

STATE OF NEVADA
Department of Health and Human Services
Division of Child and Family Services



Quality Improvement Case Reviews
State of Nevada
Statewide Report

SFY 2014

Amber Howell, Administrator
Division of Child and Family Services
4126 Technology Way 3rd Floor
Carson City, NV 89706
775-684-4400

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	5
Methodology	5
Child Welfare Outcomes	6
Overall Performance	8
Item 1: timeliness of investigations	9
Item 3: services to prevent removal	11
Item 4: assessing risk and safety	12
Item 7: permanency goal	13
Item 10: OPPLA	14
Item 17: needs and services of child, parent and foster parents	15
Item 18: family involvement in case planning	18
Item 19: caseworker visits with child	19
Item 20: caseworker visits with parents	20
Summary	21
Recommendations	22

Executive Summary

As a part of an initiative for continuous quality improvement (CQI) the State of Nevada conducts case reviews of every child welfare agency in the state every year. These case reviews mimic the 2009 Child and Family Services Review (CFSR). Clark County Department of Family Services (CCDFS) is reviewed twice annually. This report is a summative analysis of all reviews completed statewide in 2014.

In collaboration with Clark County Department of Family Services (CCDFS), Washoe County Department Social Services (WCDSS) and the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) the Quality Assurance/Improvement Team of the Family Programs Office (FPO) completed reviews of 62 cases in 2014; 42 out of home cases and 20 in-home cases.

Case reviews for each agency were held once per year, with exception of CCDFS which was reviewed twice due to relative case population size. Cases are selected from a stratified sample of all eligible cases for a given Period Under Review (PUR). Cases previously reviewed are excluded from future samples for the following two (2) years.

Methodology

The review is designed to be both a quantitative and qualitative review of casework performed by child welfare agencies in Nevada. The specific items reviewed were in accordance with the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) agreement made between Administration on Children and Families (ACF) and the State of Nevada. Nevada successfully completed all required PIP items in February 2013. Nevada continues to conduct case reviews as part of a CQI process to ultimately improve outcomes for the children and families of Nevada.

Each review encompasses a review period of one year prior to the date of the review wherein the reviewers evaluate the previous year's practice as performed by the child welfare agency and system.

The following 9 items were reviewed but may not have been applicable in every case:

- **Item 1:** Timeliness of Investigations
- **Item 3:** Services to Prevent Removal/Re-entry
- **Item 4:** Risk and Safety Assessment
- **Item 7:** Permanency Goal
- **Item 10:** OPPLA
- **Item 17:** Needs and Services to Children, Parents and Foster Parents
- **Item 18:** Child and Family Involvement in Case-planning.
- **Item 19:** Caseworker Visits with Children
- **Item 20:** Caseworker Visits with Parents.

Review Teams

The review teams are comprised of quality assurance staff from within the Family Programs Office (FPO) and staff from the child welfare agency being reviewed. All team members were specifically trained in the case review methodology and processes prior to completing the case review.

Results

The following data table is a compilation of all Quality Improvement Case Reviews (QICR) conducted throughout Nevada in 2014. The reviews require a complete case read, Unified Nevada Information Technology for Youth (UNITY) review, interview of caseworker and, when available, other stake holders relevant to the case such as: Parents, Foster Parents, Children, Independent Living (IL) workers, Child Protective Services (CPS) Investigators and Supervisors.

Based upon the rating criteria set by ACF all items are rated as either “Strength”, “Area Needing Improvement (ANI)” or “Not Applicable (NA)” partial scores are not allowed.

The data table below is a comparison of the statewide aggregate data from the CFSR in 2009 and the QICR reviews. The percent listed is the percent of applicable cases that indicated an area of strength for the applicable item reviewed.

