

## **Idaho PIP - Table of Contents**

- I. PIP General Information
- II. Narrative
- III. PIP Strategy Summary and TA Plan
- IV. Matrix
- V. PIP Agreement Form (authorizing signatures)

I. PIP General Information												
CB Region:	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
State:												
Lead Children's Bureau Regional Office Contact Person:						Telephone Number:						
<b>Jennifer Zanella</b>						(206)615-2604						
						E-mail Address:						
						Jennifer.zanella@acf.hhs.gov						
State Agency Name:						Address: 450 W State Street						
Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, Div of FACS, Child and Family Services						Boise, ID 83720-0036						
						Telephone Number:						
						(208) 334-6618						
Lead State Agency Contact Person for the CFRS:						Telephone Number:						
<b>Shirley Alexander</b>						(208) 334-6618						
						E-mail Address:						
						alexande@dhw.idaho.gov						
Lead State Agency PIP Contact Person (if different): same						Telephone Number:						
						E-mail Address:						
Lead State Agency Data Contact Person:						Telephone Number:						
<b>Brian Baldwin</b>						(208) 334-5838						
						E-mail Address:						
						baldwinb@dhw.idaho.gov						
State PIP Team Members* (name, title, organization)												
1. Shirley Alexander, Program Manager, IDHW, FACS, Child & Family Services												
2. Debra Alsaker-Burke, CIP Coordinator												
3. Jerrilea Archer, Deputy, Ada County Sheriff's Dept												
4. Bill Augsburger, Chief, Nampa Police Department, Nampa, Idaho												
5. Lynn Baird, Region 5 Chief of Social Work, IDHW, FACS, CFS												
6. Jeri Bala, Program Specialist, IDHW, FACS, FOCUS												

7. Brian Baldwin, Management Analyst, IDHW, FACS, Planning, Evaluation & Training
8. Jeanette Bennett, Tribal Social Services, Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho
9. Rep. Sharon Block, Chair, House Health & Welfare Committee
10. Rob Braniff, Region 1 Chief of Social Work, IDHW, FACS, CFS
11. Michelle Britton, Division Administrator, IDHW, FACS
12. Sen. Joyce Broadsword, Vice-Chair, Senate Health & Welfare Committee
13. Marlene Bubar, Region 7 Chief of Social Work, IDHW, FACS, CFS
14. Jon Burnham, Idaho Dept of Juvenile Corrections Council Chair
15. Valerie Burgess, Program Specialist, IDHW, FACS, CFS
16. Patti Clark, Women's Crisis Center
17. Scott Crandall, Services Contractor-Family Connections
18. Hollis and Teri Doty, foster parents
19. Linda Dripps, Kin-Care Program Manager, CCOA
20. Susan Dwello, Program Specialist, IDHW, FACS, CFS
21. Christelle Edmo, Tribal Relations Program Manager, IDHW, FACS
22. Andrew Ellis, Ada County Prosecuting Attorney
23. Wes Engel, Program Manager, IDHW, FACS, Resource Development Unit
24. Midge Fisher, Panel Member, Keeping Children Safe
25. Leona Flowers, Tribal Social Services, Coeur d'Alene Tribe
26. Kim Fordham, Professor, Idaho Child Welfare Research and Training Center
27. Carol Fowler, Region 4 Chief of Social Work, IDHW, FACS, CFS
28. Bethany Gadzinski, Prog Mgr, IDHW, Div of Behavioral Health, Substance Abuse
29. Bonnie Gallant, Area Director, Boise School District
30. Randy Geib, Region 1 Program Manger, IDHW, FACS
31. Cameron Gilliland, Bureau Chief, IDHW, FACS
32. Jennifer Gose-Eells, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Twin Falls County
33. Chuck Halligan, Prog Mgr., IDHW, Div of Behavioral Health, Children's Mental Health
34. Sharon Harrigfeld, Admin, Community Operations and Program Services Div, DJC
35. Bob Hayes, Substance Abuse Assessment and Treatment Liaison
36. Diane Helton, Program Specialist, IDHW, FACS, CFS
37. Renee Hill, Panel Member, Keeping Children Safe
38. Kathy James, Region 5 Program Manger, IDHW, FACS

39. Greg Johnson, Real Life Ministries
40. Mary Jones, Program Manager, IDHW, FACS, Infant-Toddler Program
41. Brent King, Region 3 Deputy Attorney General
42. Fred Kirn, Region 7 Program Manger, IDHW, FACS
43. Kerry Koontz, St. Luke's Magic Valley RMC – CARES Program
44. Frances Lunney, Region 6 Program Manger, IDHW, FACS
45. Kurt Lyles, Prog Spec, IDHW, Div of Behavioral Health, Children's Mental Health
46. Tony Mares, foster youth alumnus and foster parent
47. Stacey McAlevy, CASA
48. Kathy Hammond, Program Specialist, IDHW, FACS, CFS
49. Caroline McDonald, Region 3 Chief of Social Work, IDHW, FACS, CFS
50. Judge Cathleen McGregor-Irby, Magistrate Judge
51. Oscar Morgan, , Program Specialist, IDHW, FACS, PET
52. Kathy Morris, Program Specialist, IDHW, FACS, CFS
53. Mary Jo Murdie, Region 2 Program Manger, IDHW, FACS
54. Judge Bryan Murray, Magistrate Judge
55. Lori Nebeker, Victim/Witness Coordinator, Twin Falls County Sheriff's Department
56. Mardell Nelson, Program Manager, IDHW, FACS, Planning, Evaluation and Training
57. Brittany Patterson, foster youth alumni
58. Rick Phillips, Researcher, Idaho Child Welfare Research and Training Center
59. Jeremy Player, Region 3 Program Manger, IDHW, FACS
60. Brian Plowman, Region 6 Chief of Social Work, IDHW, FACS, CFS
61. Roxanne Printz, Director, Idaho Child Welfare Research and Training Center
62. Julianne Rinard, President, Idaho Foster Parent Association
63. Sarah Reitan, Social Worker, IDHW, FACS, CFS
64. Dr. Robert Roberge, Physician and Chair, Idaho Depart of Health and Welfare Board
65. Jill Robertson, Governor's Children at Risk Task Force
66. Landis Rossi, Region 4 Regional Director, IDHW
67. Sue Rose Salmon, Substance Abuse Assessment and Treatment Liaison
68. Mike Scholl, Director, Casey Family Programs
69. Terry Scraggins, foster youth alumnus
70. Frank Sesek, Deputy Division Administrator, IDHW, FACS

71. Roger Sherman, Exec Director, Idaho Children's Trust Fund
72. Steve Sparks, Region 4 Program Manger, IDHW, FACS
73. Marcy Spilker, Region 2 Deputy Attorney General
74. Bob Stahn, Substance Abuse Assessment and Treatment Liaison
75. Kathy Tidwell, Director, BSU Child Welfare Center
76. Tom Turco, Panel Member, Keeping Children Safe
77. Camie Wereley, Women's Center
78. Brandelle Whitworth Esq., Tribal Attorney, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
79. Marian Woods, Program Manager, IDHW, FACS, Navigation and CareLine
80. Erika Wainaina, Program Specialist, IDHW, FACS, CFS and ICPC
81. Jade Wallace, foster youth alumna
82. Marie Siebler, Region 2 Chief of Social Work, IDHW, FACS, CFS
83. Drew Hall, Deputy Director, Family and Welfare Services, IDHW

## **II: PIP Strategy Summary and TA Plan**

### **1. Introduction**

Idaho participated in the on-site portion of the DHHS Child and Family Services Review (CFSR-2) during the week of April 7, 2008. A courtesy copy of the Final Report was received on September 4, 2008. The information which follows is Idaho's proposed Program Improvement Plan (PIP-2) to address the issues identified during the CFSR-2 process.

