



# Child and Family Services Reviews

## Idaho

## Final Report

## 2016



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
ADMINISTRATION FOR  
**CHILDREN & FAMILIES**  
Administration on Children, Youth and Families  
Children's Bureau

This page is intentionally blank.

## Final Report: Idaho Child and Family Services Review

### INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the state of Idaho. The CFSRs enable the Children's Bureau to: (1) ensure conformity with certain federal child welfare requirements; (2) determine what is actually happening to children and families as they are engaged in child welfare services; and (3) assist states in enhancing their capacity to help children and families achieve positive outcomes. Federal law and regulations authorize the Children's Bureau, within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families, to administer the review of child and family services programs under titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act. The CFSRs are structured to help states identify strengths and areas needing improvement in their child welfare practices and programs as well as institute systemic changes that will improve child and family outcomes.

The findings for Idaho are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Idaho Department of Child and Family Services (CFS) and submitted to the Children's Bureau on March 25, 2016. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes, and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to Title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan
- The results of case reviews of 68 cases (40 foster care and 28 in-home cases) conducted via a State Conducted Case Review process in seven regions in Idaho between April 1, 2016, and September 30, 2016
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Court Appointed Special Advocates
  - Child welfare agency senior managers, chiefs, hub managers, and program managers
  - Child welfare caseworkers and supervisors
  - Foster and adoptive licensing staff and supervisors
  - Foster and adoptive parents
  - Parents
  - Representatives from the courts and Court Improvement Project
  - Service providers
  - Tribal representatives
  - Youth served by the agency

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

In Round 3, the Children's Bureau suspended the use of the state's performance on the national standards for the 7 statewide data indicators in conformity decisions. For contextual information, Appendix A of this report shows the state's performance on the 7 data indicators. Moving forward, the Children's Bureau will refer to the national standards as "national performance." This performance represents the performance of the nation on the statewide data indicators for an earlier point in time. For the time periods used to calculate the national performance for each indicator, see 80 Fed. Reg. 27263 (May 13, 2015).

### Background Information

The Round 3 CFSR assesses state performance with regard to substantial conformity with 7 child and family outcomes and 7 systemic factors. Each outcome incorporates 1 or more of the 18 items included in the case review, and each item is rated as a Strength or Area Needing Improvement based on an evaluation of certain child welfare practices and processes in the cases reviewed in the state. With two exceptions, an item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 90% or more of the applicable cases reviewed were rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies to those items. For a state to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95% or more of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome.

Eighteen items are considered in assessing the state's substantial conformity with the 7 systemic factors. Each item reflects a key federal program requirement relevant to the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) for that systemic factor. An item is rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement based on how well the item-specific requirement is functioning. A determination of the rating is based on information provided by the state to demonstrate the functioning of the systemic factor in the statewide assessment and, as needed, from interviews with stakeholders and partners. For a state to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factors, no more than 1 of the items associated with the systemic factor can be rated as an Area Needing Improvement. For systemic factors that have only 1 item associated with them, that item must be rated as a Strength for a determination of substantial conformity.

The Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting Idaho's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Idaho's performance in Round 2.

## I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

### Idaho 2016 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

The following 1 of the 7 outcomes was found to be in substantial conformity:

- Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

The following 1 of 7 systemic factors was found to be in substantial conformity:

- Statewide Information System

### Children's Bureau Comments on Idaho Performance

The following are the Children's Bureau's observations about cross-cutting issues and Idaho's overall performance:

The Idaho CFSR found that service provision and decision-making to prevent children's entry or re-entry into foster care are positively affected by comprehensive and accurate initial risk and safety assessments. The cases reviewed revealed that Idaho collaborates with families and providers to develop, implement, monitor, and update appropriate safety plans to maintain children in their own homes. In the Idaho statewide assessment, CFS reported that the Comprehensive Safety Assessment (CSA) is required and used statewide for service planning and assessing caregiver capacity at the onset of agency involvement. However, ongoing assessments of risk and safety are not as comprehensive. With the exception of the Reassessment of Safety tool used in some cases before children are returned to their homes and at case closure, ongoing assessments of risk and safety are predominantly informal and vary in quality across the cases reviewed. This variation in practice in conducting initial and ongoing assessments, specifically the use of formal and informal approaches to assessment, affected a number of the outcomes in the cases reviewed for the CFSR.

