

BREVARD FAMILY PARTNERSHIP

Quality Assurance Annual Report

FY 2016-2017

Overview:

Brevard Family Partnership (BFP) is the Lead Agency for Child Welfare Services in Brevard County, Florida within the 18th Judicial Circuit. For fiscal year 2016-2017, Brevard CARES provided contracted case management services for Non-Judicial In-Home Services Cases and IMPOWER provided it for all Judicial Cases.

As described in Florida's Windows into Practice, Brevard Family Partnership completed a total of 100 case file reviews using the Rapid Safety Feedback Tool and Florida's Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) version of the Federal Child & Family Service Review (CFSR) process. The breakdown per quarter was 10 Rapid Safety Feedback Reviews and 15 FL CQI Reviews, with two of the CQI reviews consisting of case participant interviews.

Data Sources and Utilization:

To determine performance quality and effectiveness, and identify areas for improvement and sustained system change, Brevard Family Partnership, Inc. uses both quantitative and qualitative data from FSFN, the Department of Children and Families performance measure dashboard, CBC Scorecard Performance Measures, case file reviews, quality service reviews, satisfaction surveys, local data bases, and other methods and tools as required by the Council on Accreditation (COA).

Weekly operations meetings track critical performance indicators and outcomes, case management caseloads and results, missing children data, and status of progress on critical monthly targets for children and families served, supervisor reviews, timely documentation into FSFN, and mental/dental/immunization records. This weekly focus on quantitative data to recognize trends allows rapid response to any unfavorable changes in performance and guides the implementation of real-time counter measures. Metrics for safety, permanency, well-being and other key indicators are aggregated monthly, quarterly, and yearly for the review of a system-wide Risk Management Committee organized according to the standards and practices required by COA.

Rapid Safety Feedback:

CBC Brevard Fiscal 2016-2017	Quarter 1			Quarter 2			Quarter 3			Quarter 4		
	Applicable Cases	% Strength	% Needs Improvement	Applicable Cases	% Strength	% Needs Improvement	Applicable Cases	% Strength	% Needs Improvement	Applicable Cases	% Strength	% Needs Improvement
1 Are family assessments of danger threats, child vulnerability, and family protective capacities sufficient to identify safety concerns and case plan actions needed to effectively address caregiver protective capacities and child needs?												
1.1 Is the most recent family assessment sufficient?	10	90%	10.0%	10	20.0%	80%	10	0%	100%	10	0%	100.0%
1.2 Is the most recent family assessment completed timely?	10	90%	10.0%	10	30.0%	70%	10	30%	70%	10	20%	80.0%
2 Are visits between case managers, children, and parent(s) or legal custodian(s) sufficient to ensure child safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?												
2.1 Is the quality of visits between the case manager and the child(ren) sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?	10	50%	50.0%	10	40.0%	60%	10	20%	80%	10	10%	90.0%
2.2 Is the frequency of visits between the case manager and the child(ren) sufficient to ensure child safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?	10	100%	0.0%	10	80.0%	20%	10	80%	20%	10	50%	50.0%
2.3 Is the quality of visits between the case manager and the child's mother sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?	10	100%	0.0%	9	44.4%	55.60%	9	22.20%	77.80%	9	11%	89.0%
2.4 Is the frequency of the visits between the case manager and the child's mother sufficient to ensure child safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?	10	90%	10.0%	9	100.0%	0.00%	9	77.80%	22.20%	10	80%	20.0%
2.5 Is the quality of the visits between the case manager and the child's father sufficient to address issues pertaining to safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?	7	57.10%	42.9%	4	25.0%	75.00%	6	33.30%	66.70%	6	17%	83.0%
2.6 Is the frequency of the visits between the case manager and the child's father sufficient to ensure child safety and evaluate progress toward case plan outcomes?	8	75%	25.0%	5	80.0%	20.00%	7	71.40%	28.60%	8	50%	50.0%
3 Are background checks and home assessments sufficient and responded to with a sense of urgency when needed to address potential danger threats?												
3.1 Are background checks and home assessments completed when needed?	10	90%	10.0%	10	90.0%	10.00%	10	80%	20%	10	100.0%	0.0%
3.2 Is the information assessed and used to address potential danger threats?	10	100%	0.0%	10	100.0%	0.00%	10	100%	0%	10	100.0%	0.0%
4 Is a sufficient safety plan in place to control danger threats to protect a child?												
4.1 Is the safety plan sufficient?	8	75%	25.0%	9	44.4%	55.60%	10	40%	60%	10	60%	40.0%
4.2 Is the safety plan actively monitored to ensure that it is working effectively to protect the child(ren) from identified danger threats?	8	62.50%	37.5%	8	0.0%	100%	10	0%	100%	10	0%	100.0%
5 Is the case manager supervisor conducting guided discussions at specific points in the case management process focused on promoting effective practice and decision making?												
5.1 Is the supervisor regularly consulting with the case manager?	10	100%	0.0%	10	30.0%	70.00%	10	20%	80%	10	10%	90.0%
5.2 Is the supervisor ensuring recommended actions are followed up on?	10	80.00%	20.0%	10	40.0%	60.00%	10	40%	60%	10	20%	80.0%