### **2. Overall Strategy for PIP-2 Development**

Idaho began efforts to develop PIP-2 during the state self assessment process which included:

- Examining Idaho's federal Data Profile;
- Analyzing data from Child and Family Services continuing quality improvement process (CQI);
- Reviewing the Child Protection Court Improvement Project re-assessment; and
- Convening and gathering input from stakeholders representing a wide range of agencies and community partners throughout the State.

Performance was assessed in the areas of child safety, permanency, wellbeing and systemic factors during the onsite review. Immediately following the review, CFS examined the themes which had emerged from the Self-Assessment and onsite review. CFS then convened 85 stakeholders and agency staff to gather ideas about how to improve the state's child welfare system using five (5) themes as a framework. This group met twice and included judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, Deputy Attorneys General, Child and Family Services supervisors and program managers, chiefs of social work, resource parents, law enforcement, ministers, tribal representatives, Casey Family Programs staff, university partners, legislators, citizen review panel members and staff of private child welfare organizations. Additionally, focus groups were held in each region, gathering input from youth and from all child welfare supervisors. Due to the diversity and strength of this group, the PIP-2 has depth, perspective and corroboration beyond what could have been developed by CFS in isolation.

During the stakeholder meetings, ideas were collected which would not necessarily be a good fit with the PIP or would take a longer than the 2 years of the PIP. As it has been for the last 5 years, PIP-2 will be integrated into Idaho's Comprehensive Five-Year Plan (CFSP). Ideas gathered from stakeholders that are not being incorporated into the PIP will be included in the 5-year plan.

### **3. Themes for PIP-2**

During CFSR-1 and PIP-1 (2003-2006), Idaho focused on building infrastructure to support and improve practice. These improvements included the development of a broad range of practice standards, a revised New Worker Academy, a Continuous Quality Improvement case review process and establishment of PRIDE training for resource families. Family Centered Practice (FCP) was reaffirmed as Idaho's model of practice.

FCP training was implemented for workers and for supervisors, was integrated into practice standards and is part of the New Worker Academy. Idaho's performance on all but one systemic factor (case review) during CFSR-2 reflected positive changes that have taken place since CFSR-1.

Implementation of PIP-1 also resulted in many improvements at the case review level. During CFSR-2 the majority of items 1-23 showed improvement. Most continued to meet the goals established in PIP-1. Many have yet to reach the 90% criterion set by the CFSR-2. Focusing on individual items as the place to target interventions has not led to the type of improvement needed for some of our more challenging practice issues such as placement stability.

Based on information from the Self-Assessment, the CFSR-2 case review, input from various groups including the PIP-2 Steering Committee, PIP-2 Development Committee, supervisors and youth, the current challenges for Idaho fall into the following themes.

### **Maintaining Children Safely in their Homes**

The CFSR-2 revealed that 78% of children sampled received or were offered services to prevent removal from their homes or were removed by law enforcement due to imminent danger. Idaho's data profile has revealed that 15% of children who are removed from their homes are returned home within 7 days. Of the children in care past 7 days, their median length of stay is 3.6 months. The question asked by multiple CFSR-2 case reviewers was: "If the children only need a brief stay in foster care, can services and safety planning prevent their entry into foster care?"

Idaho has dramatically increased the number of in-home cases served since CFSR-1 and those cases are clearly part of the 78% noted above. However, the decision to place a child into foster care is a complex one involving community standards, safety threats, law enforcement response, prosecutors, and limitations in agency resources. PIP-2 will address working with law enforcement and prosecutors and increasing regional capacity for in-home services to provide safety for children and support for families to prevent otherwise unnecessary removals.

There will be a statewide effort to conduct reassessments of risk prior to reunification or case closure. According to Idaho's composite measures, re-entry into foster care is a concern in several regions. As part of their Regional Improvement Plans (RIP) those regions will look at their regional data regarding lengths of stay in foster care and consider alternatives for some children and youth currently being discharged from foster care and re-entering within 12 months.

### **Engaging Families**

Overall PIP-2 will focus on increasing the frequency and quality of worker visits with children, youth and parents. Concerted attempts will be made to locate and engage non-custodial, incarcerated or otherwise absent or hard-to-involve parents. Regional supervisors will monitor monthly contacts via the FOCUS contact-visitation screen, provide feedback and do corrective action planning with workers. Additional training will

be available on how to prepare for and structure visits and how to document relevant details of the visit.

In the area of involvement of parents and youth in case planning (Item 18), Idaho has made some significant gains with the implementation of Family Group Decision Making as a strategy for family involvement in case planning. It is routine practice in several regions to use FGDM early and often via contracts. Other regions are more limited in their use of FGDM.

Beyond involvement in case planning, we have targeted engagement of families through Family Centered Practice. FCP requires actively practicing the 6 principles of partnership – the core of family centered practice. Family engagement is critical because of the relatively short time frames allowed by law and the high stakes for parents, children and extended family members.

Face-to-face contact with children and their families provides opportunities for communicating clearly, providing positive reinforcement and emphasizing client strengths – keys to engagement. Idaho's ratings on Visits with Children (item 19); Visits with Parents (item 20); and Participation in Case Planning (item 18) are indicative of missed opportunities for engagement and involvement with all family members, especially youth and non-custodial or absent parents, including both fathers and mothers.

Regional staff will examine their regional data regarding contacts and develop specific regional strategies for improving the frequency, quality and monitoring of contacts. These regional strategies will be consistent with CFS Practice Standards. Regions will also examine methods for earlier engagement of families around case planning and identification and involvement of relatives. Use of FGDM will be increased as will other forms of family meetings for the purposes of engaging parties in decision making and case planning. Methods for involving youth and resource parents in decision making will be addressed.

### **Placement Stability**

It is the frequent disruption of attachments that damages and delays development of children in the foster care system. According to Idaho's Data Profile and results of the CFSR-2 case review, Idaho is falling short of the national standard for placement stability. As is seen in other states, children who spend less than 1 year in foster care tend to have more adequate placement stability. Children and youth who are older and/or spend a longer time in foster care are less stable with regard to placement. Typically longer stays in foster care are the result of permanency challenges. Without opportunities for participation in decision making about his/her life and family members to connect with and anchor to, the child's feelings of loneliness and helplessness can express itself in maladaptive behaviors which lead to disruption and increased level of care such as residential placement and multiple placements.

Themes identified with respect to placement stability include the following:

Initial placements are too often made based on availability of a resource family vacancy rather than being able to make a “good match” between resource parent and foster youth. The vast majority of placements are emergency placements for imminent danger where the Department often knows very little about the family and children. The Department needs a larger pool of resource families so a better match can be made. Therefore, as part of PIP-2 a statewide recruitment plan will be developed.

Idaho also currently lacks the infrastructure for the development of Treatment Foster Homes for youth with very challenging behaviors. Having the capacity to effectively manage behaviors would reduce the number of placement settings.

Idaho has a relatively low percentage of placements with relatives. It has been established that safe relative placements are associated with increased placement stability. For relative placements to increase we need to have earlier and more exhaustive identification of relatives, relative search, less worker bias regarding placement with relatives, and expedited relative placement requirements that assure the relative home is safe at time of placement and continues to be safe. These issues will be addressed in this PIP.

Resource families state that they are not sufficiently included as part of the professional team and in decision making. Additionally they report that they do not receive sufficient support to maintain challenging youth in their homes.

The primary strategies for improving placement stability will be (1) increasing relative placements through early diligent search for and engagement of relatives; (2) building infrastructure to support Treatment Foster Homes; (3) supporting resource families as part of the team and assessing and meeting their needs and (4) insuring that children’s mental health needs are assessed and needed services are provided.

Regions will develop specific regional plans for improvement of placement stability while operating within CFS Practice Standards.

### **Enhancing Child Permanency**

Concurrent planning is a promising practice to reduce delays in permanency for children. Concurrent planning was a focus of training during PIP-1. During PIP-2 we will continue with implementation of concurrent planning. Supervisors will be essential in promoting this practice at the worker level. Social workers voice concerns that they don’t have adequate knowledge, skills or time to implement concurrent planning. Therefore, additional concurrent planning training will take place. The Court Improvement Project and IDHW will host joint regional trainings for the judiciary, child welfare staff and community partners.

