

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



Quality Improvement Case Reviews
State of Nevada
Statewide Report

Report Year: 2012

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	6
Methodology	7
Child Welfare Outcomes	8
Overall Performance	9
Item 1: timeliness of investigations	11
Item 3: services to prevent removal	13
Item 4: assessing risk and safety	14
Item 7: permanency goal	15
Item 10: OPPLA	16
Item 17: needs and services of child, parent and foster parents	17
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	23

Executive Summary

As a result of the 2008 Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) the State of Nevada has now completed a series of case reviews as a requirement of Nevada's Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). The PIP implementation period encompassed December 1, 2010 through November 30, 2012. Baseline data was established in 2011 and Administration on Children and Families (ACF) set adjusted goals for each performance item to be attained by the end of the PIP implementation period (November 2012). Each agency was reviewed annually, Washoe and the Department of Child and Family Services Rural Region were reviewed once and Clark County was reviewed twice annually per PIP agreement.

Methodology

The review was designed to be both a quantitative and qualitative review of casework performed by child welfare agencies in Nevada at the time of the case review. The specific items reviewed were in accordance with the PIP agreement made between ACF, the federal administration that completes the CFSR, and the State of Nevada. Each review encompassed a review period of one year prior to the date of the review wherein the reviewers evaluated the previous year's practice performed by the child welfare agency.

The following 9 items were reviewed but may not have been applicable for 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 were comprised of quality assurance staff from within the Family Programs Office (FPO) and agency staff. Team members were specifically trained in the case review methodology and processes prior to completing the case review.

Results

The following data is a compilation of all Quality Improvement Case Reviews (QICR) conducted throughout the State of Nevada in 2012. The reviews consisted of 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” or “Not Applicable”.

The table below is a comparison of the CFSR data and the most recent Quarter 8 four quarter rolling review data. 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 QUARTER 8
Item 1: Timeliness of Investigations	86.0%	76.19%	81.00%
Item 3: Services to Prevent Removal/Re-entry	78.0%	70.45%	86.46%
Item 4: Risk and Safety Assessment	55.0%	48.39%	67.74%
Item 7: Permanency Goal	62.5 %	57.14%	61.90%
Item 10: OPPLA	43.0%	50.00%	50.00%
Item 17: Services to Children, Parents and Foster Parents	37.0%	41.94%	51.61%
Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Planning	44.0%	44.07%	61.30%
Item 19: Caseworker Visits with Children	55.0%	56.45%	75.81%
Item 20: Caseworker Visits with Parents.	44.0%	45.28%	50.94%

The following table compares state wide performance in 2012 against PIP agreed-upon performance targets for improvement. The compliance of the performance target is based on four quarter rolling data. Therefore, this table provides the actual percentage amount and the actual quarter that the target was met or not met. The percent listed, is the relative percent of the cases reviewed that scored an area of strength for the applicable performance item.

State-wide QICR and PIP Targets.		
Item	PIP Target	QICR 2012
Item 1: Timeliness of Investigations	80.40%	81.00% (QTR 8)
Item 3: Services to Prevent Removal/Re-entry	74.90%	76.10% (QTR 5)
Item 4: Risk and Safety Assessment	52.50%	54.80% (QTR 5)
Item 7: Permanency Goal	62.00%	61.90% (Not met)
Item 10: OPPLA	61.30%	62.50% (QTR 5)
Item 17: Services to Children, Parents and Foster Parents	46.00%	46.80% (QTR 5)
Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Planning	48.20%	54.20% (QTR 5)
Item 19: Caseworker Visits with Children	60.50%	71.00% (QTR 7)
Item 20: Caseworker Visits with Parents	49.70%	50.94% (QTR 8)

All PIP case review targets were met during the two year PIP reviews except for Item 7: Permanency Goal. As a result of not meeting Item 7 Nevada will enter a non-overlapping year of the PIP, and will continue with quarterly reviews until the target is met.

Summary and Findings

Throughout the PIP implementation period Nevada demonstrated increasing performance for nearly all performance items. It can be inferred that the corrective measures outlined in the Performance Improvement Plan have had an overall positive impact upon the outcome measured evaluated in the annual case reviews.