State-wide QICR Comparison					
Item	CFSR 2009	QICR 2011	QICR 2012	QICR 2013	QICR 2014
Item 1: Timeliness of Investigations	86.0%	76.19%	78.57%	62.50%	77.8%
Item 3: Services to Prevent Removal/Re-entry	78.0%	70.45%	86.36%	91.89%	91.4%
Item 4: Risk and Safety Assessment	55.0%	48.39%	67.74%	74.19%	74.2%
Item 7: Permanency Goal	62.5 %	57.14%	61.90%	66.67%	71.4%
Item 10: OPPLA	43.0%	50.00%	50.00%	66.67%	43.8%
Item 17: Services to Children, Parents and Foster Parents	37.0%	41.94%	51.61%	62.90%	59.7%
Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Planning	44.0%	44.07%	61.29%	56.67%	59.0%
Item 19: Caseworker Visits with Children	55.0%	56.45%	75.81%	80.65%	83.9%
Item 20: Caseworker Visits with Parents.	44.0%	45.28%	50.94%	56.86%	54.0%

Introduction

Annual Quality Assurance Case Reviews (QICR) are conducted with each Nevada child welfare agency to determine the quality of services provided to children and families. The 2014 statewide annual review consisted of a total of 62 cases representing a selection of in-home and out-of-home cases. This report is an interpretation of data collected from all QICR reviews completed in 2014 in Nevada. For the sake of clarity, throughout the remainder of this report, the Division of Child and Family Services, “Rural Counties” will be referred to as “Carson”.

In 2014 FPO completed the following QICR reviews:

Washoe County (WCDSS): August 2014

Clark County (CCDFS): April and November 2014

Rural Counties (Carson): February 2014

In total FPO reviewed 62 child welfare cases in 2014; 42- out of home cases and 20 in-home cases. The case sample is a stratified pull of all eligible cases for a given period under review (PUR). Cases previously reviewed are excluded from future samples for 2 years. DCFS Rural Region and Washoe County DSS each have 14 cases represented in the sample. Clark County DFS, due to its larger child welfare population relative to the total statewide child welfare population, has 34 cases represented in the sample.

Methodology

Case Review Sample

The DCFS Family Programs Office (FPO) runs a data extract that includes an in-home sample, stratified out-of-home sample, and an additional over sample of cases that are potentially eligible for child welfare case reviews. The out-of-home sample and over samples mimic the categorical stratification methodology of the Federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR). This categorical stratification ensures an adequate representation of cases in the key program areas in out-of-home care such as adoption and independent living. The final samples are randomized to ensure unbiased representation of the number of cases required for the reviews of each child welfare agency.

The Quality Improvement On-Site Case Review Process Policy defines an in-home case as any “opened for services following a determination of investigation finding (i.e. substantiated or unsubstantiated case), whether formal (court ordered custody) or informal, where no child in the family was in an out-of-home placement for 24 hours or more during the period

under review”. An out-of-home placement may be a shelter or foster home, and the target child has been in out-of-home care for 24 hours or longer during the period under review. All cases reviewed must have been open for 60 days during the PUR.

The 2014 review was performed on nine child welfare indicators pertaining to children’s child welfare outcomes in the domains of Safety, Permanency and Well-being. These CFSR items are the result of an agreement and PIP with ACF.

The following CFSR items were under review in 2014:

CFSR Items Under Review	
Safety Items	
Item 1	Timeliness of investigations of reports of child maltreatment
Item 3	Services to family to protect the child in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care
Item 4	Risk assessment and safety management
Permanency Items	
Item 7	Permanency Goal
Item 10	OPPLA
Well Being Items	
Item 17	Needs and services of child, parents and foster parents
Item 18	Child and family involvement in case planning
Item 19	Caseworker visits with child
Item 20	Caseworker visits with parents

Review Ratings

The Qualitative Case Review Instrument provides Case Reviewers a series of questions for each of the performance indicators categorized under the three outcome ratings in the areas of Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being. Each performance indicator (item) is rated as a “strength,” an “area needing improvement,” (ANI) or “not applicable” (NA). Each performance indicator is then divided into unique items, which are designed to assess areas of practice related to each of the performance indicators.