Following PIP-1, (every) ninety day concurrent planning reviews were begun in the regions. Anecdotal reports indicate that these reviews are useful in “heading off” particular issues which result in permanency delays such as paternity identification, relative search and issues related to ICWA.

However, due to high caseloads and time constraints, concurrent planning reviews were not sustained. During PIP 2, the process mapping, described in the strategy below, will examine regional barriers to concurrent planning and the Child Welfare Subcommittee will examine the concurrent planning review instrument, adapting it for supervisors to use as part of their regularly scheduled case supervision.

Idaho's failure to reach substantial conformity on the systemic factor, Case Review, is partly due to court-related issues. Review hearings, permanency hearing, and filing for termination of parental rights absent compelling reasons, are not consistently occurring according to ASFA timelines. During CFSR-2, it was noted that in some judicial districts, foster parents are not accorded the right to be heard in hearings. The Child Protection Court Improvement Project (CIP) is working closely with the Department to resolve those issues. Regularly scheduled meetings between representatives from the Department and the CIP have been established to review data and monitor judicial districts to assure that hearings are happening and that timely permanency is being achieved.

As part of PIP-2, the Department will also develop a regional monitoring system to track hearings and the critical steps in concurrent planning. This information will be shared with the courts and compared with the data in the court's ISTARS system. This process and tool will serve to monitor compliance and address issues that were identified in the systemic factor, Case Review.

To improve case review and permanency outcomes, the Court Improvement Project is facilitating meetings between the Department, county prosecutors, and the Attorney General's Office to improve legal representation for the Department. As part of PIP-2, to inform the legal representation meetings, a statewide survey is being conducted to identify the current status of legal services available to the department around the state to educate department staff to be more informed consumers of legal services, to investigate the relationship, if any, between available legal services for the department and timely permanency outcomes for the child and to identify counties in which the Department needs additional legal representation. Information from the Department's CQI process, county data composites, and the monitoring system described in the paragraph above, will be reviewed and discussed. Strategies for improving legal representation in the counties where additional or improved legal representation for the department are needed, will be developed and implemented, keeping in mind current budgetary constraints, by members of the Legal Representation Committee.

The Department and the Court Improvement Project will coordinate collaborative trainings that are pertinent to both groups as outlined in the PIP-2 matrix. The Court Improvement Project will also take the lead in conducting training for new judges and additional regional trainings.

### **Organizational Structure to Support and Implement Practice Changes**

Workload studies have shown that Idaho's child welfare system has caseloads above the caseload standard in most regions. Turnover is high and is clearly a factor in permanency delays. Yet, these factors are not expected to change anytime soon and could become

more of a challenge given the current economic outlook. The challenge is to make changes in the way the work is organized and supported to make best practices and timely permanency possible for children and their families. Additionally, due to ongoing state budgetary hold backs, action steps in PIP-2 will need to be accomplished with current resources.

Process mapping of licensing and adoption is underway statewide and will show how work is conducted in central office and in the regions. Identifying these processes can lead to consideration of how work can be restructured to reduce delays and improve outcomes for children. The information and recommendations gleaned from this activity will help to inform regional improvement plans and useful changes in the adoption and licensing processes.

PIP-1 led to a complete re-tooling of the new worker pre-service academy. Supervisors will be the focus of PIP-2. This will involve training and support. Supervisors often dictate and reinforce aspects of the organization's culture. In order for the agency to make "real" change, supervisors will need to fully embrace and model Family Centered Practice and receive additional support and training. The challenge for supervisors is how to supervise in a demanding environment and promote the goals of Family Centered Practice and achievement of positive outcomes for children. This initiative has begun. A request for technical assistance with the National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice and Permanency Planning was granted. The technical assistance brought Sarah Jarvis and John Alderson to Idaho for two, 2-day visits and another two, 2-day visits are planned to develop a strategic plan with supervisors. The strategic plan will help to define supervisor's role, responsibility, needed supports and necessary training.

Additionally, CFS will work with the Idaho's universities to produce a monthly e-publication, Ideas in Practice, which will feature practice tips in order to reinforce specific aspects of child welfare practice such as improving quality of visits with children, concurrent planning, and working with both fathers and mothers.

#### **4. Data Sources and Methods for Monitoring Improvements**

Idaho has a number of data sources and several methods for monitoring improvements are already established. Every effort will be made to maximize the use of what is already in place. Regions will continue to use our CQI case review process. Based on our 5 years of experience, we elected to make some changes in timing of regional CQI and frequency of reporting. Each region will review 15 randomly selected cases every 6 months. Prior to the CQI each region will receive a list of randomly selected in-home cases and a list of randomly selected out-of-home cases for each of their field offices. The cases to be reviewed are systematically drawn from those lists. A minimum of 6 in-home cases are to be reviewed. Increasing the number of cases reviewed to 15, increases our annual reviews from 192 to 210. This marks an attempt to obtain results that are more representative of Idaho's performance. Also, in an attempt to gather a sample that represents the entire region, the cases chosen for review will be stratified by field office

according to the number of in-home and out-of-home cases open in that field office. We will continue to use the OSRI and interviews during the case reviews. Also the presence of a second level reviewer working directly with the regional Chief of Social Work will be retained.

Regions have scheduled their CQIs in the same order during the first and second half of 2009. Each region will receive 12 months of their CQI data every 6 months. Every 6 months we will also be able to report data from all 7 regions. This results in state data being consistently reported every 6 months rather than half of the state being reported one quarter and compared with the other half of the state during the next quarter.

For PIP-2, two of the original safety data indicators will be retained and four composite measures have been added to the range of measures to assess outcome improvement. The four composite measures have been broken down by region and by county. This will enable regions to more accurately assess and pinpoint improvement efforts. Before any RIPs are finalized, however, regions will examine their performance on the most current data profile available and make whatever adjustments are needed in their plans.

Today individual workers, supervisors, managers and administrators have reliable information about practice taken from CQI, a variety of FOCUS reports useful to managers and supervisors, and national data files. During PIP-1 the state and federal partners negotiated a goal for each of the 23 items. Regions compared their performance to these goals and included items that didn't meet the established goal in their RIP. In PIP-2, the regions will be challenged to rely more heavily on regional data from case reviews and multiple other data sources to assist in carefully targeting their RIPs.

In Idaho's PIP-2, several regions are required to develop a Regional Improvement Plan in the areas of Maintaining Children in their Homes, Placement Stability and Enhancing Permanency. In order to be successful, it will be critical that regions implement planning through a method which assures participation and optimal buy-in from all staff. The CFS Program Manager, a Program Specialist and the Division Administrator will attend and assist in the facilitation of the meetings in each region. We are using the following process for RIP development.

- Each regional manager is contacted by the CFS Program Manager to arrange a date for facilitation of the RIP.
- In conjunction with the region, an agenda for a day-long meeting is developed and a determination is made about who will attend.
- Data from the CFSR-2, final report, CQI, data profile, results of local focus group's process mapping and any other regionally specific information is compiled for review by participants at the meeting.
- Each RIP planning meeting includes a brief orientation to the PIP-2 and the relationship between RIPs and the PIP-2.
- The group process for each region is specific to the region's number of staff, supervisors, community partners and groups already in place to facilitate communication such as management teams etc.

- Group(s) will review all available information and make a regional assessment that identifies underlying issues contributing to the areas needing improvement.
- Each group(s) worksheet will also contain the statewide and regional activities which are required as part of the larger statewide PIP-2 in order to avoid duplication of effort.
- Group(s) will develop ideas for no more than 2 action steps on each of the region's required goals.
- Ideas will be worked into behaviorally specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time limited action steps and tasks.
- Following the meeting, the region will have approximately 2 weeks to finalize their RIP and submit to Central Office for overall review, review for consistency with Practice Standards, feedback, and approval.
- Specific measurable progress will be reported by the region to Central Office per the PIP-2 quarterly reporting schedule.

