies or offices, county integrated teams including children and youth, JPO, MH/MR, judicial and educational representatives from the sixteen NGA counties as well as children and youth representatives from non-NGA counties who agreed to be partners.

A large part of the NGA initiative was having the NGA team members and county teams come together on scheduled intervals, depending on the county preference, to conduct case reviews of out-of-home placements. During these reviews the reasons for the placements and the decisions that led to the placement were examined to determine if a better decision could have been made and also to develop a case plan for next steps for the youth being discussed. These in-depth reviews helped aid the counties in truly identifying their drivers for out-of-home placements. Finally every quarter the NGA team and all sixteen counties, and their integrated team members, came together to network and share lessons learned. A large portion of these sessions focused on the counties own sustainability planning.

3.5c and d

During quarters one and two, staff from OCFC collected Permanency Practice Initiative (PPI) county data reports. Upon review of these reports, it became clear that counties were struggling to accurately interpret the data request and, in some instances, struggling to compile the data. As such, the PPI Oversight Team reviewed county response data and provided clarification regarding the data requested. Additionally, data regarding the type of permanency achieved was added to the data request form. More recently, the need to gather better trend information regarding the timeliness of permanency goal setting was noted and as such, additional data elements are being added to the PPI quarterly report. Counties will also be requested to submit data regarding local Children's Roundtable discussion/planning related to any identified system timeliness trend issues. Finally, basic Common Pleas Case Management System (CPCMS) statistical reports were released to counties (in addition to the previously released case management reports). As a result, data entry discrepancies were identified and additional technical support was/continues to be provided by the AOPC staff. Upon enhancement of data integrity, counties will be able to identify case processing trends. These action steps were renegotiated so that county reporting will occur during quarters four and ongoing, once the necessary changes have been made.

3.5e

Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of our PIP baseline as it relates to the timely establishment of the appropriate permanency goals for children/youth. Although the QSR protocol has specific indicators that evaluate the a child/youth's achievement of permanency as well as the practice performance efforts surrounding achievement of timely permanence, QSR reviewers are gathering information surrounding the appropriateness and timely establishment of primary and concurrent permanency goals from interviews conducted. This information is collected on the QSR roll-up sheet in section seven.

PIP Strategy:**3.6 Support implementation of more frequent case reviews****PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:****3.6a**

The AOPC's PPI continues to report information submitted by the courts to support timely achievement of permanency for children and youth. According to the 20 PPI counties, there were 1,277 three month court reviews held between July 1 and September 30, 2010. Prior to the PPI, court reviews were typically held every six months. Since the PPI began in 2008, the counties involved hold three month court reviews for a specific population of children and youth served. These cases have much more frequent review by the court and CCYA which is critical to move cases forward to timely permanency.

PIP Strategy:**3.7 Establish policy and best practice related to permanency planning and concurrent planning**

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:**3.7a, b, c**

The PIP Timely Permanence workgroup began meeting in August 2009 to help establish policy and best practice related to permanency planning and concurrent planning. The workgroup's first task was to develop a survey and disseminate it to Resource Families, Birth Families, Youth, Public and Private Child Welfare agencies and the legal community (i.e. Judges, attorneys, solicitors, GALs) across the state to gauge the current perceptions and understanding about concurrent planning. The survey was made available both online via Survey Monkey and in hard copy that was shared with child welfare professionals who were also encouraged to share the survey with the families and youth with whom they work. 439 child welfare and legal professionals, 91 youth, 90 resource caregivers and 37 birth parents responded to the survey. From the results it was clear that although there seems to be some basic understanding as to what the term "concurrent planning" means, there was no indication that it is being practiced in a consistent fashion across the Commonwealth. This information was used to identify necessary components of draft guidance specific to concurrent planning which the workgroup began to develop.

Technical assistance was provided by the National Resource Center for Permanency and Family Connections (NRC-PFC). This included review and use of available resources from the NRC-PFC website. The workgroup did a thorough review of the research available to inform best practice related to Concurrent Planning and how best to approach PA's development of policy, guidance and training. The NRC-PFC reviewed PA's current Concurrent Planning training and provided feedback on its content and suggested revisions via conference call on July 28, 2010. During the call they also suggested that we research the Bridging the Gap Program, specifically, Ice Breaker Meetings, that have been occurring in Virginia. Technical assistance is also being provided by the NRC on Legal and Judicial Issues through membership on the Timely Permanence workgroup. Mimi Laver has provided resources on questions for implementation, resources on enhanced visitation for family, and feedback and input in to the draft Concurrent Planning policy. Technical assistance was originally identified in the PIP as a strategy for quarters one and ongoing but will be needed only intermittently throughout the remaining PIP quarters.

The workgroup met on August 30, 2010 at which time the draft Concurrent Planning Bulletin was reviewed and comments were made. No meetings have been held since that date as OCYF continues to work internally on the Concurrent Planning Bulletin. Once all revisions have been made, it will be sent back to the committee for final comment and revision before being issued for public comment.

3.7m

Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of our PIP baseline as it relates to concurrent planning. Although the QSR protocol has specific indicators that evaluate the a child/youth's achievement of permanency as well as the practice performance efforts surrounding achievement of timely permanence, QSR reviewers are gathering information surrounding the

appropriateness and timely establishment of primary and concurrent permanency goals from interviews conducted. This information is collected on the QSR roll-up sheet in section seven.