To date 8 of the 9 performance targets have been achieved. In PIP Quarter 5 Nevada met performance expectations on items: 3, 4, 10, 17 and 18, and in Quarter 7 Nevada met performance expectations on item 19. In PIP Quarter 8 Nevada met performance expectations on items: 1, and 20.

To date Nevada has not yet met the performance expectation for item 7, permanency goals. As of this year Nevada's performance of item 7 is 61.9% which is 0.1% under the performance expectation of 62.0% strength.

I

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 2012 statewide annual review consisted of a total of 65 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 2012 in Nevada.

In 2012 FPO completed the following QICR reviews:

Washoe County: September 2012

Clark County: April and October 2012

Rural Counties: February 2012

As a result of the 2008 Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) the State of Nevada completed Case Reviews as required in Nevada's Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). In conducting statewide reviews it was determined that Clark County would be reviewed twice annually during the PIP implementation period. The PIP implementation period encompassed December 1, 2010 through November 30, 2012. The ACF adjusted performance expectations for the nine items based upon baseline performance as evaluated in the 2011 case reviews.

In total FPO reviewed 65 child welfare cases in 2012; 42 out of home cases and 23 home-based. 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.

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 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”, and the case has been open for a minimum of 60 consecutive days. 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.

The 2012 review was performed on nine child welfare indicators pertaining to children’s child welfare outcomes in the domains of safety, permanency and well being. The indicators measured are those defined by the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF) and are the same criteria against which Nevada was measured in the federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) in August 2009.

The targeted outcomes are:

Child Welfare Outcomes	
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 provided 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) was rated as a “strength,” an “area needing improvement,” (ANI) or “not applicable” (NA).

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. For example, in Item 7 if the answers to sub-questions, 7.2, 7.3 or 7.4 is “yes” AND sub-questions 7.5 and/or 7.6 are answered “yes” BUT answers to 7.7 and 7.8 are “no” then the item must be rated as “Area Needing Improvement”.

Case Review Teams

The composition of the review teams were Program Specialists from the Family Programs Office along with DCFS and or local agency employees. Per agreement with CCDFS, the second Clark review team compositions were of only FPO staff.

Overall Performance

The results are a combination of all out of home and home- based cases reviewed in 2012 in Nevada. The following table illustrates the combined results of all 2012 reviews.

[Intentionally blank]

Item	Performance Item Rating									
		Out of Home			In Home			Combined		
		S	ANI	NA	S	ANI	NA	S	ANI	NA
Item 1	Timeliness of initiating investigations	65.22% N=15	34.78% N=8	N=19	94.74% N=18	5.26% N=1	N=4	81.00% N=34	19.00% N=8	N=23
Item 3	Services to prevent removal	79.16% N=19	20.83% N=5	N=18	95.00% N=19	5.00% N=1	N=0	86.46% N=38	13.63% N=6	N=18
Item 4	Risk and Safety Assessment	69.05% N=29	30.95% N=13	N=0	65.00% N=13	35.00% N=7	N=0	67.74% N=42	32.26% N=20	N=0
Item 7	Permanency Goal for target child	61.90% N=26	38.10% N=16	N=0	na N=0	na N=0	N=20	61.90% N=26	38.10% N=16	N=20
Item 10	OPPLA	50.00% N=5	50.00% N=5	N=32	na N=0	na N=0	N=20	50.00% N=5	50.00% N=5	N=52
Item 17	Needs and Services of Child, Parents and Foster Parents	52.38% N=22	47.62% N=20	N=0	50.00% N=10	50.00% N=10	N=0	51.61% N=32	48.39% N=30	N=0
Item 18	Child and Family involvement in case planning	61.90% N=26	38.10% N=16	N=0	60.00% N=12	40.00% N=8	N=0	61.30% N=38	38.71% N=24	N=0
Item 19	Caseworker Visits with Child	73.81% N=31	26.19% N=11	N=0	80.00% N=16	20.00% N=4	N=0	75.81% N=47	24.19% N=15	N=0
Item 20	Caseworker Visits with Parents	48.48% N=16	51.51% N=17	N=9	55.00% N=11	45.00% N=9	N=0	50.94% N=27	49.06% N=26	N=9

Note: Performance Item Ratings: S = Strength; ANI = Area Needing Improvement; N/A = 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 1 Rural:** 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. (Rural time includes a distance factor).
- **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.

