



# Child and Family Services Reviews

## Nevada

## Final Report

## 2018



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

This page is intentionally blank.

# Final Report: Nevada Child and Family Services Review

## INTRODUCTION

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

The findings for Nevada are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS), and submitted to the Children's Bureau on February 1, 2018. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the Title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan.
- The results of case reviews of 80 cases (55 foster care and 25 in-home) conducted via a State Conducted Case Review process in Washoe County, Clark County, and the DCFS Rural Region, Nevada, between April 1 and September 30, 2018.
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Attorneys for the agency, children and youth, and parents
  - Child welfare agency caseworkers and supervisors
  - Child welfare agency executive leadership
  - Child welfare agency senior managers
  - Child welfare agency program managers
  - Child welfare agency information systems staff
  - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) staff
  - Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA)
  - Court system and Court Improvement Program staff
  - Foster and adoptive parents
  - Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children staff

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Judges
- Kinship caregivers
- Parents
- Service providers
- Youth served by the agency

In Round 3, the Children’s Bureau suspended the use of the state’s performance on the national standards for the 7 statewide data indicators in conformity decisions. For contextual information, Appendix A of this report shows the state’s performance on the 7 data indicators. Moving forward, the Children’s Bureau will refer to the national standards as “national performance.” This national performance represents the performance of the nation on the statewide data indicators for an earlier point in time. For the time periods used to calculate the national performance for each indicator, see 80 Fed. Reg. 27263 (May 13, 2015).<sup>1</sup>

### Background Information

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

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

The Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state’s

---

<sup>1</sup> May 2017 revised syntax (pending final verification) uses 2 years of NCANDS data to calculate performance for the Maltreatment in Foster Care indicator. National performance is based on FY 2013–2014 and 2013AB files. All other indicators use the same time periods identified in the May 2015 Federal Register notice.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting Nevada's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Nevada's performance in Round 2.

### I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

#### Nevada 2018 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

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

- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

#### Children's Bureau Comments on Nevada Performance

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

The systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community was found to be strong and functioning within the federal requirements. Nevada collaborates, engages, and responds to internal and external stakeholders, such as Tribal representatives, children and families, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, court improvement, and other family-serving agencies in the development of major federal reports. This systemic factor provides a foundation upon which Nevada can plan ongoing change to improve outcomes for children and families served by the child welfare system. The Children's Bureau notes that Nevada has developed an effective state case review process and has provided leadership, guidance, and technical assistance to counties, modeling an approach to its case review process that is open, with a focus on uncovering what is actually happening to children and families in the child welfare system. These systemic strengths were recognized throughout the State Conducted Case Review process and will continue to be critical to the success of ongoing work.

The CFSR identified several cross-cutting practice concerns that affect the state's ability to meet safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes. The Children's Bureau encourages Nevada, in developing its Program Improvement Plan, to focus on the following key cross-cutting priorities: conducting quality safety assessments, achieving timely permanency for children in foster care, engaging families in quality service delivery and case management, and developing an effective continuous quality improvement (CQI) system throughout the state.

The state did not consistently conduct comprehensive risk and safety assessments, especially for in-home cases. In addition, safety plans that were developed were sometimes not appropriate for the needs of the family and were not monitored frequently enough to ensure children's safety. Further, maltreatment allegations concerning children in open cases were not reported or investigated using the formal investigation protocol. Safety services, including investigations, assessments, and safety planning, were insufficient to meet the needs identified for families in the case review. To improve safety assessments and ensure they are of high quality, the state may consider formalizing the response to maltreatment reports on open cases and strengthening initial and ongoing risk and safety assessment activities, especially for in-home services cases.

## **Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report**

Case review results indicated that achieving timely permanency poses challenges and the state does not effectively use concurrent planning. Although the goal of adoption was a common goal, present in most cases reviewed, it was noted that the goal may be established late in the case, is not always appropriate, is not supported with caseworker attention or adoption services, and is not achieved in a timely manner. In cases with a goal of reunification, the goal is sometimes maintained despite a lack of realistic expectation of reunification, and the goal is not achieved in a timely manner. In addition, concerns regarding achieving permanency may be due, in part, to the case review system court processes that support permanency. In some cases, there are court continuances, delays in filing termination of parental rights (TPR) petitions, and court or attorney delays in permanency decision-making. To achieve timely permanency for children in foster care, the state is encouraged to strengthen the partnership with the courts to ensure thorough assessment and regular review of case status and case plan goals to ensure that they best meet children's needs; provide appropriate services to achieve case goals, especially for adoption; file for TPR within required timeframes; finalize adoptions in a timely manner; and increase the effectiveness of concurrent planning.

