

California Child and Family Services Review

Annual SIP Progress Report 2016



California – Child and Family Services Review Signature Sheet

County	Sacramento
CSA Period Dates	2008 - 2011
SIP Period Plan Dates	June 2012 to May 2017
Outcome Data Period	University of California at Berkeley (UCB) California Child Welfare Indicators Project, Q3 2015
County Child Welfare Agency Deputy Director	
Name	Michelle Callejas, Deputy Director
Signature*	
Phone Number	(916) 875-0123
Mailing Address	3701 Branch Center Road, 2nd floor, Sacramento CA 95827
County Chief Probation Officer	
Name	Lee Seale, Chief Probation Officer
Signature*	
Phone Number	(916) 875-0310
Mailing Address	9750 Business Park Drive #220, Sacramento CA 95827

*Signatures must be in blue ink

Mail the original Signature Sheet to:	Outcomes and Accountability Bureau Children and Family Services Division California Department of Social Services 744 P Street, MS 8-12-91 Sacramento, CA 95814
----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Contact Information

Child Welfare Agency	Name	Verronda Moore, Program Manager
	E-mail address	moorev@saccounty.net
	Phone Number	916-874-5080
	Mailing address	PO Box 269057 Sacramento CA 95826
Probation Agency	Name	Carl Kagel Assistant Probation Division Chief
	E-mail address	KagelC@saccounty.net
	Phone Number	916-875-0361
	Mailing address	4100 Branch Center Road Sacramento CA 95827
CAPIT Liaison	Name	Nancy Marshall, Program Planner
	E-mail address	marshn@saccounty.net
	Phone Number	916-874-2796
	Mailing address	PO Box 269057 Sacramento CA 95826
CBCAP Liaison	Name	Nancy Marshall, Program Planner
	E-mail address	marshn@saccounty.net
	Phone Number	916-874-2796
	Mailing address	PO Box 269057 Sacramento CA 95826
PSSF Liaison	Name	Nancy Marshall, Program Planner
	E-mail address	marshn@saccounty.net
	Phone Number	916-874-2796
	Mailing address	PO Box 269057 Sacramento CA 95826

**SIP Progress Report
Sacramento County 2012-2017
Year Three Update**

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
STAKEHOLDERS' PARTICIPATION	1
STRATEGIES STATUS.....	4
BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTATION	20
OTHER SUCCESSES/PROMISING PRACTICES	20
OTHER OUTCOME MEASURES NOT MEETING STATE/NATIONAL STANDARDS.....	21
SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PLAN CHART	22

Introduction

In 2001, the California State Legislature passed Assembly Bill (AB) 636, the Child Welfare System Improvement and Accountability Act, which established the California Outcomes and Accountability Systems (COAS). In an effort to improve child welfare outcomes for children and families, COAS required all 58 counties to develop a System Improvement Plan (SIP). This process allows agencies to objectively measure county performance in administering child welfare services, assess needs and strengths to improve that performance, and plan for continuous improvement.

The core team for the California Child and Family Service Review (C-CFSR) process was comprised of representatives from Sacramento County Department of Health and Human Services, Child Protective Services Division, Sacramento County Probation Department, Child Abuse Prevention Council of Sacramento, Inc., and the California Department of Social Services. The SIP involves three collaborative planning stages: the Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR), the County Self-Assessment (CSA), and System Improvement Plan (SIP). Sacramento County submitted the SIP for the time period of June 2012 to May 2017 in 2012. The first SIP Progress Report was completed in 2013 followed by the second and third reports in 2014 and 2015 respectively.

Overall, the Sacramento County 2016 Annual SIP Progress Report will provide a written analysis of the performance toward the SIP improvement goals as measured by the UCB California Child Welfare Indicators Project, Q3 2015. The report will also provide an analysis of the status and progress of strategies and action steps, including any revisions. In addition, it will include an analysis of obstacles, systemic issues, and environmental conditions that may be contributing to outcome improvement or decline; it will describe any other successes and promising practices that have led to consistent positive performance within specific Outcome Data Measures. Lastly, it will contain a SIP chart with necessary updates to reflect the county's performance, current status of implementation strategies, and any revision to the time frames.

Stakeholders Participation

Sacramento County continues to team with community partners, county agencies and other key stakeholders to provide services to the children and families in our community. For example, the Children's Research Center (CRC) provides consultation in regard to practice needs and county findings relating to the full implementation and utilization of Structured Decision Making (SDM) as required in Strategy 1. In addition, staff participates in the Statewide SDM Workgroup.

There has been intense participation in the expansion of services to offer Aftercare services to all families exiting the dependency system, primarily at a network of nine Family Resource Centers in Sacramento County. Providers have been meeting weekly since January 1, 2015 to develop/amend Policies and Procedures to address this expanded population, as well as build/modify a database to ensure collection of appropriate data. In the last three months over 210 presentations have been made to both internal staff and external providers to educate them on this service expansion in support of Strategy 6.

Throughout the implementation process for Strategy 7, the identified stakeholders have been the permanency management team along with program administration staff. Meetings were held to review and plan the best practice as well as for purposes of implementation. Meetings were also held with program supervisors and then line level staff to obtain feedback and ultimately to train. Currently, the stakeholder feedback process consists of utilizing existing meetings and processes such as supervisor and unit meetings, the permanency management team meeting and ad hoc meetings as needed to review and update practice. Given that this practice has been implemented and is in an ongoing monitoring stage, it is incumbent on each program to review through existing quality assurance (QA) practices, such as individual and unit supervision and program statistics.

Finally, Strategy 8 continues to have strong community partners/stakeholder collaboration. For example, Casey Family Programs, Lilliput Children's Services, Sierra Forever Families and Child Welfare Services have consistent ongoing meetings to enhance permanency support services to improve child welfare outcomes.

Current Performance Toward SIP Improvement Goals:

The County's official data source for outcomes is UC Berkeley California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP). At the time the County's CSA was completed in 2012, UC Berkeley CCWIP utilized CFSR 2 outcome measures and standards. However, during this reporting period, UC Berkeley CCWIP has updated their data to CFSR 3, with updated outcome measures, methodology, and standards. Therefore, this annual SIP update will focus on the County's performance as defined by the CFSR 3 outcomes and methodology. The baseline performance for each outcome measure will also be reported based on CFSR 3 measures, and the timeframe for the baseline data remains Quarter 1 of 2011. All current performance is based on 2015 Quarter 3 data.

C1.1 Timely Reunification; currently P1 Permanency in 12 Months (entering foster care):

Sacramento County's baseline performance is 46.0%. The current performance is 48.3%, which reflects an improvement percent change of 5.1%. The national standard is performance greater than or equal to 40.5%.

In addition, the current CFSR 3 outcome of Permanency in 12 Months defines permanency as an exit to reunification, guardianship, or adoption, whereas the previous CFSR 2 outcome used in the CSA focused on reunification. Sacramento County's outcomes pertaining solely to reunification are noted below:

Reunification	
Baseline Performance	Current Performance
39.8%	44.5%

Sacramento County's performance regarding exits to permanency through reunification has also increased.

C1.4 Re-entry; currently P4 Re-entry to Foster Care in 12 Months:

The County's baseline performance data for this measure is 14.2%. In comparison, the County's current performance is 19.7%. This represents a decline in performance, with a percent change of 38.7%. The national standard is performance less than or equal to 8.3%.

C3.3 In Care 3 Years or Longer; currently P3 Permanency in 12 Months (in care 24 months or more):

Sacramento County has maintained relatively the same performance from baseline to current data. The baseline performance in this outcome is 22.2%, and the current performance is 22.2%. The national standard is performance greater than or equal to 30.3%.

C4 Placement Stability; currently P5 Placement Stability:

The baseline performance for this outcome is a rate of 5.13 placement moves per 1,000 days of foster care, and the current performance is a rate of 4.81. This represents an improvement, with 6.3% change. The national standard is performance less than or equal to 4.12.

C4 Placement Stability (Probation); currently P5 Placement Stability

Probation has seen a decline in Outcome Measure P5, Placement Stability. The baseline performance for this outcome is a rate of 1.3 placement moves per 1000 days of foster care, and the current performance for the new standard P5 is 2.45.

4B Least Restrictive Placement

UCB data for baseline performance shows Probation had 63.1% of youth in a group/shelter placement. Current performance has 1 youth placed in the least restrictive placement of with a Relative (.07%), 150 were placed in the most restrictive placement of a Group Home (99.33%).

8A ILP Well Being

Regarding Probation's Outcome Measure 8A ILP Well Being, a National Standard and county performance were not reported at the time of the original SIP. Subsequently, Probation's initial performance was determined to be 87.5%. At the time the baseline was determined for Measure 8A, the outcome examined if youth received ILP services. Current performance from October 21014 to October 2015 reflects wellbeing at 100%.

Analysis of Outcome Improvement or Decline:

Outcome measure P1 may have improved from the baseline to current data due to Sacramento County's efforts to ensure Structured Decision Making (SDM) tools geared toward reunification are completed timely. These tools provide a consistent methodology for social workers to assess reunification readiness of a family from a safety/risk perspective. The use of SDM facilitates critical thinking regarding reunification and aids social workers in clearly understanding if any safety or risk factors exist that prevent reunification. Sacramento County has increased timely completion of the SDM Risk Reassessment tool from 18.7% in May 2012 to 34.2% in January 2016. In addition, the completion of timely SDM Family Strengths and Needs Assessments rose from 13.4% in May 2012 to 21.6% in January 2016. The County has made concerted efforts to ensure ongoing training for staff regarding appropriate and timely completion of SDM tools and this may be a contributing factor for improvement in this outcome.

Sacramento County's performance related to measure P4 may be due to the temporary suspension of exit TDMs, while the County engaged in the Court Services Stabilization Plan for the first half of 2015. Exit TDMs

provide a venue to discuss aftercare planning. Aftercare planning includes identifying any supportive services and individuals a family can utilize in order to safely maintain their children in their care. Exit TDMs are a formal way to involve a family's natural supports in planning how to maintain children in the home following return. This adds an additional layer of support that can potentially last beyond case closure. The absence of an exit TDM may result in children reentering care. From the baseline time period to current, the overall decline in performance is 38.7%; however, the one year performance change from the prior year to the current performance has been a decline of 8.1%.