Reviewers are provided with specific “yes/no” sub- questions unique to each item. These questions are identical to the evaluation questions used to score the same items in the CFSR. These answers are then inputted into the Quality Case Review Tool which uses conditional statements to calculate the overall score for each item. The Quality Case Review Tool includes a logic which directs reviewers to the appropriate final scoring of the item based upon the answers to each item’s sub-questions.

Case Review Teams

The review teams were made of Program Specialists from the Family Programs Office with DCFS and local agency employees.

Overall Performance

The results are a combination of all out of home and home- based cases reviewed in 2014 in Nevada. The following table illustrates the combined results of all 2014 reviews.

[this section intentionally blank]

2014 Statewide Performance Item Rating

Performance Item			Out of Home			In Home			All Cases (Combined)		
			S	ANI	NA	S	ANI	NA	S	ANI	NA
SAFETY	ITEM 1	Timeliness of investigations of reports of child maltreatment	80.0%	20.0%	--	71.4%	28.6%	--	77.8%	22.2%	--
	(n)*		16	4	22	5	2	13	21	6	35
	ITEM 3	Services to family to protect child in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	86.7%	13.3%	--	95.0%	5.0%	--	91.4%	8.6%	--
	(n)		13	2	27	19	1	0	32	3	27
	ITEM 4	Risk assessment and Safety management	73.8%	26.2%	--	75.0%	25.0%	--	74.2%	25.8%	--
(n)		31	11	0	15	5	0	46	16	0	
PERMANENCY	ITEM 7	Permanency Goal	71.4%	28.6%	--	na	na	--	71.4%	28.6%	--
	(n)		30	12	0	0	0	10	30	12	20
	ITEM 10	OPPLA	43.8%	56.3%	--	na	na	--	43.8%	56.3%	--
	(n)		7	9	26	0	0	10	7	9	46
WELL-BEING	ITEM 17	Needs and services of child, parents and foster parents	57.1%	42.9%	--	65.0%	35.0%	--	59.7%	40.3%	--
	(n)		24	18	0	13	7	0	37	25	0
	ITEM 18	Child and family involvement in case planning	56.1%	43.9%	--	65.0%	35.0%	--	59.0%	41.0%	--
	(n)		23	18	1	13	7	0	36	25	1
	ITEM 19	Caseworker visits with child	90.5%	9.5%	--	70.0%	30.0%	--	83.9%	16.1%	--
	(n)		38	4	0	14	6	0	52	10	0
	ITEM 20	Caseworker visits with parents	43.3%	56.7%	--	70.0%	30.0%	--	54.0%	46.0%	--
(n)		13	17	12	14	6	0	27	23	12	

*Performance Item Ratings: **S** = Strength; **ANI** = Area Needing Improvement; **NA** = Not Applicable **N**= total number of applicable cases per item reviewed.

Safety Item 1

Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment

When a referral is received by an intake worker alleging possible child maltreatment, a supervisor reviews the information and makes a determination of whether the referral will become a report and what type of response the report merits. If the referral becomes a report, it is assigned to a CPS caseworker for investigation. Statewide Intake and Response Time Policy 0506 outlines the expected response time for the type of child maltreatment allegation. The timeline begins with the assignment of the referral to an intake worker. The following are child welfare agency response times that are outlined in Intake Policy/table 0506.5.1:

- **Priority 1:** within 3 hours when the identified danger is urgent or of emergency status; there is present danger; and safety factors are identified. This response type requires a face-to-face contact by CPS.
- **Priority 1R:** within 6 hours when the identified danger is urgent or of emergency status; there is present danger; and safety factors are identified. This response type requires a face-to-face contact by CPS. A priority of 1R accommodates for the physical between DCFS offices in the rural counties.
- **Priority 2:** within 24 hours when the victim is under the age of 5 with any maltreatment of impending danger; safety factors identified including child fatality. This response type requires a face-to-face contact by CPS or may involve collateral contact by telephone or case review.
- **Priority 3:** within 72 hours when maltreatment is indicated, but no safety factors are identified. This response type requires a face-to-face contact by CPS or may involve collateral contact by telephone or case review. In situations where the initial contact is via telephone call, the agency must make a face to face contact with the alleged child victim within 24 hours following the telephone contact.