The CFSR case review results reveal opportunities for improvement in effectively engaging families during caseworker visits and case planning activities, which is particularly challenging in in-home services. The lack of parental engagement significantly affects performance in well-being items related to case planning, caseworker visits, and service needs assessment and provision. The challenges in engaging parents coupled with the insufficient quality and frequency of caseworker visits with parents correlates negatively with the timely achievement of case plan goals and permanency for children in foster care. In addition, the case review results illustrate a lack of placement with, and engagement of, relatives, and a lack of engagement of incarcerated parents, which negatively affects outcomes for children. To improve family engagement, Nevada will need to increase the frequency and improve the quality of contact with parents. It is important that caseworkers have the skills to move beyond the superficial needs assessments identified in case review results and conduct accurate assessments that link needs to appropriate and timely services for children and parents on an ongoing basis.

The state does not have a comprehensive CQI system in place to assess systemic issues and ensure that there is an understanding of child welfare practice strengths and needs throughout the state. The CFSR identified areas needing improvement across the outcomes and systemic factors, some of which are due to the state's inability to effectively input, track, share, and analyze key data. Strengthening the state's ability to continuously collect data to inform decision-making, to support implementation of effective practices, and to promote outcomes will be important in developing a Program Improvement Plan and an effective program management system. The state could benefit from a process to collect information about practices, outcomes, and challenges in each jurisdiction and statewide. To strengthen the practice areas outlined above, Nevada is encouraged to build capacity for data collection and analysis in a context of CQI and can build upon its current CFSR case review process as an important foundation.

## **II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES**

For each outcome, we provide performance summaries from the case review findings. The CFSR relies upon a case review of an approved sample of foster care cases and in-home services cases. Nevada provides an alternative/differential response to, in addition

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

to a traditional investigation of, incoming reports of child maltreatment or children in need of services. Where relevant, we provide performance summaries that are differentiated between foster care, in-home, and in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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

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

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

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Nevada is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 58% of the 36 applicable cases reviewed.

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

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

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

State policy requires initiation of response to reports within timeframes that vary according to five identified levels of report priority: Priority 1, identified danger: within 3 hours; Priority 1 Rural, identified danger: within 6 hours; Priority 2, victims 5 and under, maltreatment, impending danger: within 24 hours; Priority 3, maltreatment indicated, no safety factors: within 72 hours; and Priority 3, Differential Response: within 3 business days. For all priorities, face-to-face contact with the child and family must be attempted by the next business day following initiation, and each business day thereafter, until a determination is made that a resolution has been achieved.

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 58% of the 36 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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

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

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

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

### State Outcome Performance

Nevada is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 46% of the 80 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 55% of the 55 foster care cases, 25% of the 20 in-home services cases, and 40% of the 5 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

### Safety Outcome 2 Item Performance

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 72% of the 32 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 71% of the 17 applicable foster care cases, 71% of the 14 applicable in-home services cases, and 100% of the 1 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response case.

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 46% of the 80 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 55% of the 55 foster care cases, 25% of the 20 in-home services cases, and 40% of the 5 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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

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

### State Outcome Performance

Nevada is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 5% of the 55 applicable cases reviewed.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

### ***Permanency Outcome 1 Item Performance***

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 73% of the 55 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 42% of the 55 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 18% of the 55 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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

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

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

#### **State Outcome Performance**

Nevada is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 60% of the 55 applicable cases reviewed.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

### *Permanency Outcome 2 Item Performance*

#### **Item 7. Placement With Siblings**

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 88% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father,<sup>2</sup> and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 68% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 85% of the 20 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation with a sibling(s) in foster care who is/was in a different placement setting was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 63% of the 27 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her mother was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 69% of the 16 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her father was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

#### **Item 9. Preserving Connections**

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

---

<sup>2</sup> For Item 8, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification. The persons identified in these roles for the purposes of the review may include individuals who do not meet the legal definitions or conventional meanings of a mother and father.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 75% of the 55 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 10. Relative Placement

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 53% of the 55 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father<sup>3</sup> or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 62% of the 29 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 63% of the 27 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her mother.
- In 63% of the 16 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her father.

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

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

### State Outcome Performance

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 30% of the 80 cases reviewed.

---

<sup>3</sup> For Item 11, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

The outcome was substantially achieved in 35% of the 55 foster care cases, 20% of the 20 in-home services cases, and 20% of the 5 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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

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

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency (1) made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents,<sup>4</sup> and foster parents (both initially, if the child entered foster care or the case was opened during the period under review, and on an ongoing basis) to identify the services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address the issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family, and (2) provided the appropriate services.