Outcome measure P3 Permanency in 12 Months (in care 24 months or longer) has maintained the same performance from the baseline reported in the CSA to the current data. However, of note is the fact Sacramento County's performance has increased approximately 9% in the year leading up to the current data. This recent improvement may be due to the County increasing awareness of this population and making active efforts to attain permanency for these youth. Since July 2014, Sacramento County has implemented a Permanency Initiative to target youth to receive permanency case reviews. The reviews include social workers, supervisors, managers, a permanency liaison, and the youth, family, and service partners if they are a critical component to the meeting. The goal of the permanency case reviews is to make concerted efforts to facilitate permanency for these youth in care. Overall, the heightened awareness of the need to address youth in care for 24 months or longer may have contributed to improved performance in this area.

Outcome measure P5 Placement Stability has improved. Outcome measure P5 may be impacted by work conducted by the Centralized Placement Support Unit (CPSU). The CPSU, which locates placements for children, has made strides to ensure children are matched appropriately with placement homes, in an effort to reduce the chance of placement disruptions. The standard is all placements are made by the CPSU.

Strategies Status

Strategies containing action steps scheduled to start and/or be completed during this reporting period are discussed below.

Child Welfare Services Strategies

Strategy 1: "Improve to 85% of FR program cases that have timely SDM Risk Reassessments and Family Strengths and Needs Reassessments." The May 2012 baseline is 13.4% for FSNA and 18.7% for Risk Reassessment.

Strategy 1 is primarily focused on using Structured Decision Making (SDM) assessment tools to determine reunification readiness. In May 2012, baselines were set, one for timely Risk Reassessment (18.7%), and the other for timely Family Strengths and Needs Assessments (13.4%). Sacramento County continues to make progress in Strategy 1. According to the most recent Safe Measures extract, for all cases open at any time during the month of January 2016 that have a Family Maintenance or Family Reunification service component on the last day of the month, 34.2% of Risk Reassessments are timely. Also, within 65 days prior to effective case plan for court-dependent cases, all FM and FR service component cases open at any time during the month of January 2016, 21.6% of Family Strengths and Needs Assessments are timely.

These positive improvements can be attributed to the increased awareness and training across the Division on accurate and timely use of SDM tools. In addition, the Department is making diligent efforts to increase

capacity within staff of SDM trainers. In August 2015, three program specialists from Program Administration, two program specialists from Permanency, and one Emergency Response Supervisor participated in a three-day intensive training at UC Davis to become SDM trainers and also in preparation for the implementation of SDM 3.0.

In November 2015, Permanency and Court Services social workers were trained on the policy and procedures for the SDM Reunification Reassessment and the Family Strengths and Needs Assessment tools. Additionally, Sacramento County hired a sizeable number of social workers (101) in December 2015, and SDM training was provided to all of the new hires.

Strategy 2: “Fully Implement Signs of Safety Safety Organized Practice and Engagement Practices”;

Outcome Measure C1.1 Timely Reunification; currently P1 Permanency in 12 Months (Entering Foster Care):

Sacramento County continues to make progress toward Strategy 2. Sacramento County is now participating in California's IVE Waiver Demonstration Project. The Federal portion of the project is Safety Organized Practice (SOP). SOP is an “umbrella” approach that incorporates Signs of Safety (SOS) engagement and practice; Structured Decision Making (SDM), research based decision-support tools; cultural humility (“recognizing that cultures vary from one family to the next, or even within the same family”); and trauma informed practice (understanding how trauma affects an individual’s “sense of personal safety, and their ability to trust others and navigate life changes”). In October 2015, supervising staff received an informational session on the differences between SOP and SOS. All social workers are receiving Safety Planning training and beginning March 2016 through June 2016, social workers, supervisors, and managers will attend a two-day SOP Foundational training. Additionally, Sacramento County recently acquired three SOP coaches, who each have 25 hours available per month toward coaching time. In January 2016, the coaches began meeting with managers and their supervisory teams to introduce themselves, discuss the coaching process and the coaching expectations in Sacramento County. In February 2016, the coaches met with supervisors individually to support the development of goals within their units and to assist supervisors with structured strategies, tools, and techniques for coaching their social worker teams toward the successful implementation and deepening of SOP practices. Additionally, Sacramento County participates in the quarterly SOP collaborative forums. These forums are coordinated and facilitated by CDSS and The Northern California Training Academy and include the other 8 Title IVE county participants, community partners, and the Title IVE evaluation team. These forums provide counties with opportunities to exchange implementation strategies, thereby creating a learning environment regarding SOP implementation and practicing SOP with fidelity.

Since the last 2015 Annual SIP Progress Report, we are progressing with Action Step A. Sacramento County has contracted with the Northern California Training Academy to coach and train staff in implementation and practicing SOP with fidelity. In November 2015, The Academy surveyed supervisors regarding their social workers’ integration of SOP strategies into practice with families. In addition, Sacramento County partnered with the Academy to complete case reviews and interviews with social workers to determine their level of SOP practice, i.e. “Emergent Practice, Accomplished Practice or Distinguished Practice”.

Regarding the identified measure P1, currently Sacramento is above the national standard at 48.3%. In May 2012, our baseline was at 46%. We believe the integration of the SOP Model will better support timely reunification through continued effective family engagement and involvement, the building of safety networks,

collaborative planning, and development of well-formed goals, and behavior based plans. As SOP practice skills are integrated and mastered in Sacramento County, we expect timely reunification rates to continue to meet or exceed the national standard. As previously reported, Sacramento County continues to utilize the practice intervention, Protective Emergency Placement (PEP), which is designed to mitigate immediate safety concerns that in turn allows parents to engage in services while their child is in a safe environment. These placements may impact reunification data. Sacramento County recognizes this data limitation, yet fully supports the PEP practice as a successful prevention practice in safely keeping children from entering the Court Dependency system.

Action Step B: Sacramento County is now participating in the California's IVE Waiver Demonstration Project of which the Federal portion is Safety Organized Practice (SOP). The transition from SOS to SOP as a mandatory practice is in the beginning stages. To begin this transition, Sacramento County conducted SOP/SOS case reviews in November and December 2015 to obtain staff's knowledge baseline. These reviews included interviews with social workers and reviews of case files to learn how SOP/SOS is currently being integrated with families and how and where this information is captured in case files. The reviews revealed that most staff are practicing SOP at an emergent level, meaning they have some knowledge of the practice and they are beginning to integrate this knowledge into practice with families. As a result of the reviews, it was determined that all staff (social workers, supervisors, and managers) will attend the Northern California Training Academy's SOP Foundational training by the end of May 2016. Simultaneously, social workers and supervisors are receiving safety plan training and coaching. Coaches from the Northern California Training Academy, who are retirees of Sacramento County CPS, are providing ongoing coaching with SOP practices to ensure consistency of learning and continued skill building. Sacramento County has also began to integrate SOS/SOP language in forms, investigative narratives, court reports, and case plans, which we believe will assist us in better measuring our compliance and outcomes. Lastly, Sacramento County continues to work with the Title IVE Evaluation team to develop ways to measure the implementation and fidelity of SOP practices. A lesson learned for Sacramento County was that because SOS previously was not mandatory, although it was strongly encouraged and modeled, individual levels of adoption and skill varied significantly. Additionally, SOS was rolled out regionally instead of to all staff at the same time, which led to a lack of continuity in service engagement and delivery for families. Successes encountered to date include the fact that our surveys showed 26.7% of our staff were rated as being "Distinguished" in their SOP practice.

Finally, in the original SIP, Action Step C was "Analyze reentry cases to determine if there are contributing factors that can be ameliorated through practice or service improvements," with a timeframe for completion of January 2015. In the 2015 SIP Progress Report the timeframe for completion of Action Step C changed to October 2015. Nevertheless, since the practice changed from the SOS model to the SOP model, Sacramento County has decided that it is more feasible to eliminate this Action Step and instead incorporate the timeframe for completion into the development of the County Self Assessment for the implementation into the next 5-year SIP.

Action Step D: "Implement services or program enhancements subsequent to analysis of reentry cases" is not likely to be completed by May 2016 as barriers have prevented an analysis of reentry cases to take place. There have been barriers to implementing SOP practice within the initial timeframe presented. This is partly due to continuous CPS staff turnover and competing demands for resources, requiring more focus on stabilizing resources and hiring new staff. Limited staff resources also caused gaps in SOP training and coaching, thus resulting in a decrease of use by experienced staff that had previously received SOS/SOP training and were practicing SOS/SOP at varying levels. Case reviews and social worker surveys revealed

many of our experienced staff have reverted to former practices without using SOS/SOP tools and practices with families. Further, newly hired staff have little to no exposure to SOP requiring more than half of our CPS staff needing to be introduced to SOP practices.

Action Step E: Since staff were previously trained on SOS tools, language, and philosophy, the mandatory adoption and utilization of SOP will hopefully be accelerated. For new staff, they will benefit from starting their practice within the SOP framework, rather than having to struggle with changing an older practice and/or philosophy of engagement. Presently, Sacramento County is conferring with other SOP counties and sharing information regarding implementation and integration of SOP language in forms, investigative narratives, court reports, and case plans, which will assist us in SOP execution and uniformity, and to better measure our compliance and outcomes. Due to the practice change from the SOS model to the SOP model, the surveying of supervisors to establish a baseline for improvement will be delayed and incorporated into the development of the County Self Assessment for the implementation into the next 5-year SIP.

Strategy 3: Increase the percentage of case plan objectives that are behaviorally based by 20 percentage points over the baseline.

Outcome Measure(s): C1.1 Timely Reunification and C1.4 Reentry

Sacramento County continues to be in the planning process for Strategy 3, therefore the impact of Strategy 3 on timely reunification and reentry for children is unknown.