Referrals that do not rise to the level of an investigation may be referred to a Differential Response Program. Such programs have required response timelines in accordance with a Priority Code 3, or 72 hours.

Safety Item 1 evaluates if the agency initiated the investigation and made face to face contact with all children listed in the maltreatment report in accordance with agency policy and statute. In order for Item 1 to be rated as “Strength” the agency must have met both requirements for every alleged child victim listed on every child maltreatment report received during the PUR.

Additionally, if a maltreatment report is screened out and it is the reviewers’ professional judgment that the report warranted investigation, the item may be rated as “Area Needing Improvement (ANI)”.

Results:

<i>Item 1</i>	Carson	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
STRENGTH	2	14	5	21	77.8
ANI	4	1	1	6	22.2
TOTAL APPLICABLE	6	15	6	27	
NA	8	19	8	35	
TOTAL CASES	14	34	14	62	
% STRENGTH (by site)	33.3	93.3	83.3		

Cases are not applicable for review of this item when there are no reports of maltreatment received during the period under review. Cases are not applicable for review if the report was received prior to the PUR, even if the investigation was on-going or initiated during the PUR. In total 27 cases were applicable for review reviewed and 35 cases were not applicable for review of item 1.

Safety Item 3

Services to family to protect child in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care

Safety Item 3 evaluates if services to prevent entry into foster care were provided prior to removal or prior to returning the child to the care of their parents (trial home placements are considered returned to parents' care for this item). The review takes into consideration particularly egregious situations. In some circumstances it is reasonable to assume that preventative services may not be provided in order to ensure immediate safety of the children. For example: in cases of serious physical abuse where the children require immediate medical attention it is reasonable to assume that rather than providing services to prevent removal, the agency would take custody of the children to ensure emergency medical treatment and to protect the children from further harm.

Results

<i>Item 3</i>	Carson	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
STRENGTH	8	16	8	32	91.4
ANI	2	1	0	3	8.6
TOTAL APPLICABLE	10	17	8	35	
NA	4	17	6	27	
TOTAL CASES	14	34	14	62	
STRENGTH (by site)	80.0	94.12	100.0		

Assessment of item 3 was applicable in 35 of 62 cases. Twenty-seven cases were excluded from review of this item. A case is not applicable for review of Item 3 if the target child entered foster care prior to the period under review and remained in out of home care for the entirety of the PUR, no child remained in the home and there were no substantiated reports or indications of maltreatment involving the family during the period under review.

Safety Item 4

Risk Assessment and Safety Management

Initial and ongoing assessment of risk is necessary to ensure that risk factors have not increased to a level requiring a safety response (NAC 432B.160, NAC 432B.180, NAC 432B.185) for the child whether he is in his home or in a foster home. Ongoing formal or informal risk assessments are documented in case notes and in the case file.

A safety assessment is an ongoing review of safety factors that occur at case milestones, whenever a child experiences a move (reunification or placement change) or when a planned risky event will occur (over night home visits with offending parents etc). Safety plans are developed to ensure the immediate protection of the child while the safety threats are being addressed. This document can be found in the case file or in the event of an informal plan – all relevant child and family team members are aware of the safety plan, and their responsibilities.

Results

<i>Item 4</i>	Carson	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
STRENGTH	6	33	7	46	74.2
ANI	8	1	7	16	25.8
TOTAL APPLICABLE	14	34	14	62	
NA	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL CASES	14	34	14	62	
%STRENGTH (by site)	42.9	97.1	50.0		

All cases were applicable for review of this item. In reviewing this item, reviewers determine if the agency adequately evaluated risk and safety throughout the PUR.