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 38% of the 80 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 44% of the 55 foster care cases, 25% of the 20 in-home services cases, and 20% of the 5 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 59% of the 80 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 67% of the 55 foster care cases, 45% of the 20 in-home services cases, and 20% of the 5 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 41% of the 56 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

---

<sup>4</sup> For Sub-Item 12B, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable "mothers" and "fathers" for the period under review in the case.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 52% of the 31 applicable foster care cases, 25% of the 20 applicable in-home services cases, and 40% of the 5 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 44% of the 52 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 45% of the 38 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 73% of the 52 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

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

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents<sup>5</sup> and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 48% of the 75 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 58% of the 50 applicable foster care cases, 30% of the 20 applicable in-home services cases, and 20% of the 5 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 56% of the 57 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 51% of the 49 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 47% of the 36 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve fathers in case planning.

### Item 14. Caseworker Visits With Child

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 55% of the 80 cases were rated as a Strength.

---

<sup>5</sup> For Item 13, in the in-home cases, “Mother” and “Father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, “mother” and “father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency’s work with multiple applicable “mothers” and “fathers” for the period under review in the case.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 65% of the 55 foster care cases, 35% of the 20 in-home services cases, and 20% of the 5 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

### Item 15. Caseworker Visits With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the mothers and fathers<sup>6</sup> of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 46% of the 54 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 55% of the 29 applicable foster care cases, 40% of the 20 applicable in-home services cases, and 20% of the 5 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 48% of the 50 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 47% of the 36 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with fathers were sufficient.

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

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

#### State Outcome Performance

Nevada is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 72% of the 65 applicable cases reviewed.

---

<sup>6</sup> For Item 15, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" is typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable mother and fathers for the period under review in the case.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

### *Well-Being Outcome 2 Item Performance*

#### **Item 16. Educational Needs of the Child**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To assess whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs at the initial contact with the child (if the case was opened during the period under review) or on an ongoing basis (if the case was opened before the period under review), and whether identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities.

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 72% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 83% of the 54 applicable foster care cases, 25% of the 8 applicable in-home services cases, and 0% of the 3 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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

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

#### **State Outcome Performance**

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 43% of the 74 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 45% of the 55 applicable foster care cases, 41% of the 17 applicable in-home services cases, and 0% of the 2 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 52% of the 66 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 53% of the 55 foster care cases and 45% of the 11 applicable in-home services cases. No in-home services alternative/differential response cases were applicable for this item.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 61% of the 61 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 71% of the 45 applicable foster care cases, 36% of the 14 applicable in-home services cases, and 0% of the 2 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

## III. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

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

### Statewide Information System

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

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Nevada is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

#### Statewide Information System Item Performance

### Item 19. Statewide Information System

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Nevada's information system can identify the status, demographics, location, and goals of every child in foster care. However, there are data input errors and mapping problems with no validation

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

of data accuracy. Stakeholders said the time that passes between a change in placement and data entry documenting the change results in delays in accurate placement location data in all jurisdictions.

### Case Review System

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

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Nevada is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. Two of the 5 items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

#### Case Review System Item Performance

##### Item 20. Written Case Plan

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment. Nevada agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Nevada does not develop timely initial case plans because of conflicting timelines within the state's safety model. Information in the statewide assessment also showed that case plans are not routinely developed jointly with the child's parents, as parent involvement is lacking in case planning and the agency does not consistently conduct a diligent search for parents.

##### Item 21. Periodic Reviews

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Nevada ensures that periodic review hearings are held no less frequently than every 6 months. Jurisdictions closely track the timeliness of periodic review hearings. Stakeholders said that strong scheduling protocols contribute to the jurisdictions' adherence to the 6-month deadlines.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

### Item 22. Permanency Hearings

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that permanency hearings are occurring timely in almost all cases. Stakeholders confirmed that initial permanency hearings occur no less frequently than 12 months from the date children enter foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

### Item 23. Termination of Parental Rights

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment. Nevada agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment failed to demonstrate that Nevada files TPR petitions in accordance with the provisions of the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA). Delays in filing were attributed to a lack of resources at the prosecutors' offices; court decisions to provide parents with additional time to comply with service plans; agency difficulties in locating parents; lack of provision of services to parents; backlogs in the courts; and an insufficient number of adoptive parents.