In the outcome area of permanency for children, the CFSR found Idaho's ability to maintain stability for children in placement to be a key strength. Placement stability is influenced by a number of factors, including use of relative homes and comprehensive needs assessment and service provision. In almost half of the cases reviewed, the child's most recent or current placements were with relatives, and reviewers found these placements to be stable. In addition, reviewers found comprehensive needs assessments and appropriate provision of services to meet the identified needs of children in foster care and their foster families.

Although goals are established in a timely manner and are appropriate to the child's needs for permanency and to the circumstances of the case, the CFSR found significant delays in achieving all forms of permanency for children. In most cases reviewed, there is a lack of concerted efforts by the agency and courts to achieve the goals timely. Concerted efforts are seen more often for children with goals of guardianship than for children with goals of reunification. The agency and court struggle the most with achieving permanency for children with the goal of adoption. Court delays and inconsistent implementation of concurrent planning have the most notable effect on timely achievement of permanency through adoption. Lack of concurrent planning and service provision also affect timely reunification.

In the cases reviewed, the needs of children and families were assessed and addressed in both in-home and foster care cases. However, information in the statewide assessment and collected during stakeholder interviews revealed service gaps, particularly in rural areas of the state, that include a lack of psychiatric services for children and adolescents, respite care for caregivers, and independent living services. Because of this, CFS relies heavily on caseworkers to identify and integrate alternative and/or informal supports to meet the needs of the families.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

The CFSR identified challenges with engaging parents, particularly fathers, in both foster care and in-home cases. In the cases with insufficient parental engagement and a lack of quality caseworker visits with children and/or parents, reviewers saw inadequate or delayed risk, safety, and needs assessments and service provision. In many of the cases reviewed, Family Group Decision Making (FGDM) meetings were held to develop initial case plans. However, reviewers noted that subsequent FGDM meetings were rarely held, leaving ongoing case planning almost exclusively to ineffective informal practices that varied among the cases reviewed. This was consistent with information in the statewide assessment that described the use of FGDM meetings to involve families in service plan development but noted that FGDM is not available in all areas of the state, is not used with all families, and is not consistently used for ongoing planning and family engagement. Furthermore, the case review findings align with the data CFS provided in the statewide assessment showing that involvement of parents and youth in case planning is trending downward and that performance varies significantly by region.

The cases reviewed demonstrate Idaho's commitment to placing siblings together when safe and appropriate, but reviewers identified practice concerns around preserving connections for children in foster care. Reviewers noted concerted efforts to preserve children's important connections with relatives, friends, community, faith, and Tribe. Reviewers highlighted the finding that typically mothers and siblings have more frequent quality visitation with children in foster care than do fathers. Unequal practices across mothers and fathers were also seen with regard to concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain positive, nurturing relationships with parents, conduct comprehensive needs assessments, and provide appropriate services.

In almost all applicable cases reviewed, reviewers cited positive practice around accurately assessing and appropriately addressing children's educational, physical, dental, and mental and behavioral health needs.

While the CFSR revealed some strong practices across the safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes, it also highlighted practice areas that need improvement. Sufficient evaluative data and information are not consistently available to determine how well the systemic underpinnings of Idaho's child welfare agency are functioning to support positive outcomes for children and families. For example, the agency does not have data and information to determine the effectiveness of caseworkers' efforts to meet the needs of the families they serve, or whether the training caseworkers receive is sufficient to address the skills and knowledge needed to carry out their duties. Further, there is insufficient data and information to demonstrate whether the initial and ongoing training provided to foster and adoptive parents addresses the skills and knowledge they need to care for the children in their homes. CFS indicated in the statewide assessment that recruitment and retention activities are not functioning well enough to ensure adequate placement resources that reflect the ethnic and racial makeup of the children for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed.

These gaps in evaluative data and information reinforce the need for Idaho to build upon its case review process and reporting mechanisms to develop an integrated quality assurance system. Currently, the agency has in place standards for its ongoing case record reviews. However, CFS was unable to demonstrate how these standards, whether alone or in concert with other data and information, are used to identify the strengths and needs of the service delivery system, determine the quality of services, and evaluate program improvement measures. A well-functioning continuous quality improvement (CQI) system will help CFS identify the practices supporting positive outcomes, understand the reasons for under-performance, and reconcile data and information to inform improvement strategies. Key to these efforts is partnership. There is a need to expand CFS's existing partnerships to include a greater range of stakeholders who can assist Idaho in monitoring and updating its strategic plans and help inform and shape agency

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

CQI efforts at the statewide and local levels. CB encourages CFS to continue to focus on the elements of a functioning CQI system as the foundation for shaping its program improvement efforts.

