

IDAHO PART TWO: PIP MEASUREMENT PLAN

CASE REVIEW ITEMS

TABLE 1

CFSR Items Requiring Measurement	Item Description	Z value for 80% Confidence Level ¹	Number of applicable cases ²	Number of cases rated a Strength	PIP Baseline ³	Baseline Sampling Error ⁴	PIP Goal ⁵
Item 1 ⁶	Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment (Case Review)	1.96	15472	13177	85.2%	0.005600619	85.7%
Item 3	Risk and Safety Assessment and Management	1.28	68	50	73.5%	0.068480647	80.4%
Item 4	Stability of Foster Care Placement	1.28	40	31	77.5%	0.084512721	86.0%
Item 5	Permanency Goal for Child	1.28	40	29	72.5%	0.090368136	81.5%
Item 6	Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	1.28	40	19	47.5%	0.101066315	57.6%
Item 12	Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	1.28	68	46	67.6%	0.072616758	74.9%
Item 13	Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	1.28	67	48	71.6%	0.070484753	78.7%
Item 14	Caseworker Visits With Child	1.28	68	54	79.4%	0.06276355	85.7%
Item 15	Caseworker Visits With Parents	1.28	64	39	60.9%	0.078062475	68.7%

Explanatory Data Footnotes:

¹ Z-values: Represents the standard normal (Z) distribution of a data set and measures the number of standard errors to be added and subtracted in order to achieve our desired confidence level (the percentage of confidence we want in the results). In order to have 80% confidence in the results of the sample data, a Z-value of 1.28 is used to calculate the margin of error.

² Number of Applicable Cases: Identifies the minimum number of applicable cases reviewed for the baseline period. Measurement samples must be equal to or greater than the number of applicable cases used to establish the baseline for each item. A two percent (2%) tolerance is applied to the number of cases reviewed to measure goal achievement compared to the number of cases reviewed to establish the baseline.

³ PIP Baseline: Percentage of applicable cases reviewed rated a strength for the specified CFSR item.

⁴ Baseline Sampling Error: Represents the margin of error that arises in a data collection process as a result of using a sample rather than the entire universe of cases.

⁵ PIP Goal: Calculated by adding the sampling error to the baseline percentage. Percentages computed from 12 months of practice findings are used to determine whether the state satisfied its improvement goal. To determine a PIP measurement goal using case review data is met, CB will also confirm CB has confidence in accuracy of results, significant changes were not made to the review schedule, the minimum number of required applicable cases for each item were reviewed, the ratio of metropolitan area cases and the distribution and ratio of case types was maintained for the measurement period. A five percent (5%) tolerance is applied to the distribution of metropolitan area cases and case types between the baseline and subsequent measurement periods.

⁶ Item 1: Idaho used state aggregate data as measurement approach for Item 1. A 95% confidence level is applied (Z value = 1.960) for state aggregate data as a lower confidence level would yield a more minimal improvement goal. Measurement for Item 1 is limited to face-to-face contact with alleged child victims based on CFSR findings. State provided aggregate data for 'Timeliness of all Prioritized PI CPS Investigations for Children by Region' received for the baseline period April 1, 2015 through March 31, 2016. Baseline calculation reflects statewide performance for Priority 1 Referrals (Child seen within 24 hours), Priority 2 (Child seen within 48 hours), and Priority 3 (Child seen within 72 hours). Performance does not account for delays outside of the agency's control, or what the agency refers to as a variance.

Data Source and Approach to Measurement:

Idaho CFS will review 68 randomly selected cases annually (Table 1) using the CFSR OMS' On-Site Review Instrument (OSRI) during the Program Improvement Plan period. The state chose to use a retrospective baseline using CFSR outcomes. CFS PIP measurement periods will advance every six months after the first 12 months (Table 3-Year One State CRR Schedule) is completed.

Sampling Methodology/Measurement Period

Idaho will use a 6-month fixed sampling method to draw foster care and in-home cases. Both foster care and in-home cases are pulled from Idaho's Child Welfare Data. Sample cases will be assigned a number between 0 and 1 using Microsoft Excel's random number generator. The cases will then be sorted in ascending order by

the newly assigned random number. Each region will receive their randomized case universe to schedule interviews and prepare case files using the same case distribution as the CFSR baseline (Table 2). Regions will be held responsible to select cases for review according to the official randomized order provided.

12-month measurement periods will be advanced every 6 months after Year 1 reviews are completed.