PIP Strategy:

3.8 Reinforce requirements related to timely filing of TPR and documentation of compelling reasons to not file TPR

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

3.8a

In an effort to reinforce the requirements related to timely filing of termination of parental rights petitions and assure documentation of compelling reasons when the petition is not filed, OCYF issued a special transmittal focusing on these two areas rather than reissue an entire bulletin. The special transmittal places reinforces the requirements of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997, as well as OCYF Bulletin 3130-01-01 entitled The Second Revised Interim Guidelines for the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) of 1997 (P.L. 105-89).

3.8b

Monitoring CCYAs adherence to ASFA guidelines for timely filing of petitions occurs through the ongoing licensure of CCYAs. A summary of the findings specific to this item during inspections that occurred within the first two PIP quarters has been submitted as evidence of completion.

PIP Strategy:

3.9 Utilize available resources to support local courts/legal changes to improving the timeliness of permanency

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

3.9a

Beginning July 1, 2009 SWAN Legal Services Initiative (LSI) was expanded to any county that requested the service. Since that time, 94 paralegals have been placed in 63 counties. As a result of staff turnover, the SWAN prime contractor is currently in the process of re-hiring three paralegals who vacated their positions. It takes approximately six months to train a new paralegal on their duties and on child welfare in general. Therefore, although many new staff were hired in July 2009, they only became efficient in their job duties in approximately January 2010 which can be seen in the amount of paralegal services completed in 2010 compared to 2009.

All services offered by paralegals have increased significantly since 2009. For instance, at the end of December 2009, LSI staff had drafted 4,527 petitions. By the end of December 2010, paralegals had drafted 7,495 petitions, a 65% increase. At the end of December 2010, paralegals had performed 5,752 Diligent Searches compared to 2,428 Diligent Searches by the end of December 2009, representing a 140% increase in the number of Diligent Searches performed. Paralegals helped county caseworkers

prepare for court 2,835 times in 2009 compared to 4,939 times in 2010, a 74% increase. It is hoped that these services have and will continue to help locate kin who may be a possible permanent resource and that these services will also ensure the timely permanence of children in care by filing the necessary petitions in a timely manner.

3.9b

The American Bar Association's (ABA) Barriers to Permanency Project continues their work with seven counties, including, Beaver, Westmoreland, Lehigh, Washington, Butler, Clearfield and Crawford. Counties who work with the Project commit to working with the ABA for a two year time frame but have the option of extending the project up to a year. In addition to the Barriers to Permanency Project, the ABA is providing training and technical assistance to two counties, Fayette and York. This work focuses on providing training to GAL's and creating educational protocols. Counties receiving training and technical assistance are involved with the ABA for two to 12 months, depending on the needs of the county.

During their work with these counties, the ABA has seen a trend in the types of barriers these counties experience. Some of these recent trends include: issues with timely court orders, creating and implementing policies, the need for continued training around educational and concurrent planning topics and being updated on new legislation. To address these barriers, the ABA has used several strategies. Most often, they form committees comprised of various stakeholders such as CCYA staff, DPW staff, judges, attorney's, GAL's, mental health and school professionals to address the barriers seen in a county. The ABA also provides two annual trainings that focus on current permanency issues. The next trainings are anticipated to be held in the spring and summer of 2011.

PIP Strategy:

3.10 Improving timeliness of the Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) and adoption finalization process

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

3.10a and b

OCYF, in collaboration with legal and technical assistance provider partners, is developing a Facilitated Discussion Guide based on identified barriers to timely petitioning of TPR and TPR appeals, which will be provided to CCYAs and Courts for use during county roundtables to identify county-specific solutions. Two draft documents have been developed which will be reviewed and edited with assistance from the Technical Assistance Collaborative and once the discussion guide is finalized, it will be disseminated to CCYAs to use to identify barriers and then work with technical assistance providers to develop work plans to address those barriers.

PIP Strategy:

3.12 Promote utilization of PLC as a permanency option when adoption has been ruled out

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:**3.12a and b**

In an effort to promote the use of Permanent Legal Custodianship (PLC)/Subsidized Permanent Legal Custodian (SPLC) once adoption has been ruled out, OCYF revised and reissued the previous PLC Bulletin. The revised bulletin not only reinforces the use of PLC as a permanency option, but also includes guidance related to the Federal Guardianship Assistance Program option provided through the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008. Pennsylvania has opted to utilize the GAP option and has rolled this into our current PLC program. The revised PLC Bulletin also includes model forms including a standardized subsidy agreement form.

OCYF provided training to county fiscal officers at the Pennsylvania Children and Youth Administrators conference on January 13, 2011. An SPLC eligibility checklist was provided to county staff via electronic mail on January 31, 2011. This document consolidated the federal, state and county SPLC eligibility requirements to assist counties in accurately deeming children eligible for the different types of subsidy. OCYF has also been providing, and will continue to provide, technical assistance to counties via e-mail and telephone requests.

OCYF is currently developing an SPLC Question and Answer document that will be released in February 2011 to provide further guidance to counties on issues that have arisen through training and technical assistance. Since this information is time sensitive, this document will first be released informally via electronic mail and will then be released in bulletin format in March 2011. OCYF will also provide follow-up SPLC training and technical assistance to county fiscal officers/administrators at the PCYA meeting in March 2011.

3.12c

Monitoring CCYAs adherence to the PLC/SPLC bulletin occurs through the ongoing licensure of CCYAs. A summary of the findings specific to this item during inspections that occurred within the first two PIP quarters has been submitted as evidence of completion.

PIP Strategy:**3.15 Provide support to CCYAs to enhance timely permanence****PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:****3.15a**

SWAN TA is provided to SWAN affiliate agencies and CCYAs upon request via on-site visits, electronically and by telephone. SWAN has a team of TA providers each of whom is assigned to specific counties and affiliates. In addition to providing TA as requested SWAN TAs meet with each of their respective agencies during on-site visits at least once per quarter.