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment. Nevada agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- In the statewide assessment, Nevada reported that the state did not have a statewide process and did not consistently provide notice to caregivers of hearings and their right to be heard. The failure of notices arriving timely; limited time for court hearings; high caseloads for caseworkers; and the practices of some caseworkers discouraging caregiver attendance were identified as challenges.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

### Quality Assurance System

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

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

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

#### Quality Assurance System Item Performance

##### Item 25. Quality Assurance System

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment. Nevada agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Nevada lacks the capacity for ongoing case reviews and data collection and analysis. Additionally, program improvement measures are not linked to the case review results and the state does not evaluate implemented improvement measures or provide relevant reports.

### Staff and Provider Training

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

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

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

#### Staff and Provider Training Item Performance

##### Item 26. Initial Staff Training

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

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment. Nevada agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Nevada does not have the ability to track initial training over time for newly hired agency staff and differential response staff. Training overall was described as being too broad for the various program areas and lacking practical training aimed at completion of basic job tasks.

### Item 27. Ongoing Staff Training

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that ongoing training is provided for staff<sup>7</sup> that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment. Nevada agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Nevada requires 30 hours of ongoing training every 2 years. The state has limited capacity to track ongoing staff trainings. Often, the state relies on licensed staff to maintain an updated license, which requires training. The state, however, does not monitor staff's license status. The state has only a few mandatory ongoing trainings related to child welfare, and most mandatory trainings pertain to personnel concerns. Supervisor training is generic and not geared toward specific supervisor assignments. There is no ongoing supervisor training requirement.

### Item 28. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment. Nevada agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.

---

<sup>7</sup> "Staff," for purposes of assessing this item, includes all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP. "Staff" also includes direct supervisors of all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

- In the statewide assessment, Nevada reported that the training the state provides for foster and adoptive parents differs by jurisdiction. The state requires that each foster parent annually complete a minimum of 4 hours of training provided by or approved by the agency. Advanced foster homes must take a minimum of 40 hours of pre-service training and 20 hours of advanced training annually. Nevada does not have a system in place to monitor and track completion of foster parent training. Some training lacks content specific to carrying out the duties of being a foster parent.

### Service Array and Resource Development

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

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

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

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

##### Item 29. Array of Services

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders identified service gaps, especially in substance abuse services and monitoring, and behavioral and mental health service delivery. The state has a limited number of providers and long waiting lists for services such as neuropsychological assessments, psychological assessments, and comprehensive services. There are also gaps in housing and transportation. The state does not have the capacity to report service delivery numbers of clients served, track waiting lists, or identify unmet service needs.

##### Item 30. Individualizing Services

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

- In the statewide assessment, Nevada reported that although some services can be individualized, the state struggles with services for children with special needs. According to information in the statewide assessment and from stakeholders, although Language Link (a phone-in line) and interpreters are available, services are limited. For example, there are limited numbers of Spanish-speaking counselors and evaluators. The statewide capacity to individualize services to address developmental and cultural needs and disabilities is also lacking.

### Agency Responsiveness to the Community

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

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

Nevada is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Both of the items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

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

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Nevada reported that DCFS collaborates, engages, and responds to internal and external stakeholders such as Tribal representatives, children and families, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, court improvement, and other family-serving agencies in the development of the CFSP, APSR, and CFSR.

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Nevada described collaboration with the Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; the Administrative Office of the Court; the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Affairs and Tribal entities in Nevada; the Department of Justice, which supports Court Appointed Special Advocates through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; the Office of Child Support Enforcement Program; the Office of Family

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

Assistance; the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services/Division of Welfare and Supportive Services Assistance, which administers Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Housing Assistance, Medical Assistance, and Mental Health; the Department of Education; and the Adoption Exchange.

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

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

#### State Systemic Factor Performance

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

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

##### Item 33. Standards Applied Equally

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment. Nevada agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Nevada's child welfare agencies are not systematically tracking the specific reasons for using waivers of licensing standards for foster homes. Further, the state is waiving licensing standards for non-relative licensed homes funded under titles IV-B and IV-E.

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Strength for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that criminal background checks were completed as required for all licensed and unlicensed foster caregivers. The state policy mandates that all licensing requirements be met before a license can be issued.

## Nevada 2018 CFSR Final Report

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment. Nevada agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed a lack of consistency in the process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state who need homes across the state. The state lacks demographic data on the state's resource families.

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

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

- Nevada received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Nevada reported a low percentage of home studies from other states completed within the required 60 days. The state identified a lack of cooperation/compliance by the prospective caregivers and delays in processing criminal background checks as barriers to completing home studies timely. Nevada does not maintain data regarding ICPC requests for placement in other jurisdictions within the state. Stakeholders said that ICPC requests are kept open longer than 60 days, with delays commonly attributed to the resistance or ambivalence of the prospective placement home.

## Appendix A

### Summary of Nevada 2018 Child and Family Services Review Performance

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

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

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

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Safety Outcome 1</b> Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	Not in Substantial Conformity	58% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 1</b> Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	58% Strength

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Safety Outcome 2</b> Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	46% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 2</b> Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	72% Strength
<b>Item 3</b> Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	46% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Nevada 2018 CFSR Performance

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 1</b> Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	Not in Substantial Conformity	5% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 4</b> Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	73% Strength
<b>Item 5</b> Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	42% Strength
<b>Item 6</b> Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	18% Strength

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 2</b> The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	Not in Substantial Conformity	60% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 7</b> Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	88% Strength
<b>Item 8</b> Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength
<b>Item 9</b> Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	75% Strength
<b>Item 10</b> Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	53% Strength
<b>Item 11</b> Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	62% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Nevada 2018 CFSR Performance

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 1</b> Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	30% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 12</b> Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	38% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12A</b> Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	59% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12B</b> Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	41% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12C</b> Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	73% Strength
<b>Item 13</b> Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	48% Strength
<b>Item 14</b> Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	55% Strength
<b>Item 15</b> Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	46% Strength

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 2</b> Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	72% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 16</b> Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	72% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Nevada 2018 CFSR Performance

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 3</b> Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	43% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 17</b> Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	52% Strength
<b>Item 18</b> Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	61% Strength

## II. Ratings for Systemic Factors

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

### STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Statewide Information System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 19</b> Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

## Appendix A: Summary of Nevada 2018 CFSR Performance

### CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

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

### QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

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

### STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

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

## Appendix A: Summary of Nevada 2018 CFSR Performance

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

### SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

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

### AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Agency Responsiveness to the Community</b>	Statewide Assessment	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 31</b> State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 32</b> Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Statewide Assessment	Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Nevada 2018 CFSR Performance

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

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

### III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators<sup>8</sup>

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

---

<sup>8</sup> In October 2016, the Children's Bureau issued Technical Bulletin #9 (<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9>), which alerted states to the fact that there were technical errors in the syntax used to calculate the national and state performance for the statewide data indicators. Performance shown in this table reflects performance based on May 2017 revised syntax that is pending final verification.

## Appendix A: Summary of Nevada 2018 CFSR Performance

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.5%	Lower	8.5%	7.6%–9.4%	FY15–16
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	9.67	Lower	8.52	7.03–10.33	15A–15B, FY15–16
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	42.7%	Higher	45.7%	44.0%–47.4%	14B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	45.9%	Higher	46.8%	44.2%–49.4%	16B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	31.8%	Higher	37.2%	35.0%–39.5%	16B–17A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.1%	Lower	6.9%	5.7%–8.4%	14B–17A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.44	Lower	6.43	6.18–6.69	16B–17A

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

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

\*\*\* Data Period(s) Used for State Performance: Refers to the initial 12-month period and the period(s) of data needed to follow the children to observe their outcomes. The FY or federal fiscal year refers to NCANDS data, which spans the 12-month period October 1–September 30. All other periods refer to AFCARS data. "A" refers to the 6-month period October 1–March 31. "B" refers to the 6-month period April 1–September 30. The 2-digit year refers to the calendar year in which the period ends.

## Appendix B Summary of CFSR Round 2 Nevada 2009 Key Findings

The Children’s Bureau conducted a CFSR in Nevada in 2009. Key findings from that review are presented below. Because the Children’s Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round and in response to feedback from the child welfare field, a state’s performance in the third round of the CFSR is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round.

### Identifying Information and Review Dates

<b>General Information</b>
<b>Children’s Bureau Region:</b> 9
<b>Date of Onsite Review:</b> August 31–September 4, 2009
<b>Period Under Review:</b> April 1, 2008, through September 4, 2009
<b>Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued:</b> November 30, 2009
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Due:</b> March 1, 2010
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Approved:</b> December 1, 2010

### Highlights of Findings

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

## Appendix B: Nevada 2009 CFSR Key Findings

### State's Conformance With the National Standards

Data Indicator or Composite	National Standard	State's Score	Meets or Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of maltreatment recurrence (data indicator)	94.6 or higher	93.6	Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.60	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	152.8	Meets Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	83.1	Does Not Meet Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	120.0	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	82.6	Does Not Meet Standard

### State's Conformance With the Outcomes

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

## Appendix B: Nevada 2009 CFSR Key Findings

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

### State's Conformance With the Systemic Factors

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

## Appendix B: Nevada 2009 CFSR Key Findings

### Key Findings by Item

#### Outcomes

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

## Appendix B: Nevada 2009 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
20. Caseworker Visits With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
21. Educational Needs of the Child	Strength
22. Physical Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

### Systemic Factors

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

## Appendix B: Nevada 2009 CFSR Key Findings

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