Reviewers evaluate written safety and risk assessments such as the Nevada Initial Assessment (NIA), present danger assessments (PDA), out of home safety checks, pre-placement safety checks, safety plans, visitation plans and other relevant assessments that may provide detail regarding risk and or safety. Additionally reviewers evaluate informal activities that may provide insight to the agency's evaluation of child safety such as case worker visits with children and parents.

Permanency Item 7

Permanency Goal for the Target Child

Item 7 evaluates the agency's establishment of appropriate and timely permanency goals for the target child. The most current permanency goal in regards to the target child is evaluated against Adoption and Safe Family's Act 1997 (ASFA) guidelines. Permanency planning must be in compliance with ASFA timeframes. This item also reviews the appropriateness and timeliness of initiating termination of parental rights proceedings (where applicable). In this item more than others included in the reviews, the actions of legal partners, including the courts can influence the overall rating.

Results

<i>Item 7</i>	Carson	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
STRENGTH	4	19	7	30	71.4
ANI	5	5	2	12	28.6
TOTAL APPLICABLE	9	24	9	42	
NA	5	10	5	20	
TOTAL CASES	14	34	14	62	
%STRENGTH (by site)	44.4	79.2	77.8		

All 42 of the out of home cases were eligible for review of this item. All 20 in-home cases are excluded from review of item 7.

Permanency Item 10

Other planned permanent living arrangement (OPPLA)

This item evaluates whether the agency made diligent efforts and achieved positive outcomes to help the target child achieve the goals related to independence when the permanency goal or concurrent goal for the target child is *Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (OPPLA)*. This may include referrals to the Independent Living (IL) program and assisting the target child in placement in a permanent living situation. Children who are receiving IL services but do not have a permanency goal of OPPLA are not included for review of this item, as those services are included in item 17A: needs and services to children.

<i>Item 10</i>	Carson	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
STRENGTH	0	4	3	7	43.8
ANI	4	4	1	9	56.3
TOTAL APPLICABLE	4	8	4	16	
NA	10	26	10	46	
TOTAL CASES	14	34	14	62	
%STRENGTH (by site)	0.0	50.0	75.0		

Results

The sample yielded eight cases eligible for review of this item; all agencies are represented in review of this item.

Typically the sample size of this item is very small; therefore each case has a larger impact upon the overall scoring.

Well Being Item 17

Needs and Services for Target Child, Parent and Foster Parents

Properly assessing need and linking the family with services aimed to meet those needs is critical to the family's success. Families and children who are properly assessed and quickly provided with intervention or prevention services are more likely to have positive outcomes.

This item is reviewed in three sub-parts. Item 17A evaluates how effectively the agency identified the needs of the target child, and linked the target child with services to meet those needs. The reviewers consider if all relevant needs were identified and if services were provided regardless of availability in the community. The child's medical, educational, and mental health/psychological needs are covered in a separate item not currently under review and are thus omitted from consideration. Item 17A is evaluated with regards to all children of in home cases. In the event the target child returns home during the PUR, and there are siblings in the home, 17A is applicable for all children in the home, however only for those months following the TC's return home.

Sub-parts 17B (needs and services for parents) and 17C (needs and services for foster parents) are evaluated in the same manner as 17A however medical, educational and mental health needs are applicable for sub part 17B and 17C. Item 17A is evaluated in regards only the target child in out of home cases.

For the purposes of this review foster parents can include relative caregivers regardless of if they are licensed as foster parents. Correctional facilities, hospitals and staffed residential facilities are excluded from evaluation of this item. All eligible foster placements during the PUR are evaluated under item 17C.

Results

In order for this item to achieve an overall rating of “strength” all sub parts, (items 17A, 17B and 17C) must be rated as either “strength” or “NA”. A single subpart earning an “ANI” renders item17 overall as ANI. Sixty-two (62) cases were reviewed for this item. Sub item 17C is NA for home based cases.