TA requests from counties and affiliates vary. Agencies may request assistance related to practice issues, the timeliness of the completion of services referred, problem

resolution (related to any possible disputes between county and affiliate agencies), on-site training, contract compliance issues or referral and invoicing issues. If and when an issue arises that requires further action, a correction plan may be developed with the agency involved, the completion of which is monitored by the SWAN TA and their supervisor, as well as agency staff.

During the first two quarters of the current state fiscal year, numerous requests were made to SWAN TA staff related to the new portal system. The new portal system is the SWAN computer based referral and invoicing system. Since it is a new system, we did experience some glitches in the system as well as some user error that required TA to resolve. Corrections have been made to the portal system based upon the feedback of the county and affiliate agencies and SWAN TAs and as a result, we expect to see a decline in the number of requests for this type of TA.

In addition to the direct TA provided to county and affiliate agencies, SWAN TAs provide training and assistance as requested at SWAN/IL Quarterly Meetings, the Annual Permanency Conference, the SWAN Advisory Committee, the Pennsylvania State Resource Family Association conference and other meetings as requested, such as the DHS Protocols Meeting held on December 13, 2010.

3.15b

In an effort to ensure the timely permanence for children in care, OCYF and Diakon Lutheran Social Ministries, the SWAN prime contractor, collaboratively monitor requests for services from CCYAs, identify barriers to the completion of those services, and provide technical assistance to counties and SWAN affiliates as needed and/or requested to improve service delivery.

As is typical of the referral flow to SWAN, the first quarter of the state fiscal year showed an increase in the number of services referred. As counties have often expended all of their funds by the end of the fiscal year, there is often an increase in the number of services requested when the new fiscal year begins on July 1. Nearly two thousand more services were referred in the first quarter of state fiscal year 2010 - 2011 than in the second quarter. Although more referrals were received in the first quarter, SWAN affiliate staffing remained relatively stable and this increase in referrals flooded the market causing a delay in timely service completion. This is a pattern we have seen in the SWAN program before and often times CCYAs, who can refer the services to any SWAN affiliate agency of their choosing, make the referrals to the affiliates with whom they have the best working relationship even if they know that it may take a month longer for the service to be completed. Since most counties refer for the services prior to the court ordered goal of adoption, the counties are aware that they have enough time for the service to be completed before the finalization. To change this pattern of referral, which impacts the timely completion of the referred services, OCYF and the SWAN prime contractor have been encouraging counties to examine their caseloads and make timely referrals throughout the fiscal year rather than waiting until the end of the fiscal year to make referrals.

As the referrals decreased in the second quarter, so too did the number of services that went beyond the OCYF approved time frames for completion. At the end of the second quarter, we had seen an overall decrease of 87% in the number of child preparation services that were overdue, a 27% decrease in the number of child profiles that were overdue and an 80% decrease in the number of child specific recruitment services that were overdue for children with a goal of adoption.

While we have seen increases in the amount of time it has taken to complete these same services for children and youth with a goal of reunification we believe that those increases are seen for several reasons including the addition of Philadelphia DHS to the SWAN program coupled with the fact that Philadelphia DHS is now making referrals prior to the court established goal of adoption, as OCYF has asked them to do.

To further address these issues, regular meetings have been held with DHS in attempt to understand their referral process and determine how to best meet their needs. It was decided to create written protocols, including a referral and certification flow process that would inform both affiliates and DHS staff of how DHS would manage the volume of referrals made. Several meetings were held to develop the protocols and flow process. On December 13, 2010 a meeting was held with all SWAN affiliates that provide services to DHS. The meeting was jointly held by DHS, the SWAN prime contractor and OCYF. The new protocols and flow chart was shared with the affiliates and it is hoped that the new processes put in place will help to ensure better monitoring of services referred and more timely completion of services.

In addition to the services provided directly to the children and youth, SWAN provides family profiles to prospective adoptive families, kinship families and permanent legal custodianship (PLC) families. We have found that kin and PLC families are often the most difficult family profiles to complete within our 120 day time frame for various reasons such as the need to attend training, obtain medical examinations and criminal and child abuse clearances. To address some of the struggles both county and affiliate workers are having in working successfully with kin, Betsy Keefer-Smalley, Institute for Human Services, Columbus, Ohio, will provide a keynote address, Understanding and Supporting Kinship Caregivers, at the SWAN/IL Winter Statewide Meeting on January 26, 2011. We are also considering forming a workgroup to examine how we can improve our service delivery to kinship families.

3.15 c and d

Throughout quarters one and two, only one corrective action plan was required, and that evidence was submitted in quarter one. In quarter two, although TA was requested and provided to both county and affiliate agencies, there was no need for corrective action plans. However, the SWAN Prime Contractor, Philadelphia DHS and OCYF continued to meet to review cases referred by Philadelphia DHS to SWAN for services. Of primary focus were overdue family profile and child profile units of service. Per SWAN policy, child profiles are to be completed within 90 days and family profiles within 120 days. Each profile that exceeded that timeframe was examined to determine the reason that the service was not completed within the prescribed timeframes.

After extensive review of the cases, several key issues were identified as the primary reasons that cases were not being completed within the prescribed timeframes. Some of those issues include:

- Affiliate staffing issues
- Affiliate access to DHS records;
- Affiliate/DHS communication issues; and
- Delays in prospective adoptive families completing the necessary medical examinations, criminal and child abuse history clearances in a timely manner.