## II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

For each outcome, we provide performance summaries from the case review findings. The CFSR relies upon a case review of an approved sample of foster care cases and in-home services cases. Where relevant, we provide performance summaries that are differentiated between foster care and in-home services cases.

This report provides an overview. Results have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Details on each case rating are available to CFS. The state is encouraged to conduct additional item-specific analysis of the case review findings to better understand areas of practice that are associated with positive outcomes and those that need improvement.

### **Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Item 1.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Idaho is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 76% of the 42 applicable cases reviewed.

#### ***Safety Outcome 1 Item Performance***

##### **Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether responses to all accepted child maltreatment reports received during the period under review were initiated, and face-to-face contact with the child(ren) made, within the time frames established by agency policies or state statutes.

State policy requires that referrals meeting the definitions of the Child Protective Act are assigned one of three priorities. Time frames for providing an initial response and face-to-face contact with children begin when the CFS social worker receives the referral information. Initial response is defined as any earnest and persistent documented effort to place in motion actions to assess the allegations of a referral and/or protect the child. Priority I referrals require that the CFS social worker provide an initial response and have face-to-face contact with the alleged child victim immediately. All other children in the home must be seen within 14 days. Priority II referrals require that the CFS social worker provide an initial response within 24 hours and have face-to-face contact with the alleged child victim within 48 hours. Priority III referrals require that the CFS social worker provide an initial response within 72 hours and have face-to-face contact with the alleged child victim within 120 hours.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 76% of the 42 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the safety statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

### **Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 2 and 3.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Idaho is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 74% of the 68 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 75% of the 40 foster care cases and 71% of the 28 in-home services cases.

#### **Safety Outcome 2 Item Performance**

##### **Item 2. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-Entry Into Foster Care**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to provide services to the family to prevent children's entry into foster care or re-entry after a reunification.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Strength for Item 2 because 90% of the 20 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 100% of the 16 applicable foster care cases and 50% of the 4 applicable in-home services cases.

##### **Item 3. Risk and Safety Assessment and Management**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns relating to the child(ren) in their own homes or while in foster care.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 74% of the 68 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 75% of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 71% of the 28 applicable in-home services cases.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

### Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 4, 5, and 6.

#### State Outcome Performance

Idaho is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 30% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

#### *Permanency Outcome 1 Item Performance*

##### Item 4. Stability of Foster Care Placement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether the child in foster care is in a stable placement at the time of the onsite review and that any changes in placement that occurred during the period under review were in the best interests of the child and consistent with achieving the child's permanency goal(s).

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 78% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

##### Item 5. Permanency Goal for Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether appropriate permanency goals were established for the child in a timely manner.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 73% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

##### Item 6. Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether concerted efforts were made, or are being made, during the period under review to achieve reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 48% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the permanency statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

### Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

### State Outcome Performance

Idaho is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 75% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

### *Permanency Outcome 2 Item Performance*

#### Item 7. Placement With Siblings

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that siblings in foster care are placed together unless a separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Strength for Item 7 because 96% of the 24 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

#### Item 8. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father,<sup>1</sup> and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 70% of the 37 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 78% of the 9 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation with a sibling(s) in foster care who is/was in a different placement setting was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 85% of the 34 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her mother was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 79% of the 28 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her father was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

---

<sup>1</sup> For Item 8, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification. The persons identified in these roles for the purposes of the review may include individuals who do not meet the legal definitions or conventional meanings of a mother and father.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

### Item 9. Preserving Connections

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to maintain the child's connections to his or her neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, Tribe, school, and friends.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 88% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 10. Relative Placement

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to place the child with relatives when appropriate.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 88% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 11. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father<sup>2</sup> or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 69% of the 36 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 85% of the 34 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her mother.
- In 71% of the 28 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her father.

## Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 12, 13, 14, and 15.

### State Outcome Performance

Idaho is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1.

---

<sup>2</sup> For Item 11, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

The outcome was substantially achieved in 63% of the 68 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 63% of the 40 foster care cases and 64% of the 28 in-home services cases.

### **Well-Being Outcome 1 Item Performance**

#### **Item 12. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency (1) made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents,<sup>3</sup> and foster parents (both initially, if the child entered foster care or the case was opened during the period under review, and on an ongoing basis) to identify the services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address the issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family, and (2) provided the appropriate services.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 68% of the 68 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 63% of the 40 foster care cases and 75% of the 28 in-home services cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

#### **Sub-Item 12A. Needs Assessment and Services to Children**

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 87% of the 68 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 88% of the 40 foster care cases and 86% of the 28 in-home services cases.