Regarding Action Step A, Sacramento County is currently working with UC Davis to develop staff training for behaviorally based case plans that will include services to meet the behavioral needs of the child, as well as the requirements of Katie A. Due to an impacted training schedule and UC Davis trainer availability, as well as Sacramento County transitioning from Signs of Safety (SOS) to Safety Organized Practice (SOP) behaviorally based case plan training will be integrated into the Safety Organized Practice (SOP) training. This will help support the framework of SOP in that services will include the child and family voice as well as be tailored to families' needs. The anticipated training start date will be in October 2016.

Action Step B & C – Case Plan quality assurance reviews will be conducted after all staff have been trained and behaviorally based case plans have been implemented. Division Management has to approve the Aftercare Plan. In the 2015 SIP Progress Report the timeframe for completion of Action Steps B and C were due June and July 2016. Nevertheless, since the practice changed from the SOS model to the SOP model, Sacramento County has decided that it is more feasible to incorporate the timeframe for completion into the development of the County Self Assessment for the implementation into the next 5-year SIP.

Strategy 4: “60% of the parents who have a Detention Hearing held regarding their children will have a social worker engage the parent/family within 15 days of the Detention Hearing in the preferred location. Baseline data derived from the Elements of Dependency showed 20% compliance, while a hand count of logs showed 38% compliance.”

Outcome Measure(s): C1.1 Timely Reunification; currently P1 Permanency in 12 Months (Entering Foster Care) and C1.4 Reentry; currently P5 Placement Stability:

Strategy 4 is intended to address Outcome P1 Permanency in 12 Months and Outcome P4 Re-entry to Foster Care in 12 Months. Sacramento County has improved performance in Outcome P1, with a baseline performance of 46.0% and a current performance of 48.3%. This outcome area remains above the national standard of 40.5%. However, Sacramento County's performance in Outcome P4 has declined from 14.2% at the baseline to 19.7% for current data. This represents a decline in performance of 38.7%. The national standard for Outcome P4 is 8.3% or lower.

Action Steps A and B under Strategy 4 have been completed. A baseline for Sacramento County's performance under Strategy 4 was previously established to be 20%, based on Elements of Permanency reviews, and 38% based on supervisor hand counts from logs. Strategy 4 specifies the standard to achieve is 60%.

Pertaining to Action Step C, current comparison data for Strategy 4 via a routine quality assurance review is not available at this time. Therefore, Sacramento County is currently unable to determine the impact this engagement has had on our Permanency and Re-entry outcomes. As reported in the 2015 SIP Update, the Elements of Permanency quality assurance reviews, which would capture this data was placed on hold in December 2014 to support the Court Services Program Stabilization Project. However, Elements of Permanency remain on hold due to the agency's need to shift staff resources to the Federal and State mandated Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) case review process. The agency will identify staff to conduct the Elements of Permanency quality assurance reviews.

Strategy 5: "Hold a Reunification/Exit TDM prior to reunification occurring";

Outcome Measure C1.4 Reentry; currently P5 Placement Stability:

Strategy 5 was developed with the understanding that Team Decision Making (TDM) meetings should be held at key decision points in a case when any type of placement is made, including reunification/ exit from placement. Sacramento County has adopted the use of Reunification/Exit TDM as a means to develop a solid aftercare plan with the family, including a network of support, with of the goal of maintaining the child safely in the home of the parent/guardian, and prevent reentry into foster care. Team Decision Making, which is grounded in the concepts of family engagement and uses Safety Organized Practice (SOP) as a framework, elicits feedback from the child and family to promote buy-in and accountability to the action plan/ aftercare plan created at the meeting.

In the past year, there were positive changes and also challenges in full implementation of Strategy 5. As mentioned in the 2015 SIP Update, the parameters of what constitute an Exit TDM were defined as:

- Permanency Programs: 1 to 45 days prior to reunification or 0 to 15 days after reunification
- Emergency Response/ Informal Supervision: 1 to 30 days prior to reunification or 0 to 15 days after reunification

In October 2015, baselines for the use of Reunification/Exit TDM were established using Business Objects and Efforts to Outcome (ETO) as data sources. Of the 715 children who reunified From January 1, 2013 to

December 31, 2013, 96 children had an Exit TDM, resulting in a baseline of 13.43%. Of these children, 184 were assigned to ER/IS at the time of reunification and 17 had an Exit TDM, resulting in a baseline of 9.24%. 531 children were assigned to the Permanency Program at the time of reunification and 79 had an Exit TDM, resulting in a baseline of 14.88%.

The table below shows the current data for Strategy 5 for the timeframe of January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015:

	Baseline	Current Data (1/1/2015 to 12/31/2015)			
		# of Children Reunified	# of Children with an Exit of TDM	Current Performance	% Change from Baseline
ER/IS	9.24%	379	15	3.96%	-57.14%
Permanency	14.88%	633	12	1.90%	-87.23%
Sacramento CPS	13.43%	1012	27	2.67%	-80.12%

As noted on the table, there was a significant decline in performance for the Permanency program, Emergency Response/ Informal Supervision program, and overall performance as a county. This may be attributed to the fact that from January 26, 2015 to July 27, 2015, Exit TDMs were placed on hold, as all but one of the TDM facilitators were temporarily reassigned as case-carrying social workers to support the Court Services Stabilization Project. At the present, the TDM unit is not operating at its full capacity, with only three TDM facilitators.

Although there were several barriers to implementation of Strategy 5, there are also positive changes. TDM facilitators were recently moved to another office building in order to be co-located with the TDM supervisor and to be easily available to case-carrying social workers.

Strategy 6: “Require social workers to develop an aftercare plan for each family who has successfully reunified and is exiting the system.”

Outcome Measure C1.4 Reentry; currently P4 Re-entry to Foster Care in 12 Months:

The Prevention/Aftercare Policy and Procedure has been written and includes aftercare for additional programs including Informal Supervision and Court Services. The policy/procedure is in the vetting process in preparation for finalization. The practice in cases where placements occur prior to court intervention and children are sent home from a PEPS placement remains that a safety plan is developed with the family in order to keep the children in their family home safely.

Within the Permanency Program steps have been taken to ensure that an aftercare plan is created prior to closing the case. For a period of 2 months prior to closure of the family's dependency court case the family will be co-served by Birth and Beyond Aftercare Program and the Permanency Social Worker to assist in the family's transition to voluntary community based support. After reunification occurs and the case is recommended for dependency termination, the case carrying social worker outlines in the final court report the services and safety nets which can be accessed by the family in order to keep the children safely at

home. Additionally, social workers in the Informal Supervision Program discuss aftercare with their families throughout the case and develop Aftercare Plans with their families prior to case closure.

The Prevention initiative has invested in child abuse prevention services in the community to provide increased services and supports for children ages 6 through 17 by contracting with Birth & Beyond Family Resource Centers. The service enhancements include home visitation for families with children 6 and older as well as parenting classes and support/social groups. By increasing available services, CPS expects to decrease entries and re-entries as well as increase safe and timely permanence. Given the recent Budget approval for this initiative, the Aftercare Plan will be modified to include this model. Trainings have taken place within CPS Divisions to notify Social Workers of the new expanded age range for both Prevention and Aftercare services. The new proposed completion date for the Prevention/Aftercare Policy and Procedure is April 2016.

Regarding Action Step B, the completion date to establish baseline data for reentries was July 2014. Defining the parameters for the baseline is part of Prevention/Aftercare Policy and Procedure development which has not been completed. Once the parameters are defined, baseline information can be obtained. With a proposed completion date of May 2016 for the policy/procedure, the completion date for Action Step B is now December 2016.

Strategy 7: "Modify the reoccurring six month permanency staffing to include reunification as an option for long staying children."

Outcome Measure C3.3 In Care 3 Years or Longer (Emancipated/Age 18); currently P3 Permanency in 12 Months (in care 24 months or more):

For this reporting period stakeholder participation consisted of communication between the lead planner and program administration support staff responsible for overseeing the administrative process of the staffing and carrying concerns to the larger group of management stakeholders. The enhanced staffing process and strategies were discussed as needed at the Permanency Management Team meetings, as well as at supervisor meetings in program as needed. Due to this being an internal practice process, there was no stakeholder involvement at the parent or partner level for this strategy.

Sacramento County successfully implemented Action Step A, the revised staffing model on July 1, 2014; Action Step has been completed.

In regard to Action Step B, the Concurrent Planning and Enhanced staffing have now been in effect for one and a half years. A review of the data shows that for the most recent reporting period available, October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2015, permanency for children in care 3 years or longer was 22.2%. Sacramento County has improved this measure by 9% in the last year. As with any new or promising practice, it is the belief of the management team that implementing these staffing has contributed to the increase in our overall performance, while also acknowledging that no one practice is directly responsible for all improvement.

In terms of reviewing and modifying, Sacramento County has a structure for review and to address issues when they arise. While there have been no specific barriers identified, practice or operational issues are brought to the attention of the lead program planner and are then brought to the management team as needed for any action items. As an example, operational issues were recently brought to the attention of the lead

planner which resulted in a management discussion identifying various operational steps to be taken, including: 1) strengthening the points of administrative support contacts in each region to improve the use of video conferencing, 2) Revisiting program points of contact to ensure supervisory attendance at conferences and 3) to highlight and refresh the practice, for both new and current social workers and supervisors in program, trainings will occur via program "Power Hours". Power Hours are specific program based trainings and at times focus on identified practice improvement needs. Holding a Power Hour in all regions will shine a spotlight on the practice and its impact on outcomes for children as well as clarify the process.

As with any new or modified social work practice, it will take an ongoing commitment of oversight, review and modification to continue to enhance and support the practice. At this point in time, the practice has been implemented, satisfying Action Step A and we have demonstrated an ability to monitor and review and will continue to do so in the future. To ensure ongoing review, program administration will continue to send monthly reports to managers reflecting the use of the enhanced staffing allowing managers to directly intervene in individual cases to ensure timely staffing. On a program level, the program administration staff will continue to notify the planner of any operational issues that arise. For the purposes of this report, Action Step B is also deemed completed, and while monitoring in program will be ongoing, there is no further need to report on this strategy in future reports.