Affiliate staffing issues

Some services were late because affiliates, small private adoption agencies, had unexpected staff turn-over. In at least two instances, staff simply walked off of the job. Those issues were managed by the SWAN prime contractor who holds and manages the sub-contracts with all affiliates on behalf of DPW. Those agencies were provided with technical assistance around their staffing issues and reminded of their responsibilities to complete all services in a timely manner and to request assistance from the prime contractor when need. In one case, an affiliate was put on hold, meaning they were not allowed to accept any new SWAN referrals until their staffing issues were resolved.

Affiliate access to DHS records

DHS only recently expanded the use of SWAN services to all youth in care, regardless of their court-ordered permanency goal. In the past, only the DHS Adoption Unit made referrals to the SWAN program. As a result, services are now being referred from all areas of DHS. When a referral is made it is often necessary for the affiliate worker to review the child's case file. Affiliates were having trouble gaining access to files because some DHS workers from On-going Service Regions (OSR) did not know they needed to allow the affiliate worker to review the file. In other cases, the DHS file was in the DHS Law Department and they were also not aware that the record needed to be shared with the affiliate worker. DHS staff managed this issue internally with their OSR staff and Law Department and developed protocols on how to manage affiliate requests to view the record.

Affiliate/DHS communication issues

Although the DHS Adoption unit was very familiar with the SWAN program, including how to make referrals, provide information to the affiliate and monitor the timely completion of the services, OSR were not familiar with how the process worked and what they needed to do once a referral was made.

To address these issues written protocols were created, including a referral and certification flow process that would inform both affiliates and DHS staff of how DHS would manage the volume of referrals made. Several meetings were held to develop the protocols and flow process.

On December 13, 2010 a meeting was held with all SWAN affiliates that provide services to DHS. The meeting was jointly held by DHS, the SWAN prime contractor and OCYF. The new protocols and flow chart was shared with the affiliates and it is hoped that the new processes put in place will help to ensure better monitoring of services referred and more timely completion of services.

Delays in prospective adoptive families completing the necessary medical examinations, criminal and child abuse history clearances in a timely manner

There are several issues surrounding families not obtaining the necessary medical examinations and criminal and child abuse history clearances within the past year to meet the requirements of the Philadelphia courts. All families that have accepted the placement of a child for foster care or adoption have had the required clearances and medical exams prior to the placement of children into their home. However, in addition to those medical exams and clearances, the Philadelphia court requires that the family have those items done within one year of the date of finalization. Since the courts will not proceed to finalize the adoption, DHS would not approve the profiles and certify them for payment even though the profiles met all of the SWAN benchmarks, including the time frames surrounding clearances and medical exams.

OCYF policy, including a chart showing that clearances are only required every two years once placement has occurred, was shared with DHS and the Philadelphia courts. John Houlan, DHS Solicitor, met with the group and explained that the court will not change its position. DHS however, will now accept and approve those profiles that have clearances and medical exams completed, even if it is known that the clearances and medical exams will need to be completed again prior to the expected court date. This issue was also addressed with the affiliates at the meeting on December 13, 2010.

A larger issue surrounding the completion of medical exams and clearances is that although the families have current medical exams and clearances, they realize they will need to obtain them again prior to going to court, particularly kinship and foster families who are in the process of adopting children they have had in their care for a year. Since most of these SWAN services are referred prior to the court established goal of adoption, many families are refusing to get another medical exam or new clearances until the finalization date is scheduled because they do not want to pay for numerous medical exams and clearances and those costs are not covered by DHS.

Future meetings have been scheduled to continue the case review process to determine what barriers exist that are impeding the timely delivery of services and attempt to put protocols in place to reduce or eliminate those barriers. Both DHS and SWAN affiliates have expressed the desire to continue with such meetings to address the difficulties being experienced by both in meeting the established SWAN time frames.

3.15e

Data from Philadelphia's December 2010 QSR review will be included in the establishment of our PIP baseline as it relates to the achievement of timely permanence

for children and youth. There are two QSR indicators that examine the achievement of timely permanence for children/youth. These indicators include:

- Permanency – This indicator examines the degree to which there is confidence by the child/youth, parents, caregivers or other team members that the child/youth is living with parents or other caregivers who will sustain in this role until the child/youth reaches adulthood and will continue onward to provide enduring family connections and supports into adulthood. Furthermore, if there is little confidence that this will occur, it examines whether the permanency efforts presently being implemented on a timely basis will ensure that the child/youth will soon be enveloped in enduring relationships that provide a sense of family, stability and belonging.
- Efforts to Timely Permanence – This indicator examines the degree to which current efforts by system agents are achieving safe case closure (consistent with the long-term view) and that a pattern of diligence and necessary urgency for timely attainment of permanency with sustained adequate functioning of the child/youth and family following cessation of protective supervision.

Practice Change Agents

Pennsylvania acknowledges and wants to support the critical role that supervisors play as practice change agents due to their pivotal in identifying and supporting the need for organizational and practice change as well as evaluating progress toward positive outcomes for children, youth and families. This critical role also places supervisors in a position in which they must identify policy issues and needs, while at the same time promoting and advocating for change. Knowing that supervisors could benefit from support in their role as practice change agents, supervisor support sessions have been established. These forums will provide opportunities for supervisors to receive additional knowledge and support related to various practice issues including practices areas such as SAMP and concurrent planning. These educational and supportive sessions will be rooted in our practice model and may include training as well as facilitated discussion centered on practice and policy issues in addition to providing an atmosphere in which supervisors can provide peer support to one another. These practice areas will be more reality and skill based and therefore connected to the overall improvement of outcomes for the individual child and family system as opposed to being general concepts that are initiative-based. These forums will be held regionally at least quarterly and the focus will be developed in conjunction with supervisors from the field. It is believed that offering regionally based sessions will provide a supportive peer network for supervisors within the same region.