Rapid Safety Feedback Reviews assess real time case work practice related to safety of children ages zero to 4, placed in the home with a parent or caretaker in the living arrangement who has been an alleged perpetrator for allegations of Family Violence Threatens Child AND/OR Substance Misuse. The review samples for each quarter were selected using the business objects report entitled Children Receiving In-Home Services Listing – OCWDRU in Florida Safe Families Network (FSFN). All cases were open at the time of the review and a consultation was completed with the case manager and supervisor within 24-48 hours of completion of the review as required. Tools were updated with information and documentation obtained during

the consultations. Final tools and data are shared with Florida's Department of Children and Families, Case Management staff, as well as CBC staff.

During case consultations, Formal *Requests for Action (RFAs)* were assigned for any case identified with an immediate safety concern not ameliorated by the case consultation. Other concerns that did not immediately impact child safety were assigned follow-up tasks. RFAs and Tasks were tracked through completion. There were 14 RFAs initiated and resolved during the fiscal year and 24 Tasks assigned and completed.

The aforementioned chart breaks down the results per quarter for each question of the tool. Brevard Family Partnership has seen a decline in the measures during the last fiscal year compared to previous, *which can be attributed to the strict adherence on the fidelity of the practice model*. Due to the need for specific Safety Methodology practice model training, BFP contracted with Action 4 Child Protection to provide 4 2-day onsite trainings during the fiscal year (occurred during Quarter 4) that focused on areas identified as needing improvement – Assessing Impending Danger, Assessing and Scaling Caregiver Protective Capacities, Assessing and Scaling Child Needs and Crafting Case Plan Outcomes which are components of the Family Assessments.

- ***Are family assessments completed timely and sufficient:*** Family Functioning Assessments Ongoing are usually completed and approved timely; however, case management has struggled with completing and approving Progress Updates timely. In addition, the updates are not of sufficient quality as they are not updated in their entirety and the information noted in each domain does not reflect the ratings of the child need indicators or parent protective capacities.
- ***Frequency & quality of visits with child(ren):*** Overall home visits are completed with the children at the required frequency. Though the children's overall well-being is noted during visits, one on one conversations with the children away from caregivers are not being completed which is the primary reason for the insufficient ratings. Consultations indicate a documentation issue with the quality of visits and not that the information is not being obtained.
- ***Frequency and quality of visits with parents:*** Case management does well with frequency of contact with the parents. Visits did not focus on services and how the parents were utilizing those services and showing behavioral changes. As with the quality of visits with the children, it was learned during case consultations that most case managers were able to articulate this information, but struggled with documenting the information in FSFN.
- ***Background checks and home study assessments:*** This is BFP's strongest performance measure for the RSF Tool. Background screens are completed and shared at the time of the

Early Services Intervention (ESI) staffing as well as completed in conjunction with Parent Readiness and Reunification Home Studies. Case Management needs to remain diligent in completing background screens and responding timely to completion of home study assessments.

- ***Developing Safety Plans and monitoring them:*** Safety plans are only being completed approximately half of the time. Staff continue to struggle with the both creating the plans and actively monitoring those plans throughout the life of the case. An in-depth 6-hour Safety Plan training was provided to case management during Quarter 4 of the Fiscal Year through utilizing a resource from DCF and individual help has been provided to staff to help educate them on creating, implementing, and monitoring safety plans.
- ***Supervisory Consultations:*** Within the current practice model, supervisory consultations are required at certain junctures which is different than supervisor reviews. This measure has been a struggle for case management. Although timely formal supervisor reviews were conducted, supervisors are not being diligent in completing supervisor consultations in conjunction with family assessments or safety plans, but are better at documenting them when completed at critical junctures. Supervisors have been provided guidance regarding the requirements of consultations.

Florida Continuous Quality Improvement:

Florida's Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Review is a version of the Federal Child & Family Service Review (CFSR) process. The cases are either identified as Out of Home Care or In Home. For the case to qualify as In Home, the children have to be placed in the home during the entire period under review; if at any point during the review period the children are placed out of the home for more than 24 hours, the case does not qualify for the In Home Sample but must be reviewed as an Out of Home Care Case. The review samples for the cases identified as In Home were randomly selected each quarter using the business objects report entitled Children Receiving In-Home Services Listing – OCWDRU in Florida Safe Families Network (FSFN). The review samples each quarter for the cases identified as Out of Home Care were randomly selected using the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting (AFCAR) extract provided by DCF. The cases are not required to be open at the time of the FL CQI Review and only FSFN documentation is considered as a resource for the ratings. The two reviews that have an interview component each quarter are assessed and rated using a combination of case file documentation and interviews of all case participants.

This last fiscal year, BFP began completing consultation with the case manager and supervisor within 24-48 hours of the review. The same process regarding safety concerns for RSF reviews was implemented for the FL. CQI reviews. There were 8 RFAs initiated and resolved during the fiscal year and 40 Tasks assigned and completed.

The following charts break down the results for the fiscal year of each Item and Outcome of the tool. Individual items reviewed are scored as *Strength (S)*, an *Area Needing Improvement (ANI)* or as *Not Applicable (NA)*. Each Safety, Permanency and Well-Being Outcome is scored as *Significantly Achieved (SA)*, *Partially Achieved (PA)*, *Not Achieved (NACH)* or *Not Applicable (NA)*.

Performance Item or Outcome		Cases: 55						
		Performance Item Ratings			Outcome Ratings			
		S	ANI	NA	SA	PA	NACH	NA
Safety Outcome 1	Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.				100% n=27	0% n=0	0% n=0	n=28
Item 1	Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment	100% n=27	0% n=0	n=28				

Safety Outcome 1 ~ Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect: Specifically, it focuses on the timely commencement of the investigation by the Department of Children and Families. In cases involving an investigation, all investigations were commenced and face to face contact completed with the children timely.

Performance Item or Outcome		Cases: 55						
		Performance Item Ratings			Outcome Ratings			
		S	ANI	NA	SA	PA	NACH	NA
Safety Outcome 2	Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.				91% n=50	5% n=3	4% n=2	n=0
Item 2	Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-Entry Into Foster Care	94% n=15	6% n=1	n=39				
Item 3	Risk and Safety Assessment and Management	91% n=50	9% n=5	n=0				

Safety Outcome 2 ~ Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate: This measure focuses on preventing the removal or re-entry of children into care by providing safety services, Assessing Risk and Safety, and Managing Safety Plans (not to be

confused with the Practice Model’s Safety Plan requirement for all cases). This past Fiscal Year BFP initiated a Safety Management Services contract for intensive services with Brevard CARES. Safety Management Services were utilized on several cases to help stabilize the family so treatment services could later be referred for and be effective. These Items and Outcome ratings improved since last fiscal year.

Performance Item or Outcome		Cases: 55						
		Performance Item Ratings			Outcome Ratings			
		S	ANI	NA	SA	PA	NACH	NA
Permanency Outcome 1	Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.				36% n=12	61% n=20	3% n=1	n=0
Item 4	Stability of Foster Care Placement	52% n=17	48% n=16	n=0				
Item 5	Permanency Goal for Child	78% n=25	22% n=7	n=1				
Item 6	Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	85% n=28	15% n=5	n=0				

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

This measure looks at the current placements of the child as well as the child’s permanency goals. Cases that scored low in this area were cases in which the child was moved for reasons outside of trying to achieve the case goals and the placement was not currently stable; this was especially true for children with a goal of Adoption who were in a placement with a caregiver whom was not willing to permanently care for the child. Though Items 5 and 6 were rated higher than Item 4, there are still opportunities for improvement. Item 5 addresses the timeliness and appropriateness of the permanency goals. Overall, the goals were appropriate, but in a few cases the goal was not established timely. Item 6 deals with efforts to achieve permanency. Cases that scored an Area of Need, had issues with efforts to achieve the concurrent goals which most simultaneously be addressed during the case. Permanency staffings are held monthly with Child Legal Services (CLS) and the CMA staff, to ensure cases are moving forward. Permanency Round Tables were also held which focused on children who continue to remain in out of home care for over 24 months.

Performance Item or Outcome		Cases: 55						
		Performance Item Ratings			Outcome Ratings			
		S	ANI	NA	SA	PA	NACH	NA
Permanency Outcome 2	The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.				42% n=14	52% n=17	6% n=2	n=0
Item 7	Placement With Siblings	58% n=11	42% n=8	n=14				
Item 8	Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	52% n=15	48% n=14	n=4				
Item 9	Preserving Connections	82% n=27	18% n=6	n=0				
Item 10	Relative Placement	78% n=25	22% n=7	n=1				
Item 11	Relationship of Child in Care With Parents	18% n=5	82% n=23	n=5				

Permanency Outcome 2 ~ The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children: This Outcome is an area in which case management had some significant struggles. Item 7 was impacted by cases involving large sibling groups and where there were multiple fathers to which the children were split between paternal relatives. BFP continues to work on building capacity within our foster homes to house siblings together. Improvement was made with sibling visits and children visits with the mother, but visits with the child and father was the leading cause of Item 8 not being rated an area of Strength. The item with the biggest opportunity for Improvement is Item 11 which focuses on supporting the parent child bond outside of visitation. Concerted efforts need to be made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in out-of-home care and his or her mother and father or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed by involving the parent in the child’s extracurricular activities, medical appointments, education needs, and mentoring opportunities for the parent.

Performance Item or Outcome		Cases: 55						
		Performance Item Ratings			Outcome Ratings			
		S	ANI	NA	SA	PA	NACH	NA
Well-Being Outcome 1	Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.				58% n=32	31% n=17	11% n=6	n=0
Item 12	Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	78% n=43	22% n=12	n=0				
Item 12A	Needs Assessment and Services to Children	96% n=53	4% n=2	n=0				
Item 12B	Needs Assessment and Services to Parents	78% n=39	22% n=11	n=5				
Item 12C	Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents	100% n=32	0% n=0	n=23				
Item 13	Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	67% n=36	33% n=18	n=1				
Item 14	Caseworker Visits With Child	67% n=37	33% n=18	n=0				
Item 15	Caseworker Visits With Parents	54% n=27	46% n=23	n=5				

Well-Being Outcome 1 ~ Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs: This Outcome had Items that scored well and others that did not. Case management does exceptionally well with assessing and addressing the needs of children and caregivers. There is an opportunity for improvement in assessing and addressing the needs of the parents, specifically fathers. Case Management's struggle with involvement in case planning fell short in involving children who are age appropriate and fathers. Case Management's struggle with visits with the children is around having and documenting private one on one conversations with them away from their caregivers as not completing this automatically causes a negative rating, even if the rest of the quality or frequency is met. Contact with parents, specifically fathers remains a measure that is discussed with the weekly Operations Meeting held with our CMA.

Performance Item or Outcome		Cases: 55						
		Performance Item Ratings			Outcome Ratings			
		S	ANI	NA	SA	PA	NACH	NA
Well-Being Outcome 2	Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.				87% n=26	7% n=2	7% n=2	n=25
Item 16	Educational Needs of the Child	87% n=26	13% n=4	n=25				

Well-Being Outcome 2 ~ Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs: This Item and Outcome focuses on children's educational needs being assessed and addressed. Case management did fairly well on this item. The four cases that impacted this

measure involved case management not obtaining the child’s IEP or having contact with the educational establishment.

Performance Item or Outcome		Cases: 55						
		Performance Item Ratings			Outcome Ratings			
		S	ANI	NA	SA	PA	NACH	NA
Well-Being Outcome 3	Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.				67% n=22	24% n=8	9% n=3	n=22
Item 17	Physical Health of the Child	91% n=30	9% n=3	n=22				
Item 18	Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	38% n=5	62% n=8	n=42				

Well-Being Outcome 3 ~ Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs: There was evidence of children’s physical and dental health needs being assessed and addressed. The child’s mental health needs were assessed and addressed, but the eight cases which caused the Area of Need rating was due to the appropriate oversight of Psychotropic Medications. This standard is based upon State Protocol which is extremely strict in the requirement of oversight and documentation of the medications. Psychotropic Medications will continue to be tracked during weekly Operations Meeting held with the CMA.

Trainings:

Due to the need for specific Safety Methodology practice model training, BFP contracted with Action 4 Child Protection to provide 4 2-day onsite trainings during the fiscal year (occurred during Quarter 4) that focused on areas identified as needing improvement – Assessing Impending Danger, Assessing and Scaling Caregiver Protective Capacities, Assessing and Scaling Child Needs and Crafting Case Plan Outcomes which are components of the Family Assessments. This training involved a total of 48 hours of Safety Methodology specific training and an additional 4 days of On-Site Case Review Consultation days. Additionally, a 6-hour Safety Plan training was provided, utilizing a training resource from DCF to conduct the intensive training.

Recommendations:

- As of July 2017, Case Management Agency services are now under a new Agency, Family Allies. BFP has met with senior leadership from Family Allies and Brevard CARES to review the past Fiscal Year QA findings and develop a plan for improvement. BFP, along with its subcontracted Providers, have identified areas for improvement and trainings will be provided each Quarter that specifically address areas of opportunity as identified in quality assurance reviews. Trainings will also continue to be provided around safety planning and monitoring of safety plans. Trainings are currently being developed to address the current needs (around following Safety Methodology practice) in the areas of quality home visit documentation (1 on 1 child conversations, parent's behavioral change, etc.) and supervisor consultations.
- Implementation of a new home visit documentation form, to trigger conversation and documentation around needed quality improvements noted in the RSF reviews (1 on 1 conversations, ongoing monitoring of Safety Plan, etc).
- Continuation of Permanency Round Tables to help achieve permanency for children who continue to remain in out of home care for over 24 months.
- As part of the Region's Program Improvement Plan (PIP), BFP is in process of the following improvements:
 - Implementation of monthly out-of-home care reviews of the status of ALL children in out-of-home care, to drive increased permanency performance.
 - Workgroup to research and explore options for ensuring fathers are engaged and provided services as needed, including incarcerated fathers.
 - Implement improved kinship search process (i.e. Family Finders) so that more children and sibling groups are placed with relatives, as appropriate.
 - Continued practice of Permanency Roundtables and initiation of Youth Centered Permanency Roundtables.
 - Revamp the Supervisor Review/Consultation process to ensure alignment with Safety Methodology practice.