<i>Item 17 (overall)</i>	Carson	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
STRENGTH	4	24	9	37	59.7
ANI	10	10	5	25	40.3
TOTAL APPLICABLE	14	34	14	62	
NA	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL CASES	14	34	14	62	
%STRENGTH (by site)	28.6	70.6	64.3		

Needs and services for Children

<i>Item 17A</i>	Carson	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
STRENGTH	8	33	14	55	90.2
ANI	5	1	0	6	9.8
TOTAL APPLICABLE	13	34	14	61	
NA	1	0	0	1	
TOTAL CASES	14	34	14	62	
%STRENGTH (by site)	61.5	97.1	100.0		

Needs and Services of Parents

<i>Item 17B</i>	Carson	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
STRENGTH	3	18	9	30	57.7
ANI	8	9	5	22	42.3
TOTAL APPLICABLE	11	27	14	52	
NA	3	7	0	10	
TOTAL CASES	14	37	14	62	
%STRENGTH (by site)	27.3	66.7	64.3		

Needs and Services of Foster Parents

<i>Item 17 C</i>	Carson	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
STRENGTH	5	20	7	32	91.4
ANI	3	0	0	3	8.6
TOTAL APPLICABLE	8	20	7	35	
NA	6	14	7	27	
TOTAL CASES	14	34	14	62	
%STRENGTH (by site)	62.5	100.0	100.0		

Well Being Item 18

Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

This item evaluates how the agency involved the child, mother and father (and/or other legal guardians) in case planning. The target child, mother and father are rated separately, however as in item 17, the mother, father and child must each be evaluated as a “YES” or “NA” for the total scoring to be a “strength”. In circumstances when it is not realistic to include the child or parent for example: the target child is non-verbal; or a parent is deceased, the reviewers rate their involvement as “NA” which does not negatively affect the scoring of this item. When appropriate, all children are expected to be included in the case planning process of in home cases.

Parental incarceration is not grounds to exclude him/her from the planning processes. Until the agency has been legally absolved from providing services to the parents, it is expected that all parents are involved in case planning.

All 62 cases were applicable for review of this item.

Results

<i>Item 18</i>	Carson	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
STRENGTH	6	23	7	36	59.0
ANI	8	10	7	25	41.0
TOTAL APPLICABLE	14	33	14	61	
NA	0	1	0	1	
TOTAL CASES	14	34	14	62	
%STRENGTH (by site)	42.9	69.7	50.0		

Well Being Item 19

Caseworker Visits with the Target Child

This item evaluates both the frequency and the quality of the caseworker’s (or other responsible party) visits with the target child or all children of in home cases. The reviewers determine if the frequency and duration of the visits with the caseworker were sufficient to evaluate for risk, safety, child’s need and to promote positive child welfare outcomes. Because this item is an evaluation of both the compliance (frequency) and quality of case visits it is possible for a rating of “ANI” even when the case is compliant with federal and state expectations regarding monthly caseworker contact with children. Conversely, a rating of strength is possible even when frequency of caseworker visits with children is not in compliance with established expectations. In those cases the reviewers must determine that the visits were of exceptional quality, that the less than monthly contact did not negatively impact the outcomes for the children, and that more frequent visits were not likely to result in improved outcomes for the children.

For the purposes of this review, a visit is defined as a “face to face contact between the child and the caseworker or other responsible party”. The use of video conferencing, Skype, FaceTime and other similar technology is not an acceptable substitute for a caseworker visit.

All children regardless of placement are expected to be visited; including children placed out of state and in residential treatment facilities.