#### **Sub-Item 12B. Needs Assessment and Services to Parents**

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 70% of the 64 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 67% of the 36 applicable foster care cases and 75% of the 28 applicable in-home services cases.

---

<sup>3</sup> For Sub-Item 12B, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable "mothers" and "fathers" for the period under review in the case.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

- In 81% of the 63 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 73% of the 59 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

### Sub-Item 12C. Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 84% of the 38 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 13. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents<sup>4</sup> and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 72% of the 67 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 77% of the 39 applicable foster care cases and 64% of the 28 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 74% of the 39 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 81% of the 63 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 75% of the 59 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve fathers in case planning.

### Item 14. Caseworker Visits With Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the child(ren) in the case are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 79% of the 68 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 88% of the 40 foster care cases and 68% of the 28 in-home services cases.

---

<sup>4</sup> For Item 13, in the in-home cases, “Mother” and “Father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, “mother” and “father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency’s work with multiple applicable “mothers” and “fathers” for the period under review in the case.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

### Item 15. Caseworker Visits With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the mothers and fathers<sup>5</sup> of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 61% of the 64 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 56% of the 36 applicable foster care cases and 68% of the 28 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 73% of the 63 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 61% of the 59 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with fathers were sufficient.

### Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Item 16.

#### State Outcome Performance

Idaho is in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 95% of the 38 applicable cases reviewed.

#### Well-Being Outcome 2 Item Performance

### Item 16. Educational Needs of the Child

**Purpose of Assessment:** To assess whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs at the initial contact with the child (if the case was opened during the period under review) or on an ongoing basis (if

---

<sup>5</sup> For Item 15, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" is typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable mother and fathers for the period under review in the case.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

the case was opened before the period under review), and whether identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Strength for Item 16 because 95% of the 38 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 97% of the 31 applicable foster care cases and 86% of the 7 applicable in-home services cases.

### **Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.**

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 3 using the state's performance on Items 17 and 18.

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Idaho is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 86% of the 58 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 85% of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 89% of the applicable 18 in-home services cases.

#### ***Well-Being Outcome 3 Item Performance***

##### **Item 17. Physical Health of the Child**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the physical health needs of the children, including dental health needs.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Strength for Item 17 because 90% of the 51 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 90% of the 40 foster care cases and 91% of the 11 applicable in-home services cases.

##### **Item 18. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the children.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 84% of the 38 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 83% of the 24 applicable foster care cases and 86% of the 14 applicable in-home services cases.

### III. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

For each systemic factor below, we provide performance summaries and a determination of whether the state is in substantial conformity with that systemic factor. In addition, we provide ratings for each item and a description of how the rating was determined. The CF SR relies upon a review of information contained in the statewide assessment to assess each item. If an item rating cannot be determined from the information contained in the statewide assessment, the Children's Bureau conducts stakeholder interviews and considers information gathered through the interviews in determining ratings for each item.

#### Statewide Information System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 19.

##### State Systemic Factor Performance

Idaho is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

##### *Statewide Information System Item Performance*

##### Item 19. Statewide Information System

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The statewide information system is functioning statewide to ensure that, at a minimum, the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is (or, within the immediately preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Strength for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Idaho's information system, iCARE, is functioning statewide and ensures that the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for placement of every child who is (or within the immediate preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care. Idaho's data quality analysis found that children's placement locations were accurate almost all of the time. Idaho has an ongoing process in place to ensure data quality.

#### Case Review System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

### State Systemic Factor Performance

Idaho is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. None of the 5 items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

### Case Review System Item Performance

#### Item 20. Written Case Plan

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the child's parent(s) and includes the required provisions.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that although each child has a written case plan that contains the required provisions, the state did not demonstrate that each case plan is developed jointly with the child's parents. Results from Idaho's 2015 case record review data showed that while most families actively participated in their case plan development, State performance on Item 13 was trending downward and there were significant variations in performance by region. FGDM is used to involve family members. However, FGDM is not available in all areas of the state, and stakeholders noted that FGDM is not consistently used for ongoing planning and family engagement.

#### Item 21. Periodic Reviews

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that a periodic review for each child occurs no less frequently than once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and obtained from stakeholder interviews showed that periodic reviews are not routinely occurring for each child at least once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review. Data in the statewide assessment showed that while statewide timeliness averages were relatively high, regional performance varied, with some regions showing a significant portion of periodic reviews not being held timely. Stakeholders confirmed that there were gaps in the data presented for one jurisdiction, and that performance varied across the state.