The following outline provides more detailed information regarding the progress made for the applicable PIP quarter one and two strategies.

PIP Strategy:

8.5 Supervisory forums will be held regionally to support supervisors and their staff

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:

8.5a and b

A workgroup has been formed to plan, oversee and monitor the ongoing delivery of Quarterly Practice Sessions (QPS) throughout each region in the state. Currently, the workgroup is comprised of various CWTP staff needed to develop curriculum, plan the delivery, engage supervisors and deliver the QPS throughout the state. As more sessions are held the workgroup has begun and will continue to reach out to its collaborative partners and regional offices for planning and delivery of these sessions.

Efforts have been underway to communicate the definition and scope of QPS to Child Welfare Administrators and Supervisors across the state. A joint letter between the OCYF and CWTP was sent to all Administrators and Supervisors explaining the Quarterly Practice Sessions. This letter also included a survey for supervisors to complete. The survey was developed along with the assistance of a small workgroup of supervisors to help obtain information regarding training and technical assistance needs of all supervisors throughout the state. Supervisors had until January 28, 2011 to complete the survey upon which time the workgroup will collect the data to use to inform upcoming training sessions.

A QPS was held within each region during quarter one entitled “Sexual Abuse and Safety: A Panel Discussion”. During quarter two a QPS was held within each region, entitled “Connecting PIP Strategies and Actions to Practice”. During quarter three the QPS will again be held within each region. The topic of this session will be “Vicarious Traumatization and Taking Care of You”. Notes following the completion of each session are posted on CWTP’s website to allow supervisors access to the information from each regional QPS.

Communication regarding QPS continues ongoing on both a formal and informal basis. Regional Team Members are making many efforts within each of their regions to promote and engage the supervisors that they are serving.

Statewide Information System

In January of 2008, PA procured vendor services to conduct a Feasibility Study and Alternatives Analysis that would determine how best to move forward with an automated system that would meet federal, state and county business needs. The outcome of this feasibility study and alternatives analysis culminated with the development of a strategic plan for successful implementation of a technology solution that will result in real or near real time statewide data. The implementation of the strategic plan will occur over multiple years using a phased approach, thus extending beyond this two year PIP and into our five year state plan.

The following outline provides more detailed information regarding the progress made for the applicable PIP quarter one and two strategies.

PIP Strategy:

1.2 Utilize the DPW Master Client Index (MCI) Service to provide CCYAs with means to search statewide for all children known to child welfare system

PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:**1.2a and b**

A key component of identifying and tracking children across counties and service areas is the use of a unique child identifier. Expanding the existing DPW MCI Service to include children served by CCYAs provides CCYAs with additional knowledge of service systems that children have interacted with and will help in the identification of underlying safety issues and improve tracking of information across counties at the time of assessment/investigation and throughout the life of the case.

The MCI Service expansion project began in April 2010. Requirements and a General System Design were completed in May 2010. Data conversion activities and Detailed System Design occurred June through September 2010, with a final conversion occurring on October 2, 2010. The system was successfully tested in August and September 2010.

All 67 CCYAs participated in conversion activities with a total of 139,565 child records submitted for conversion. Approximately 65% of the records were assigned an MCI number automatically and a manual clearance of the remainder of the records is being performed by the CCYAs. The converted records included all open child records as of July 1, 2010 and all placement records as of April 1, 2010.

PIP Strategy:**9.1 Finalize a plan for a statewide information technology solution that will efficiently and effectively support child welfare programs and case management in PA****PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:****9.1a and b**

The strategic implementation plan for a statewide information solution was completed and approved in September 2009. The plan was presented to the Commonwealth's Information Technology (IT) Governance body via the Health and Human Services Community of Practice. New information technology projects are presented to the Governor's Office for Information Technology (OIT) for approval and prioritization. OIT approved this project as a Category 2 project, which means that the project concept was approved and that DPW will be expected to fund the project within its base budget or via other funding sources. Funding amounts were approved through fiscal year 2010-2011.

The Implementation Advanced Planning Document (IAPD) and associated Request for Proposal (RFP) that included the child welfare long term plan components was submitted to multiple agencies within the federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), including the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) on May 19, 2010. An approval letter dated August 5, 2010 was received from ACF approving funding through June 30, 2011.

PIP Strategy:**9.5 Interim Project Work for federal reporting and county case management****PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:****9.5 a, e and f**

The OCYF strategic IT Plan includes the design, development and implementation of a communication tool to distribute and exchange information with the 67 CCYAs. This tool will also support the ability to collaborate with county agency staff on specific projects and associated tasks in an efficient, reliable and secure manner. Activities supporting this strategy occurring in quarters one and two are as follows:

- OCYF collated high level requirements that had been collected from state and county users. Detailed requirements were documented, reviewed and verified. OCYF staff met with the DPW's Bureau of Information System (BIS) staff to identify the best software for the development of the portal.
- The detailed requirements were used to design and mock up screens and related functionality. OCYF Information and Data Management Unit staff attended trainings to learn how to work within the portal. Further trainings have been planned for additional OCYF staff and CCYA users in quarter three. The Portal screens have been tested by internal OCYF users and are now in place for testing and implementation in quarter three.