Results:

<i>Item 1</i>	Rural	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
strength	9	17	8	34	81.00
ANI	1	7	0	9	19.00
total applicable	10	24	8	42	
NA	4	13	6	23	
total cases	14	37	14	65	
strength by site	90.0	70.83	100		

Cases are not applicable for review of this item when there are no reports of maltreatment received during the period under review. This item also excludes cases when a report was received prior to the PUR, even if the investigation was on-going or initiated during the PUR. In total 42 cases were reviewed and 23 cases were not applicable for review of item 1. Of the applicable cases, 23 were out of home, and 19 were in home cases. In the second review for Clark County (October 2012) an additional 3 in home cases were selected from the over sample for review of item 1. As part of the PIP process the state as a whole must evaluate a minimum number of cases and of those cases there must be a minimum representation of case items. FPO learned late in the federal year that an additional 3 cases applicable for review of item 1 would be required; therefore, 3 in home cases from the Clark County over sample were selected. The reviewers did not evaluate any additional items in regards to the cases selected from the over sample. The cases drawn from the oversample were all rated as an area of strength for 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 while investigating allegations of maltreatment, 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 those 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 intervening services, the agency would take custody of the children to ensure emergency medical treatment is provided and to protect the children from further harm.

Results

<i>Item 3</i>	Rural	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
strength	9	21	8	38	86.46
ANI	2	4	0	6	13.63
total applicable	11	25	8	44	
NA	3	9	6	18	
total cases	14	34	14	62	
strength by site	81.82	84.00	100.00		

Assessment of item 3 was applicable in 44 of 62 cases; 24 out of home and 20 home based cases. 18 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 no child remained in the home or if there were no substantiated reports or indications of maltreatment during the period under review.

Safety Item 4

Risk Assessment and Safety Management

Initial and ongoing risk assessment is necessary to ensure that risk factors have not increased to a level requiring a safety response (NAC 432B.155) 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>	Rural	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
strength	9	23	10	42	67.74
ANI	5	11	4	20	32.26
total applicable	14	34	14	62	
NA	0	0	0	0	
total cases	14	34	14	62	
strength by site	64.29	67.64	71.43		

All cases were applicable for review of this item. In reviewing this item, reviewers determine if the agency is currently and/or has in the past adequately assessed the safety and risk of harm to all children involved in each case.

Reviewers evaluate written safety and risk assessments such as the Nevada Initial Assessment (NIA), 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.

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).

Results

<i>Item 7</i>	Rural	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
strength	3	17	6	26	70.83
ANI	6	7	3	16	29.16
total applicable	9	24	9	42	
NA	5	10	5	20	
total cases	14	34	14	62	
strength by site	33.33	70.83	66.67		

All 42 of the out of home cases were eligible for review of this item. Home-based 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 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.

Results

<i>Item 10</i>	Rural	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
strength	1	3	1	5	50.0
ANI	0	4	1	5	50.0
total applicable	1	7	2	10	
NA	13	27	12	52	
total cases	14	34	14	62	
strength by site	100.0	42.86	50.0		

The sample yielded 10 cases that were eligible for review of this item; all agencies were represented in review of this item.

Well Being Item 17

Needs and Services for Target Child, Parent and Foster Parents

Proper identification of need and linking services aimed to meet the needs of child clients, the parent's/care takers and the foster parents (when applicable) is critical to the successes of the family. Families and children who are properly assessed and quickly provided with intervention/ preventative services are more likely to have positive outcomes and are less likely to be associated with extensive durations in care, multiple placement changes and non-compliance of case plan objectives.

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. 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 17 A is evaluated in regards only the target child in out of home cases. Item 17 A is evaluated with regards to all children of in home cases.

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 will cause the overall rating to be ANI. All 62 cases were reviewed for this item. Sub item 17C is NA for home based cases.