TABLE 2: Baseline CFSR Cases

Site	CFSR Foster Care Cases	CFSR In-Home Services Cases	CFSR In-Home Services Cases "other"	Baseline CFSR Total Cases	Baseline CFSR Percentage
Region 1 (Hub 1)	6	6		12	18%
Region 2 (Hub 1)	2	2	1	5	7%
Region 3 (Hub 2)	9	3		12	18%
Region 4* (Hub 2)	10	3	1	14	21%
Region 5 (Hub 3)	6	4		10	15%
Region 6 (Hub 3)	4	5	1	10	15%
Region 7 (Hub 3)	3	2		5	7%
Total	40	25	3	68	100%
Case Type Ratio	59%	41%			

*Includes Metro

PIP Monitored Review Cases, Sample Period, and Review Period

TABLE 3: Year One State CRR Schedule

YEAR 1									
Site	Year 1 Foster Care Cases	Year 1 In-Home Services Cases	Year 1 In-Home Services Cases "other"	Sample Period	Review Period	Year 1 Total Cases	Year 1 Percentage	Year 1 Oversample Cases (if needed) *	
								Foster Care Cases	In-Home Cases
Region 1	6	6		FC 4/1/18 – 9/30/18	4/1/19-9/30/19	12	18%	1	1
Region 2	2	2	1	IH 4/1/18 – 11/15/18		6	7%	1	
Region 3	9	3				12	18%	2	
Region 4*	10	3	1	FC 10/1/18 – 3/31/19	10/1/19-3/31/20	14	21%	2	
Region 5	6	3	1	IH 10/1/18 – 5/15/19		10	15%	1	1
Region 6	4	6				10	15%	2	
Region 7	3	2		FC 4/1/18 – 9/30/18	4/1/19-9/30/19	5	7%	1	

				IH 4/1/18 – 11/15/18					
Total	40	25	3			68	100%	10*	2*
Case Type Ratio	59%	41%							

TABLE 4: Year Two State CRR Schedule

YEAR 2									
Site	Year 2 Foster Care Cases	Year 2 In-Home Services Cases	Year 2 In-Home Services Cases "other"	Sample Period	Review Period	Year 2 Total Cases	Year 2 Percentage	Year 2 Oversample Cases (if needed) *	
								Foster Care Cases	In-Home Services Cases
Region 1	6	6	1	FC 4/1/19 – 9/30/19 IH 4/1/19 – 11/15/19	4/1/20-9/30/20	12	18%	1	1
Region 2	2	2				6	7%	1	
Region 3	9	3	1				12	18%	2
Region 4*	10	3		FC 10/1/19 – 3/31/20 IH 10/1/19 – 5/15/20	10/1/20-3/31/21	14	21%	2	
Region 5	6	3				10	15%	1	1
Region 6	4	6	1				10	15%	2
Region 7	3	2		FC 4/1/19 – 9/30/19 IH 4/1/19 – 11/15/19	4/1/20-9/30/20	5	7%	1	
Total	40	25	3			68	100%	10*	2*
Case Type Ratio	59%	41%							

TABLE 5: Year Three State CRR Schedule

YEAR 3									
Site	Year 3 Foster Care Cases	Year 3 In-Home Services Cases	Year 3 In-Home Services Cases "other"	Sample Period	Review Period	Year 3 Total Cases	Year 3 Percentage	Year 3 Oversample Cases (if needed) *	
								Foster Care Cases	In-Home Services Cases
Region 1	6	6		FC 4/1/20 – 9/30/20 IH 4/1/20 – 11/15/20	4/1/21-9/30/21	12	18%	1	1
Region 2	2	2	1			6	7%	1	
Region 3	9	3				12	18%	2	
Region 4*	10	3	1	FC 10/1/20 – 3/31/21 IH 10/1/20 – 5/15/21	10/1/21-3/31/22	14	21%	2	
Region 5	6	3				10	15%	1	1
Region 6	4	6				10	15%	2	
Region 7	3	2	1	FC 4/1/20 – 9/30/20 IH 4/1/20 – 11/15/20	4/1/21-9/30/21	5	7%	1	
Total	40	25	3			68	100%	10*	2*
Case Type Ratio	59%	41%							

Foster Care Sample

The sampling universe will be organized by individual and consist of all children served according to the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System-defined reportable cases for the specified sample period.

In-Home Case Sample

The sampling universe will be organized by family unit and consist of cases open for at least 45 consecutive days during the sampling period and in which no children in the family were in foster care for 24 hours or longer during any portion of the period under review, and:

- a) Have a service plan, or
- b) Have a safety assessment with an “unsafe” designation, or
- c) Have no service plan and no safety decision has been made, or
- d) Have an open presenting issue and the safety assessment has not been entered into the system.

Quality Assurance and Source of Information

All cases will be reviewed by two case reviewers under the supervision of an initial quality assurance reviewer. Additionally, one randomly selected case from each set of reviewers will be analyzed for statewide consistency by a second level quality assurance reviewer.