PIP Strategy:**9.6 Increase the number of CCYAs with a sustainable case management system****PIP Action Steps Quarters 1 and 2:****9.6 a**

The OCYF strategic IT Plan includes the implementation of automated case management systems in all counties. OCYF supports counties in the operation and maintenance of sustainable case management systems that will, as part of our long term strategy, become interoperable with a statewide child welfare database. Counties with unsustainable systems or no system will transition to one of the approved systems. Activities supporting this strategy occurring in quarters one and two are as follows:

- At the time of PIP approval 15 counties were using the Child Accounting and Profile System (CAPS), which is one of the approved systems available for use by other counties. By the end of quarter one, eight additional counties were using CAPS for a total of 23 counties. During quarter two, two counties implemented CAPS for a total of 25 counties.
- Two other case management systems were approved for use by CCYAs during quarter two. The Joinder Clinical Information System (JCIS) is used by Lycoming, Clinton and Sullivan CCYAs; and the Integrated Human Services

Information System (IhSIS) is used by Lehigh CCYA. These systems are also available for adoption by other counties that do not have a sustainable system.

- On October 27, 2010, four counties (Montgomery, Bucks, Dauphin, and Philadelphia) attended a demonstration of the Allegheny County system, Key Information and Demographics System (KIDS), to help them determine if KIDS is appropriate for use in their county.

Philadelphia Department of Human Services

Philadelphia encompasses PA's largest metropolitan area and therefore serves the largest population of children, youth and families. Due to the fact that Philadelphia County serves the largest population of children/youth in the state, it is important to target strategies for children/youth served by Philadelphia Department of Human Services (DHS). The PIP matrix includes Philadelphia-specific strategies and action steps, based on our statewide self assessment and onsite findings, which were developed through collaboration amongst both internal and external stakeholders. In addition to the Philadelphia specific strategies outlined in the PIP matrix, Philadelphia will also be included as responsible parties whenever CCYAs are listed, as CCYAs reference all 67 counties in the Commonwealth of PA.

The Philadelphia DHS mission is to provide and promote safety, permanency and well-being for children at risk of abuse, neglect, and delinquency. It is the vision of DHS to use innovative and collaborative practices in a way that improves outcomes for children and leads the Department to being a national model in the field of child welfare. Work during the first two quarters of the PIP has been designed to support the Department in improving the outcomes of safety, permanency, and well-being as well as in creating processes aimed at performance management and continuous quality improvement.

Regarding safety, DHS has continued to further develop, implement, and sustain the safety model of practice. Work in this area included an extensive process of case file review of approximately 250 cases monthly regarding the quality and consistency of the safety assessment process. Feedback regarding the results of these reviews was provided both verbally and in written form to each level of the agency. This feedback was then used as a management tool for middle level management and was also used to inform the need for additional supports such as training, communications to staff, and updates to policy. Monthly ratings of section scores were also distributed to upper management so that progress could be tracked and identified challenges addressed.

Further development of the safety model of practice included the work being done to assess and further develop the continuum of safety services. DHS has worked to increase the level of monitoring of the department's highest level in-home service, In-home Protective Services (IHPS), through quarterly case file reviews of the work completed by the contracted in-home providers. Also regarding placement services, work during the first two quarters of the PIP included the streamlining of the evaluation tool, and the development of a "report card" for the contracted providers. The

expansion of the “Child Stat” process to contracted providers is planned to be implemented in quarter three. Philadelphia was also actively involved in the planning and pilot for the Out of Home Safety Assessment process. This assessment process is anticipated to be fully implemented by the beginning of quarter five.

Performance measures have been developed across many parts of the agency. For both “investigation sections” and “on-going services regions,” benchmarks consistent with federal and state guidelines were adopted. Specifically for the “hotline sections” and “adoption regions” of the agency, additional internal benchmarks were tied to desired performance measures. Performance measures for all case carrying sections were communicated to staff during monthly “Child Stat” meetings. In addition to providing a structured place for the reporting out of performance measures, the monthly Child Stat meetings occurred as a process that served to increase communication, to break down silos, and to allow each part of the agency to accept responsibility for their portion of the work. Other monthly measures are captured in a DHS “Fast Facts” report and a bimonthly report out to the Community Oversight Board.

Work to develop and implement an Electronic Case Management System (ECMS) was successful in producing a structured case note process for both the county staff and contracted providers. As a result county staff are now entering case notes electronically for all cases and investigations and contracted placement providers are entering case notes electronically for documentation of monthly quality visits. Next steps with the implementation of ECMS include the integrating the contracted in-home services documentation around visitation into the system as well as the electronic safety assessment worksheet for county staff.

Partnership with outside stakeholders has included extensive work with the School District of Philadelphia around the sharing of data. As a result, DHS has for the first time the ability to report out on attendance, academic, disciplinary, and school stability measures for children known to the Department.

The Department of Human Services and the Family Court of Philadelphia have also partnered in several areas to increase permanency and improve access to services for children and families in Philadelphia. The following are a few examples of this partnership:

- Family Court has begun to collect data relating to the timeliness of family and child profiles and other key events between the time of termination of parental rights and finalization. This data is shared with DHS and is used as a tool to improve the process between termination and finalization.
- DHS and Family Court meet monthly with other system partners to discuss Adoption Court related issues. At this meeting, the parties discuss data collection as well as suggestions for improving the adoption process. As an outgrowth of this meeting, the Family Court has streamlined the process for individuals who want to intervene in an adoption. One judge now hears all petitions to intervene.