Strategy 8: "90% of the cases will reflect that relatives are documented in CWS/CMS. Baseline data derived from the Elements of Investigation review showed 54% for Emergency Response. Baseline data derived from the Elements of Dependency showed 64% for Dependency cases."

Outcome Measure C3.3 In Care 3 Years or Longer (Emancipated/Age 18); currently P3 Permanency in 12 Months (in care 24 months or more):

Strategy 8 is intended to address Outcome Measure P3 Permanency in 12 Months (in care 24 months or more). This measure is new and replaces C3.3 In Care 3 Years or Longer. P3 looks at the number of children in care for 24 months or longer on the first day of a 12-month reporting period and calculates what percentage of those children are discharged to permanency within the following 12 months. The national standard for this measure is 30.3%. Using the new outcome measure, Sacramento's baseline performance was 22.2% while the current performance for Q3 2015 is 22.2%.

As noted in previous reports, Action Steps A and B were completed. The Elements of Investigation QA Review tool was updated in July 2013 and the Elements of Permanency QA Review tool is finished. Both assess whether relatives are documented in CWS/CMS as collaterals.

Action Step C has been implemented. However, both the Elements of Investigation and the Elements of Permanency review processes were placed on hold in December 2014 as division-wide QA staff were deployed to alternative work units as part of the Court Services Program Stabilization Project. The review processes remain on hold due to the agency's need to shift staff resources to the Federal and State mandated Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) case review process. The agency will identify staff to conduct both the Elements of Investigation and Elements of Permanency quality assurance reviews. In the meantime, monitoring of staff compliance with the directive of documenting relative information in the collateral section of CWS/CMS has been the role of Emergency Response and Permanency Supervisors and is done at an individual worker, rather than programmatic level.

A significant barrier to implementation has been ensuring that the high volume of new staff receive and integrate training regarding documentation of relatives in CWS/CMS. Newly hired staff members engage in a multitude of trainings including CORE and can find it challenging to retain all the information presented. Consequently, the need to have supervisory stability to ensure correct practice remains high. Sacramento County faces an additional barrier due to recent promotions at all levels that have resulted in either unfilled and/or relatively new supervisory teams that are also in the phases of early transfer of learning.

To further address this barrier, ongoing practice of ensuring relatives are documented in CWS/CMS has been implemented. For example, Sacramento County began work with both Lilliput Children's Services and Sierra Forever Families to develop a form that can be uploaded in CWS/CMS that includes all the relatives identified via the Family Finding searches. At this time, Lilliput Children's Services staff has created and is using a form that, when completed, is provided to case carrying social workers. The template will be shared with Sierra Forever Families. The Permanency Steering Committee is in the process of developing a procedure for how the information will be incorporated into CWS/CMS.

Strategy 10: "December 2015, 60% of non-relative placements will be made by the CPSU."

Outcome Measure C4 Placement Stability; currently P5 Placement Stability.

The Centralized Placement Support Unit (CPSU) was created in 2009. Regarding Action Step A, CPSU used to maintain an Excel spreadsheet to log the referrals and placements made by CPSU staff. This Excel spreadsheet did not interface with the CWS/CMS system and required the CPSU supervisor to compare the CPSU log to the CWS/CMS report of all placement changes made during a given time period. A planner also maintained and checked the spreadsheet, comparing it to the Placement Change form (CS1173), which was labor intensive. Since May 2014, the expectation has been that all placements be made by the CPSU; therefore, monitoring of how many are completed by CPSU has become obsolete. Additionally, our Placement Policy indicates "all initial placements will be made by CPSU except Relative/NREFM placements assessed and made by Emergency Response (ER) Social Workers or placements made between 11pm and 7AM by the ER on-call social workers. Placement changes for cases with the service components of ER, Family Reunification or Permanent Placement will be processed by CPSU except Relative/NREFM placements, placements needed between 11PM and 7 AM and youth referred to service programs such as Children's Receiving Home's Independent Living Program, Assessment Center or Residentially Based Services Program (RBS)."

Youth who are brought to CPSU are tracked by use of the Day List, however, this does not account for all of the youth CPSU locate placements for. The CS1173 is used to track placements in CWS/CMS. As for oversight, social workers are supposed to send the CS1173 to a data entry electronic mailbox. The form is then forwarded to the CPSU. Social workers are supposed to include their Supervisor when they send the form so supervisors can provide oversight and be kept aware on what youth are needing a placement change. This provides opportunity to have a conversation about relatives and NREFMs who may be available, holding a Team Decision Making (TDM) meeting to salvage a placement or put supports in place. The TDM supervisor is training all units in all programs on the advantage of utilizing TDM meetings when there is a risk of a placement change as well as the necessary information needed on the TDM referral form.

Sacramento is nearing but not yet meeting the national standard for P5 Placement Stability. The national standard is 4.12% and our current performance is 4.81%, an improvement from the baseline of 5.13%. CPSU has contributed to this stability by matching youth with the foster families, trying to place with relatives and attempting to keep siblings together.

Regarding Action Step B, "Increase CPSU staffing to meet demand", Recruitment Allowance (RA) positions have been added to assist in the growth of not only the number of placements CPSU finds, but how many youth come through CPSU. However, because RA positions are not permanent positions, Sacramento County will continue to examine the need to increase CPSU staffing to meet placement demand. The demand fluctuates for staff. CPSU staff has taken on more tasks such as processing JV180s and attending IMAC as well as direct care of youth brought into CPSU, which then leads to a demand for more staff. The staff has been divided into different work shifts to ensure coverage between 7AM and 11PM, 7 days a week.

Child Welfare Initiatives

Sacramento County has been involved in the following initiatives:

Residentially Based Services (RBS)

Sacramento County RBS implementation began on September 16, 2010 and continues in full operation with three providers working in partnership with DHHS/Child Protective Services and Behavioral Health Services and Sacramento County Probation to offer Residential and Community Based Services to youth, ages 12-18, who require a high level of residential care. As of December 2015, 98 youth and their families have been served in RBS and there are currently 14 youth enrolled in the program. Of the 14 youth enrolled, 3 of the youth have completed the residential component of RBS and are residing with family or extended family, receiving Community Based Services. Of the 84 youth who have exited the RBS Program since implementation, 39 of those youth (46%) have successfully completed the program.

The RBS census continues to be lower than initially projected. As a result, the referral criteria have been modified to be more inclusive and to ensure that youth who can benefit from the services are referred and enrolled. The County and RBS providers are continuing to work in partnership to strengthen RBS services and supports to ensure positive permanency and safety outcomes for RBS youth. The following array of services continues to be provided to youth enrolled in the RBS Program and their families:

- Family Engagement
- Permanency Services
- Intensive Environmental Services
- Therapeutic Services
- Parallel Community Based Services
- Aftercare and Support
- Family Finding Services

Extended Foster Care (AB12)

The goal of Extended Foster Care (AB12) is to assist foster youth in maintaining a safety net of support while experiencing independence in a secure and supervised living environment. The extended time as a non-minor dependent can assist the youth in becoming better prepared for successful transition into adulthood and self-sufficiency through education and employment training.

As of December 31, 2015, there were 469 Extended Foster Care youth being served by Sacramento County Child Protective Services. There are two units of social workers who are specifically assigned to this population, although for various reasons, there are 16 youth with social workers who primarily serve the general foster care population and 75 youth served by ongoing Guardianship social workers. The Extended Foster Care Unit social workers have an average caseload of 34. The overall number of Extended Foster Care Youth being served has decreased as a result of an increase in exits from the program as youth are now reaching the maximum age of eligibility.

Continuous Quality Improvement/Quality Assurance (CQI/QA) Framework

CPS hired six (6) additional staff to implement a Continuous Quality Improvement/Quality Assurance (CQI/QA) Framework designed to measure the quality of services provided by assessing the impact those services have on children and families and the effectiveness of the processes and systems utilized to deliver those services. The framework also incorporates the Plan, Do, Study, Act model and represents a key strategy for creating a learning culture, strengthening critical thinking, enhancing critical incident and case reviews and improving the overall quality of investigations; all of which contribute to increased safety.

On October 28, 2015, the CPS Executive Management Team attended a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) training sponsored by the Casey Foundation. The training was intended to develop a common language and understanding about CQI systems and prioritize Sacramento County's CQI development and implementation efforts. As a result of this training, the CQI staff developed two CQI-PDSA studies (i.e. Disposition and Re-entry) to get baseline data, test assumptions to better assess systemic issues and develop strategies to create targeted interventions. Once the studies are completed, CQI staff will partner with the Training Unit to develop any necessary training to enhance social worker practice.

Monitoring Foster Family Agencies (FFAs)

Sacramento County currently has Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with 37 Foster Family Agencies (FFA). The MOU outlines performance goals for FFAs in the areas of safety, permanency and well-being. FFAs are required to submit an outcomes report semi-annually detailing their performance in the targeted areas. FFAs with low performance levels are required to report quarterly until performance improves. The monitoring process includes site visits and corrective action plans as needed. When necessary, Sacramento County utilizes placement holds for FFAs with poor performance levels and/or unresolved safety issues. Sacramento County works closely with Community Care Licensing, sharing information and conducting joint site visits and home inspections.

Title IV-E California Well-Being Project

The purpose of this project is to assist counties in developing and implementing innovative services by providing more flexible funding streams. Savings accrued by participating counties as a result of improved outcomes are to be re-invested in services to children and families that meet the objectives of the Well-Being Project. Long term outcomes for this project include decreased entries, decreased re-entries and increased child and family well-being. Sacramento, along with seven other counties, is participating in Cohort 2. Sacramento County submitted a Project Plan describing the initiatives to be implemented under the Well-Being Project. These are: Safety Organized Practice (SOP), which is mandatory; the Child Abuse Prevention

Initiative, which provides home visitation and other supportive services to families with children 6 years and older via the Birth and Beyond Family Resource Centers; and the Permanency Initiative which provides Intensive Family Finding and Kinship Support services. Both Probation and Child Welfare are participating.