#### Item 22. Permanency Hearings

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a permanency hearing in a qualified court or administrative body that occurs no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that there is not consistent statewide practice to ensure that for each child, a permanency hearing occurs no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter. While data for some regions indicated initial and subsequent permanency hearings were timely, other regions, demonstrated delays. Stakeholders shared data from 2016 showing slightly improved performance but the data continue to show that performance varies by region and demonstrated delays continue in some regions.

### Item 23. Termination of Parental Rights

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that the filing of termination of parental rights proceedings occurs in accordance with required provisions.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment. Idaho agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- The statewide assessment did not provide sufficient data or information to demonstrate that the state's case review system is functioning statewide to ensure the filing of termination of parental rights (TPR) proceedings occurs in accordance with required provisions. Idaho reported that neither the court nor the state agency have a system in place to monitor compliance with the required provisions in required cases. The limited case review data reported by the state indicated a need to improve on statewide functioning of this systemic factor item.

### Item 24. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The case review system is functioning to ensure that foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care are notified of, and have a right to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment. Idaho agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- In the statewide assessment, Idaho reported that the state does not have an effective system that functions statewide to ensure foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care are notified of, and have a right to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child. The state reported having several good processes and practice guidance in place, but said it lacks a mechanism for data collection to ensure notice is occurring and an ongoing survey process to evaluate caregivers' right to be heard.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

### Quality Assurance System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 25.

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Idaho is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

#### Quality Assurance System Item Performance

##### Item 25. Quality Assurance System

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The quality assurance system is functioning statewide to ensure that it (1) operating in the jurisdictions where the services included in the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) are provided, (2) has standards to evaluate the quality of services (including standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect their health and safety), (3) identifies strengths and needs of the service delivery system, (4) provides relevant reports, and (5) evaluates implemented program improvement measures.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that although Idaho has a case record review (CRR) process operating in the state in the jurisdictions where the services included in the CFSP are provided, it is unclear how the information gathered through the CRR is used to target change at the regional levels. The state was not able to provide sufficient information on any ongoing processes for evaluation of program improvement measures because local CQI evaluations and program improvement efforts are no longer in effect. The state did not demonstrate how the state's standards are used to evaluate the quality of the services that protect children's health and safety, and did not provide sufficient information and data to demonstrate ongoing processes for identifying strengths and needs of the service delivery system and to inform the array of services.

### Staff and Provider Training

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 26, 27, and 28.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

### State Systemic Factor Performance

Idaho is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. None of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

### *Staff and Provider Training Item Performance*

#### Item 26. Initial Staff Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that initial training is provided to all staff who deliver services pursuant to the CFSP that includes the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Idaho did not provide sufficient information or data to demonstrate that initial training provides staff with the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions. Idaho State University coordinates the Child Welfare New Worker Academy to provide the initial training and tracks attendance and completion. Stakeholders said that initial training does not consistently provide workers with the basic skills and knowledge needed to handle the day-to-day tasks of the job. Internal stakeholders noted that supervisors and embedded trainers provide support and fill in the gaps but added that embedded trainers were not readily available statewide.

#### Item 27. Ongoing Staff Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that ongoing training is provided for staff<sup>6</sup> that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

---

<sup>6</sup> "Staff," for purposes of assessing this item, includes all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP. "Staff" also includes direct supervisors of all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Information in the statewide assessment and obtained during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state has ongoing training requirements and staff receive some ongoing training. However, there is neither a system for tracking compliance with ongoing training requirements nor a process for evaluating the effectiveness of the training. The state did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate staff compliance with state ongoing training requirements.

### Item 28. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that training is occurring statewide for current or prospective foster parents, adoptive parents, and staff of state licensed or approved facilities (that care for children receiving foster care or adoption assistance under title IV-E) that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adopted children.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Idaho reported that there is a process in place to ensure that current and prospective foster and adoptive parents receive initial and ongoing training. However, the state lacked data on the completion and quality of ongoing training received by resource parents and stakeholders reported the need for improvement in the area of ongoing training. Idaho did not provide sufficient data or information to evaluate whether initial and ongoing training addressed the skills and knowledge resource parents need to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adoptive children. Additionally the state reported that for 2015, 7 facilities were cited for not meeting initial staff training requirements and 6 facilities were cited for not meeting ongoing staff training requirements.

## Service Array and Resource Development

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 29 and 30.