- The Court Improvement Project (CIP) at Family Court holds a monthly meeting held at Court. DHS is a key participant and speaker at this regular meeting which includes several stakeholders and community partners. At this meeting, DHS presents information regarding new initiatives. In addition, other City agencies speak at this meeting to educate stakeholders regarding the array of city services such as health care, mental health, and housing.
- Family Court and DHS have worked together to develop a process to resolve and dispose of cases in which there are challenges to permanent legal custody orders that could affect child safety.

Finally over the last year, DHS has been successful in fully implementing a Quality Service Review (QSR) process that measures child and family status and system performance across 20 indicators. The QSR process in Philadelphia occurs six times a year and each review focuses on children receiving a different level of care. The results of each QSR are tied back into recommendations for system reform and assigned to an area of responsibility with the expectation that they be implemented. Progress toward implementing and sustaining each recommendation is then tracked by the Division of Performance Management and Accountability (PMA) and reported out on a consistent basis. Through this process, the Department will continue to measure progress in improving the safety, permanency, and well-being of children and also continue to tie recommendations into larger system reforms.

**IV. PIP Strategy Summary and TA Plan
State: Pennsylvania**

Primary Strategies	Key Concerns	TA Resources Needed
Child, Youth and Family Engagement	The need for increased family engagement to involve the child, youth and family throughout the case process.	Not Applicable
Collaboration	All outcomes are impacted by the need for increased collaboration among key stakeholders.	Technical Assistance from the National Center on Substance Abuse and Child Welfare (NCSACW) to develop a work plan to address barriers and ways to improve collaboration and information sharing between the courts, drug and alcohol services, and child welfare.
Sustaining Change	Need to implement change at the local level.	Technical Assistance from the National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement related to implementing change at the local level.
Quality Practice	Shift focus from compliance to quality.	Not Applicable
Enhancing Assessments	Assessments should identify and then address underlying issues. Response times were inconsistent.	Technical assistance with Action for Child Protection, Inc., National Resource Center for Child Protective Services (NRCCPS) will include case reviews in selected CCYAs to evaluate the implementation of the Safety Assessment and Management Process and suggest changes, transfer of learning, and help with finalizing bulletin, and evaluation of existing Risk Assessment process. Technical assistance from the National Resource Center for Youth Development to assist in the development of a model for assessing safety of older youth.
Timely Permanence	Concurrent goals are established but casework is being done sequentially.	Technical assistance from NRC for Permanency and Family Connections and NRC on Legal and Judicial Issues regarding

	Not establishing timely and appropriate goals for children and youth in Foster Care.	policy implications and recommendations for procedural changes related to concurrent planning.
--	--	--

Part V. PIP Matrix

Part A: National Standards Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report

**Part B: Item-Specific and Quantitative Measurement Plan and Quarterly
Status Report**

Part C: Amendments

**Part D: Attachment - Strategy Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status
Report - PA PIP Logic Model Matrix**

Pennsylvania

Type of Report: PIP

Quarterly Report for Quarter: ____

Part A: National Standards Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report

Permanency Outcome 1: Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification												
Safety Outcome 1: Absence of Recurrence of Maltreatment												
National Standard	94.6%											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	97.0 %											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	N/A											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	N/A											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	N/A											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
Safety Outcome 2: Absence of Maltreatment of Children in Foster Care												
National Standard	99.68%											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	99.76%											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	N/A											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	N/A											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	N/A											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

National Standard	122.6											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	85.2											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	88.6 (2008ab file)											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	N/A											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	N/A											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
Permanency Outcome 2: Timeliness of Adoptions												
National Standard	106.4											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	119.9 (2009ab file)											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	N/A											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	N/A											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	N/A											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

Permanency Outcome 3: Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care for Long Periods of Time	
National Standard	121.7

Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	135.5											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	N/A											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	N/A											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	N/A											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
Permanency Outcome 4: Placement Stability												
National Standard	101.5											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	102.4											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	N/A											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	N/A											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	N/A											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

Part B: Item-Specific and Quantitative Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report

Safety Outcome 1: Item 1 Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	57.7%											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	TBD – Baseline will be established during 1 st year of PIP implementation.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	TBD											
Method of Measuring Improvement	Quality Service Reviews (QSR) case reviews will be conducted and a determination will be made regarding the timeliness of the initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment using the information collected during the file review and interviews and captured on the QSR roll-up sheet as an area of strength, area needing improvement, or not applicable. Results will be compiled semi-annually.											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

Safety Outcome 2: Item 3 Services to family to protect child(ren) in the home and prevent removal or reentry into foster care												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	67%											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	TBD – Baseline will be established during 1 st year of PIP implementation.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	TBD											
Method of Measuring Improvement	Quality Service Review (QSR) case reviews will be conducted resulting in a rating of 1 through 6 regarding the provision of services. Those items rated as 1, 2, or 3 will be converted to an ANI; while items rated as 4, 5, or 6 will be considered a strength. Items addressed in the QSR will be cross walked to the CFSR measurements. Ratings may be composed of results of a single item measurement or a composite of items as indicated in the cross walk. Results will be compiled semi-annually.											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

Safety Outcome 2: Item 4 Risk assessment and safety management												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	69%											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	TBD – Baseline will be established during 1 st year of PIP implementation.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	TBD											
Method of Measuring Improvement	Quality Service Review (QSR) case reviews will be conducted resulting in a rating of 1 through 6 regarding risk assessment and safety management. Those items rated as 1, 2, or 3 will be converted to an ANI; while items rated as 4, 5, or 6 will be considered a strength. Items addressed in the QSR will be cross walked to the CFSR measurements. Ratings may be composed of results of a single item measurement or a composite of items as indicated in the cross walk. Results will be compiled semi-annually.											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