<i>Item 17 (combined)</i>	Rural	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
strength	7	14	12	32	53.23
ANI	7	20	2	29	46.77
total applicable	14	34	14	62	
NA	0	0	0	0	
total cases	14	34	14	62	
strength by site	50.00	41.18	85.71		

Needs and services for Children

<i>Item 17 (sub-part a)</i>	Rural	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
strength	11	27	13	51	82.26
ANI	3	7	1	11	17.74
total applicable	14	34	14	62	
NA	0	0	0	0	
total cases	14	34	14	62	
strength by site	78.57	79.41	92.86		

Needs and Services of Parents

Item 17 (sub-part b)	Rural	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
strength	7	13	10	30	56.60
ANI	6	15	2	23	43.40
total applicable	13	28	12	53	
NA	1	6	2	9	
total cases	14	34	14	62	
strength by site	53.85	46.43	83.33		

Needs and Services of Foster Parents

Item 17 (sub-part b)	Rural	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
strength	7	13	10	30	76.92
ANI	1	8	0	9	23.08
total applicable	8	21	10	39	
NA	6	13	4	23	
total cases	14	34	14	62	
strength by site	87.50	61.90	100.00		

Well Being Item 18

Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

This item evaluates the agency's inclusion of the child, mother and father 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 evaluation tool rates their inclusion as "NA" which does not negatively affect the scoring of this item. When it is 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 the parents are involved in case planning.

All cases were applicable for review of this item.

Results

<i>Item 18</i>	Rural	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
strength	8	16	14	38	61.29
ANI	6	18	0	24	38.71
total applicable	14	34	14	62	
NA	0	0	0	0	
total cases	14	34	14	62	
strength by site	57.14	47.06	100.00		

Well Being Item 19

Caseworker Visits with the Target Child

This item evaluates both the quantity and the quality of the visits with the target child. In Nevada the reviewers determine if the frequency and duration of the visits with the caseworker were sufficient to evaluate for risk, safety, need and to promote the progress of the target child. 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.

Results

<i>Item 19</i>	Rural	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
strength	9	26	12	47	75.81
ANI	5	8	2	15	24.19
total applicable	14	34	14	62	
NA	0	0	0	0	
total cases	14	34	14	62	
strength by site	64.29	76.47	85.71		

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

through out 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, 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, and not expectations of visits that may be established through state policy.

Results

<i>Item 20</i>	Rural	Clark	Washoe	Total	Percent
strength	5	12	10	27	50.94
ANI	8	16	2	26	49.06
total applicable	13	28	12	53	
NA	1	6	2	9	
total cases	14	34	14	62	
strength by site	38.46	42.85	83.33		

Summary/ Findings

The QA unit of the Family Programs Office completed quality improvement case reviews on 65 cases state-wide in 2012.

The following review areas indicated an improvement in performance from the 2009 CFSR review:

Item	CFSR 2009	QICR 2012
Item 3: Services to prevent removal/re-entry	78.0	86.46
Item 4: Risk and safety assessment	55.0	67.74
Item 17: Services to child, parent and foster parent	37.0	51.61
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning	44.0	61.29
Item 19: Caseworker visits with child	55.0	75.81
Item 20: Caseworker visits with parent	44.0	50.94

When compared against the results of the 2011 QICR reviews, NV workers show an increase in strength ratings across all performance items evaluated with the exception of item 10.

Item	QICR 2011	QICR 2012
Item 1: Timeliness of Investigations	76.19%	81.00%
Item 3: Services to Prevent Removal/Re-entry	70.45%	86.46%
Item 4: Risk and Safety Assessment	48.39%	67.74%
Item 7: Permanency Goal	57.14%	61.90%
Item 10: OPPLA	50.00%	50.00%
Item 17: Services to Children, Parents and Foster Parents	41.94%	51.61%
Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Planning	44.07%	61.30%
Item 19: Caseworker Visits with Children	56.45%	75.81%
Item 20: Caseworker Visits with Parents.	45.28%	50.94%

Since 2009 Nevada has demonstrated improvement in 7 of the 9 performance items evaluated in the QICR. The only performance items that continue to indicate a decrease in performance since the CFSR of 2009 are:

Areas of declining performance compared to CFSR 2009		
Item	CFSR 2009	QICR 2012
Item 1: Timeliness of investigations	86.0	81.00
Item 7: Permanency Goals	62.5	61.90

Throughout the PIP implementation period Nevada demonstrated increasing performance for nearly all performance items. It can be inferred that the corrective measures outlined in the Performance Improvement Plan have had an overall positive impact upon the outcome measured evaluated in the annual case reviews.