The case review will include the SACWIS file, the paper file if applicable, and phone/in-person interviews with case participants (youth, parents, foster parents, case workers, and supervisors).

Other Cases

Cases that have no service plan and the safety assessment has a “safe” designation, which were open for more than 45 consecutive days during the sampling period. Idaho will duplicate the case distribution of In-Home cases used for the CFSR Baseline (28 total cases) and will rotate 1 “other” case between the regions of each of the three hubs during every round of annual reviews. For example, during the CFSR baseline the other case was reviewed in R1, during the next round of reviews, the other case will be reviewed in region R2, as seen in Table 3. If there are no assessment (“other”) cases that meet this criteria during a scheduled review, the case will be replaced with a traditional In-Home services case.

Minimum Number of Applicable Cases per Item

In the event that the number of cases reviewed in each region does not meet the minimum number of applicable cases from the CFSR baseline (Table 1), the state will review additional cases during the review period to meet the requirements necessary to measure goal achievement. Please see Table 6 for a breakdown of minimum number of applicable cases needed for each 6-month review period making up the 12-month measurement period. This will be monitored throughout the review

period, at a minimum of once a month, to evaluate if the required number of applicable cases for each region and/or CFSR item requiring measurement have been achieved. If additional case are needed to meet the minimum number of cases for the region and/or an item then oversampling will occur as outlined in shown in Tables 3-5. The additional cases will be reviewed during the same scheduled review period. (see Table 3-5 for how cases will be oversampled for each area, as needed). The state will apply the OSRI in its entirety during these reviews to maximize the collection of data used to inform ongoing CQI efforts. The sample frame for the additional cases will be the same as shown in table 3-5.

TABLE 6: Minimum number of applicable cases needed for each 6-month reviews

Items	Min # of appl cases needed	April 1 – Sept 30 reviews	Oct 1 – March 31 reviews
3	68	34	34
4	40	20	20
5	40	20	20
6	40	20	20
12	68	34	34
13	67	34	33
14	68	34	34
15	64	32	32

Case Elimination

Cases will be eliminated during sample selection prior to onsite reviews based on the following criteria:

- An in-home services case open for fewer than 45 consecutive days during the period under review;
- An in-home services case in which any child in the family was in foster care for more than 24 hours during the period under review;
- A foster care case open fewer than 24 hours during the period under review, which starts at the beginning of the sampling period and ends when the case is reviewed;
- A foster care case in which the child was on a trial home visit (placement at home) during the entire period under review;
- A foster care case that was closed according to agency policy before the sample period begins resulting in no state responsibility for the case;

- A case open for subsidized adoption or guardianship payment only and not otherwise inclusive of a child in foster care or open for in-home services during the period under review;
- A case in which the target child reached the age of majority as defined by state law (18 years old in most states) before the period under review;
- A case in which the child is or was in the placement and care responsibility of another state, and the state being reviewed is providing supervision through an Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children agreement;
- A case appearing multiple times in the sample, such as a case that involves siblings in foster care in separate cases or an in-home services case that was opened more than one time during a sampling period;
- A foster care case in which the child's adoption or guardianship was finalized before the period under review and the child is no longer in foster care; and
- A case in which the child was placed for the entire period under review in a locked juvenile facility or other placement that does not meet the federal definition of foster care at 45 CFR § 1355.20.

With approval from the local child welfare chief, the following additional Case Elimination Criteria may be applied after final sample lists are generated, documentation must be provided in the Case Elimination Worksheet (Appendix D):

- More than 2 cases from the same social worker that would result in overrepresentation of local agency staff;
- A case which properly closed prior to the PUR (through a court proceeding or administrative action), and was left open in the SACWIS system during the Sampling Period, but no case management activities were necessary nor took place during the entire PUR.
- Unable to contact family (concerted efforts made to contact family must be documented in the space provided on the sample list); **
- Family refused to participate (concerted efforts made to engage family must be documented in the space provided on the sample list). **

**Concerted efforts to contact/engage families will include at a minimum, but not be limited to, administrative letter, 3 attempts to contact family (via phone, text, or other department-approved electronic form), family-locate services, attempt to engage family through assigned social worker or other agency staff that may have a positive working relationship with the family, etc.

Conflict of Interest

The following guidelines will be utilized to prevent any conflicts of interest:

- No reviewer or QA team member will review any cases in which they were directly or indirectly involved, including supervision, oversight, or case consultation.
- No reviewer or QA team member will review cases from their own region.

- No reviewer or QA team member will review any cases in which they have any real or perceived personal interest. For example, the case of a relative or close friend.

Once the case sample list is received by the regional office and reviewer assignments have been made, the local child welfare chief will be responsible for reassigning cases with additional conflicts of interest—not prevented by the above criteria—to a different review team.