Permanency Outcome 1: Item 7 Permanency goal for child												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	51%											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	TBD – Baseline will be established during 1 st year of PIP implementation.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	TBD											
Method of Measuring Improvement	Quality Service Review (QSR) case reviews will be conducted resulting in a rating of 1 through 6 regarding the appropriateness and timeliness of the permanency goal for the child. Those items rated as 1, 2, or 3 will be converted to an ANI; while items rated as 4, 5, or 6 will be considered a strength. Items addressed in the QSR will be cross walked to the CFSR measurements. Ratings may be composed of results of a single item measurement or a composite of items as indicated in the cross walk. Additional supporting information will also be collected on the QSR roll up sheet. Results will be compiled semi-annually.											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

Permanency Outcome 1: Item 10 Other planned permanent living arrangement	
Performance as Measured in Final Report	83%
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	TBD – Baseline will be established during 1 st year of PIP implementation.
Negotiated Improvement Goal	TBD
Method of Measuring	Quality Service Review (QSR) case reviews will be conducted resulting in a rating of 1 through 6 regarding

Improvement	the appropriateness of the goal of OPPLA. Those items rated as 1, 2, or 3 will be converted to an ANI; while items rated as 4, 5, or 6 will be considered a strength. Items addressed in the QSR will be cross walked to the CF SR measurements. Ratings may be composed of results of a single item measurement or a composite of items as indicated in the cross walk. Information will also be collected on the QSR roll up sheet. Results will be compiled semi-annually.											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

Well-Being Outcome 1: Item 17 Needs and services of child, parents and foster parents												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	45%											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	TBD – Baseline will be established during 1 st year of PIP implementation.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	TBD											
Method of Measuring Improvement	Quality Service Review (QSR) case reviews will be conducted resulting in a rating of 1 through 6 regarding meeting the needs and providing services for the child, parents and foster parents. Those items rated as 1, 2, or 3 will be converted to an ANI; while items rated as 4, 5, or 6 will be considered a strength. Items addressed in the QSR will be cross walked to the CF SR measurements. Ratings may be composed of results of a single item measurement or a composite of items as indicated in the cross walk. Additional supporting information will also be collected on the QSR roll up sheet. Results will be compiled semi-annually.											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

measurement for the reported quarter.)													
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Well-Being Outcome 1: Item 18 Child and family involvement in case planning												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	42%											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	TBD – Baseline will be established during 1 st year of PIP implementation.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	TBD											
Method of Measuring Improvement	Quality Service Review (QSR) case reviews will be conducted resulting in a rating of 1 through 6 regarding child and family involvement in case planning. Those items rated as 1, 2, or 3 will be converted to an ANI; while items rated as 4, 5, or 6 will be considered a strength. Items addressed in the QSR will be cross walked to the CFSR measurements. Ratings may be composed of results of a single item measurement or a composite of items as indicated in the cross walk. Additional supporting information will also be collected on the QSR roll up sheet. Results will be compiled semi-annually.											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

Well-Being Outcome 1: Item 19 Caseworker visits with child																									
Performance as Measured in Final Report	75%																								
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	TBD – Baseline will be established during 1 st year of PIP implementation.																								
Negotiated Improvement Goal	TBD																								
Method of Measuring Improvement	Quality Service Review (QSR) case reviews will be conducted resulting in a rating of 1 through 6 regarding the quality of caseworker visits with child. Those items rated as 1, 2, or 3 will be converted to an ANI; while items rated as 4, 5, or 6 will be considered a strength. Items addressed in the QSR will be cross walked to the CFSR measurements. Ratings may be composed of results of a single item measurement or a composite of items as indicated in the cross walk. Information regarding the frequency of caseworker visits with child will be collected on the QSR roll up sheet. Results will be compiled semi-annually.																								
Renegotiated Improvement Goal																									
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Q1</th> <th>Q2</th> <th>Q3</th> <th>Q4</th> <th>Q5</th> <th>Q6</th> <th>Q7</th> <th>Q8</th> <th>Q9</th> <th>Q10</th> <th>Q11</th> <th>Q12</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12												
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12														

Well-Being Outcome 1: Item 20 Caseworker visits with parents												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	29%											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	TBD – Baseline will be established during 1 st year of PIP implementation.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	TBD											
Method of Measuring Improvement	Quality Service Review (QSR) case reviews will be conducted resulting in a rating of 1 through 6 regarding the quality of caseworker visits with child. Those items rated as 1, 2, or 3 will be converted to an ANI; while items rated as 4, 5, or 6 will be considered a strength. Items addressed in the QSR will be cross walked to the CFSR measurements. Ratings may be composed of results of a single item measurement or a composite of items as indicated in the cross walk. Information regarding the frequency of caseworker visits with parents will be collected on the QSR roll up sheet. Results will be compiled semi-annually.											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

Part C: Amendments

This section should be completed only in the event of renegotiations regarding the content of the PIP, pursuant to 45 CFR 1355.35(e)(4). Copies of approved, renegotiated PIPs must be retained and distributed as noted above immediately upon completion of the renegotiation process.

The content of the attached PIP was renegotiated on [enter date]. The renegotiated content of the attached PIP has been approved (initialed) by State personnel and the Children's Bureau Regional Office with authority to negotiate such content and is approved by Federal and State officials:

Renegotiated Action Steps, Benchmarks or Improvement Goal	Date	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Approval of State Executive Officer for Child Welfare Services
						Approval Children's Bureau

Part D: Attachment - Strategy Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report - PA PIP Logic Model Matrix