While regions will have some latitude in developing RIPS, program integrity as established in the CFS Practice Standards will be maintained. The RIPS will address solutions and monitoring by Central Office will address implementation and progress. Ideas and progress from the RIPS will be regularly shared with Regional Program Managers and the Child Welfare Subcommittee at their meetings. This feedback will also lead to the sharing of ideas of what is working, ongoing analysis of the plans with integration of effective or promising practices into statewide policies and training, and statewide consistency in practice.

In a number of cases reviewed during the CFSR-2, initial assessment of safety factors was also an issue. Idaho's CQI baseline on items 3 and 4 was 99% and 87% respectively as compared to 73% on both items 3 and 4 on the CFSR-2. A further examination of ratings of items 3 and 4 on approximately 25 CQI case reviews revealed that second level reviewers in Idaho were consistent in rating items 3 and 4 in the CQI process. However, Idaho reviewers were making a distinction between items 3 and 4 that may not be made during the CFSR. For example, Idaho may rate Item 3 a strength and Item 4 as an area needing improvement where CFSR reviewers may rate both Items 3 and 4 as an area needing improvement when safety factors are at issue. Idaho CQI reviewers are distinguishing what is happening regarding services to prevent removal (3) and initial/ongoing safety assessment. Idaho second-level reviewers will work with Region 10 to assure that the OSRI instructions are being interpreted consistently and correctly. Given the discrepancies between the CFSR-2 and Idaho current baselines, a new 6-month base line will be collected for both Items 3 and 4. Based on those results, an improvement goal will be negotiated.

In summary, during PIP-2 we will use CQI data, semi-annual composite data, the CW Outcomes Report and a variety of other FOCUS management reports.

### III. PIP Strategy Summary and TA Plan

Primary Strategy	Key Concerns	TA Resources Needed
<p>Maintaining Children Safely in their Home and in alternate care placements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short stays in foster care may play a role in foster care re-entry;</li> <li>• Formal re-assessments are not completed before recommending reunification;</li> <li>• Substance abuse relapse plays a role in foster care re-entry. In most cases, relapse plans were not in place or followed;</li> <li>• Decisions to remove a child are often made by law enforcement and in some cases without CFS input and the opportunity to provide in-home services to prevent removal; and</li> <li>• Capacity for in-home services needs to be strengthened through contracts.</li> <li>• Lack of adequate safety and risk assessment in the foster home or when a child is placed with a relative or having unsupervised visits with relatives.</li> <li>• Lack of safety and risk assessment of the siblings remaining in the home.</li> <li>• In-home services to ensure safety and prevent removal were not provided initially and only began several months after the case was opened.</li> <li>• Child was reunified without ensuring services were provided to prevent re-entry.</li> </ul>	<p>Request consultation with National Resource Center for Child Protective Services on how to increase safe in-home and alternate care placements by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a decision tree that shows instances when children can be safely maintained in their home. The Decision Tree will be shared with MDTs, including law enforcement;</li> <li>• Training on conducting initial and ongoing assessment with relative placements and in foster homes.</li> <li>• Training on re-assessing safety prior to re-unification and case closure with inclusion of services to prevent re-entry.</li> </ul>

<p>Engaging Families</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FGDM and/or family meetings are under utilized in some areas of the state;</li> <li>• Social workers often meet the needs of one parent, but not both parents when the parents are living apart;</li> <li>• Social Workers need to have more frequent quality contact with fathers, mothers, and children.</li> <li>• Families and youth state they need more involvement in the development of their plan</li> </ul>	<p>National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice and Permanency Planning</p> <p>We request training-of-trainers focused on engaging fathers and enhancing quality and frequency of social worker contact. Training should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family centered practice methods of engaging reluctant parents and parents who are incarcerated or live long distances.</li> <li>• How to conduct and document effective face-to-face visits with each child and each parent.</li> </ul>
<p>Enhancing Child Permanency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of consistent legal representation for the Department was identified as a factor impacting permanency outcomes for children.</li> <li>• Concurrent planning activities are not being completed early in the case;</li> <li>• FGDM is not being utilized at critical points in the case to search for relatives and finalize the permanent plan for the child;</li> <li>• There are often delays in pursuing TPR.</li> <li>• Children bond with foster parents and late in the case, relatives are discovered and considered as placement options;</li> <li>• At times, lack of inquiry and follow-up on a child's Indian status is a cause for delayed permanency as adoptions are held in abeyance while tribes are notified;</li> <li>• Numerous youth who turn 18 years old are exiting the system after they are legally free without having a permanent home established;</li> </ul>	<p>National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice and Permanency Planning National Resource Center for Legal and Judicial Issues</p> <p>We request consultation on how to implement concurrent planning activities, early in the case, including making a full disclosure with parents, relatives, and resource parents, within a family centered practice model.</p> <p>The judicial system requests training on how to monitor concurrent planning within the judicial role.</p> <p>National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement</p>

<p>Improving Child/Youth Stability in Foster Care</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of resource homes to handle children with challenging behaviors;</li> <li>• Lower percentage of children being placed in relative homes;</li> <li>• Need foster homes that reflect Idaho’s ethnic and racial diversity;</li> <li>• Resource families need additional support in order to continue to foster children with challenging behaviors.</li> </ul>	<p>National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice and Permanency Planning</p> <p>We request technical assistance and training-of-trainers around identifying and placing children with relatives.</p> <p>Consultation and training should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to engage and find relatives within 30 days of a child coming into care when parents are reluctant to supply names of relatives.</li> <li>• How other states are safely placing children with relatives, pending licensure.</li> </ul> <p>We request technical assistance and training to build a stronger partnership between resource families and CFS social workers and supervisors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This TA will assist resource parents, licensing staff, risk assessors, and case managers in clarifying their roles and operationalization of the PRIDE model’s philosophy of “working together as a professional team.”</li> </ul> <p>Adopt US Kids</p> <p>We request assistance in building the infrastructure on a statewide basis to recruit additional resource families to allow for better resource family/child matching</p> <p>This TA will assist Idaho in assessing the current need for foster homes in each region, which reflects the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the</p>
---	---	--

		<p>State. After assessing the need and reviewing current regional recruitment activities, the TA will assist the State in linking and enhancing regional activities through a Statewide plan.</p>
<p>Improving administrative and operational structure and processes to support change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional training, role clarification, and support needs to be given to CFS supervisors to assist them in doing their job;</li> <li>• Heavy workloads make it difficult for social workers to respond and support resource parents in a timely manner;</li> <li>• Workloads can have a negative impact on the frequency of contact with children and their parents;</li> <li>• Concurrent planning activities are not occurring early in the case. Therefore permanency for children is delayed as permanency worker completes work that ideally would have been done earlier in the case;</li> <li>• Office structure may impact outcomes in permanency;</li> <li>• There is a delay in completing licensing requirements for resource and pre-adoptive families;</li> <li>• Dual homestudies for foster and adoption are completed inconsistently in each region of the state;</li> </ul>	<p>National Resource Center on Family-Centered Practice and Permanency Planning  We request technical assistance in strengthening supervisors through a strategic planning process that will include role definition, identification of training and supports;  Technical Assistance may be necessary to assist Idaho in implementing the Strengthening Supervisor’s Strategic Plan.  National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement  We request onsite consultation for the Department and the Courts to learn more about evidenced based change strategies that will allow both systems to more effectively implement concurrent planning and work towards improved legal representation for the Department. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges is a resource regarding system change necessary to improve outcomes for children.</p>

**IV. PIP Matrix**

State: Idaho

Type of Report:

**PIP X**

Quarterly Report: \_\_\_\_\_

(Quarter: \_\_\_\_\_)

Date Submitted:

**Part A. Strategy Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report**

<b>Primary Strategy:</b> MAINTAIN CHILDREN SAFELY IN THEIR OWN HOME			<b>Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors:</b> Safety Outcomes 1 and 2; Permanency Outcome 1		
<b>Goal:</b> Assessments and services will be available and used to protect children in their own home and in out-of-home placement.			<b>Applicable CFSR Items:</b> Items 2, 3, 4, and 5		
<b>Action Steps and Benchmarks</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Evidence of completion</b>	<b>Qtr Due</b>	<b>Qtr Done</b>	<b>Quarterly Reporting</b>
<b>1.0 Reassessment instrument will be incorporated into FOCUS with a system alert to complete a re-assessment prior to closure of a removal episode and an integrity rule that will not allow case closure until a reassessment has been completed.</b>					
<b>1.1</b> Complete program development and testing for incorporation of re-assessment tool into FOCUS.	Shirley Alexander	Copy of FOCUS implementation calendar indicating completion of demonstration and testing	1		
<b>1.2</b> Regional Information System Coordinators (ISC) are trained on the reassessment tool and they provide mandatory training to all regional case managers and permanency social workers prior to statewide implementation.	Shirley Alexander	Summary report on statewide training, including number of participants, on FOCUS Reassessment	1		
<b>1.3</b> FOCUS re-assessment is implemented statewide.	Shirley Alexander	Date of statewide implementation of Reassessment in FOCUS	1		
<b>2.0 Each region will increase its capacity to serve in-home cases.</b>					
<b>2.1</b> Each region will conduct an assessment of regional in-home case capacity and develop a written plan and goal for increased in-home case capacity.	Regional Program Manager	Regional plans to increase in-home case capacity	1		
<b>2.2</b> Regions will implement and monitor their regional in-home services improvement plan.	Regional Program Manager	Summary report on plan implementation including # of new/ongoing contracts, increases in in-home services.	2		

<b>3.0 Develop a decision tree to share with law enforcement and MDTs on when children can be maintained in their homes through in-home services.</b>					
<b>3.1</b> With TA from the NRC on Child Protective Services and in collaboration with law enforcement develop a decision tree that shows instances when children can safely be maintained in their homes.	Shirley Alexander	In-home services decision tree	3		
<b>3.2</b> The draft decision tree will be shared with LE and with MDTs as part of the process described in 4.0 below	Regional Program Manager	Meeting dates	3		
<b>3.3</b> Finalize decision tree to use in the process described in 4.0 below	Regional Program Manager	Finalized decision tree	3		
<b>3.4</b> The Department will share the decision tree with the State Police Officer's Standards and Training for consideration of including it in their Police Academy.	Shirley Alexander	Date and summary of meeting	4		
<b>4.0 Each region will have a mutual exchange of information between local law enforcement, prosecutors, and the Department regarding impact of removal on children, local data and services available to prevent removal.</b>					
<b>4.1</b> Regional program managers and supervisors will meet with local law enforcement and prosecutors to discuss local removal data, and the region's plan (see 2.1) to increase availability of in-home services to prevent removal	Regional Program Manager	Meeting dates	3		
<b>4.2</b> RPM will submit a report with the results of their meetings with law enforcement and prosecutors to Central Office	Regional Program Manager	Summary of results of contacts	3		
<b>4.3</b> Follow up meeting with local law enforcement and prosecutors on utilization of in-home services to prevent removal.	Regional Program Manager	Meeting dates and results of follow-up	6		
<b>5.0 Regions will reduce re-entry into foster care.</b>					
<b>5.1</b> Regions not meeting the standard for re-entry will analyze their regional re-entry data, assess strengths and challenges and develop regional plan with a specific goal for improvement (reduction in	Regional program manager	Copies of regional improvement plans for reduction of foster care re-entry	1		

foster care re-entries).					
<b>5.2</b> Regions will implement and monitor their regional plan to reduce re-entry.	Regional program manager	Update status of plan implementation	2		
<b>5.3</b> Regions and central office will examine progress of implementation and adjust or terminate RIPs as needed.	Regional Program Manager Central Office	Copy of region's adjusted plan or letter to the region regarding action step completion	4, 7		
<b>5.4</b> Regional plans and progress will be shared and discussed at Operations Team and the Child Welfare Subcommittee to promote the integration of promising practices into policies and training and to ensure statewide consistency.	Michelle Britton and Shirley Alexander	Agendas of Operations and Child Welfare Subcommittee meetings	2,4,7		
<b>6.0 Train all CFS risk assessors, case managers, licensing and permanency teams to conduct initial and ongoing assessment with relative placements and foster homes and to re-assess child safety prior to reunification and case closure.</b>					
<b>6.1</b> Receive consultation from NRC on Child Protective Services to provide tools and training for assessing relative placement and foster homes, initial, on-going and at re-assessment.	Shirley Alexander	Brief summary of consultation and copies of tools and/or handouts that are provided	1		
<b>6.2</b> As a result of the consultation, review and revise standards, academy new worker curriculum, and the Child Welfare Practice Manual to incorporate tools and training.	Valerie Burgess	Revisions of standards, curriculum and manual	2		
<b>6.3</b> Deliver hub based mandatory training to all CFS social workers, supervisors and licensing contractors. Tribes and law enforcement will be invited	Valerie Burgess	Training agenda, dates and numbers (and role) of participants	3		

<b>Primary Strategy:</b> <b>ENGAGING FAMILIES</b>			<b>Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors:</b> Permanency Outcome 2; Well-Being Outcomes 1 and 2		
<b>Goal: Using a family-centered practice approach, social workers will engage children and families to increase active involvement in case decision-making.</b>			<b>Applicable CFSR Items:</b> Items 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20		
<b>Action Steps and Benchmarks</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Evidence of completion</b>	<b>Qtr Due</b>	<b>Qtr Done</b>	<b>Quarterly Reporting</b>
<b>1.0 Monitor and increase the quality and quantity of monthly contacts between social workers and children and social workers and fathers and mothers.</b>					
<b>1.1</b> Each region will monitor and increase social worker contacts with both children and fathers and mother, summarize regional progress, and report it to Central Office.	Regional Chief of Social Work	Regional summaries of contacts broken out by children, mothers, fathers	2		
<b>1.2</b> Each quarter, regions and Central Office will examine progress toward the PIP goal of worker contacts.	Michelle Britton Regional Program Managers	Division Operations Agendas	3 and 6		
<b>1.3</b> Assess each region to determine if PIP goal is met. If it has not been met, regional strategy for increasing contacts will be re-examined.	Michelle Britton Regional Program Managers	List of regions that have met the PIP-2 goal and a summary of strategies for regions still needing improvement	6		
<b>2.0 Increase the use of FGDM or other type of family meetings at the beginning and at critical points in the case.</b>					
<b>2.1</b> Each region will assess, develop and implement a plan to increase the number of FGDM's or other type of family meeting.	Michelle Britton	Regional implementation plans	3		
<b>2.2</b> For 6 months, each region will monitor the increase of family meetings	Regional Program Managers and Chief of Social Work	Report of regional progress and results of CQI – item 18- Family Involvement	5		
<b>2.3</b> Assess each region to determine if PIP goal for Item 18 is met. If it has not been met, the regional strategy for increasing family involvement will be re-examined and a revised strategy will be implemented.	Regional Program Managers and Chief of Social Work	CQI results for Item 18 and revised regional strategy if goal has not been met	6		

**3.0 Train all CFS social workers on engaging both mothers and fathers and enhancing the quality of contact with all family members.**