### State Systemic Factor Performance

Idaho is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array and Resource Development. None of the items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

### *Service Array and Resource Development Item Performance*

#### Item 29. Array of Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning to ensure that the following array of services is accessible in all political jurisdictions covered by the CFSP: (1) services that assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, (2) services that address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe home environment, (3) services that enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and (4) services that help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment did not show that the array of services is functioning in all jurisdictions covered by the CFSP, specifically, services that address the needs of families and children to create a safe home environment and to allow children to remain safely with their parents and services that help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency. In the statewide assessment, Idaho reported a need for improved data collection to determine how the array of services is functioning. Stakeholders highlighted extensive service gaps in rural areas that include psychiatric services for children and adolescents, respite care for caregivers, independent living services, child care, transportation, and housing. Stakeholders also reported that the timeliness and appropriateness of services varies by jurisdiction. While stakeholders noted promising services such as permanency roundtables, a substance abuse court, and independent living services for children over 18, these services are not available statewide. The state reported that it relies heavily on the creativity of the staff to provide services in rural areas of the state but does not analyze the effectiveness of this practice in meeting the needs of children and families.

### Item 30. Individualizing Services

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The service array and resource development system is functioning statewide to ensure that the services in Item 29 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the agency.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders did not demonstrate that Idaho individualizes services to meet the needs of children and families served by the agency. Idaho did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate that staff creativity is an effective strategy for routinely meeting the unique needs of children and families. The state did not provide sufficient data or information on the statewide availability and accessibility of services that are developmentally and/or culturally appropriate and responsive to persons with disabilities or special needs. Stakeholders reported services are often limited or unavailable in rural areas, which makes accessing culturally based services particularly challenging in those areas. Stakeholders noted that culturally appropriate services for Native Americans are limited and difficult to access for families not near a reservation, and that existing Tribal services, such as alcohol and drug abuse treatment, are underused.

### Agency Responsiveness to the Community

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 31 and 32.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

### State Systemic Factor Performance

Idaho is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Both items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

### *Agency Responsiveness to the Community Item Performance*

#### Item 31. State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that, in implementing the provisions of the CFSP and developing related APSRs, the state engages in ongoing consultation with Tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals, objectives, and annual updates of the CFSP.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information from the statewide assessment and obtained during stakeholder interviews showed that although the agency gathers input initially from stakeholders to develop goals and objectives for the CFSP, there is no ongoing consultation regarding implementation and annual updates of CFSP goals and objectives.

#### Item 32. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state's services under the CFSP are coordinated with services or benefits of other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and obtained from stakeholder interviews provided a limited description of the process for coordination with some federal programs at the statewide and local levels; however, no data or information was provided to demonstrate the impact of this coordination on services or benefits of other federal programs serving the same population.

### Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 33, 34, 35, and 36.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

### State Systemic Factor Performance

Idaho is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. Two of the four items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

### *Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention Item Performance*

#### Item 33. Standards Applied Equally

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that state standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information from the statewide assessment and obtained during stakeholder interviews showed that the state has standards for foster and adoptive parent licensing that are applied equally across the state. The state has processes in place to ensure a consistent statewide application of the standards. Compliance with the standards is reviewed at the time of initial agency or institutional licensing and during each agency or institution's annual re-licensing review. Compliance with state standards is also reviewed as part of the finalization process for all adoptions.

#### Item 34. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state complies with federal requirements for criminal background clearances as related to licensing or approving foster care and adoptive placements and has in place a case planning process that includes provisions for addressing the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Strength for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the processes for ensuring that the state's compliance with federal requirements for criminal background checks and case planning includes provisions for addressing the safety of foster care and adoptive placements are functioning statewide. Idaho's data and information on background checks indicated that they occur and are documented.

#### Item 35. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed is occurring statewide.

## Idaho 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment. Idaho agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Idaho is not ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed.

### **Item 36. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptive or permanent placements for waiting children is occurring statewide.

- Idaho received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment. Idaho agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information provided in the statewide assessment showed that although the state has processes in place to ensure effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptive or permanent placements for waiting children, Idaho does not meet the requirement for conducting home studies received from other states within the 60-day requirement. The statewide assessment reports incoming home studies are completed statewide approximately 49% of the time, with wide regional variations in performance.

## Appendix A: Summary of Idaho 2016 CFSR Performance

### Appendix A Summary of Idaho 2016 Child and Family Services Review Performance

#### I. Ratings for Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being Outcomes and Items

**Outcome Achievement:** Outcomes may be rated as in substantial conformity or not in substantial conformity. 95% of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the state to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

**Item Achievement:** Items may be rated as a Strength or as an Area Needing Improvement. For an overall rating of Strength, 90% of the cases reviewed for the item (with the exception of Item 1 and Item 16) must be rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies.