Education Equals Initiative

Sacramento County Office of Education (SCOE) and CPS partnered on a five-year grant awarded by the Stuart Foundation. The grant (Education Equals Initiative) is aimed at achieving dramatic improvement in educational outcomes for foster youth through engagement, school stability, and academic achievement across the educational continuum—from preschool to college. The overarching goal for this initiative is to help foster youth in California succeed at levels equal to or greater than the general population through mutual accountability and deliberate coordination between child welfare, juvenile court, and the education system. There are three core program elements: education-informed home placements, systematic information gathering and sharing, and customized case management and collaboration. The partnership is currently in the final grant year. SCOE has Intensive Case Managers (ICM) co-located in the North, East and South Central CPS offices.

The grant was designed to target foster youth in the following groups:

- Preschool Program—offer enrollment assistance, kindergarten transition, and link to district special education for evaluation
 - Services provided from January 2014 to December 2015
 - 131 enrollment referrals processed
 - 75 special education referrals processed
 - 112 preschool enrollments
 - 83 received special education related assistance
 - 20 received kindergarten assistance
 - 278 waitlist and District enrollment appointments
- K-12 Program—offers Instructional Case Management (ICM) support to youth who are transitioning from 8th to 9th grade, back into the home, or higher education. The ICM develops an education plan and meets with them to provide support around grades, attendance, behavior, test scores, or any special education services they may be receiving.

Additionally, SCOE provides an Education Progress Summary (EPS). Four weeks prior to the court date, SCOE provides the EPS to the social worker, foster parent, education rights holder, and the child (if age appropriate).

Expectant and Parenting Youth (EPY) Initiative

In 2014 Children's Law Center of Sacramento in collaboration with CPS was selected for the Expectant and Parenting Youth in Foster Care (EPYFC) National Peer Network. Children's Law Center was awarded \$50,000 per year for three years to develop and implement a multi-generational and developmentally informed service for expecting and parenting teens. Other jurisdiction in the network includes New York City.

Sacramento's vision is:

- To create a collaborative approach to serving EPY by both social workers and attorneys
- To decrease incidents of pregnancy for youth in foster care
- To develop trauma informed practices and services
- To increase positive outcomes for EPY and their children

- Sacramento's priority strategies are:
- Improve the Whole Family Foster Care Program
- Circles of Support meeting implemented for EPY
- Create a network of mentoring groups for EPY
- Embed sexual and reproductive health policy into countywide practice
- Ensure priority access to key supportive services for EPY
- Include youth voice in planning and development of programs and policies

Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM)

This is a collaborative effort between Sacramento County CPS, Probation, SCOE, Behavior Health Services (BHS), County Counsel and the Juvenile Court to establish protocols, practices, services and supports to reduce the number of youth involved in the child welfare system who crossover from Child Protective Services to Juvenile Justice in Sacramento County. The partners mentioned above are working with Georgetown University to develop Sacramento County's CYPM.

Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC):

Recent legislation (SB855) established the Commercially Sexually Exploited Children (CSEC) Program, to be administered by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). It also amended Section 300 of the Welfare & Institutions Code (WIC) to clarify that children who are commercially sexually exploited are within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and may become dependents of the court. Participation in the CSEC Program is voluntary; therefore, counties must elect to participate in order to access allocated funds. CSEC Program funds may be used for prevention and intervention activities and services to children who are victims, or at risk of becoming victims, of commercial sexual exploitation. SB855 requires each county electing to receive funds to develop an interagency protocol to be utilized in serving sexually exploited children who have been adjudged to be dependents of the juvenile court. Interagency collaboration is strong in Sacramento and includes a multi-disciplinary team and a CSEC Steering Committee. Additionally, for FY 2015-2016, Sacramento is contracting for training, advocacy and 24/7 field response services.

Foster Parent Recruitment, Retention and Support

Sacramento is participating in the Foster Parent Recruitment, Retention and Support (FPRRS) program and has received a state allocation to implement several strategies aimed at moving youth from congregate care to lower levels of care with emphasis on addressing disproportionality. These strategies include a foster parent recruitment campaign, increasing Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) homes and placements, providing respite care for county foster homes and increasing Wrap Around Services (WRAP) services.

Project SOARS

Sacramento County Office of Education and CPS partnered on a grant funded by First 5 to target youth from infancy to 5 years of age. The grant, Project SOARS (Screening Outreach And Referral Services), provides free and voluntary comprehensive services for children with potential developmental delays and/or disabilities. Family advocates conduct developmental, hearing, and vision screenings in the home and refer families to early intervention or other comprehensive services. Project SOARS collaborates with a variety of agencies to maximize outreach and prioritize services to children and families residing in permanent/transitional housing programs. A pilot program was initiated in November 2015 with the South/Central Informal Supervision Program to provide comprehensive services to non-dependent youth who might need developmental screening and/or referrals to early learning programs. Services provided from November to December 2015 were:

- 3 Ages and Stages Questionnaires
- 9 home visits
- 1 Family Service Plan
- 8 referrals for additional services
- 3 families provided with developmental bags to assist with child's development
- 1 family provided First 5 New Parent Kit

Probation Strategies

Strategy 11: "Improve support provided to relatives and NREFMs"; Outcome Measure C4.3 Placement Stability (At least 24 months in care)

To support parents, relative substitute care providers, and non-related extended family member (NREFM) substitute care providers, Probation developed a Placement Intake Unit in November of 2014. This unit consists of a Supervising Probation Officer, a Senior Deputy Probation Officer and a Deputy Probation Officer. They are responsible for interviewing each probation foster youth for the purpose of identifying additional relative and potential non-related extended family members. The identified persons are contacted by the unit and evaluated for potential placement. Based on the new CFSR Federal Data Measures, Placement Stability under section P5 must now be less than 4.12. From Q2 2014 to Q2 2015, Probations performance was 2.45. Probation will continue to work on lowering this number even more, with the goal of reaching 2.25 during the next year. With the limited number of NREFM and relative placements, the impact of these strategies is hard to assess for outcomes.

Regarding Action Step B, a review of our community resources took place at the November 2012 monthly Unit Meeting. In addition, the resource list was made available to all staff in print form. In August of 2014, Field Officers were trained and allowed to use WRAP services as prevention to removal from the home on cases they were supervising, as an additional support to those families. These officers had the ability to complete WRAP referral exceptions and additional contracts were developed with 2 providers in the community. These contracts were only for non-foster care probationers who were still living in the home with their parents. Use of WRAP continued to increase in the field during 2015.

In November of 2014 Probation started evaluating homes for potential Kinship services. CPS trained Probation in February 2015 in the process of certifying homes to assist those placements in gaining Kinship revenue. CPS has been helpful in providing support for emergency Kinship assessments; however, with the upcoming implementation of resource family approval (RFA) an MOU is no longer necessary as CPS will be taking the lead on Probations approvals.

In Action Step E, in July 2013, Probation developed a questionnaire to send to relatives and NREFMs to determine if these two groups felt supported by the resource guide and WRAP services. Surveys conducted over the past several years revealed little information helpful to Probation. In November 2014, Probation also started conducting twice a year phone surveys of our relative and NREFMs placements.

Strategy 12: "Increase number of youth placed in relative or non-related extended family member (NREFM) homes";

Outcome Measure 4B Least Restrictive Placement

In Action Step A relatives are routinely evaluated based upon criminal history, CPS referral history, current functioning and willingness to participate. In November of 2014, Probation developed a Placement Intake Unit. This unit consists of a Supervising Probation Officer, a Senior Deputy Probation Officer and a Deputy Probation Officer. They are responsible for interviewing each probationer for the purpose of identifying additional relative and potential non-related extended family members. The identified persons are contacted by the unit and for evaluated for potential placement. A Placement Referral form was also developed to record the names of the potential family placements as well as record a history of out of home placements utilized. The development of the Placement Intake unit has seen a reduction in the number of days a youth spends in the Youth Detention Facility pending transition to a group home. The number of youth placed with relative has not increased. The small number of relatives have been informally assessed. With the limited number of NREFM and relative placements, the impact of these strategies is hard to assess for outcomes.

Regarding Action Step B, in earlier SIP updates the development of an MOU with Child Protective Services regarding the relative approval process and the roles of the two agencies was not completed as Child Protective Services did not have the capacity to assist Probation with this function. CPS trained Probation on the home evaluation process and has invited us to Kinship trainings. An MOU with CPS is still seen as the best plan and an MOU is again being pursued with the plan of finalizing it by June of 2016.

In January 2013, the training of staff on the relative approval policy and procedure was reviewed in the Divisional Meeting. The relative approval process was reviewed with staff in the initial meeting in January. The follow up has been further discussions in subsequent Divisional Meetings where relative placement was stressed as a priority where an appropriate relative exists. Supervisors are supporting this effort as they review cases with the officers. This is now the focus of the Placement Intake Unit and is a case procedure.

Action Step E is to track youth placed in relative/NREFM homes via the Safe Measures report. This tracking is being done currently by the Supervising Probation Officer of the Placement Intake Unit who reports the findings to the Chief Deputy.

To support the goal of having the least restrictive placement possible, the Probation Department does Family Finding to the fifth degree. Meaning, Probation contacts five layers of family members to ascertain if there is any appropriate family member with whom to place the child. Typically, few appropriate family members are willing to care for children with the types of behaviors commonly exhibited by children served by the Probation Placement Unit. Prior to recommending an in-state or out-of-state placement and before Probation recommends removal of a child from their home of origin, all available relatives and non-related extended family members are assessed. Probation makes a recommendation to the Court for placement and the Court makes the final decision to remove the child from the home.