<p><b>3.1</b> Receive consultation from NRC on Family Centered Practice and Permanency Planning on improving engagement with both mothers and fathers and enhancing the quality of visits with all family members.</p>	<p>Shirley Alexander</p>	<p>Dates of consultation with brief summary of consultation sessions or NRC report</p>	<p><b>1</b></p>		
<p><b>3.2</b> As a result of the consultation, review and revise standards, academy new worker curriculum, and child welfare practice manual (for new and experienced workers) to incorporate best practice for engaging both mothers and fathers and enhancing the quality of visits with all family members.</p>	<p>Valerie Burgess</p>	<p>Copy of revised practice standards and practice manual pages.</p>	<p><b>2</b></p>		
<p><b>3.3</b> Training of Trainers by NRC</p>	<p>Shirley Alexander</p>	<p>Training Agenda; List of trainers</p>	<p><b>4</b></p>		
<p><b>3.4</b> Deliver mandatory training to all CFS social workers and supervisors. Invite tribes and contractors.</p>	<p>Shirley Alexander</p>	<p>Summary report of regional trainings by date</p>	<p><b>5</b></p>		

<b>Primary Strategy:</b> <b>IMPROVING CHILD/YOUTH STABILITY IN FOSTER CARE</b>			<b>Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: Permanency Outcome 1 and 2</b>		
<b>Goal:</b> <b>Improve placement stability for children and youth in foster care</b>			<b>Applicable CFSR Items:</b> <b>Items 6, 14, 15, 16 and 23</b>		
<b>Action Steps and Benchmarks</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Evidence of completion</b>	<b>Qtr Due</b>	<b>Qtr Done</b>	<b>Quarterly Reporting</b>
<b>1.0 Establish model and administrative rules for CFS treatment foster homes for youth with challenging behaviors.</b>					
1.1 Convene a subcommittee to review other state treatment foster home models, make a recommendation to the Operations Committee.	Cameron Gilliland	Summary of treatment model recommended for Idaho.	1		
1.2 For selected model subcommittee will draft proposed administrative rules to implement model and review with program managers and administration.	Cameron Gilliland	copy of proposed rules	3		
1.3 Complete promulgation process for all treatment foster home rules.	Cameron Gilliland	copy of Legislative docket	5		
<b>2.0 Prepare curriculum for training treatment foster parents concurrently with step 1.0 above</b>					
2.1 Establish a subcommittee to review and select curriculum from other states	Valerie Burgess and Kurt Lyles	Names of curriculum selected	1		
2.2 Adapt curriculum for Idaho and get feedback	Valerie Burgess and Kurt Lyles	Draft of curriculum	2		
2.3 Curriculum finalized for statewide distribution	Valerie Burgess and Kurt Lyles	final, dated copy of curriculum	4		
2.4 Training of trainers on treatment foster home curriculum delivered to university partners, identified Department staff and licensing contractors. followed by regional worker training	Valerie Burgess and Kurt Lyles	agenda/training dates for TOT	6		
2.5 All CFS and CMH staff are trained on the model of treatment foster homes including an overview of the treatment and foster care currently available.	Valerie Burgess	Training Agenda and training dates	6		

<b>3.0 Develop a statewide recruitment plan to increase available resource families for improved family/child matching.</b>					
<b>3.1</b> Consult with AdoptUSKids about regional assessments and developing a statewide recruitment plan.	Susan Dwello and Julie Pratt	Date of onsite consultation including report by NRC	<b>1</b>		
<b>3.2</b> Conduct regional assessments per 3.1	Susan Dwello and Julie Pratt	Summary report of assessments	<b>2</b>		
<b>3.3</b> Develop statewide recruitment plan based on assessment in 3.2	Susan Dwello and Julie Pratt	Copy of statewide recruitment plan	<b>5</b>		
<b>3.4</b> Implement statewide recruitment plan.	Susan Dwello and Julie Pratt	Summary report of implementation	<b>6</b>		
<b>4.0 Receive consultation and training to explore model for identifying family members to increase relative placement.</b>					
<b>4.1</b> Receive consultation and training-of-trainers curriculum on early identification of relatives from the National Resource Center on Family Centered Practice and Permanency Planning.	Shirley Alexander	Copy of curriculum and training agenda	<b>3</b>		
<b>4.2</b> Review standards, academy curriculum, and the child welfare practice manual and incorporate the model of early identification of relatives.	Shirley Alexander and Susan Dwello	Revised standard issued, academy curriculum, and practice manual content	<b>4</b>		
<b>4.3</b> Deliver mandatory training on identifying relatives to CFS social workers and supervisors. Invite tribes and contractors	Shirley Alexander	Summary report of regional trainings by date and percentage of staff in attendance.	<b>4</b>		
<b>5.0 Expedite placement of children with relatives</b>					
<b>5.1</b> Convene a workgroup to explore if the current standard for placing children with relatives can be revised to safely expedite the placement of children with relatives prior to licensure.	Susan Dwello	Names of individuals participating on sub-committee	<b>2</b>		
<b>5.2</b> Workgroup to examine safe practices and policies in other states and revise Idaho's practice standard.	Susan Dwello	Draft of revised standard	<b>3</b>		
<b>5.3</b> Release revised standard to regional management (supervisors, chiefs, program manager) with a conference call with sups followed by release to all staff	Susan Dwello	Date of call with supervisors Revised standard with effective date	<b>4</b>		

5.4 Incorporate revised standard into New Worker Academy	Susan Dwello	Academy curriculum revision	5		
<b>6.0 Each region will develop and implement a RIP to address stability in foster care that includes steps to increase relative placements and support of resource families.</b>					
6.1 Regional RIP development meeting will be held in each region. Participants will assess regional stability data including recommendations of process mapping and develop a regional plan with specific improvement goals. Plans will include steps for increasing relative placements and supporting resource families	Regional Program Manager	Copies of RIPs for increased stability	1		
6.2 Regions will implement and monitor their regional plans to increase stability.	Regional Program Manager	Summary report on implementation and monitoring.	2		
6.3 Regions and central office will examine progress of implementation and adjust or terminate RIPs as needed.	Regional Program Managers Central Office	Copy of adjusted plan or letter of action step completion	4, 7		
<b>7.0 Develop training/facilitation for resource parents, both relative and non-relative, and child welfare staff that encourages and assists both groups to build partnerships that provide clear expectations and identification of roles within a practice model that supports placement stability.</b>					
7.1 Request consultation from the National Resource Center on Family Centered Practice and Permanency on building partnerships.	Shirley Alexander	NRC request form	1		
7.2 Convene a subcommittee to develop a training/facilitation process that would include identification of benefits and barriers to partnerships, and identification of the tools and resources each partner would be expected to utilize in order to mutually achieve the goals of stability, permanency, safety and well-being.	Shirley Alexander and Susan Dwello	Copy of curriculum	3		
7.3 Trainers/facilitators are trained	Shirley Alexander and Susan Dwello	agenda and list of trainers/facilitators	4		
7.4 Training/facilitation is mandated for 25% of regional resource parents and CFS social workers in each region of the state.	Shirley Alexander	Summary report of regional trainings by date and percentage of staff in attendance.	5		

<p><b>7.5</b> The roles and expectation of resource families and social workers which result from the training/facilitations in 7.4 above will be incorporated into PRIDE and the new worker academy as well as in the annual resource family development plan.</p>	<p>Susan Dwello and Kim Fordham</p>	<p>PRIDE and academy curriculum handouts and samples of resource family development plans.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>		
<p><b>8.0 Each region will assure that each child in out of home care is assessed and provided necessary mental health services.</b></p>					
<p><b>8.1</b> Each region will assess its baseline on Item 23. Regions will develop a strategy for improvement as needed.</p>	<p>Chiefs of Social Work Program Managers</p>	<p>Strategy to meet goal</p>	<p><b>2</b></p>		
<p><b>8.2</b> Regions with Item 23 strategies will monitor progress toward the goal and report that to Central Office.</p>	<p>Chiefs of Social Work Program Managers</p>	<p>Ongoing monitoring results</p>	<p><b>5</b></p>		
<p><b>8.3</b> Regions who do not meet the goal will re-examine and revise their strategy and continue to monitor.</p>	<p>Chiefs of Social Work Program Managers</p>	<p>Revised strategy</p>	<p><b>6</b></p>		