Safety concerns identified during Case Record Reviews

Child safety concerns uncovered in a case record under review or during an interview must be reported immediately to the Centralized Intake Unit (1-855-552-5437). The risk or safety concern will be documented in the OSRI Case QA Notes, and the actions taken by the review team will be tracked using the CRR Issue Tracker.

Case-specific Interviews

The scheduling of case-specific interviews will be the responsibility of the regional office under the direction of the local child welfare chief who will ensure adherence to Case Elimination Criteria and concerted efforts to engage families in the review process.

Interviews should be scheduled to take place after reviewers have had an opportunity to thoroughly review case record documentation. This allows reviewers to explore relevant issues and confirm or verify information found in the case record with each person interviewed. Interviews are to be conducted with key informants on every case to inform outcome ratings, including all of the following individuals: child, parents, caregiver/foster care provider, and caseworker or supervisor.

As needed, on a case-by-case basis, other individuals who have relevant information about the case also may be interviewed, such as the child's guardian ad litem or advocate, a parent's significant other, or other family members.

The following individuals related to a case will be interviewed unless they are unavailable or completely unwilling to participate:

- The child (school age and developmentally appropriate).
- The child's parent(s), unless termination of parental rights occurred prior to the period under review.
- The child's foster parent(s), pre-adoptive parent(s), or other caregiver(s), such as a relative caregiver or group home houseparent, if the child is in foster care.
- The child and/or family's caseworker(s), or caseworker's supervisor if the caseworker is unavailable. (When the caseworker has left the agency or is no longer available for interview, it may be necessary to schedule interviews with the supervisor who was responsible for the caseworker assigned to the family.)

Acceptable Interview Exceptions

- Only school-age children are interviewed, unless other arrangements are made. Cases involving children younger than school age, or children who are developmentally younger than school age, may be reviewed but do not require an interview with the child. Instead, the reviewers might observe the child in the home while interviewing the birth or foster parent(s).
- The parents cannot be located, or are outside of the United States.
- There is a safety or risk concern in contacting any party for interview.
- Any party is unable to consent to an interview due to physical or mental health incapacity.
- Any party refuses to participate in an interview and the regional office can document attempts to engage them.
- Any party is advised by an attorney not to participate due to a pending criminal or civil matter.

Unacceptable Interview Exceptions

- A party refuses to participate in an interview. Regional office staff must attempt to engage them beyond a letter/or telephone call.
- A party has a pending criminal, civil, or procedural matter before the agency; e.g., appealing a TPR.
- The regional office has not made attempts to locate a party for an interview.
- Any party speaks a language other than English.

Process for ensuring Consistency of Documentation

Reviewers shall adhere to the instructions provided in the OSRI for Item Rating comments. Documentation in these sections should include a brief summary of the rating rationale with comments that highlight strengths or challenges related to specific practices (training needs), systemic issues, or resources that affected the item rating. If any outcome question is marked "No", reviewers should explain any concerns in the narrative field provided.

Supervision and guidance to Initial QA by Second Level QA

Prior to onsite review, the designated reviewer tasked with Second Level QA will review the latest FAQ from the OMS help site and will facilitate a phone or email review of highlights to assigned Initial QA review team.

The designated Second Level QA reviewer will convene Initial QA team members each evening during case record reviews. Child welfare chiefs of the current review site will be invited to attend, however, will remain in an observer role only. The goals of these meetings are:

- For the designated Second Level QA reviewer to provide supervision and clarification to ensure continuity regarding questions and decision points raised on the SharePoint Alert System.
- For Initial QA reviewers to provide a 5 to 7-minute overview of the case(s) and outcome ratings; Initial QA reviewers will highlight themes contributing to the ratings as well as those raised from Case Reviewers during the process. Questions and themes from these meetings will be gathered by the designated Second Level QA reviewer and will be advanced to the entire Case Reviewer team (including those Initial QA reviewers not participating in a particular review) within one month of each case record review.
- For Initial QA reviewers to troubleshoot CRR dynamics (teams, timeline, support needs). On the final evening of the review, Initial QA reviewers will share and record Case Reviewer feedback (strengths and areas of growth) to be shared with reviewers (process under development).

Any formal guidance from these discussions will be documented in the program's Continuous Quality Improvement Manual and be covered in detail during Reviewer Booster Training courses, as well as subsequent annual Case Reviewer and Initial QA Trainings.

Second Level QA definition and designation

Second Level QA reviewers must have experience participating in at least 3 reviews as Initial QA team members and have completed both Case Reviewer and Initial QA level trainings. Second Level QA reviewers will participate off-site with the narrow role of observing and recording the themes pertaining to the initial QA process, ensure accuracy of ratings, monitor rating overrides, and follow-through with the resolution of any disputed ratings.