Strategy 13: "Accurately enter placement information into CWS/CMS"; Outcome Measure 4B Least Restrictive Placement

In May of 2014, Probation developed a CWS/CMS check sheet for the officers to complete. The sheet is then submitted to clerical staff for entry into the CWS/CMS system. The clerical staff have attended CWS/CMS update training in April of 2014. Placement Supervisors continue to audit the CWS/CMS system data through Safe Measures and have been directed to do so no less than quarterly. The percentage of CWS/CMS entries made by the department has increased dramatically. During the month of October 2015, 85.9% out of home

placements had a face to face contact recorded in the CWS/CMS System. The effect of the increase in entries allows probation to better compare itself to other probation departments in the state. Probation uses its own case management system to monitor monthly face to face contacts, recidivism, and re-entry.

**Strategy 14: “Utilize Family Finding techniques to locate family and placement resources for youth”;
Outcome Measure 4B Least Restrictive Placement**

In Strategy 14, Action Step A was to develop a Family Finding protocol for Probation staff to follow. Family Finding protocols were in place when the PCQR came out in October 2012. Probation Officers in the Juvenile Court and Placement Divisions both do family finding in an attempt to place children with parents or relatives. Both divisions use an online search tool (Lexis Nexis) to assist in identifying family members. The search is completed to the fifth degree of relation to comply with current law.

In Action Step B the use of the Placement Intake Interview was added in November of 2014. All officers were also trained in the Family Finding search tool.

Action Step C is to utilize technology, such as internet search engines and software tracking tools, for Family Finding. The Probation department added Lexis Nexis to our Court and Placement Divisions in April of 2014. During any case staffing by the Juvenile Court Division where removal from home is being considered, the court officers are questioned as to the outcome of family finding search.

As related to Action Step D, an audit of the Family Finding function is still under development at this time.

**Strategy 15: “Continue to be an active participant in the AB 12/212 planning committee”;
Outcome Measure 8A ILP Well Being**

Action Step A, outstation a Probation Officer in a joint unit with CPS, was completed April 2012. This allows for the free exchange of information between staff who are conducting the same business. The Probation Officer attends Assembly Bill 12 and Assembly Bill 212 training and is accessible for questions and feedback to the CPS staff. This will be an ongoing assignment and the Probation Officer will continue to work directly with AB 12 clients to provide services. The department is adding a 4th officer to the AB 12 caseloads. Currently 3 officers supervise 70 cases. Adding this 4th officer will lower the caseload numbers to an average of 17.5 per officer. The additional officer will start in January of 2015.

**Strategy 16: “Utilize Wraparound meetings to provide ILP services that are identified in the ‘Youth Team’ meeting, 90 day Transition Plan, and/or by ILS provider”;
Outcome Measure 8A ILP Well Being**

Strategy 16 Action Steps A-C include meet with Wraparound providers and discuss the priority of providing ILP services within the Wraparound context, develop a plan of action, outline how the services will be discussed and handled within the meeting, and continue to meet on a quarterly basis to track progress and problem solve. WRAP services were added to the Field Division in August of 2014. During any case staffing by the Juvenile Court Division where removal from home is being considered, the use of WRAP is requested prior to recommending removal from home. As a result more youth at imminent risk have been connected to services and are experiencing the support of a WRAP team.

Barriers to Implementation

Child Welfare Services

Sacramento County is still feeling the impact from last year's efforts to stabilize Court Services which has delayed the work for Action Step B of Strategy 1. The Program Specialists who conduct the SDM case reviews were reassigned to Court Services through July 2015. Reviews were expected to resume in September 2015, however, due to a considerable number of promotions and transfers at the management and supervisory level, this was postponed. Case reviews are expected to commence in July 2016 after managers and specialists have had a chance to acclimate to their new roles and responsibilities.

Additional barriers include the lack of a stable work force. As noted above, Sacramento County hired 101 new social workers. Due to the high volume of work, existing social workers in all programs had difficulty carrying out the demands of the workload while new social workers received training and could be assigned cases.

Probation

Strategy 15, Action Steps B, C, and D are for Probation to develop a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that outlines how the relationship with Child Protective Services and service provision will proceed, train staff on this, and implement a related policy and procedure. An MOU has not been developed as coordinating this function has not become a priority. The current verbal agreement is working well. In addition, initiated June 2013, the out-stationed Probation Officer attends AB 12 trainings and updates and briefs the unit, Senior Probation Officers, and Placement Manager in the monthly Division Meeting. Further, the implementation of Policy and Procedure has not taken place due to staffing limitations. It appears the MOU with CPS may not be necessary.

Other Successes/Promising Practices

Child Welfare Services has ongoing collaborative efforts as it relates to the implementation of Safety Organized Practice (SOP). In addition to participating in the CDSS Title IV-E Well Being Waiver Project and attending meetings sponsored by CDSS along with other Waiver Counties and Probation, Child Welfare Services continue to work with the Northern California Training Academy, Casey Family Programs, Sacramento County Counsel and Labor partners. The agency has also conducted a mass hiring event in December 2015 resulting in approximately 40 new social workers who began training in February 2016. They will participate in intensive training for 10-12 weeks before being assigned cases. Sacramento County is predicting this will result in increased retention and provide workload relief to the current workforce.

Furthermore, Child Welfare Services continues to explore other strategies that will likely have a positive impact on Strategy 7, "Modify the reoccurring six month permanency staffing to include reunification as an option for long staying children." A few examples are the implementation of the Permanency Case Review (PCRs), our focus on kinship and kinship support through partner agencies, as well as our Permanency Academy. With PCRs, managers and supervisors, as well as line staff are engaged in a dynamic process of in depth case review for youth by utilizing the Safety Organized Practice (SOP) mapping foundation for youth who have been

in care over two years. The case review process looks for way to enhance permanency efforts, including family finding, second chance reunifications, initiating new supports to move youth to permanent homes or lower levels of care. The effort supports our key value of permanency by changing focus and practice in support of such efforts for all our youth. We are also focusing on our efforts with relative care and support and have contracted with community partners to increase our relative finding, placement and in care supports to increase our relative placements and stability of youth in those relative placements for early cases. Finally, we are moving forward with our Permanency Leadership Academy, starting the effort with our supervisors. This will support further focused attention on permanency efforts during all case stages, as well as identifying clear roles of supervisors in a leadership position and how that impacts the ability to navigate a youth through the journey to permanence.

Probation modified the computer information system in November of 2014. An officer case view report was modified to show the date of last CWS/CMS entry, days in current placement, last parent contact and the age of the probationer. These changes allow the officer and their supervisor to quickly see potential problems with supervised cases and ensure the best outcome for the case. During the last year the department has continued to see our in state out of home placement numbers drop. In October of 2014 there were 138 cases, in October of 2015 the number was reduced to 114 (an 18% reduction). We have continued to see this number drop in the months following October. The addition of WRAP by the field division is seen a potential reason these numbers have continued to drop.

Other Outcome Measures Not Meeting State/National Standards

The UCB Q3, 2015 data shows Sacramento County CWS is not meeting the National Standard in Outcome Measure S2 Recurrence of Maltreatment, nor is it meeting the State compliance standard in Outcome Measures 2B Timely Response (10-Day Response Compliance), and 2F Monthly Visits (Out of Home).

S2 Recurrence of Maltreatment

Federal outcome measures have changed with the implementation of Round 3 of the Federal Child and Family Services Review. When the 2012-2017 SIP was developed outcome measure S1.1 No Recurrence of Maltreatment, which compared the total number of children who were victims of a substantiated maltreatment allegation during a 6-month period with the number of children who were not victims of another substantiated maltreatment allegation within the next 6 months, was in effect. The current analogous measure is S2. It compares total number of children who were victims of a substantiated maltreatment allegation during a 12-month period with the number of children who had another substantiated allegation within 12 months. The national standard for this measure is $\leq 9.1\%$. Based on information available from UC Berkeley, the county's performance for measure S2 for the baseline period identified in the SIP (Q3 2012) is 9.5%. The outcome measure during the SIP Update 2013 time frame was 10.2% and for 2014 it was 13.9%. The current performance for this measure is 12.1%. Sacramento County has consistently not met the national standard for this measure. However, the County is working on addressing this area through a CQI-PDSA.

2B Timely Response (10-Day Response Compliance)

The compliance standard for timely response for 10-day referrals is 90%. Sacramento County was at 88.8% for this reporting period. During previous reporting periods Sacramento County has consistently exceeded the compliance standard. CPS recently completed a mass hiring event which resulted in 37 social worker positions being filled, 13 of which are assigned to the Emergency Response Division. It is anticipated this addition to the workforce will enhance our ability to meet or exceed this compliance standard.

2F Monthly Visits (Out of Home)

The compliance rate for the current reporting period is 91.8% which falls below the new state standard of 95%. In the past, Sacramento County has consistently been above 90%, the previous state standard. This may be attributed to data entry lag in cases. However, staff in the Permanency Division is currently working on streamlining the data entry process as well as developing a documentation template for workers to use to improve our overall performance in this area.

Probation

Other Outcome Measures Not Meeting State/National Standards

The UCB Q3, 2015 data shows Sacramento County Probation is not meeting the National Standard in Outcome Measure P1 Permanency in 12 months (entering foster care), P2 Permanency in 12 months (in care 12-23 months), P3 Permanency in 12 months (in care 24 months or more), P4 Reentry into foster care in 12 months and 2F Monthly Visits out of home.

Permanency

P1, permanency in 12 months, the national standard is greater than 40.5%; Probations performance during Q3 2015 was 19.4%. P2, permanency in 12 months (in care 12-23 months), the national standard is greater than 43.6%, Probations performance during Q3 2015 was 31.8%. P3, permanency in 12 months (in care 24 months or more), the national standard is greater than 30.3%, Probations performance during Q3 2015 was 15.2%. Probation implemented a monthly report to show days in current placement, to assist in monitoring permanency. This report is reviewed each month between the officer and their supervisor.

P4 – Re-entry into Foster Care in 12 Months

Relative to P4, re-entry in Foster Care in 12 months, the national standard is less than 8.3%; Probations performance during Q3 2015 was 23.8%. As a result, this measure has been selected for a full analysis in the upcoming CSA.