<b>Primary Strategy: ENHANCING CHILD PERMANENCY</b>			<b>Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: Permanency Outcome 1; Systemic Factor – Case Review</b>		
<b>Goal: Improve permanency outcomes for children with the goal of reunification, guardianship, adoption and another planned permanent living arrangement (APPLA)</b>			<b>Applicable CFSR Items: Items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 26, 27, 28, 29</b>		
<b>Action Steps and Benchmarks</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Evidence of completion</b>	<b>Qtr Due</b>	<b>Qtr Done</b>	<b>Quarterly Reporting</b>
<b>1.0 Increase effective use of 90-day concurrent planning reviews</b>					
<b>1.1</b> Make revisions to 90 day concurrent planning review tool based on regional feedback and obtain Program Manager approval.	Valerie Burgess	Revised form	<b>1</b>		
<b>1.2</b> Issue a guidance document and the revised form following a conference call with supervisors statewide to review revisions to the form and reinforce the importance of using the review process as part of supervisory process.	Valerie Burgess	copy of dated release memo	<b>2</b>		
<b>1.3</b> Assess the effectiveness of the 90-day concurrent planning review which includes worker follow up on uncompleted tasks.	Chief of social work	Regional reports on the effectiveness of the 90-day Concurrent planning process	<b>3</b>		
<b>1.4</b> Feedback on the effectiveness of the 90-day concurrent planning process will be presented to the Operations Committee and the Child Welfare Subcommittee with adjustment of process as needed.	Michelle Britton	Division Operation Meeting agenda and minutes. CW Subcommittee meeting agenda and minutes	<b>5,7</b>		
<b>2.0 Receive consultation and train all staff and the judicial system on effective ways to implement concurrent planning</b>					
<b>2.1</b> Contact NRC for FCP and Permanency Planning and NRC on Legal and Judicial Issues for consultation about training to effectively implement concurrent planning.	Shirley Alexander and Debra Alsaker-Burke	Date and list of individuals participating in the initial call`	<b>1</b>		
<b>2.2</b> Work with NRCs (per 2.1) to deliver training to judges, attorneys, CASA, tribes and Department social workers at hub-based trainings. Training is mandated for all Department	Shirley Alexander Debra Alsaker-Burke and	Summary report that includes agendas, dates and participants/position by agency	<b>4</b>		

social workers and strongly encouraged by the judicial system.	Stephanie Miller				
2.3 Information from the training will be used to modify, if necessary, the concurrent planning training currently available in the New Worker Academy.	Stephanie Miller and Susan Dwello	Revised curriculum if revisions are needed	4		
<b>3.0 For 8 quarters, Legal Representation team will meet at least quarterly to (1) identify legal services that IDHW deems necessary for adequate legal representation, (2) identify areas of the state that need improved legal representation, and (3) strategize solutions to improve the delivery of legal services to the Department.</b>					
3.1 Convene Legal Representation team composed of representatives from the Attorney General's Office, the Idaho Prosecutor's Association, the Chairman of the Child Protection Committee, the Coordinator of the Child Protection Committee, CFS Division Administrator, CFS Deputy Administrator, and the Child Welfare Program Manager in Central Office to review/analyze results of the CFSR and permanency data including CQI, data composites, results of process mapping and the monitoring matrix and survey results described in 8.0 and 3.2 respectively.	Judge Bryan Murray (CIP) Debra Alsaker-Burke (CIP) Michelle Britton	Meeting agendas and list of participants.	1		
3.2 Develop and administer a survey to identify legal services that are currently being provided to the Department.	Michelle Britton	Completed survey	1		
3.3 Conduct a statewide focus group of CFS social workers and supervisors to gather input of the strengths and challenges of legal representation that exist in different areas of the state.	Michelle Britton; Sherm Furey; Debra Alsaker-Burke	Agenda and list of participants	2		
3.4 Review results of survey and focus group input and compare to a list of critical services that was previously developed to identify counties in which critical legal services are needed.	Judge Murray Debra Alsaker-Burke Michelle Britton Sherm Furey Grant Loeb	Meeting agenda and list of counties currently where IDHW needs critical legal services	3		

3.7 Upon agreement, develop Memorandums of Understanding between identified DHW offices, regional DAGS, and County Prosecutors to address critical legal services that are needed by the Department.	Judge Murray Debra Alsaker-Burke Michelle Britton Sherm Furey Grant Loebs	Submit any Memorandums of Agreement	8		
3.8 Submit final report that summarizes the progress of the Legal Representation Group with future recommendations and strategies that will sustain progress, but may exceed the PIP-2 timeframes.	Michelle Britton and Debra Alsaker-Burke	Final report with progress future plans and strategies.	8		
<b>4.0 Collaborate with the Idaho Prosecutors Association to train child welfare prosecutors on the laws and procedures in a child protection case.</b>					
4.1 Meet with multidisciplinary IDHW legal representation workgroup to identify trainers and topics to be included in the training.	Shirley Alexander Debra Alsaker-Burke Grant Loebs Jennifer Gose-Eells	List of trainers and topics to be trained	3		
4.2 Prosecutors/DAGS present training for prosecutors	Debra Alsaker-Burke Jennifer Gose-Eells	Agenda, participants and # of counties represented	6		
<b>5.0 All new judges in Idaho will be trained in child protective proceedings</b>					
5.1 Representatives on the CIP committee will develop and schedule training for new judges including training on children ad foster parents' right to be heard (see 6.0).	Debra Alsaker-Burke	training agenda including list of topics covered	4		
5.2 Training will be held for new judges on an annual basis	Debra Alsaker-Burke	Dates of training and list of participants	6		
<b>6.0 Familiarize magistrates with children and foster parents' right to be heard.</b>					
6.1 Identify method of training for magistrate judges on children and foster parents' right to be heard	Judge Murray Debra Alsaker-Burke	Summary of method(s) selected	2		
6.2 Conduct training for judges on children and foster parents' right to be heard	Judge Murray Debra Alsaker-Burke	Agenda and list of participants	6		
6.3 Incorporate children and foster parents' right to be heard in ongoing new judges training	Judge Murray Debra Alsaker-Burke	Agenda for new judge training sessions	6		

<b>7.0 Each region will develop regional improvement plans to address appropriate and timely permanency for children.</b>					
<b>7.1</b> Regional RIP development meeting will be held in each region. Participants will analyze their regional permanency data including the results and recommendation of process mapping and develop a regional plan with specific improvement goals for permanency.	Regional Program Manager	Copies of RIPs for improved permanency	<b>1</b>		
<b>7.2</b> Regions will implement and monitor their regional plans to improve permanency outcomes.	Regional Program Manager	Summary report on plan implementation	<b>2</b>		
<b>7.3</b> Regions and Central Office will examine progress of implementation including the results of the tracking matrix (see 8.1) and adjust or terminate RIPs as needed.	Regional Program Manager Central Office	Copy of adjusted regional plans or letter to region of action step completion	<b>4,7</b>		
<b>8.0 Each region will develop and maintain a regional matrix which tracks the timeliness of review and permanency hearings, TPR or Compelling Reasons and Time to Adoption for each child in out of home care.</b>					
<b>8.1</b> A matrix will be developed by each region which tracks the timeliness of review and permanency hearings, TPR or Compelling Reasons and Time to Adoption for each child in out of home care.	Chief of Social Work Regional Program Manager	Copies of regional matrices	<b>2</b>		
<b>8.2</b> Matrices will be reviewed at Division Operations meeting and Legal Representation Group	Regional Program Manager and Debra Alsaker-Burke	Agenda of Division Ops and Legal Representation Group	<b>3</b>		
<b>8.3</b> Each region will maintain its matrix and it will be compared with data available from ISTARs by representatives from the Department and CIP.	Regional Program Manager, Michelle Britton and Debra Alsaker-Burke	Summary of ISTAR/DHW data comparisons	<b>3 and 7</b>		
<b>9.0 Train Department social workers to know how to work within the judicial system</b>					
<b>9.1</b> Deputy Attorneys General will develop and train social workers in new worker academy by establishing a new academy session on how to access legal representation, how to present themselves	Jeanne Goodenough	Date of first academy training and handouts	<b>1</b>		

professionally in court, and write effective court reports.					
<b>9.2</b> Regional Deputy Attorneys General will conduct regional trainings for all CFS social workers who have not had the new academy training.	Jeanne Goodenough	Dates of regional training and training agenda	7		
<b>10.0 Prepare older youth to have life skills to successfully transition from foster care to adulthood.</b>					
<b>10.1</b> Develop set of additional inquiries related to Independent Living to be gathered on each youth over 15 who is part of any regional CQI and include additional inquiries as attachment to OSRI	Kathy Morris and Diane Helton	Copy of OSRI attachment on IL	1		
<b>10.2</b> Make a semi-annual report regarding IL CQI data as well as regionally identified issues, solutions and improvement.	Kathy Morris	Semi-annual report summarizing data, identified issues, regional solutions and improvement	3,5,7		