#### **SAFETY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN ARE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, PROTECTED FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT.**

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Safety Outcome 1</b> Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	Not in Substantial Conformity	76% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 1</b> Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	76% Strength

#### **SAFETY OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE.**

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Safety Outcome 2</b> Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	74% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 2</b> Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Strength	90% Strength
<b>Item 3</b> Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	74% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Idaho 2016 CF SR Performance

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN HAVE PERMANENCY AND STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATIONS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 1</b> Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	Not in Substantial Conformity	30% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 4</b> Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	78% Strength
<b>Item 5</b> Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	73% Strength
<b>Item 6</b> Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	48% Strength

### PERMANENCY OUTCOME 2: THE CONTINUITY OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS IS PRESERVED FOR CHILDREN.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 2</b> The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	Not in Substantial Conformity	75% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 7</b> Placement with siblings	Strength	96% Strength
<b>Item 8</b> Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	70% Strength
<b>Item 9</b> Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	88% Strength
<b>Item 10</b> Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	88% Strength
<b>Item 11</b> Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	69% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Idaho 2016 CF SR Performance

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 1: FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 1</b> Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	63% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 12</b> Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12A</b> Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	87% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12B</b> Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	70% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12C</b> Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	84% Strength
<b>Item 13</b> Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	72% Strength
<b>Item 14</b> Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	79% Strength
<b>Item 15</b> Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	61% Strength

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 2</b> Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	In Substantial Conformity	95% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 16</b> Educational needs of the child	Strength	95% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Idaho 2016 CF SR Performance

### WELL-BEING OUTCOME 3: CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 3</b> Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	86% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 17</b> Physical health of the child	Strength	90% Strength
<b>Item 18</b> Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	84% Strength

## II. Ratings for Systemic Factors

The Children’s Bureau determines whether a state is in substantial conformity with federal requirements for the 7 systemic factors based on the level of functioning of each systemic factor across the state. The Children’s Bureau determines substantial conformity with the systemic factors based on ratings for the item or items within each factor. Performance on 5 of the 7 systemic factors is determined on the basis of ratings for multiple items or plan requirements. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with these systemic factors, the Children’s Bureau must find that no more than 1 of the required items for that systemic factor fails to function as required. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with the 2 systemic factors that are determined based on the rating of a single item, the Children’s Bureau must find that the item is functioning as required.

### STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Statewide Information System</b>	Statewide Assessment	In Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 19</b> Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Idaho 2016 CF SR Performance

### CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Case Review System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 20</b> Written Case Plan	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 21</b> Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 22</b> Permanency Hearings	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 23</b> Termination of Parental Rights	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 24</b> Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement

### QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Quality Assurance System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 25</b> Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Staff and Provider Training</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 26</b> Initial Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

## Appendix A: Summary of Idaho 2016 CFSR Performance

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Item 27</b> Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 28</b> Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Service Array and Resource Development</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 29</b> Array of Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 30</b> Individualizing Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Agency Responsiveness to the Community</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 31</b> State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 32</b> Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

## Appendix A: Summary of Idaho 2016 CF SR Performance

### FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 33</b> Standards Applied Equally	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 34</b> Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 35</b> Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement
<b>Item 36</b> State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement

### III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators<sup>7</sup>

The state's performance is considered against the national standard for each statewide data indicator and provides contextual information for considering the findings. This information is not used in conformity decisions. State performance may be statistically above, below, or no different than the national performance. If a state did not provide the required data or did not meet the applicable item data quality limits, the Children's Bureau did not calculate the state's performance for the statewide data indicator.

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.1%	Lower	4.8%	3.8%–6%	FY13–14
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	8.50	Lower	5.49	3.59–8.39	14A–14B, FY14

<sup>7</sup> In October 2016, the Children's Bureau issued Technical Bulletin #9 (<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9>), which alerted states to the fact that there were technical errors in the syntax used to calculate the national and state performance for the statewide data indicators. The syntax revision is still underway, so performance shown in this table is based on the 2015 Federal Register syntax.

## Appendix A: Summary of Idaho 2016 CF SR Performance

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	40.5%	Higher	47.1%	43.9%–50.3%	12B–15A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	43.6%	Higher	54.4%	49.7%–59%	14B–15A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	30.3%	Higher	45.2%	39.5%–51.1%	14B–15A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.3%	Lower	4.2%	2.7%–6.6%	12B–15A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.12	Lower	3.90	3.6–4.23	14B–15A

\* **Risk-Standardized Performance (RSP)** is derived from a multi-level statistical model and reflects the state's performance relative to states with similar children and takes into account the number of children the state served, the age distribution of these children, and, for some indicators, the state's entry rate. It uses risk-adjustment to minimize differences in outcomes due to factors over which the state has little control and provides a more fair comparison of state performance against national performance.