To date 8 of the 9 performance goals have been achieved.

In PIP Quarter 5 Nevada met performance expectations on:

- Item 3: Services to Prevent Removal/Re-entry
- Item 4: Risk and Safety Assessments
- Item 10: OPPLA
- Item 17: Needs and Services to Children, Parents and Foster Parents
- Item 18: Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

In PIP Quarter 7 Nevada met performance expectations on:

- Item 19: Caseworker Visits with Children

In PIP Quarter 8 Nevada met performance expectations on:

- Item 1: Timeliness of Investigations
- Item 20: Caseworker visits with Parents

To date Nevada has not yet met the performance expectation for item 7, permanency goals. As of this year Nevada's performance of item 7 is 61.9% which is 0.1% under the performance target expectation of 62.0% strength.

Recommendations

Nevada is currently under a PIP for many of the identified issues and recommendations. Over time Nevada should see improvement after implementation of many of the action steps being conducted in the PIP. It is further recommended that if improvement is not shown over time, another strategy may need to be identified and implemented to improve performance.

- In out-of-home placement cases, the assessment of the foster parent's needs and provision of suitable services must be reflected in the case record documentation. Efforts to successfully resolve the problem(s) ensure continued placement stability for children in foster care.
- Continue to collaborate with the Court Improvement Programs and partner on current and future legislative and practice changes to enhance methods for carrying out permanency and concurrent goal objectives.
- Permanency goals should be thoughtful and determined on a case by case basis with involvement of the child and parents. Continued collaboration with the court is essential to timely permanency for children.
- Ensure that all safety and risk assessments are completed in and in the case record. When assessment tools are used in the field, a paper copy must be found in the case file. Develop a system to ensure that these tools are properly used, verified by supervisors and promptly placed in the case file.
- Review and consider methods of assessing family functioning or training on the current assessment tools. The current NCFAS G+R is not being used to its full potential. Often the final results are incomplete and out of date. The documents reviewed do not reflect who, when or how information was collected. Furthermore there is no meaningful translation of information gleaned from assessments into the case plan itself. The NCFAS G+R is just

one of several assessment tools available to the caseworker. The caseworker should consider the results of several assessments when creating case plans and making recommendations.

- Initial risk and safety assessment to include family history to include applicable out of state abuse/neglect histories need to be accurately reflected on the assessment tool. On in-home cases the assessment must encompass all the children in the home.

- Comprehensive initial and on going assessments for child and family needs throughout the life of the case needs to begin at the onset by engaging the mother, father, and the child (as age appropriate), to include documented safety planning as well as independent living. Facilitate access to suitable services and monitor access/progress through collateral contacts need to be reflected in case documentation. If one parent is absent from the home diligent search efforts be initiated to locate that parent as well as concerted efforts to engage him/her need to be reflected in the case documentation. In out of home situations assessment of the foster parents needs and suitable services must also be reflected in case documentation and those needs must be successfully resolved to ensure placement stability for children.

- A solid assessment of family functioning drives the case plan objectives. The best case plans and goals consider information collected over a period of time and from a variety of different types of assessments. The caseworkers should consider the results of several assessments when creating case plans and making recommendations.

- There should be a clear relationship between the information collected in various assessments, child and family team meetings and case visits and the case plan including the permanency goals.

- Case plan objectives may be more effective and more likely achieved when the family is actively engaged in the development of those objectives through regular Child Family Team (CFT) meetings; which are then explicitly reflected in the case file. These regularly documented CFT also function as an effective forum to address barriers to case plan progress and monitor successes.

- Continue to work to remove barriers to engagement with non-custodial parents including incarcerated parents.

- Consider developing a work group aimed to identify the elements of best practice by focusing on improving the quality of case management for OPPLA and independent living referrals and collaborations.