<b>Primary Strategy: IMPROVING ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATIONAL STRUCTURE AND PROCESS TO SUPPORT CHANGE</b>			<b>Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: Systemic Factor – Case Review</b>		
<b>Goal: Organizational structure will promote and support the improvement of outcomes.</b>			<b>Applicable CFSR Items: all items</b>		
<b>Action Steps and Benchmarks</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Evidence of completion</b>	<b>Qtr Due</b>	<b>Qtr Done</b>	<b>Quarterly Reporting</b>
<b>1.0 Conduct adoption and licensing process mapping on a statewide and regional basis.</b>					
<b>1.1</b> Convene statewide committee, including regional adoption and licensing social workers and supervisors to map the current adoption process used in each region and in Central Office.	Michelle Britton	Summary report of results of statewide mapping group.	<b>1</b>		
<b>1.2</b> Present results of the process mapping to program managers and prioritize any statewide recommendations that were determined as a result of the mapping process.	Michelle Britton	Program operations meeting agenda where results are presented	<b>1</b>		
<b>1.3</b> Incorporate results of process mapping into revisions of standards, rules and processes.	Michelle Britton and Shirley Alexander	Summary report of changes in rules, policy, structure and process	<b>7</b>		
<b>2.0 Strengthen supervisory practices through a strategic plan that will include role definition, training, and support.</b>					
<b>2.1</b> Contact the National Resource Center on Family Centered Practice and Permanency Planning to facilitate a subcommittee of supervisors in developing a statewide strategic plan for supervision.	Shirley Alexander	NRC request form	<b>1</b>		
<b>2.2</b> Resource Center will meet with supervisors to draft the strategic plan.	Shirley Alexander	Draft of strategic plan	<b>2</b>		
<b>2.3</b> Plan is presented to program managers and approved.	Shirley Alexander	Program Managers Operations Team meeting agenda	<b>3</b>		
<b>2.4</b> Supervisors, statewide, are convened to discuss and begin implementation of the plan.	Shirley Alexander	copy of sup strategic plan and meeting agenda	<b>4</b>		

**3.0 Develop a monthly e-publication called Ideas in Practice for distribution to workers statewide.**

<p><b>3.1</b> Idaho’s Child Welfare Training Centers will review the CFSR Final Report and statewide CQI results to gather topics for <u>Ideas in Practice</u> and develop an annual list of topics for publication including ways to use family meetings at critical points in a case, ways to engage both mother and father, and enhancing the quality of worker visits with children and their families.</p>	<p>Idaho’s Child Welfare Training Centers</p> <p>Roxanne Printz Kathy Tidell</p>	<p>List of topics for first 12 months of PIP-2</p> <p>List of topics for second 12 months of PIP-2</p>	<p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>4</b></p>		
<p><b>3.2</b> By the end of each month, Ideas in Practice will be submitted to Central Office and distributed to supervisors</p>	<p>Roxanne Printz Kathy Tidell</p>	<p>Monthly copies of <u>Idaho in Practice</u></p>	<p><b>3</b> <b>and</b> <b>7</b></p>		

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

<b>Outcome: Safety 2</b>				<b>Item: (3) In-home services and prevention of removal</b>								
Performance as Measured in Final Report				73% (CFSR-2 case review)								
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period												
Negotiated Improvement Goal				State will develop a new 6-month prospective baseline following discussion with Region 10 on Item 3 rating.								
Method of Measuring Improvement				CQI								
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Outcome: Safety 2</b>				<b>Item: (4) Risk of harm to the child</b>								
Performance as Measured in Final Report				73% (CFSR-2 case review)								
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period												
Negotiated Improvement Goal				State will develop a new 6-month prospective baseline following discussion with Region 10 on Item 4 rating. See narrative under Data Sources and Methods for Monitoring Improvement for further discussion								
Method of Measuring Improvement				CQI								
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Outcome: Permanency 1      Item (5) foster care re-entries</b>												
Performance as Measured in Final Report		<b>83% (CFSR-2 case reviews) 11.2 on Composite C1-4 (9.9% is the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile)</b>										
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period		<b>10.0% on Composite C1-4 (9.9% is the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile)</b>										
Negotiated Improvement Goal		<b>9.55% on Composite C1-4 (9.9% is the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile)</b>										
Method of Measuring Improvement		<b>Permanency Composite Measure C 1-4</b>										
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Outcome: Permanency 1      Item: (6) Stability of foster care placement</b>												
Performance as Measured in Final Report		<b>79 % (CFSR-2 case reviews) 93.0 on Composite 4 (standard 101.5 or higher)</b>										
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period		<b>97.3 on Composite 4 (Data profile FY 2006-07-08/year ending 9/30/08)</b>										
Negotiated Improvement Goal		<b>100.2</b>										
Method of Measuring Improvement		<b>Permanency Composite 4: Placement Stability</b>										
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Outcome: Permanency 1                      Item: (7) Permanency goal for the child</b>												
Performance as Measured in Final Report				77% (CFSR-2 Case review)								
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period				68% (CQI results 10/2007 through 11/2008)								
Negotiated Improvement Goal				73.1%								
Method of Measuring Improvement				CQI								
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Outcome: Permanency 1                      Item: (9) Adoption</b>												
Performance as Measured in Final Report				31% (CFSR-2 case review)								
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period				56% (CQI results 10/2007 through 11/2008)								
Negotiated Improvement Goal				64%								
Method of Measuring Improvement				CQI								
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Outcome: Well-being 1</b>				<b>Item: (17) Needs/services of child, parents, and foster parents</b>								
Performance as Measured in Final Report				66% (CFSR-2 case review)								
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period				78% (CQI results 10/2007 through 11/2008)								
Negotiated Improvement Goal				81.4%								
Method of Measuring Improvement				CQI								
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Outcome: Well-being 1</b>				<b>Item: (18) Child and family involvement in case planning</b>								
Performance as Measured in Final Report				68% (CFSR-2 case review)								
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period				74% (CQI results 10/2007 through 11/2008)								
Negotiated Improvement Goal				77.7%								
Method of Measuring Improvement				CQI								
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Outcome: Well-being 1</b>				<b>Item: (19) Worker visits with child</b>								
Performance as Measured in Final Report				84% (CFSR-2 case review)								
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period				82% (CQI results 10/2007 through 11/2008)								
Negotiated Improvement Goal				85.2%								
Method of Measuring Improvement				CQI								
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Outcome: Well-being 1</b>				<b>Item: (20) Worker visits with parents</b>								
Performance as Measured in Final Report				56% (CFSR-2 case review)								
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period				75% (CQI results 10/2007 through 11/2008)								
Negotiated Improvement Goal				78.8%								
Method of Measuring Improvement				CQI								
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

**V. Agreements**

The following Federal and State officials agree to the content and terms of the attached Program Improvement Plan:

---

Richard M. Armstrong, IDHW Director Date

---

Children's Bureau Date