2F – Monthly Visits - out of home

Relative to 2F, Monthly visits out of home, the national standard is greater than 95%, Probations performance during Q3 2015 was 83.1%. Probation modified the computer information system in November of 2014. An officer case view report was modified to show the date of last CWS entry, days in current placement, last parent contact and the age of the probationer. These changes allow the officer and their supervisor to quickly see potential problems with supervised cases and ensure the best outcome for the case.

SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PLAN CHART

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: C1.1 Timely Reunification (exit cohort) – Child Welfare (changed to P1 Permanency in 12 months (entry cohort))

National Standard: 75.2% (exit cohort) New measure 40.5% (entry cohort)

Initial Performance: 63.5% (10/1/10-9/30/11 UCB) New measure 46% (entry cohort)

Current Performance: From 10/01/13 to 09/30/14, of those children who entered foster care, Sacramento discharged 48.3% to permanency within 12 month of entering foster care. (Q3, 2015 UCB)

Target Improvement Goal: The county has improved from the baseline performance by 5.1%. The county plans to continue enhancing performance on this permanency measure to supersede the national standard of 40.5%. ~~Improve timely reunification as measured by C1.1 to 75.2% by June 2017.~~

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: C1.4 Reentry – Child Welfare (changed to P4 Reentry (entry cohort))

National Standard: 9.9% New measure 8.3% (entry cohort)

Initial Performance: 13.7% (from 01/01/11-12/31/11 UCB). New measure 14.2% (entry cohort)

Current Performance: 19.7% of Sacramento children reentered foster care 12 months (from 10/01/12 to 9/30/13 – Q3, 2015 UCB).

Target Improvement Goal: Decrease reentry rates by another 3% in the next reporting period as an effort to reach the National Standard and beyond.

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: C3.3 In Care 3 Years or Longer (Emancipated/Age 18)– Child Welfare (although no direct comparable measure, changed to P3 Permanency in 12 months (in care 24 months or more – entry cohort))

National Standard: 37.5%. New measure is greater than or equal to 30.3% (entry cohort)

Initial Performance: 64.7% (10/1/10-9/30/11 UCB) New measure 22.2% (entry cohort)

Current Performance: In Sacramento County 22.2% (from 10/01/14 to 09/30/15 – Q3, 2015 UCB) of those children had been in care 2 years or more.

Target Improvement Goal: Increase permanency by another 3% in the next reporting period as an effort to reach the National Standard and beyond.

SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PLAN CHART (Cont'd)

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: C4.3 Placement Stability Outcome: Placement Stability (At Least 24 Months In Care)--**Probation**

National Standard: 4.12

Initial Performance: 13.8% of youth placed in foster care for at least 24 months had less than 2 placements, UCB July 2012 to June 2013.

Current Performance: 2.45 New measure P5 Placement Stability

Target Improvement Goal: The goal is to be below the national standard.

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: C4 Placement Stability – Child Welfare (changed P5 Placement Stability)

National Standard: 4.12

Initial Performance: 5.13, (Q4, 2012 UCB) New measure P5 Placement Stability (entry cohort)

Current Performance: 4.81, (Q3, 2015 UCB) New measure P5 Placement Stability (entry cohort)

Target Improvement Goal: The county has improved from the baseline performance. The county's goal is to continue increasing above the national standard as indicated by the current performance.

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: 4B Least Restrictive Placement—**Probation**

National Standard: N/A

Initial Performance: 66% of youth are placed in the most restrictive placement of Group Homes. (FFA 2.5%, REL 3.4%, FH.0%, for a total of 5.9% based on UCB 2011 Q1 data.

Current Performance: 1 youth was placed in the least restrictive placement of with a Relative (0.7%), 150 were placed in the most restrictive placement of a Group Home (99.33%).

Target Improvement Goal: Use the above Initial Performance as a baseline and increase the number of children placed in these three programs by 2% annually.

SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PLAN CHART (Cont'd)

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: 8A ILP Well Being--Probation

National Standard: N/A

Initial Performance: 87.5% UCB July 2012 to June 2013.

Current Performance: 100% - October 2014 to October 2015

Target Improvement Goal: Continue to maintain a 100% status.

Strategy 1: Improve to 85% of FR program cases that have timely SDM Risk Reassessments and Family Strengths and Needs Reassessments Assessments. The May 2012 baseline is 13.4% for FSNA and 18.7% for Risk Reassessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): C1.1 Timely Reunification New CFSP Measure P1 Permanency in 12 Months C1.4 Reentry P4 Reentry to Foster Care in 12 Months
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Include this standard in the Data Integrity and Accountability Plan. Data Integrity and Accountability Plan is in development. (May require meet and confer with labor.) Train ER and Dependency social workers to ensure that staff across the division is aware of their role in completing timely SDM given the new change as measured by monthly Safe Measures data reports.	June 2013 – May 2017 and on-going October 2014 and ongoing	Division Managers
B. Conduct SDM case reviews in the Dependency program to ensure accountability and determine if there are contributing factors that can be ameliorated through practice or service improvement.	On-going	Division Managers and QA Manager

Strategy 2: Fully implement Signs of Safety and engagement practices	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): C1.1 Timely Reunification P1 Permanency in 12 Months C1.4 Reentry P4 Reentry to Foster Care in 12 Months
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Provide ongoing training for direct service, supervisory, and management staff on Signs of Safety.	December 2013 June 2013 Update: On-target and ongoing.	Division Managers
B. Train ER investigators and Dependency social workers to ensure that parties in a safety network or aftercare plan know their role as measured by the ER Elements of Investigation Review or Dependency SDM review the in-development Dependency Practice Elements Review tool. Audit Tool. Elements of Dependency.	January 2013 – June 2013 Update: Completed and ongoing	ER Division Managers
C. Analyze reentry cases to determine if there are contributing factors that can be ameliorated through practice or service improvements.	January 2015 October 2015	QA Program Manager
D. Implement service or programs enhancements subsequent to analysis of reentry cases.	May 2016	Deputy Director
E. Survey direct service staff Supervisors to determine how many of their staff routinely use Signs of Safety tools. Use the results as a baseline for improvement.	June 2013 June 2013 Update: Preliminary survey completed. Ongoing work is occurring with SOS SOP Model Fidelity Workgroup.	ER Division Manager QA Program Manager

Strategy 3: Increase the percentage of case plan objectives that are behaviorally based by 20 percentage points over the baseline.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): C1.1 Timely Reunification P1 Permanency in 12 Months C1.4 Reentry- P4 Reentry to Foster Care in 12 Months
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Train dependency and IS staff on case plan policy/process/procedure and creation of behavioral objectives.	September 2014 July 2015	Program Specialists
B. Conduct a Case Plan quality assurance review to establish a baseline.	June 2016 [resource dependent]	QA Unit Program Manager
C. Conduct a Case Plan quality assurance review monthly.	July 2016 [resource dependent]	QA Unit Program Manager
D. Monitor staff performance and support staff improvement when needed, using the approaches in the Data Integrity and Accountability Plan.	September 2016	Supervisors

Strategy 4: Engage the parents/family in reunification services more often within 10-15 days of the dependency worker's assignment to the case. Detention Hearing. 60% of the parents who have a Detention Hearing held regarding their children will have a social worker engage the parent/family within 15 days of the Detention Hearing in the preferred location. Baseline data derived from the Elements of Dependency showed 20% compliance, while a hand count of logs showed 38% compliance	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): C1.1 Timely Reunification P1 Permanency in 12 Months C1.4 Reentry P4 Reentry to Foster Care in 12 Months
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Determine the current baseline.	June 2012 June 2013 Update: Completed	QA Unit Program Manager-Dependency Division Managers
B. Set a standard.	August 2012 June 2013 Update: Completed	Division Managers
C. Conduct a routine quality assurance review.	August 2012 June 2013 Update: Change to August 2013 June 2014 Update: Completed and on-going.	QA Unit Program Manager

Strategy 5: Hold a reunification/exit TDM within 14 calendar days of SDM reassessment when the reassessment shows that prior to reunification occurring, is indicated.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): C1.4 Reentry P4 Reentry to Foster Care in 12 Months
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A Create a monitoring mechanism and set a baseline. Define "Reunification/Exit TDM" for the Permanency Program and for the Emergency Response and Informal Supervision Programs.	January 2013 June 2013 Update: Change to January 2014 July 2014 December 2015	Quality Assurance Program Manager and Division Managers
B Create a monitoring mechanism and improvement standards. Set two baselines: one for the Permanency Program, one for the Emergency Response/Informal Supervision Program.	March 2013 June 2013 Update: Change to March 2014 August 2014 December 2015 Update: Completed	Quality Assurance Program Manager and Deputy Director and Division Managers
C Review the effect and practice of exits TDMs. Make modifications as needed. Conduct a review of the Emergency Response/Informal Supervision Programs Protective Emergency Placement Services (PEPS) practice.	September 2013 September 2014 Update: Completed	Deputy Director and Division Managers Quality Assurance Program Manager and Division Managers
D Monitor staff performance and support improvement if needed. Add Create a monitoring mechanism and improvement standards.	September 2013 September 2014 December 2015 Update: Completed and On-going	Supervisors Quality Assurance Program Manager and Division Managers

E Monitor staff performance and support improvement if needed.	September 2013	Supervisors
	September 2014	
F Add: Review the effect and practice of Reunification/Exit TDMs. Make modifications as needed.	On-going	Division Managers

Strategy 6: Require social workers to develop an aftercare plan for each family reunifying who has successfully reunified and is exiting the system.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): C1.4 Reentry- P4 Reentry to Foster Care in 12 Months
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A Develop policy/process/procedure requiring an aftercare plan.	June 2013 June 2013 Update: Change to September 2013 July 2014 October 2015	QA Program Manager
B Set improvement targets for B above. Establish a baseline.	July 2016 June 2013 Update: Change to March 2014 July 2014 December 2015-2016	Deputy Director and Division Managers
C Review the effect and practice of family meetings and make modifications, if necessary.	December 2016 June 2013 Update: omit	Deputy Director and Division Managers
D Create improvement standards (Monitor staff performance and support staff improvement when needed)	October 2016 June 2013 Update: Change to July 2014 Ongoing	Supervisors

Strategy 7: Modify the reoccurring six month permanency staffing to include reunification as an option for long staying children.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): C3.3 Permanency for Long Stayers P3 Permanency in 12 months (in care 24 months or more)
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A Implement the revised staffing model.	June 2013 Update: Completed	Adoption and Dependency Program Managers
B Review the effects and practice of the revised staffing model. Make modifications if necessary.	January 2014 February 2015 Update: Completed	Adoption and Dependency Program Managers

Strategy 8: January 2015, in 90% of the cases, will reflect that relatives are documented in CWS/CMS. as reported in the emergency response quality assurance review. The review of December 2011 cases showed the baseline to be 54%. Baseline data derived from the Elements of Investigation review showed 54% for Emergency Response. Baseline data for Dependency will be identified via the in-development Dependency Practice Review tool. Baseline data derived from the Elements of Dependency showed 64% for Dependency cases.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): C3.3 Permanency for Long Stayers P3 Permanency in 12 months (in care 24 months or more)
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A Train staff when to list relatives as collaterals vs. clients in CWS/CMS	October 2012 June 2013 Update: Completed	ER and Dependency Division Managers
B Add documentation of relatives as collaterals to the Elements of Investigation QA monthly review and to the Dependency Case Review, which is in development.	January 2013 June 2013 Update: Change to July 2013 for Elements of Investigation review Change to September 2013 for Dependency Case Review Audit Tool April 2014 Update: Completed	ER and Dependency Division Managers
C Monitor staff performance and support staff improvement when needed as reflected by outcome data from reviews.	March 2013 June 2013 Update: Additional strategies will may be planned April 2014 Update: Completed and on-going	ER and Dependency Division Managers

Strategy 9: June 2015, 60% of children experiencing a possible placement change will have a TDM within a specified timeframe, or an approved waiver on file. The baseline as reported on page 11 is 17%. June 2013 Update: Omit Strategy 9	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): C4 Placement Stability
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A Specify timeframe for TDM	December 2012 June 2013 Update: Omit	Executive Management Team
B Develop a pilot program training at least 3 dependency unit supervisors to create data reports to monitor TDM use.	August 2012 June 2013 Update: Omit	Dependency Program Managers and QA Program Manager
C Review the effect and process of the monitoring report on increasing TDM compliance. Make modification if necessary.	December 2012 June 2013 Update: Omit	Dependency Program Managers and QA Program Manager
D Train all dependency unit supervisors to create the TDM monitoring report.	January 2013 June 2013 Update: Omit	QA Program Manager
E Monitor supervisor performance and support improvement when needed.	February 2013-June 2013 Update: Omit	Dependency Program Managers

Strategy 10: December 2015, 60% of non-relative placements will be made by the CPSU.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): G4 Placement Stability P5 Placement Stability
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A Create a monitoring system.	December 2012 June 2013 Update: On target April 2014 Update: On target	QA Program Manager
B Increase CPSU staffing to meet demand.	June 2015	All Program Managers

Strategy 11: (Probation) Improve support provided to relative and NREFM.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): C4.3: Placement Stability Outcome: Placement Stability (At Least 24 Months In Care)
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Identify community resources available for relatives like Family Resource Centers, etc.	Initially by October 2012 and ongoing thereafter. June 2013 Update: Completed on target and ongoing	Placement Supervisor
B. Train PO staff to the availability of resources.	November 2012 In unit meetings on a monthly basis June 2013 Update: Completed on-target and ongoing.	Placement Supervisor
C. Develop resource list for relatives and distribute to all relatives via the probation officer monthly contact.	January 2013 June 2013 Update: Completed on-target and ongoing	Placement Supervisor
D. Link all relative placements with SB163 wraparound program.	January 2013 June 2013 update: Completed on-target and ongoing.	Placement Supervisor
E. Develop an evaluation process to measure if relatives feel supported, and implement this on a yearly basis.	Twice a year survey	Placement Supervisor
F. Update policies and procedures based on the evaluation information.	August 2013 and ongoing	Placement Supervisor

Strategy 12: (Probation) Increase number of youth placed in relative or non-related extended family member (NREFM) homes.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 4B Least Restrictive Placement
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Develop a written Relative Approval policy and procedure.	By September 2012 June 2013 Update: Relatives are routinely evaluated based upon their criminal history, CPS referral history, current functioning and willingness to participate. November 2014: Addition of Placement Intake Unit	Placement Supervisor
B. Develop and MOU with DHHS regarding the Relative Approval policy and the roles of the two agencies.	By November 2012 June 2013 Update: Omit	Placement Supervisor
C. Train staff on the policy and procedures regarding the relative approval process.	By January 2013 June 2013 Update: Completed on-target November 2014: Kinship evaluation	Placement Supervisor
D. Develop an audit process to ensure that the policy is being followed and conduct the audit on a quarterly basis.	Quarterly commencing in July 2014	Chief Deputy
E. Track youth placed in relative/NREFM homes via Safe Measures Report.	February 2013 on a monthly basis through 2017. June 2013 Update: Completed on-target and ongoing	Placement Supervisor

F. Continue to communicate or meet as needed to track progress and problem solve issues.	Ongoing through 2017 June 2013 Update: On-target and ongoing.	Chief Deputy
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

Strategy 13: (Probation) Accurately enter placement information into CWS/CMS.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 4B Least Restrictive Placement
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Identify CWS/CMS training.	March/April 2012 – 2017 April 2014 update: Completed on-target and ongoing.	Placement Supervisor
B. Train identified Clerical staff to enter data into CWS/CMS.	March/April 2012 – 2017 June 2013 update: Completed on target.	Chief Deputy Placement Supervisor
C. Develop audit process utilizing Safe Measures to ensure that the protocol is being followed.	April 2012 – On-2017 June 2013 update: Ongoing.	Placement Supervisor

Strategy 14: (Probation) Utilize Family Finding techniques to locate family and placement resources for youth.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 4B Least Restrictive Placement
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Develop Family Finding Protocols for probation placement staff including search and tracking procedures.	October 2012 June 2013 update: Completed on-target.	Placement Supervisor
B. Train all placement staff in Family Finding techniques.	Initially by November – December 2012 and then on an as needed basis thereafter, through 2017. June 2013 update: Completed on-target and ongoing.	Placement Supervisor
C. Utilize technology for Family Finding such as internet search engines and software tracking tools.	January/February 2013 – 2017 Lexis Nexis training April 2014 – Update training scheduled for later in 2015	Placement Supervisors
D. Develop a quarterly audit process to ensure that the protocol is being followed – Safe Measures.	Ongoing quarterly through 2017	Placement Supervisor

Strategy 15: (Probation) Continue to be an active participant in the AB 12/212 planning committee.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 8A ILP Well Being
	<input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP	
	<input type="checkbox"/> PSSF	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Outstation Probation officer in a joint unit with CPS to partner with AB12/212 youth.	April 2012 June 2013 update: Completed on-target.	Placement Supervisor
B. Develop a Plan of Action (MOU) that outlines how relationship and service provision will proceed.	April 2013 July 2014 update: The vacant SPO position has been filled and the current plan of action will continue	Placement Supervisor
C. Train staff on the plan of action and policies and procedures.	June 2013	Placement Supervisor
D. Implement policies and procedures.	July 2013 July 2016	Placement Supervisor
E. Meet quarterly to monitor progress and problem solve issues.	September 2013 and quarterly ongoing through 2017.	Placement Supervisor
F. Participate in cross regional groups to participate in practice sharing.	September 2013 and quarterly ongoing through 2017.	Placement Supervisor
G. Update policies and procedures on a yearly basis to provide the best support for youth.	July 2014 and yearly ongoing through 2017.	Placement Supervisor
H. Provide yearly training and technical assistance to staff regarding new information obtained.	August 2014 and ongoing through 2017.	Placement Supervisor

Strategy 16: (Probation) Utilize wraparound meetings to provide ILP services that are identified in the "Youth-Team" meeting, 90- day Transition Plan and/or by ILS Provider.	<input type="checkbox"/> CAPIT <input type="checkbox"/> CBCAP <input type="checkbox"/> PSSF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Applicable Outcome Measure(s) and/or Systemic Factor(s): 8A ILP Well Being
Action Steps:	Timeframe:	Person Responsible:
A. Meet with Wraparound Provider and discuss priority of providing ILP services within the wrap context.	April 2012 November 2013	Placement Supervisor AB 12 Officer
B. Develop a Plan of Action and outline how the services will be discussed and handled within the wrap meeting.	June 2012 June 2013 update: Completed on target. November 2013 – On going	Placement Supervisor AB 12 Officer
C. Continue to meet on a quarterly basis to track progress and problem solve issues.	October 2012– 2017 June 2013 update: Completed on target and ongoing. November 2013	Placement Supervisor AB 12 Officer
D. Continuously update policies and procedures to provide the best support for youth.	January 2013— 2017 June 2013 update: Completed on target and ongoing. November 2013 Policies and procedures will be developed once the supervisor vacancy is filled. The Supervisor position has been filled and the new Supervisor will attend the next Cross Systems Meeting. Policy development will begin after the meeting on Feb. 11, 2014. Updated information will be shared with the Placement Division at the monthly Placement meetings.	Placement Supervisor

<p>E. Collect and review Wrap Plans to ensure ILP is being discussed and provided.</p>	<p>January 2013—2017 June 2013 update: Completed on target and ongoing. November 2013 This process will be initiated once the supervisor vacancy is filled. The new Supervising Probation Officer (SPO) will inform the two other SPO's on ILP issues and reviews.</p>	<p>AB12 Officer</p>
<p>F. Provide ongoing training and technical assistance to staff regarding information obtained in the monitoring of the Wrap program.</p>	<p>January 2013 – 2017 June 2013 update: Completed on target and ongoing. November 2013 Training up dates and TA will be given after the supervisor vacancy is filled. The new SPO will provide this assistance to the two other SPO's as the new information becomes available.</p>	<p>AB 12 Officer</p>