Results

<i>Item 19</i>	Carson	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
STRENGTH	9	31	12	52	83.9
ANI	5	3	2	10	16.1
TOTAL APPLICABLE	14	34	14	62	
NA	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL CASES	14	34	14	62	
%STRENGTH (by site)	64.3	91.18	85.7		

Well Being Item 20

Caseworker Visits with the Parents

Item 20 is similar to Item 19 in that it is both a qualitative and a quantitative evaluation of caseworker interaction with the parents. It is expected per policy that the agency will visit with the parent monthly, until termination of parental rights, or when the court relieves the agency from providing “reasonable efforts”. To evaluate the quality of case worker visits with parents reviewers define a visit as: *face to face contact between the caseworker or another responsible party and the parent*. Reviewers are also instructed to: *consider the most typical pattern of visitation throughout the PUR, length of the visits, and if the agency made on-going concerted efforts to locate parents*. It is expected that caseworkers will make monthly contact with parents unless visits with parents is contrary to the welfare of the child, caseworker is unable to locate the parent despite on-going concerted efforts to locate the parents, the parent refuses contact with the agency despite agency efforts to engage the parents and or the parent has never had any involvement in the child’s life. Reviewers are specifically instructed to evaluate this item based upon the instructions of the review tool, applicable special definitions of “parent” and not expectations of visits that may be established through state policy.

Results

<i>Item 20</i>	Carson	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
STRENGTH	5	16	6	27	54.0
ANI	6	10	7	23	46.0
TOTAL APPLICABLE	11	26	13	50	
NA	3	8	1	12	
TOTAL CASES	14	34	14	62	
%STRENGTH (by site)	45.5	61.54	46.2		

Summary/Findings

The QA unit of the Family Programs Office completed quality improvement case reviews on 62 cases state-wide in 2014.

The following table compares current results against prior reviews including the CFSR in 2009.

Item	CFSR 2009	QICR 2011	QICR 2012	QICR 2013	QICR 2014
Item 1: Timeliness of investigations	86.0	76.19	78.57	62.50	77.8
Item 3: Services to prevent removal/re-entry	43.0	70.45	86.36	91.89	91.4
Item 4: Risk and safety assessment	55.0	48.39	67.74	74.19	74.2
Item 7: Permanency goal	62.5	57.14	61.90	66.67	71.4
Item 10: OPPLA	43.0	50.00	50.00	66.67	43.8
Item 17: Services to child, parent and foster parent	37.0	41.94	51.61	62.90	59.7
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning	44.0	44.07	61.29	56.67	59.0
Item 19: Caseworker visits with child	55.0	56.45	75.81	80.65	83.9
Item 20: Caseworker visits with parent	44.0	45.28	50.94	56.86	54.0

In comparison to the 2013 QICR Nevada shows continued improvement in all but 3 items under review. Items with declining performance are:

Item	CFSR 2009	QICR 2011	QICR 2012	QICR 2013	QICR 2014
Item 10: OPPLA	43.0	50.00	50.00	66.67	43.8
Item 17: Services to child, parent and foster parent	37.0	41.94	51.61	62.90	59.7
Item 20: Caseworker visit with parent	44.0	45.28	50.94	56.86	54.0

Recommendations

In an effort to improve system performance and promote positive outcomes for the children and families we serve please consider the following recommendations:

- Ensure all cases open for services (i.e. in home) have a written case plan on file; to include a collaborative/partnership between primary & secondary workers (if applicable).
- In the event a child is removed from a caregiver other than a parent (i.e. guardians); be cognizant of intact parental rights & ASFA mandates.
- Failing to document caseworker visits with absent parents continues to have a negative impact on the scoring of items 17, 18 and 20. Focus upon methods that ensure absent parents are offered visits with their caseworker and that those visits are appropriately documented in the case record.
- Develop operating procedures to ensure that children placed out of state are visited by their caseworker or another approved party, and that those visits are adequately documented in accordance with applicable policy and statute.
- Youth that are placed should not be exempted from Independent Living services simply because they were placed in a residential treatment center (RTC). Agencies should revise current IL policies to ensure that youth placed in an RTC's are assessed on a case by case basis when making determinations about IL services.
- In some cases the transition from one permanency worker to another disrupted the momentum of the case. If possible, avoid unnecessary case transfers. When it is necessary to transfer cases to a new worker, additional efforts beyond a transitional CFT may be necessary to prevent loss of momentum.