\*\* **95% Confidence Interval** is the 95% confidence interval estimate for the state's RSP. The values shown are the lower RSP and upper RSP of the interval estimate. The interval accounts for the amount of uncertainty associated with the RSP. For example, the CB is 95% confident that the true value of the RSP is between the lower and upper limit of the interval.

\*\*\* **Data Period(s) Used for State Performance:** Refers to the initial 12-month period and the period(s) of data needed to follow the children to observe their outcome. The FY or federal fiscal year refers to NCANDS data, which spans the 12-month period Oct 1st–Sept 30th. All other periods refer to AFCARS data. 'A' refers to the 6-month period Oct 1st–March 31st. 'B' refers to the 6-month period April 1st–Sept 30th. The two-digit year refers to the calendar year in which the period ends.

## Appendix B: Summary of CFSR Round 2 Idaho 2008 Key Findings

### Appendix B Summary of CFSR Round 2 Idaho 2008 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in Idaho in 2008. Key findings from that review are presented below. Because the Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round and in response to feedback from the child welfare field, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSR is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round.

#### Identifying Information and Review Dates

<b>General Information</b>
<b>Children's Bureau Region:</b> 10
<b>Date of Onsite Review:</b> April 7–11, 2008
<b>Period Under Review:</b> April 1, 2007, through April 7, 2008
<b>Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued:</b> September 4, 2008
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Due:</b> December 4, 2008
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Approved:</b> April 1, 2009

#### Highlights of Findings

<b>Performance Measurements</b>
A. The State met the national standards for <b>four</b> of the <b>six</b> standards.
B. The State achieved substantial conformity for <b>one</b> of the <b>seven</b> outcomes.
C. The State achieved substantial conformity for <b>six</b> of the <b>seven</b> systemic factors.

## Appendix B: Summary of CFSR Round 2 Idaho 2008 Key Findings

### State's Conformance With the National Standards

Data Indicator or Composite	National Standard	State's Score	Meets or Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of maltreatment recurrence (data indicator)	94.6 or higher	94.8	Meets Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.79	Meets Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	146.1	Meets Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	109.9	Meets Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	117.0	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	93.0	Does Not Meet Standard

### State's Conformance With the Outcomes

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

## Appendix B: Summary of CFSR Round 2 Idaho 2008 Key Findings

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

### State's Conformance With the Systemic Factors

Systemic Factor	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Statewide Information System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Case Review System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Quality Assurance System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Achieved Substantial Conformity

## Appendix B: Summary of CFSR Round 2 Idaho 2008 Key Findings

### Key Findings by Item

#### Outcomes

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment	Strength
Item 2. Repeat Maltreatment	Area Needing Improvement
Item 3. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-entry Into Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
Item 4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	Area Needing Improvement
Item 5. Foster Care Re-entries	Area Needing Improvement
Item 6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 7. Permanency Goal for Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives	Area Needing Improvement
Item 9. Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
Item 10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	Strength
Item 12. Placement With Siblings	Strength
Item 13. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
Item 14. Preserving Connections	Area Needing Improvement
Item 15. Relative Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 16. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
Item 17. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	Area Needing Improvement

## Appendix B: Summary of CFSR Round 2 Idaho 2008 Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	Area Needing Improvement
Item 19. Caseworker Visits With Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 20. Caseworker Visits With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
Item 21. Educational Needs of the Child	Strength
Item 22. Physical Health of the Child	Strength
Item 23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

### Systemic Factors

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 24. Statewide Information System	Strength
Item 25. Written Case Plan	Area Needing Improvement
Item 26. Periodic Reviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 27. Permanency Hearings	Area Needing Improvement
Item 28. Termination of Parental Rights	Area Needing Improvement
Item 29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Area Needing Improvement
Item 30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
Item 31. Quality Assurance System	Strength
Item 32. Initial Staff Training	Strength
Item 33. Ongoing Staff Training	Strength
Item 34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Strength
Item 35. Array of Services	Strength
Item 36. Service Accessibility	Area Needing Improvement
Item 37. Individualizing Services	Strength
Item 38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength

## Appendix B: Summary of CFSR Round 2 Idaho 2008 Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 39. Agency Annual Reports Pursuant to CFSP	Strength
Item 40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Strength
Item 41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength
Item 42. Standards Applied Equally	Strength
Item 43. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Strength
Item 44. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Strength
Item 45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength