

## **Table of Contents**

Work Plan Detail A -- Item 2, Repeat Maltreatment (Maltreatment of Children in Foster Care)

Work Plan Detail B -- Item 3, Services to Families to Protect Child(ren) in Home and Prevent Removal and Item 4, Risk of Harm to Child

Work Plan Detail C -- Item 6, Stability of Foster Care Placement

Work Plan Detail D -- Item 7, Permanency Goal for Child

Work Plan Detail E -- Item 9, Adoption

Work Plan Detail F -- Item 10, Permanency Goal of Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement

Work Plan Detail G -- Item 12, Placement with Siblings

Work Plan Detail H -- Item 13, Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

Work Plan Detail I -- Item 17, Needs and Services of Child, Parents, Foster Parents

Work Plan Detail J -- Item 18, Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

Work Plan Detail K -- Item 19, Worker Visits with Child

Work Plan Detail L -- Item 20, Worker Visits with Parents

Work Plan Detail M -- Item 21, Educational Needs of the Child

Work Plan Detail N -- Item 22, Physical Health of the Child

Work Plan Detail O -- Item 23, Mental Health of the Child

Work Plan Detail P -- Item 24, Statewide Information System

Work Plan Detail Q -- Items 35-37, State has in place an array of services that assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe environment, enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency.

Work Plan Detail R -- Item 42, The standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or childcare institutions receiving title IV-E or IV-B funds.

Work Plan Detail S -- Item 44, State has in place a process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the State for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed.

## Work Plan Detail A -- Item 2, Repeat Maltreatment (Maltreatment of Children in Foster Care)

*Goal: To improve the incidence of maltreatment in foster care*

A11 ACTION STEPS:		Implement new training plan in family foster care and/or institutional foster care.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Feb. 2003	<p>May 2003</p> <p><b>2nd Quarter Federal Response:</b> Is this task completed? Deadline is May.</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter Reply:</b> Task is not yet completed. The state is requesting a change in completion date to September 2004 to allow for the qualitative review process.</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter Federal Response:</b> September 2004 is closer to the end of PIP period!</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation and Renegotiations, the State requested an extension to July 2004 to allow the</p>	Betty Wrights, Education and Research Section	<p>Report to team.</p> <p>Evaluation: Quarterly monitoring reports will analyze and compare outcome data with 2001 CFSR. Progress/needs will be addressed and revised as needed in the Annual IV-B State Plan</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter:</b> A Qualitative Case Review (QCR), similar to the CFSR, will be conducted on a representative sampling of cases. DFCS county supervisors, Social Service Program staff, Consultation and Support Units, IV-B Advisory Committee members and other stakeholders may participate in this review. The results of the first QCR will be included in the 2003 IV-B State Plan.</p> <p><b>2nd Quarter Federal Response:</b> Has the State started its quality reviews yet? Do we have any results?</p> <p><b>Georgia's Reply 3rd Quarter:</b> No. Qualitative reviews are scheduled to begin October 2003. The first report to state and federal teams is expected January 2004 and every quarter thereafter.</p> <p><b>5th Quarter Report:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiations, the State requested to restate the benchmark to "Implementation of new training plan to address identified training needs for foster families" to place more emphasis on the implementation of training as it relates to the action step.</p>

	Division more time to evaluate and implement training plan.		
--	---	--	--

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Reports:** Recommendations for additional staff to provide TA training and a vendor is needed to develop a review process.

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** (THE ABOVE STATEMENT DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE AN ACCOMPLISHMENT -- YOU NEED TO JUSTIFY THAT YOU HAVE COMPLETED YOUR ACTION STEPS GOAL)

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** (THIS SENTENCE DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE AN ACCOMPLISHMENT) What steps have you taken to locate a vendor? Completion date is May 2003 for a report to the team. Is this done?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** The progress made in Action Steps 9, 10 and 12 overlap with this Action Step.

Qualitative Case Review: Current fiscal constraints prevented outsourcing the QCR to an outside vendor. The E&R Section, who will conduct in-house QCR's, is currently developing an evaluation instrument to be used in gathering data for the reviews and will initiate the first round of reviews in October 2003.

Comparison of 2001 and current data -- source: PSDS: 1).The incidence of child maltreatment in foster homes for FFY 2002, 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter has decreased to 0.71%.

(0.79% indicated in the report)

2). See reports by E & R on Georgia's statewide data indicators

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** E&R Section has initiated the in-house Qualitative Case Review involving case-specific and stakeholder interviews

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** In addition to the QCR, the state is developing a new pre-service training curriculum for implementation, based on recommendations made by the Committee on Pre-Service Training, that will take a more instructive, hands-on approach in preparing families to meet the basic needs of children in placement. As with the present training, staff training will be made available to both public and private agencies. To accompany this change, the pre-service policy (Section 1014) is being revised. The committee

was composed of representatives from the state level, county level, resource families and the private sector. The new curriculum and training of staff are expected to be completed by July '04.

Individual counties based on individual needs provide additional in-service training opportunities. The state has on hand a log of training opportunities for the 159 counties for 2002 and 2003. To offset the cutback on state sponsored training institutes is the opportunity for online training to address individual needs at web sites approved by the state. The current recommended site, [www.fosterparents.com](http://www.fosterparents.com) is also endorsed by the National Foster Parent Association. The initial site approved by the state provides a post-test and certificate of completion. Resource families obtain agency approval or must be directed toward specific training needs. Families may download proof of payment for reimbursement. Other comparable sites will be added as needed.

#### **5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Draft Report - Committee on Pre-Service Training and The Selection Process for Resource Parents
2. See Statewide Data Indicators. In three reporting quarters thus far, Georgia has met its PIP goal to decrease the incidence rate of foster parent maltreatment to 0.94%.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Utilizing the report from the Committee on Pre-Service Training in addition to reviewing programmatic guidelines from other states, Georgia has moved forward with developing its new pre-service training and new intake procedures for foster and adoptive parents. The new initiative tentatively called **IMPACT** stands for I-initial interest, M-mutual selection, P-pre-service training, A-assessment, C-continuing development, and T-teamwork. **IMPACT** emphasizes the critical components of foster / adoptive parent preparation and continuing service. **IMPACT** will consist of a structured two-hour orientation followed by 20 one-hour blocks of training. The training blocks are based on the five broad categories identified by the Committee on Pre-Service Training: *The Fostering/Adoption Process, Emotional/Cognitive/ Behavioral Implications in Fostering/Adopting, Sexuality and Sexual Orientation, Communication and Partnership, and Identity and Cultural Issues*. It is expected that the entire 22-hour curriculum will be completed by May 28, 2004 and training to county staff to begin June, 2004.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** **IMPACT** Two Hour Orientation Outline and the **IMPACT** Training Continuum Outline.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** A11: Please provide the revised copy of the pre-service policy (Section 1014).

A11: Does the state remain on track to have the new curriculum and staff training completed by July 04 as reported in the 5<sup>th</sup> Quarterly Report? The 6<sup>th</sup> Quarterly Report indicates that training is expected to begin in June. It is concerning that the state appears to be delayed in the completion of the step as agreed upon following a recent renegotiation of the Benchmark and completion date. Is the **IMPACT** Training for both staff and foster parents and if so, what is the plan to train foster parents?

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Delays were encountered in the development of the IMPACT curriculum due to the enormity and scope of the work. IMPACT is not only a pre-service training but also outlines the way inquiries (foster and adoptive) will be handled from initial inquiry to entry into IMPACT Pre-Service Training. IMPACT will positively impact the agencies pre-service training policy and retention, on-going development and tracking. Supporting policy (Social Services Policy 1014) is in its final revisions and should be released to coincide with the start of IMPACT leader certification workshops.

The IMPACT Pre-Service Curriculum is in its final stages of development. During the week of June 28, 2004, technical assistance was provided by the Spalding National Resource Center (SNRC). The SNRC reviewed the curriculum for content, objectives and overall quality. As a result, the following deadlines were established: (1) All suggested rewrites/edits were completed by July 9, 2004. (2) Curriculum delivery to the printer by 4 PM July 9, 2004.

The 6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Documentation provided a high level outline for the IMPACT Resource Family Services Continuum for foster and adoptive provider resource training.

IMPACT leader certification will be a four-day workshop and include training on the revised family evaluation guidelines. Training for DFCS staff leaders began July 19<sup>th</sup> and will continue for 5 weeks with two classes being held each week. Additional classes are planned for September, which will include private agencies and contractors.

The IMPACT training is for both staff and foster parents. The logistical plan for training foster parents is developed by each local county. Excerpts of the IMPACT training curriculum are attached.

#### **7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

Social Services Report Qualitative Case Reviews (Cumulative) October 2003 – June 2004

Draft of the revised pre-service policy (Section 1014 - Foster Care Services: Foster Parents

CFSP Services Plan Report FY 2000-2004, pages 26-27, Foster Parent Training and Support.

Excerpts from the IMPACT training curriculum (the full curriculum is Attachment E of the CFSR Report FY 2000-2004)

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Identify barriers to implementing the action steps. Quarterly monitoring of reports to analyze and compare outcome data with 2001 CFSR, and a QCR are essential action steps that needs to be accomplished.

**3rd Quarter Report /Reply:** Due to fiscal constraints, the Division was unable to outsource the development and implementation of the QCR. The E&R Section has agreed to the completion of this task, and has begun working diligently to develop the instruments to be used in reviewing cases, with a beginning date of October 2003.

---

## Work Plan Detail B -- Item 3, Services to Families to Protect Child(ren) in Home and Prevent Removal and Item 4, Risk of Harm to Child

*Goal: To improve this outcome by January 2004*

<b>B1 ACTION STEPS:</b>	<p><b>Develop family assessment, which includes policy for the assessment of mental health, substance abuse and domestic violence needs and prevents premature case closure.</b></p> <p>Review existing assessment policy in CPS and Foster Care. Review includes multi-disciplinary team and experts in the field. (Achieved)</p> <p>Develop revised CPS assessment policy, training and staffing recommendations. (Achieved)</p> <p>Develop training and budget recommendations to implement revised policy. (Achieved)</p> <p>Develop policy/procedure for prevention of premature case closure. (Achieved)</p> <p>Develop CPS domestic violence policy and procedure. (Achieved)</p>		
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
June 2002	Jan. 2004	Protective Services and Foster Care Policy Committee, CPS, Foster Care Units, Office of the Child Advocate, Professional Development Section, Social Services Section as deemed appropriate, DFCS Economic Support Section, Substance Abuse Assessment Workers.	<p>Development of recommendations for policy, practice and training based on the completed review. Policy, practice and training steering meetings. Written revised policy. Recommendations for training and budget for implementation of recommendations.</p> <p>Monitoring Steps (Family Assessment and DV): Participant notes and meeting minutes, Policy Draft, and Training and budget recommendations.</p> <p>Core competency development by Professional Development Section for future training. CPS Policy/Procedure Training</p>

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Partially Achieved

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Is this fully achieved now? How will we measure it? What can the State provide us to show this has been achieved?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Georgia's Reply:** Developed Family Assessment (FA) /Family Team Meeting (FTM) and Domestic Violence (DV) materials are attached.

**1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report/Status Update:**

Existing CPS policy was reviewed and decisions made on how to revise CPS policy to expedite decisions about safety, well being and permanence and to bring it more in line with existing foster care policy that already includes an expanded family assessment. For CPS, a decision was made that this will be accomplished by requiring a more comprehensive family assessment followed by a family team meeting. Review periods will change from a maximum of three months to a maximum of six months. If sufficient change is not made by the end of fifteen months (in line with foster care time standard for TPR requirements), policy will require a multi-disciplinary staffing to determine plan for immediate safety of children. This group included state and county DFCS, Child Welfare Policy and Practice Group, Office of the Child Advocate. This new process requires a much more in-depth study of the family, including individual family members. Required information covers many functioning, looking at individual children and adults in the household. Requirements also include completion of a genogram and eco map. By having more information about the family and more family involvement in planning, better case plans and better results for change are expected. With more information, it will be possible to better assess mental health, domestic violence and substance abuse. Better assessment is one way to help reduce premature case closure.

Work group for policy and procedure development for new family team meeting procedures for CPS families included state and county DFCS, Child Welfare Policy and Practice Group, Office of Child Advocate, state Professional Development (training), Family Connection Partnership. CPS policy/procedure for family assessment and family team meeting (FTM) was completed for the nine-county pilot in December 2002. This includes guidelines, within the family assessment, to collect information for better assessment of mental health, substance abuse and domestic violence. The FTM should also help reduce premature case closure, since it provides the opportunity to discuss problems (MH, DV, SA) identified during the assessment. The nine pilot counties received this policy and procedure in December 2002.

**DOCUMENTATION:**

[See Attachment 1: pilot manual, Sections I and V, for family assessment and family team meeting.]

Work group for developing domestic violence (DV) policy and procedure included state and county DFCS, state DV staff, DV shelter representatives. Draft policy development was completed in January 2003

**DOCUMENTATION:**

(See Attachment 2: pilot manual sections for domestic violence response). The pilot counties have the policy and are in pre-planning stage toward implementation of the pilot. Greater awareness and assessment of domestic violence should result in a more comprehensive case plan and thus reduce premature case closure.



## **Continues in Process**

Work on premature case closure began December 2002. The Protective Services Unit is emphasizing in policy training sessions already existing policy and procedure for achieving goals prior to case closure. Policy training is scheduled throughout the state in 2003.

### **DOCUMENTATION:**

(See Attachment B1 - # 3 -- Training Schedule).

Professional Development Section is on track with core competency development. That Section is also developing CPS training topics that will be available to staff via the Internet.

In response to expressed policy clarification and training needs, voiced by the nine counties piloting family assessment/family team meeting counties, two program consultants in the Division's Protective Services Unit are currently developing a more in depth policy training. They have held meetings in both the north and south regions of the state with pilot participants to determine the areas of greatest need. Training is being planned for fourth quarter.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter:** Training sessions have been developed and were scheduled to begin in October; however, these sessions are on hold, because of the directive for immediate statewide mandated safety and risk training for all CPS staff.

In response to directives from the department's transition team, preparing for top administrative changes, Child Protective Services is assisting with developing additional requirements for recognition of safety and risk factors. This includes completing a risk assessment on every CPS investigation. Previously, the risk assessment has been completed only on substantiated reports. For an unsubstantiated investigation that rates as High on the risk scale, preventive services will be offered to the family, and an attempt will be made to provide ongoing services to the family in an effort to reduce the risk and prevent likely future maltreatment. Statewide mandatory training on new case requirements begins in October 2003. Staff will first attend a one-day introductory session, followed within the next few weeks by a more in-depth two-day training on the new requirements. Several forms have been revised to better capture the individual conditions and needs of each child.

Additions being made to CPS policy also include additional requirements for supervisor review and for supervisor and case manager conferences and more documented joint decision making at key decision points. A copy of the enhancements to policy and procedure that become effective next PIP quarter will be included with Georgia's next quarterly report. Another tool that will support this is a newly developed Supervisor's Handbook that will be introduced to supervisors at the mandatory training beginning in October.

The pilot discussed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report for Internet training began in October 2003.

## **DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 4<sup>TH</sup> Quarter:**

(See attachment -- Form 455A Safety Assessment; Form 457 Risk Assessment). (See attachment -- Supervisor's Handbook)

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** Additional policy and procedure changes pertaining to Safety and Risk (MT 2003-05) and Suspicions of Child Maltreatment (MT 2003-07) are written and in the field. These changes strengthen the review process for screening out a report, helps the case manager to better individualize each child's safety needs, require a risk assessment on every investigation (both substantiated and unsubstantiated) and strengthens supervisor requirements at all major decision points. Policy now requires that every report, received from a mandated reporter on any age child, will be opened for investigation. A reporter's reasonable suspicions or concerns are sufficient to accept the report and to begin an investigation.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** (See Attachments -- MT 2003-05 and MT 2003-07)

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** Additional policy supports child safety and risk by requiring (1) that an accumulated record of all CPS history, including screened-out reports be attached inside the case record (MT 2004 – 01) and (2) that a criminal background check be completed on all persons identified as a significant other to a household member or who takes on a caretaking role to children in the household (MT 2004 – 05).

As a result of departmental reorganization, several steps are in place to further enhance the results of B1 Action Steps. These include the development of a Child Protection Certification Program (CPCP) that involves the certification of frontline workers and supervisors (new hires and incumbents) in the Office of Child Protection (OCP, formerly Social Services Section) to ensure that standards of competency are met and that certification is tied to a career path program that encourages and rewards professional growth. Staff in all service program areas must be certified by December 31, 2004. The Education and Research Section has designed major new worker certification training. The first new worker certification class (sixteen weeks of classroom study and field mentoring) began in April 2004. Weeks 1 – 4 are classroom instruction; weeks 5 – 8 are working with a mentor; weeks 9 – 12 are classroom instruction; weeks 13 – 16 are working with a mentor. Classroom instruction includes segments devoted to domestic violence issues, family systems and child development, including “normal” vs. “not normal” behaviors.

All case managers have been issued (and received training on) a tablet PC which will assist with field work and have links to needed forms and information. Use of the PC reduces the time case managers must spend in the office, thus allowing for more time on home visits and other field contacts.

State policy writers for CPS, placement services and adoptions, along with county staff representation, are currently combining all service policy for their respective programs into one streamlined user manual.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Documentation:**

Attachment – New Worker Certification Training (weeks 1 – 4)

Attachment – MT 2004 - 01 and MT 2004 - 05

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** B1: The completion date for this step was January 04 -- the state is seriously delayed and did not include this step in the annual renegotiation. State cites MT 2003-05 and MT 2003-07 as documentation to support its assessment that the step is achieved. How does the State intend to implement training on the new policies given the concerns raised in the Barriers to Achievement section.

B1. Again, the state rates the step as achieved, but reports inconsistent information from what was reported last quarter. The State provides MT 2004-01, MT 2004-05, and New Worker Certification Training (weeks 1 -- 4) as documentation to support their assessment. This report also states that the Child Protection Certification Program (CPCP) is 'in development.' ACF cannot concur with the State's assertion of achievement for this step until the necessary training has been developed as stated in the Action Step. The reorganization issues raised by the State in the 5<sup>th</sup> Quarterly Report are not addressed in the 6<sup>th</sup> Quarterly Report. Do these issues continue to have a negative impact on the State's ability to complete the work for this step and how will those issues be managed?

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The development of recommendations and policy has been completed. The revised family assessment policy was implemented in the pilot Community Partnership for Protection of Children (CPPC) sites. The revised domestic violence policy was implemented in two pilot counties. The mission, values and beliefs supporting this policy has been incorporated in the “Authority to Intervene” training which was provided statewide and also in the redesign of the new worker training. The impact of this policy will be measured in part by changes in the Key Indicators in Performance (KIP), which is monitored monthly. The new worker training is being redeveloped at this time. CPPC is continuing at the original nine sites but fiscal restraints do not permit expansion at this time. The impact of CPPC is being evaluated by contract through the Carl Vinson Institute for Government, University of Georgia.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

Additional policy and procedure will add to the responsibilities of CPS staff, whose numbers continue below what is needed to adequately handle the number of CPS cases in the state. It is anticipated that training on Domestic Violence policy/procedure will alleviate some of these concerns. Preplanning for the pilot for DV policy is underway in two selected counties. Meetings with DFCS, local law enforcement and other community players have begun.

**3rd Quarter:** The department has designated funding (\$60,000 for each county) to assist with this pilot. Each county will demonstrate a different approach to piloting policy. One county will pilot a 'first responder' concept, for which the additional funding will provide support for additional staff who will respond with law enforcement on DV calls and make a decision of whether a case is (1) assigned

for further CPS investigation, (2) is referred for early intervention services or (3) determine there is no DV concern. It is anticipated that this funding will help overcome the previously identified barriers to accomplishing the steps of this section. These were the workload size and the turnover rate of staff. Both high caseloads and lack of experience will hurt the results that the state is trying to accomplish.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** How does the State plan to fully accomplish this goal?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Georgia Reply:** The pilot for family assessment and family team meeting is only in nine counties. The pilot for domestic violence response is in two counties. Both require funding. Family assessment and team meeting procedure require a phased-in implementation. It is known that it took Alabama several years to phase in a similar assessment and family team meeting process. It cannot be a statewide reality for Georgia by 2004; however, it is anticipated that information will be available by then from the pilot to help determine how well this process is working in Georgia and how soon it can become a statewide reality. The two counties in the domestic violence pilot are receiving \$60,000 each for the yearlong pilot. Increased funding in any program is currently difficult to find. Georgia has 159 counties. Based on the findings from the two pilots, it will likely be necessary to draw conclusions about some of the most important findings and make decisions on which enhanced practices in these areas can be expanded to all counties with a minimum of available funding.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** State indicated that they have fully achieved the benchmark in January 2003, but now list all these barriers. Has it been fully achieved? How do we know?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Georgia Reply:** The benchmark is mostly achieved, but not fully. Attachments support achievements to date. An achievement date was recorded by mistake.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Training sessions are on hold, because of the directive for immediate statewide mandated safety and risk training for all CPS staff. The State comments in the third quarter report indicate funding issues. **Is this still an issue?** If so, how will it impact this segment of the PIP?

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Georgia Reply:** State DFCS reorganization is changing the size of state office, with many of those who have previously trained being assigned back to counties or to other programs. Much of the training that had been planned was to be presented by persons who now have other assignments. The Education and Research Section (formerly Professional Development Section) is responsible for training and continuing to develop new worker core training and other more specialized training modules.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Georgia Reply:** Action Steps are completed. There were several barrier questions remaining. The 6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Documentation should further clarify progress made toward eliminating barriers.

<b>B4 ACTION STEPS:</b>	<p><b>Strengthen prevention and early intervention strategies to prevent child abuse and support families.</b>          Develop and implement voluntary support for medically fragile children at high risk of abuse. <b>(Achieved)</b>          Expand capacity for parent aide and early intervention. <b>(Achieved -</b> programs have not been reduced in difficult budget times.)          Enhance access and use of UW 211 for screened out CPS calls to voluntary community assistance. <b>(Achieved)</b>          Develop with Budget Office recommendations to adequately fund early intervention, parent aide, PUP and Homestead. <b>(Achieved –</b> programs have not been reduced in difficult budget times)          Develop a more thorough assessment of family strengths and needs, particularly regarding the presence of substance abuse and domestic violence. <b>(Achieved)</b>          Complete an annual Qualitative Case Review (QCR), similar to the CFSR, on a representative sampling of case records. <b>(Partially Achieved.</b> Two quarterly QCRs have been completed. The first QCR was submitted as documentation in the 5<sup>th</sup> report. The second QCR report is attached as documentation). <b>7th Report: Partially Achieved. The third QCR was a cumulative report from October 2003 – June 2004. An annual has not been completed.</b>          Complete a comparison to the results of Georgia's 2001 CFSR and the level of compliance after additional policy clarification, training and program implementation is operational. <b>(Achieved)</b></p>		
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Sept. 2002	Jan. 2004 <b>5th Quarter Report:</b> Per PIP Annual Evaluation/Renegotiations requested to extend date to July 2004 to allow for accumulative QCR data.	Protective Services state and county staff, Grady Hospital, United Way 211 staff, DHR MHDDAD Staff.	Partnership with Dekalb and Fulton DFCS and Grady Hospital for early intervention of children at high risk. Partnership with United Way 211 to provide dedicated, formalized information and referral outbound calling services to CPS screened out reports. Number of CPS cases in CPPC hub communities with in-depth family assessment and family team meeting. Number of families served through early intervention.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** The success of the current partnership with Grady Hospital is incentive to extend this model to other state hospitals. Approximately fifty families were referred to this program in 2002. There have been no reports of serious injury or child death of any of the fragile infants whose families receive services through the high-risk program. Parent aide and early intervention funding remains at the same level. For the quarter ended October 2002, there were a total of 151 referrals for screened out reports made to UW 211. A total of 62 families were available for resource referral, with a total of 355 referrals provided. Researching a way to measure outcomes for families that receive referrals through UW 211 was begun during the quarter.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** Exploration has begun with the DHR Division of Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities and Addictive Diseases (MHDDAD), to explore using addiction specialists to participate in family team meetings. There are various Medicaid-reimbursable services that might be needed as a result of a family team meeting where it is determined that identified family members need assistance with substance abuse or mental health problems.

**DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 3<sup>RD</sup> Quarter:**

[See attachment - United Way 211 April 2003 Monthly Report for additional information on this preventive service.]

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The State did not document any progress made in the fourth quarter. The completion date is January 2004, and there appears to be no indication that the funding issue would be resolved. The QCR report would shed light on the progress of this action step.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report** The UW 211 project is now expanded to include Region V, the twelve counties that are part of the pilot for centralized intake in Georgia. This should address some of the federal concerns discussed in the "Barriers to Achievement".

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** See attached QCR Report. This report has also been forwarded to ACF Regional Office via email.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Funding for the CPPC pilot was not continued; however, counties that piloted this project are maintaining community involvement. Much was learned from the CPS component that piloted use of an expanded family assessment and the family team meeting. This knowledge will be useful in the development of future policies and procedures.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** B4: One of the Action Steps is to develop 'a more thorough assessment of family strengths and needs, particularly regarding the presence of substance abuse and domestic violence.' The State has reported this as achieved -- please

provide ACF with a copy of the assessment to document completion. Additionally, has the State determined the 'number of CPS cases in CPPC hub communities with in-depth family assessments and family team meetings' - one of the Benchmark items.

**7<sup>th</sup> Report:** B2 Action Step was to develop family assessment, which includes policy for the assessment of mental health, substance abuse and domestic violence needs and prevents premature case closure. This **assessment was developed** and was part of the pilot in the CPPC hub communities in nine counties. Funds were not available to expand this assessment process to additional counties. To help support the plan, vendors were used to complete the expanded assessment and the family team meeting that followed. Currently CPPC is being reestablished in the nine pilot counties. Although, the expanded assessment is not in use statewide, it was developed prior to the projected completion date. The mission, values and beliefs supporting this policy has been incorporated in the “Authority to Intervene” training which was provided statewide and also in the redesign of the new worker training. The impact of this policy will be measured in part by changes in the Key Indicators in Performance (KIP), which is monitored monthly.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

Expansion of UW 211 to other counties where this service is available will involve finding additional funding. Maintenance of this resource is hoped for at the current level for the next fiscal year. United Way is also reducing service.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter:** Expansion of UW 211 is also dependent upon United Way's capacity to expand their resource to other parts of the state. Anticipated effects on intervention strategies, based on state budget cuts, are not yet known. Efforts are being made to maintain these strategies at the current funding levels.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** How does the agency plan to accomplish these action steps? Is this achievable by the due date?

**Georgia's Reply 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter:** Maintaining what's already in place in this time of budget cuts is viewed as an achievement.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** These action steps are essential in keeping track of progress. Will these activities just not be accomplished if the funding is not achieved? What is the State's contingency plan (if any)?

**Georgia's Reply 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter:** Continued improvements and expansion will be made when/if opportunity permits. Full completion of most of these action steps, as written, involves expanding each step throughout the state and is dependent upon increased funding. At present, it is more realistic to try to maintain what is in place, while being alert to and acting on any expansion opportunities that may occur.

**Georgia's Reply 6<sup>th</sup> Quarter:** Georgia remains in a severe budget crisis. As state agencies are required to continue cutting programs, this department is fortunate that funding for key programs serving children has not been cut.

## Work Plan Detail C -- Item 6, Stability of Foster Care Placement

<b>C5 ACTION STEPS:</b>	<p>Analyze data at the county and worker level to identify issues of stability on a certain caseload or in a certain county.</p> <p>The following was added per ACF review of 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:</p> <p>To address the data discrepancy, DFCS must complete several assessments of moves in the financial reporting system (COSTAR) to the number of moves reported in the Internal Data System/AFCARS (IDS). When the computer system upgrade is completed, DFCS will compare the number of placement moves in the data system to the number of placement moves in an on-site review of case records for children in non-related family foster homes in Toombs, Fulton and Carroll counties. The Evaluating and Reporting Section (E&amp;R) will generate a sample of cases similar to the Child and Family.</p>		
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
May 2002	<p>July 2003 3rd Quarter: Requesting approval to extend the date to November 2003 in order to gather more data for the analysis.</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested an extension to July 2004 in order to collect data and initiate data analysis in the newly added COSTAR data fields.</p>	Andy Barclay, Joe Wassell, Jill Andrews, TA: Shirley Vassey, Andy Barclay	Provide report of the findings to the team and each county department.

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1st Quarter Report: This benchmark was partially achieved.** The Work Group developed a process to analyze data at the county and worker level. DFCS must complete several computer system upgrades prior to implementing this action step. The upgrades should be completed by June 2003. **What needs to be accomplished:** During the 2001 on- site case record review portion of the CFSR, a



discrepancy in the accuracy of data reported for this indicator was identified. The number of placement moves identified during the on-site record reviews was 70% while the AFCARS data was 92% for the same reporting period. Due to this discrepancy, the PIP addresses the need to improve the accuracy of the reporting data and the stability of children in foster care (actual number of placement moves).

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report** - A change in the completion date was approved. No report is due this quarter.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** What is the status/update of this action steps? We need to be able to know your progress in this area.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report Georgia's Reply:** We have analyzed the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter in FFY 2003, which was the first time that a comparison of the two systems could be made. We are requesting an extension to the completion date in order to gather more data and perform a more thorough analysis.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Extension granted with the expectation that by the fourth Qtr. Of the PIP, the State will identify any accomplishments in this action step.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The CoStar System, used for reporting financial information, incorporated some changes at the beginning of FFY 2003. Changes included adding fields with limited biographical information on the children in a placement setting with a required per diem. This information can be used to identify foster children included in CoStar and AFCARS allowing a comparison for the stability of foster care placements. The comparisons for the first and second quarters cannot be valid until identifying information for AFCARS children is in the system and all financial data in the CoStar System is complete.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Why has there been a delay in collecting all the information? When does the State anticipate that the information for all necessary fields in 'CoStar' will be collected? Following the collection of information, when will the comparative analysis be ready?

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** All of the data fields have been added to CoStar. The state is now in the process of analyzing the data.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** C5: The State has apparently missed one of the steps which was to have been accomplished prior to COSTAR modifications – DFCS was to complete several assessments comparing the number of moves shown in COSTAR with those shown in IDS. Has this comparison been completed and what were the results? What data source did the State use to report Placement stability in the PIP Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report? In the 6<sup>th</sup> Quarterly Report the State reports being “in the process of analyzing the data.” ACF looks forward to the results of the analysis in the next quarterly report which will also include a comparison of COSTAR placement stability with case records of children in 3 counties. ACF approved the collapse of five additional Action Steps

(C12, C13, C14, and C15) into Action Step C5 increasing the importance of the completion of timely and accurate work. Furthermore, this step is foundational to the completion of Action Step C18.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** To address the data discrepancy, DFCS has completed a comparison of moves recorded in the financial reporting system (COSTAR, County Statistical Reporting System) to the number of moves reported in the Internal Data System/AFCARS for children in foster care in Toombs, Carroll and Fulton County DFCS. The Evaluation and Reporting Section has examined placement moves in conjunction with an on-site review in Toombs, Carroll and Fulton County DFCS. The following is the process used for the comparison as well as a summary of suggested follow up to address with county DFCS staff issues surrounding stability of foster care placements. The Report below is also made a part of the documentation attachments for this report.

## **Examination of the Correlation Between COSTAR Payees and AFCARS Number of Previous Placements**

### **Introduction**

Much attention has been given to the validity of the number of previous placements as tracked in the NUNPREVPLC field in the AFCARS data system. In the interest of improving the quality of data collection practices within the counties, a brief examination of data extracted from the COSTAR data system was utilized as a method of comparison and verification. AFCARS (Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System) is the federal information system used to collect and process the data for children in foster care. COSTAR (County Statistical Reporting System) is Georgia's DFCS system used to track purchases of services and Title IV-E expenditures for all social services programs for budgetary purposes.

### **Scope**

The study consisted of three counties: Carroll, Fulton, and Toombs. The time span that was selected was FFY 2003 (October 1, 2002 – September 30, 2003). The data was evaluated for each quarter within the FFY. COSTAR data was selected from both IVE and Non-IVE Children who had been serviced during FFY 2003. In addition, children were selected from the AFCARS database who had also been in foster care during FFY 2003. The logic of the comparison was to count the number of payees within the COSTAR data system to deduce the number of movements for the client/child who had received services. In AFCARS, whenever a child is placed with a differing valid placement setting, the number of previous placements is incremented to reflect the movement.

### **Data analysis/examination**

The steps that were involved in conducting this analysis were as follows:

1. Universal selection of children from AFCARS who were in foster care for each Quarter of FFY 2003 and all COSTAR children who received services during the same time spans.
2. Establish a matching process between both systems to determine the population of children who are common to both data systems.

3. Track and count the number of payees in the COSTAR system alongside the number of recorded placements in AFCARS.
4. Compare the number of payees (equivalent to a move) in the COSTAR system with the number of moves in the AFCARS data system.

## Selecting the Universal Population of Children

In AFCARS, constraints were placed on the latest removal date and placement discharge dates. Children who entered care (latest removal) prior to the end of each quarter (December 31, 2002, March 31, 2003, June 30, 2003, and September 30, 2003) and who were discharged (PLCDISCH) on or after the beginning of each quarter (October 1, 2002, January 1, 2003, April 1, 2003, and July 1, 2003) were considered to be "in-care" during the respective time spans. Social security numbers were then extracted from IDS online database utilizing the county, case numbers, and client numbers for the children.

COSTAR children were selected from two different data tables. IVE Children were extracted for respective quarterly service dates as the AFCARS children along with corresponding payee names, payee amounts, and UAS codes (codes used in COSTAR to denote type and source of payment). Non-IVE children were extracted for respective quarterly service dates along with corresponding payee names, payee amounts, and UAS codes by social security numbers. Payee amounts are per diem expenditures for both IVE and Non-IVE children.

### Comparing the Number of Moves in COSTAR to the Moves in AFCARS

The table below lists the resulting comparison of the previous step. The analysis included only children that could be matched (using demographic data fields) between the two systems. Table I indicates the total number of differences of moves between the IDS/AFCARS system and the COSTAR system.

TABLE I

### **COSTAR vs AFCARS MOVES**

#### **Matching Unique Children and No. of Differences**

		COUNTY		
Quarter of FFY 2003		CARROLL	FULTON	TOOMBS
Quarter 1	No. of Unique Children	99	709	39

	# of Differences	35	124	11
	% of Children With Differences	35%	17%	28%
Quarter 2	No. of Unique Children	98	760	40
	# of Differences	32	115	13
	% of Children With Differences	33%	15%	33%
Quarter 3	No. of Unique Children	102	807	24
	# of Differences	29	73	9
	% of Children With Differences	28%	9%	38%
Quarter 4	No. of Unique Children	108	866	32
	# of Differences	31	134	11
	% of Children With Differences	29%	15%	34%

Table II gives the instances of the number of moves in COSTAR that were greater than AFCARS.

Table II

## COSTAR GREATER THAN AFCARS

		COUNTY		
Quarter of FFY 2003		CARROLL	FULTON	TOOMBS

Quarter 1	# of Differences	35	124	11
	COSTAR Moves > AFCARS	25	95	9
Quarter 2	# of Differences	32	100	13
	COSTAR Moves > AFCARS	15	66	10
Quarter 3	# of Differences	29	71	9
	COSTAR Moves > AFCARS	1	57	5
Quarter 4	# of Differences	31	134	11
	COSTAR Moves > AFCARS	17	122	7

#### Unique Children in Care 12 Months or Less

In order to make comparisons with the federal measure on stability the three county study of children population from COSTAR and AFCARS was further refined selecting only those children with 2 or less placement moves and in care 12 months or less. The total number of children in FFY 2003 in Carroll, Fulton, and Toombs counties who had been in care less than 12 months with 2 or less placements was 625 unique children.

Carroll County produced 52 matches with the COSTAR database. Thirty-one (60%) children had the same number of moves in both data systems. In 13 (25%) cases, the number of COSTAR moves exceeded the number of AFCARS moves.

Fulton County produced 544 matches with the COSTAR database. Four hundred five (74%) of these children had the same number of moves in both data systems. In 117 cases (22%), the number of COSTAR moves exceeded the number of AFCARS moves.

Finally, Toombs County had only 29 matches between the COSTAR and AFCARS databases. Sixteen of the children (55%) were the same in both systems. In 8 cases (28%), the number of COSTAR moves exceeded the number of AFCARS moves.

The total number of children with equivalent moves was 452 (72%). The number of children who had more moves in COSTAR than AFCARS was 138 (22%).

There were 35 children (6%) who had more moves recorded in AFCARS than COSTAR.

Analysis of the AFCARS moves are greater than COSTAR moves can be explained to some degree by procedures inherent to federal definitions of a move and the data captured in the COSTAR system. In AFCARS, a move is added when a child is transferred to any non per diem relative placement. This move would not be recorded in COSTAR. AFCARS current functionality indicates a move when a child's placement setting

changes to Pre-Adoptive. However, this change should be counted only when the child's physical setting changes, not if the child's foster home becomes the pre-adoptive placement. There is a possibility that placement change is recorded in AFCARS for respite care. Federal AFCARS regulations exclude respite care from the count of placements.

#### SUMMARY OF COMPARISON RELATED TO ISSUES OF STABILITY

Comparison of data related to Stability of foster care placements points to the need to clarify with county DFCS staff policies and procedures regarding placement moves. Emphasis should be placed on consistency of the data entered into the AFCARS and COSTAR systems and updating all data with every placement in AFCARS. A change in the AFCARS query from the IDS system should be made so as to exclude counting a move when a child's placement type is changed to Pre-Adoptive home yet the child remains in the same physical placement.

### Qualitative Review of Fulton, Carroll and Toombs County DFCS

Results of the on site reviews in these counties are included in the report for Qualitative Reviews.

#### **7th Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

- (1) Examination of the Correlation Between COSTAR Payees and AFCARS Number of Previous Placements
- (2) Social Services Report, Qualitative Case Reviews – October 2003 – June 2004 (cumulative)

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter:** The collection of the additional fields in CoStar has not been completed for all children in foster care (AFCARS) for FFY 2003 quarters one and two.

<b>C7 ACTION STEPS:</b>	Georgia will provide technical assistance (TA) to DFCS staff and private providers as to how to use FP/BP assessment information to make the most appropriate permanency decisions and implementation of wraparound services at the beginning of the child's stay in care. The FP/BP information will be used to develop more effective case plans for the child and family. Incorporate FP/BP Summary and Recommendation Reports in the CPRS. The inclusion of the FP/BP information in the CPRS will assist staff in developing case plans for children and their families. A pilot of the CPRS is underway in Dekalb DFCS and Juvenile Court to assure that the FP/BP Summary Reports meet the needs of families, judges and DFCS staff. For the phase two CPRS development, we will expand to include FP/BP data collection. Generally, plans are to include the ability to collect the recommendations from the
-------------------------	---

FP/BP comprehensive assessment. It will also collect data about the services actually provided to the child. Because of a mandate on Public Health to assure that our Foster Children have all the services available, we will add a section to the CPRS to track the child's Health Check Schedule and assure that any required treatment or follow up is provided.			
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
July 2002	February 2004 <b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested an extension to July 2004 to allow for the build of the CPRS report and accumulative QCR data.	Joe Wassell, Betty Wrights, Millicent Houston, Dianne Yearby, Alice Marie Hutchison, Leslie Cofield, Stakeholders	Provide 11 county site trainings to staff and providers beginning 7/2002 and review cases in selected counties during the annual on-site review beginning 10/2002. <b>5th Quarter: Per Annual evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to change benchmark to say 'Provide 11 county site trainings to staff and providers beginning 7/2002. Cases reviewed in selected counties'.</b>

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: This benchmark was partially achieved.** All current DFCS staff and providers have been trained on FP/BP wrap around policies and procedures. All foster care staff have been trained on the Case Plan Reporting System (CPRS). The PIP states that this will be completed on July '03. The new target date for completion will be February '04. Business process analysis will begin in early March '03. Implementation will begin in March 2004.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report** - A change in the completion date was approved. No report due this quarter.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** What is the status/update of this action steps? We need to be able to know your progress in this area.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report Georgia's Reply:** The Case Plan Reporting System (CPRS) has been trained on and implemented in all 159 Georgia counties. DFCS policy mandates its use. Functionality to capture data about First Placement Best Placement is being added to CPRS by 12/03. Reporting will assist in data collection about recommendations made during the comprehensive assessment and the state's ability to provide the recommended resources. This information will be available by county, region, and state.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The build of the report has been requested. It is anticipated that the state will renegotiate this item.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The First Placement Best Placement has been added to CPRS but not trained on. Tracking the child's Health Check Schedule has not been added. Work is in process.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The training for the pilot of the enhancements to the CPRS has experienced a delay. Training will begin in May 2004.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** C7: When does the State anticipate completion of the Health Check Schedule in CPRS to be complete? How will this delay impact the renegotiated completion date of 7/04?

C7: Has the Health Check Schedule been implemented in CPRS? Is the State on track to complete this step by 7/04?

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Health Check is complete.

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

<b>C8 ACTION STEPS:</b>  Georgia will complete an annual review (of selected counties) of the First Placement/Best Placement Program to include on-site case reviews of 50 randomly selected cases. This review will be similar to the federal on-site review. Children, caregivers/families and other stakeholders will be interviewed. Fulton will be included at each annual review. These Consultants will assist county supervisors and other stakeholders in conducting the annual qualitative case review. DFCS will provide training to these consultants and other stakeholders on the procedures for conducting this annual review. DFCS will develop a contract with a provider to provide this training. <b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter:</b> Georgia request ACF approval to change this action step to the following statement: Qualitative Case Reviews similar to the CFSR will be conducted on a representative sample of approximately 180 cases by the end of September 2004. <b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:</b> Identify accomplishment and the new action steps adopted <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to change this action step to read 'The Evaluation and Reporting Section will conduct qualitative case reviews on a representative sample of cases'.			
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Oct. 2002 3rd Quarter: Request	October 2003 3rd Quarter: Request	3rd Quarter: Delete the following names: Joe Wassell. Bettv Wrights. Millicent	Complete at least 50 case review beginning 1/2003. 3rd Quarter: Produced Qualitative Review Reports to



approval to change date to October 2003. The Qualitative Review is scheduled to begin in Oct.	approval to change this date to September 2004 to accommodate the Qualitative Review process. <b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to an extension to July 2004.	Houston, Dianne Yearby, Leslie Cofield, Alice Marie Hutchison, Change to Evaluation & Reporting and Consultation & Support Sections	State and Federal partners in January 2004 and every quarter thereafter. <b>5th Quarter: Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to change to 'Reports will be generated to State and Federal partners quarterly'.</b>
---	--	---	---

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: This benchmark was partially achieved.** Four Foster Care Consultants have been assigned to the 12 Field Areas to monitor foster care PIP indicators in collaboration with other state staff and county staff.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report** - A change in the completion date was approved. No report is due for this quarter.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** What is the status/update of this action steps? We need to be able to know your progress in this area.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report Georgia's Reply:** The state is requesting a change to this Action Step. The Evaluation and Reporting Section is working on developing review instruments.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** We anticipate that the State will be able to begin the QCR in October and report this action step in the January QPR.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** It is expected that the Georgia will renegotiate this item.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Why does the State want to switch from annual reviews of 50 cases to review of 180 cases by Sept. 2004. State needs to provide a little more detail in terms of how many cases per month, per quarter, counties, etc. What is the progress thus far?

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The first round of QCRs have been conducted and the report has been forwarded to the Regional ACF over eight personnel and is made a part of the 5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Progress Report. Twelve county offices were reviewed. Twenty-five cases were

randomly selected. The Stability of Foster Care Placement indicator was rated as strength in 20 of the 24 records reviewed (83.33%). For further discussions on this indicator please see the attached report. The State will continue to provide quarterly QCR reporting

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Documentation:** Social Services Quarterly Report, Qualitative Case Reviews, October 2003 -- December 2003

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The second round of QCRs were conducted in 16 county offices. Thirty-seven cases were randomly selected. The Stability of Foster Care Placement indicators was rated a strength in 26 of the 36 records reviewed (72.22%). The average number of placement moves for the 36 applicable cases reviewed during the six month reporting period was 1.71 moves (1.92 in the previous QCR). For further discussions on this indicator please see the attached report. The State will continue to provide quarterly QCR reporting.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Quarterly Report, Qualitative Case Reviews, January 2004 - March 2004.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** C8: The State reports in the 6<sup>th</sup> Quarterly Report that in 72.22% of cases reviewed, Item 6 was rated as a strength. This is inconsistent with what is reported in the QCR table and also the reduction in the average number of moves when comparing the most recent QCR with the previous. Please clarify.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Statement, 72.22% of cases reviewed, were rated as a strength, was taken from the narrative of the report at the top of page 4. There appeared to be misunderstanding regarding this indicator as well as a mistake in the table. The previous two quarterly reports included information about moves for the entire foster care episode rather than in care for less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal. The time frame was not limited to the reporting period.

The current information is based on only the children who have been in care less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal. Only 14 of the 72 cases 64.28% (cumulative) met the federal definition for this measure. Five cases had more than two moves 35.72%. An additional 40 randomly selected cases that meet the definition of the federal measure will be reviewed in order to bring the case reviews to more than 50 for this item. This should provide a more representative result.

Statewide data from FFY 2004, 2nd quarter indicates that 89.03% had no more than two placement settings.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter: DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Qualitative Case Reviews, October 2003 – June 2004 (cumulative)

## **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>C16 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Analyze a sample of cases to identify characteristics of children and resource families that might lead to disruptions.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Jan. 2003	July 2003 <b>3rd Quarter:</b> Requesting a change in date to November 2003. Action Step 15 will need to be completed before sample cases can be identified. <b>3rd Quarter Federal Response:</b> We anticipate to measure your progress in this area by the end of 4th Qtr. <b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested an extension to July 2004.	Shirley Vassey	Complete a report to the team.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** The Work Group on Stability clarified this action step in order to capture variables that impact this outcome.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response: DOES CLARIFICATION OF THIS ACTION STEP INDICATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS?**  
 Will the State be on target to complete this by the July due date?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Georgia's Reply:** No report at this time. See request for change of completion date.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** No report at this time. See request in change for completion date. It is expected that the state will renegotiate this time

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The State has not addressed RO's question regarding how the effectiveness of policy and training is being examined. No update is given on these steps.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** See Action Step 12 for response to RO's question. For Federal Fiscal year 2003 an analysis is underway to extrapolate from the total population of children in foster care those with special needs. The measurements of placement moves will be taken and comparisons made to determine the characteristics of children that might lead to placement moves.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The two Qualitative Case Review Reports indicate the following reasons for foster placement disruptions: (1) requested by foster parents due to child's behavior or changes in the foster parent's living arrangement; (2) child did not adjust to the placement; (3) foster parent could not effectively handle the child's mental health issues; (4) health issues expressed by the foster parents; (5) several of the moves involved initial moves into foster care until relative placements could be explored and approved (once relative were approved, children were placed with relatives); (6) requests made by foster parent due to complaints from the parent about the foster parent; and (7) temporary placements until a more stable placement was located.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Quarterly Report, Qualitative Case Reviews, January 2004 - March 2004.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** C16: Information provided in the 6<sup>th</sup> Quarterly Report lists *reasons for disruptions*, it is not an analysis which identifies “*characteristics of children and resource families that might lead to disruptions.*” The State may want to consider engaging the help of an NRC to assist them with conducting such an analysis using data obtained from the QCR's.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State will consider soliciting the help of NRC for a true analysis. It is doubtful that this action step will be completed by the end of the Pip reporting period.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

\_\_\_\_\_

<b>C18 ACTION STEPS:</b>	If the stability as measured by the data systems and file reviews has not improved significantly within 2 quarters. then the following additional actions will be taken:
--------------------------	--

		Recommend additional training and policy changes. Identify additional factors that may contribute to the stability of children in foster care.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
January 2003	<p>April. 2003</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter:</b> Georgia is requesting an extension to September 2003.</p> <p><b>2nd Quarter Federal Response:</b> Provide reason(s) for requesting extension</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter Georgia Reply:</b> Georgia request to extend this date to November 2003 to coincided with the activities of action steps 15, 16, 17.</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter Federal Response:</b> We anticipate to measure your progress in this area by the end of 4th Qtr.</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested an extension to July 2004...</p>	Joe Wassell, Betty Wrights, Millicent Houston, Dianne Yearby, Alice Marie Hutchison, Leslie Cofield	Complete a report to the team.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report :** Georgia is requesting an extension for this Action Step. Due to preparation for the Inspector General EPSDT Review; a 25% increase in the number of Interstate Compact case request and a complete review of 120 First Placement/Best Placement providers, the four Foster Care Consultants have not had sufficient time to initiate the case reviews.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response: Indicate your up to date progress.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report Georgia's Reply:** This action is contingent upon the previous three action steps.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** This action is contingent upon the previous three action steps.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The State has not addressed RO's question regarding how the effectiveness of policy and training is being examined. No update is given on these steps.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** See Action C12 regarding training and policy. Action Step C1 and C5 enumerate the strategies by which data will be collected and analyzed. An analysis of this data will then provide information regarding any needed training and policy changes as well as additional factors contributing to the stability of children in foster care.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Report:** C18: Given the foundational nature of Step C5 and the delays associated with it, does the State believe that the renegotiated date for this step is reasonable since it is contingent upon the completion of C5. Both C5 and C18 have renegotiated goal completion dates of 7/04.

NO progress reported in the 6<sup>th</sup> Quarter report

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The report from C5 is complete. See report. The obvious conclusions are to recommend additional training, and solicit the help of NRC to conduct an analysis.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---

## Work Plan Detail D -- Item 7, Permanency Goal for Child

D2 ACTION STEPS:		Maintain accurate documentation of every placement of a child in foster care	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Jan. 2002	<p>May 2003</p> <p><b>2nd Quarter</b></p> <p><b>Request:</b> Georgia is requesting to change the completion date to July 2003</p> <p><b>2nd Quarter</b></p> <p><b>Federal Response:</b> Provide reason(s) for requesting extension.</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter</b></p> <p><b>Georgia Reply:</b> The online supervisory review application experienced technical hardware difficulties. The Qualitative Review process is scheduled to begin in October 2003. The first report to the state and federal partners is scheduled for January 2004. Therefore, we are requesting approval to change this date to July 2004.</p>	County Supervisors, County Directors, Field Directors	<p>Have developed staff performance standards with DFCS county staff, Field Directors, and social service staff to assure that case files are accurately documented to reflect every placement of a child in foster care.</p> <p>Evaluation: Spot checks of files will be performed by the E &amp; R group to make sure this documentation is occurring.</p> <p>Evaluation: All needed information about placements will be available for next Federal Review.</p>

## ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Reports:** Supervisory tools are under development and the information system is being enhanced to account for the placement of every child in custody.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** Based on the increased data needs to support IDS Online with the proposed enhancement projects, there was a need to re-distribute our data to new servers to accommodate our growing data needs. The server that will support the site was not available in July 2003 and it is our plan to have the site available and operational by September 2003. The Qualitative Reviews are scheduled to begin in October 2003. The first report to state and federal partners is due January 2004 and every quarter thereafter.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Are you maintaining accurate documentation of every placement of a child in foster care?

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** IDS Placement Central database has been built and is in place. Linking of children to their placement locations has begun and is an on-going process.

## DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 4<sup>TH</sup> Quarter:

See Placement Central News

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** One of the measurable benchmarks is development of staff performance standards. 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter reports note that 'supervisory tools' are under development. Are the supervisory tools a product of the staff performance standards and if yes, have they been developed? This, along with the evaluation piece, would mark a successful completion of this action step.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Supervisory Tools are complete. The performance standards are a product of the supervisory tools. The online version of the Supervisory Review Form is complete. The first wave of QCRs is complete. The IDS Online is complete.

## 5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:

1. Child Placement Services Review Guide
2. Social Services Quarterly Report, Qualitative Case Reviews, October 2003 - December 2003.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** IDS Placement Central is fully implemented, as are the tools to evaluate consistency and accuracy in linking children to current placements. Request a change in the completion date to July 2004. This would allow E & R to conduct its spot check of files (mentioned in the benchmark) and for the results to be reported next quarter.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** D2: The State has submitted its third request for a change in goal completion to 7/04.



**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State has made two requests to extend the completion date in an effort to achieve this action step within this PIP implementation period. E & R does spot check files during reviews to determine if the child's placement is correctly captured in IDS. This is the State's ongoing way to monitor accuracy when reviewing the individual case file. Documentations below are report examples generated from the IDS Placement Central System (identifying information has been removed).

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** (1) Current Placements Report, (2) Foster Adoptive Home Report, and (3) Provider List Report, (4) Provider's Current Placements; (5) Child Placement History

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

**1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** The statewide database has been completed for the placements of all children in custody. Phase 2 will be complete in the spring of '03 and will account for each child in care. Developing the statewide database was labor intensive and required additional support and checking for accuracy.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter:** The above statements are not barriers and were inappropriately stated under this column.

<b>D4 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Require that permanency goals be documented as part of the on-line Case Plan Reporting System, CPRS Evaluation: A report will be developed quarterly from the CPRS about documented permanency goals from around the state.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
May 2002	May 2003 INDICATE THE DATE YOU PLAN TO ACCOMPLISH THIS GOAL. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> the State request an extension to July 2004 Reason: to fully address the ACF	Kelli Stone, Field Directors, County Directors, Supervisors, Consultation & Support Unit, Mentor Unit	Every child coming into care will have a case plan in the CPRS. <b>6<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> The state is requesting to change the benchmark to say "Permanency goals will be documented 90% of the case plans." Reason: to more specifically measure the achievement of the PIP Item and Action Step. New request: Your subsequent quarterly report should be able to demonstrate progress made in documenting permanency goals.

	concerns expressed in their 4th Quarter response. Had the State known of the ACF concern prior to renegotiations, this request would have been made during that time.		
--	---	--	--

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**Partially achieved.** There is an ongoing implementation plan for CPRS that will eventually include all 159 counties. Currently, 104 of the 159 counties have been trained to use the new system. After the implementation plan is complete at the end of January 2003, the quarterly reports about permanency goals will begin

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report** - No report is due for this quarter.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Due date was May 2003, why is this only partially achieved?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report Georgia's Reply: ACHIEVED.** CPRS requires the documentation of the Permanency Goal in all case plans. Implementation and training is complete in all 159 counties. Documentation of training by county and by date is also supplied.

The attached screen print (Permanency 1 Item 7) is taken from the Case Plan Reporting System (CPRS) Case Tracking and Legal Screen. CPRS is required, supported by policy, and implemented in all 159 GA counties. In all cases, the user must document the type of Permanency Plan selected for the child. The system requires any user who selects a type other than adoption, living with fit and willing relatives, guardianship, or reunification to document a compelling reason why this type is in the child's best interest.

CPRS is on the Internet at [www.gacaseplan.org](http://www.gacaseplan.org). A demo that does not require an ID or password is available.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** This step is noted to be achieved, based on completed trainings. However, based on the measurable benchmark, it sounds like it will be achieved when every child coming into care has a case plan in the CPRS. How does completion of training show that each child has a case plan and that the permanency goal (PG) is documented in the CPRS? How does the CPRS 'require' the documentation of the PG? The action step also calls for a statewide quarterly report from the CPRS that will show that the PGs are documented.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** As of December 2003, CPRS is in use in 157 counties. Still 2 counties are not using the system and that is being

addressed administratively. The state needed full adoption before a meaningful report could be produced. The first statewide report on permanency goals is attached. Of the more than 16,000 case plans in the system, 55% record reunification as the permanency goal. Quarterly reports will be produced from this point on and the plan is to automate these reports by June '04. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report documentation was submitted which addressed how CPRS 'require' the documentation of the PG.

#### **5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

PIP Results 02/18/2004 From CPRS... Permanency Goal for Children

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The last CPRS quarterly report “Permanency Goal for Children” was run in February 2004. It is too early to report another quarter. The next CPRS report will be reflected in the next PIP reporting period.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** D4: The State is requesting another modification -- to change the Benchmark from 'Every child coming into care will have a case plan in CPRS' to 'Permanency goals will be documented in 90% of the case plans.' The State has previously reported that the permanency goal is a 'required field' in CPRS. If that is the case, then permanency goals would, by virtue of the requirement, be documented in 100% of the case plans. The original benchmark has more meaning for Item 7 than the requested change.

**7<sup>TH</sup> Quarter Report:** The intent of the request to change the benchmark was to quantify the measurement as it relates to the evaluation statement in the Action Step. However, in complying with ACF 6<sup>th</sup> Report comments, the State will provide information on the number of children having case plans in CPRS. There are 20,730 case plans in CPRS. The AFCARS Data Frequency Report for October 1, 2003 through March 31, 2004 reports a total number of 19,426 children in foster care for that time period, with 14, 410 children remaining in foster care on March 31, 2004. The number of plans in CPRS is higher due to several factors. During the migration of plans from the original CPRS to CPRSv2, duplicate cases were created. The counties were not aware that they needed to close the original plan, so the duplicate plans remain. Other plans should have been closed when their case was closed. The Division is now providing training to supervisors on how to identify plans that need to be closed and how to close them. Additionally, supervisors and workers are receiving training on how to create a new plan and review existing plans. The developer for the system will review the system for “junk plans” and delete as appropriate. Even without the duplication, it will be difficult to have two different data systems to exactly match. However, the State is striving to get as close as possible to

#### **7<sup>TH</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** CPRS Case Plan Report by Plan Types

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** The training of all 159 counties (1,200 caseworkers) and juvenile court judges and staff (approximately 100 judges) has taken longer than planned but will be complete January 2003.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Is the training completed?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Georgia Reply:** Yes.

<b>D6 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Conduct annual training for judges, case managers, SAAGs, GALs, parent attorneys, CASAs, and Citizen Panel volunteers on the Permanency Hearing requirements.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Mar. 2002	November of every year: Two cross cultural trainings will be completed by Nov. 2004	Michelle Barclay, Geraldine Jackson White	Permanency hearings will take place in juvenile court for every child in state care no later than 12 months after a child has entered foster care and periodically no later than 12 months thereafter if the child remains in care. Evaluation: Georgia's Court Improvement Project (CIP) will evaluate a sample of court case files annually to see if permanency hearings are occurring for every child.

#### **ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarterly Report: Partially Achieved.** The 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Child Placement Conference Cross-Training Conference took place November 2002. Judges, case managers, Saags, GALs, parent attorneys, CASAs, and Citizen Panel volunteers attended. Workshops were taught on the requirement that permanency hearings occur on every case. The 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Child Placement Conference is being planned for Atlanta at this time for November 12-14, 2003. During the summer of 2002, the Court Improvement Project (CIP) reviewed random court case file reviews of 9 counties across Georgia. The judges and staff of those courts were either interviewed or surveyed regarding caseload and resource allocation. In addition, 70 court-hearing observations were performed. This work was collected in a database and shared with the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges Permanency Planning Department. From the initial report and the sample of data it does not appear that permanency hearings are occurring in every case. Further interviews reveal that while permanency issues are being addressed in court hearings, but are not being properly documented. A report has been written from this data and has been distributed to DHR and is posted on the CIP website:

<http://www.state.ga.us/courts/supreme/cppp/>

A second CIP study is being planned for the summer of 2003 and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court judges has again agreed to do the data analysis.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** The first GA CIP study was done in preparation of the CP Conference. Many courts were found NOT to be doing permanency hearings timely or the courts were NOT doing proper documentation of permanency hearings (i.e. addressing permanency issues, but not labeling such hearing as a permanency hearing). Recent judicial training emphasized that permanency hearings must be done and documented. A follow up study being conducted this summer and will look for improvement. The 4<sup>th</sup> Child Placement Conference is scheduled for November 2003.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** This step is noted to be achieved based on completed trainings again. However, the measurable benchmark is that timely permanency hearings (PHs) will occur for each child. 3<sup>rd</sup> QR (where the action step is noted as being achieved) shows that courts are not conducting PHs on a timely basis nor are they properly documenting these hearings. The step cannot be achieved unless each child has timely PHs...according to the action step and benchmark. The State needs to continue to monitor this action step.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Court Improvement Project (CIP) has done another review and is preparing another report based on that data which includes whether and when permanency hearings are done. CIP will have the report completed by the next quarter. A draft document is attached, but it is not ready for public distribution. CIP also has the capacity built within the CPRS to mark when the permanency hearing is occurring, however that field is rarely completed, so we cannot produce a good report. We will seek better ways to collect data on this action step and benchmark by next quarter's report.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

Draft - Summer Assessment Review 2003 - A Snapshot of Juvenile Court Performance in Child Deprivation Cases and Recommendations for Continued Improvement.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Efforts continued in monitoring the achievement of this benchmark. However, as reported in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter, documentation of a “permanency hearing” per se, is not always present in the court file and/or is not clearly labeled as such. When the Court Improvement Project (CIP) conducted its 2003 case file review, the file documents did not clarify whether the hearing was just a review (extension of custody at 12 months) or when held, if the hearing also reflected a “permanency hearing” phase. It was estimated that only ½ of the cases had a distinct hearing that was referred to in the court file as a “permanency hearing.” Since there appears to be an issue with how such hearings are documented as “permanency hearings,” it is our next step to recommend that judges adopt the permanency hearing model order. It is specifically labeled and provides findings for the hearing. Thus, when the court case files are sampled, the measurement will more accurately reflect the timeliness and occurrence of permanency hearings.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** D6: It is concerning that the State does not yet have the ability to accurately assess whether or not permanency hearings are occurring for children as mandated by ASFA.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State shares the federal concern that permanency hearings are not being accurately tracked and monitored via court files reviewed by the Court Improvement Project (CIP). Efforts continue to randomly review court files. An instrument has been developed for courts to self-report @ <http://www.objectresourcegroup.com/cpp/cpp.html>. The CIP is also conducting interviews of judges around the state regarding permanency hearings. Also, a model order for a permanency hearing (developed by a group of Georgia Juvenile Court Judges) is available for downloading via the CPRS website. The model order was also distributed statewide by email to the Georgia Juvenile Court Judges list serv. The State believes that these efforts along with continued training at the bi-annual Georgia judicial conferences will influence that permanency hearings will take place in every court and be meaningful. The State recognizes that even if the court files do not contain accurate documentation that “permanency hearings” (see terminology issue with respect to “motions to extend” hearings), the E & R Review does require this item in its standard desk review of case records.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Identify the reason/s for partial achievement.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Georgia Reply:** See 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report.

<b>D7 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Examine the present review system for children in care to determine the optimum frequency of reviews needed for expediting permanency.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Jan. 2002	Nov. 2002	Linda Doster, TA: Michelle Barclay	A decision will be made whether to change if necessary to ensure a review occurs every 3 months. Evaluation: Georgia's CIP will evaluate a sample of court case files annually to see if more frequent hearings lead to faster permanency.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Reports:** **Achieved.** During the summer of 2002, court case file reviews were done of nine counties across Georgia. The judges and staff of those courts were either interviewed or surveyed regarding caseload and resource allocation. In addition, 70 court-hearing observations were done. The data from this work was collected in a database and shared with the National

Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges Permanency Planning Department. From the initial report and the sample of data, reviews are occurring more often than every six months. From the snapshot of information collected, having more frequent reviews did not appear to effect time to permanency. More data will need to be collected in order to draw firm conclusions.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.**

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Did you conduct a review this summer? Have you made a determination? When do you plan to collect more data?

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Georgia Reply:** A subsequent review was conducted during the summer of 2003. The data collected from that study is presently being analyzed by the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges; however, preliminary indications suggest that although hearings are occurring more frequently, the increased frequency does not appear to increase time to permanency.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** This step is also noted as achieved but the State does not provide any information regarding the frequency of reviews. From the 4<sup>th</sup> QR narrative, it does not appear that this step will be achieved until the data analysis is completed and the State can determine why the frequency of reviews does not impact permanency.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** There is the capacity within the CPRS to mark the frequency of reviews, however the field is not completed regularly and therefore, a good report cannot be produced. We will seek better ways to collect data on this action step and benchmark by next quarter's report.

Judicial reviews are only required every 6 months. When we saw reviews being conducted more frequently during our CIP review, it usually meant it was a complex case (meaning it was going to take a lot of time anyway) and the judge holding more reviews to push the case along. Yet, in our sample, it was still taking more than 2 years for the children to get to permanency. See attached draft for summer assessment report.

What really seems to matter regarding which children get to permanency faster is the activist state of the local DFCS and the local court. If the court and the DFCS office are both activist and if the caseload is not too high for either group, then the cases move to permanency quicker. Thus, just doing more frequent reviews may not make permanency happen faster, but lots of problems get resolved at review time so it is still helpful.

The most helpful reports that the CIP has seen, describing which counties are most effective at permanency efforts, are at the end of the Office of the Child Advocate's annual report, entitled 'Time from Removal to Finalized Adoption' and 'Time from Removal to Reunification'. See: [www.gachildadvocate.org/pdf/2002ar.pdf](http://www.gachildadvocate.org/pdf/2002ar.pdf)

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** The Supreme Court of Georgia, Administrative Office of the Courts, Child Placement Project,

Model Courts Project, **DRAFT**, Summer Assessment Review 2003 - A Snapshot of Juvenile Court Performance in Child Deprivation Cases and Recommendations for Continued Improvement, February 2004

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** See 5<sup>th</sup> Quarter response concerning the analysis of the data indicating that the frequency of reviews does not necessarily appear to increase time to permanency. Individual case nuances may require more frequent review. However, the current standard of review continues, with policy encouraging more frequent reviews as needed.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** <http://www.state.ga.us/courts/supreme/cpp><http://www.state.ga.us/courts/supreme/cpp/>

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** D7: Need to review documentation (CIP Report) provided which the State uses to assess step as achieved. The report from the Office of the Child Advocate referenced as documentation is 2 years old and is a scathing report on DFCS.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State has evaluated a sample of court case files annually to see if more frequent hearings lead to faster permanency. It was the conclusion reached that more frequent hearings did not necessarily lead to expedited permanency. As stated earlier, the “activist state of the local DFCS and the local court, coupled with the size of the caseload, impacted the swiftness at which permanency was achieved. With this conclusion reached, the State will not amend its review periodicity, which is within 90 days of the entering of the dispositional order incorporating the 30-day case plan (but no later than 6 months following removal), and then at least every six months thereafter. The Office of the Child Advocate Report reference in the 5<sup>th</sup> reporting quarter may have been a "scathing" report on DFCS. As for this Action Step, the reference in the 5<sup>th</sup> report was at end of the Office of the Child Advocate's annual report, entitled 'Time from Removal to Finalized Adoption' and 'Time from Removal to Reunification'.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---

<b>D11 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Recruit and maintain more minority foster and adoptive resources giving special attention to placements for minority children.		
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>	



Nov. 2001	Sept. 2004	Resource Development Unit Foster Care Unit	<p>A campaign will be launched to focus on recruiting minority foster and adoptive parents for minority children. Increase the numbers of minority parents by 15% in 2002; by 25% in 2003; and by 25% in 2004.</p> <p>Evaluation: The results of the campaign will be measured to see if it results in an increase of minority placement recruitment and which tactics were most effective.</p> <p>3rd Quarter Federal Response: Do you have available data for 2002 and 2003?</p> <p>4th Quarter Report: See Documentation</p>
-----------	------------	--	---

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: Partially achieved.** Materials have been completed and mailed to county DFCS offices for support of the recruitment campaign beginning February 2003.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report: A change in completion date was approved. No report is due for this quarter.**

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** In collaboration with DFCS county offices, One Church One Child of Georgia and private child-placing agencies, the state has launched recruitment initiatives that target minority families. These include roundtable meetings with local clergy and presentations to ministerial alliances, public service announcements for minority recruitment, adoption fairs at various churches, gospel fests, recruitment activities with neighborhood advocacy groups, support of foster parent support groups and shopping mall exhibits, among other activities.

Closure of foster homes, which offsets the number of new homes developed, continues to be an issue. We are addressing this concern by stepping up retention efforts (implementation of foster parent poster campaign, development of a respite program, revising policy that supports parenting while concurrently protecting children, developing a support desk reference for staff, etc.).

#### DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 3<sup>RD</sup> Quarter:

Service Delivery/Payment Schedule Oct. 1 -- Nov., 9, 2002; Round Table Discussion Foster Care and Adoption Crisis; and FFY 2003 Service Delivery/payment Schedule.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** DFCS continues in its efforts to recruit minority families and engage in on-going general recruitment for families of all races/ethnicities. The state continues it's contract with One Church One Child to assist with this effort and is launching a

Comprehensive Resource development Plan to address specific county placement needs relative to the maintenance of a pool of families that reflect the placement needs of children within specific counties/areas.

**DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 4<sup>TH</sup> Quarter:**

See draft of revised Comprehensive Resource Development Plan.  
Primary Foster Parent Ethnicity SFY 2003

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Does the supplemental documentation the State provides reflect the targeted increases in the numbers of minority parents per year?

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Increase in minority families has been renegotiated to a 10% increase by September 2004. So as not to be in conflict with the new federal initiative, elements from the Comprehensive Resource Development Plan will be used in the implementation of this new recruitment initiative (by DHHS/ACF) 'Recruitment Response Team Planning' involving a national recruitment and follow-up strategy for resource families for foster care and adoption. Based on the attached table of data from E&R there has only been a slight increase (2%) in minority families from SFY 2001 TO SFY 2003. See table Primary foster parent ethnicity. Also, there is an additional 200-300 private agency foster homes that we have not included in our overall count, because a breakdown by ethnicity is not currently available.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**  
Primary Foster Parent Ethnicity

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Next month (May) is when a major recruitment effort for both foster and adoptive homes will occur and will coincide with national, state and regional campaigns. A goal of 500 new families by the end of 2004 has been set. Already, some 8,000 telephone calls have been made to follow-up with earlier inquirers. With the restructuring of DFCS and the organizational placement of the Office of Adoptions within DFCS (April 2004), recruitment efforts for resource families can be better focused. An automated report highlighting recruitment activities (successes and barriers) as well as data reflecting each step of the process from orientation to home approval will enhance efforts to recruit and maintain homes. Currently, private agency foster homes (which have not been included in the overall count) are being polled for their recruitment data. By the next reporting period, the targeted increases will be provided.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** See Quarterly Recruitment and Statistical Report (new)

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Progress should be documented in the next quarterly report.

D11: What is the baseline? The State needs to provide information in the next report regarding the rate of increase of minority foster homes.

**7<sup>TH</sup> Quarter Report:** When comparing the State’s AFCARS Data Frequency Reports of April 1, 2003 –September 30, 2003 against the October 1, 2003 – March 31, 2004 there is an 8.1% increase in the number of First Foster Caretaker identified as Black and an 39.5% increase in the Hispanic Origin Caretaker (see attached reports). There is an AFCARS reporting field of “Unable to Determine Caretaker Ethnicity” that also showed an increase of 41.1%. Some of the caretakers in this number may be of minority ethnicity.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** First Foster Caretaker Ethnicity Increase Table; AFCARS Data Frequency Report for Foster Children April 1, 2003 THROUGH September 30, 2003; and AFCARS Data Frequency Report for Foster Children October 1, 2003 THROUGH March 31, 2004

AFCARS Data Frequency Report for Foster Children October 1, 2002 THROUGH March 31, 2003

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---

## Work Plan Detail E -- Item 9, Adoption

**Goal: Reduce lengthy time period to file TPR (Termination of Parental Rights)**

<b>E4 ACTION STEPS:</b>		<b>Develop measures to determine that TPR is filed according to ASFA and policy (this action step was previously attached to the above strategy in the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter report):</b> Develop capacity within CPRS or another reporting system to produce an exception report when TPR and non-reunification are not filed timely.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Dec. 2002	June 2004	Michelle Barclay, Kelli Stone, Evaluation & Reporting Section	Timely filing of TPR 5th Quarter: State request to revise benchmark to "Production of Exception Report: Reason: measurement more related to action step.

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: Same as above.**

Work committee to review current data systems to determine if this data is available in either CPRS or AFCARS and if not, to establish data elements needed for exception report. A meeting will be scheduled within the next quarter after work group is established.

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved.** No report is due for this quarter.

A work committee reviewed the CPRS and proposed a way to capture this information in the CPRS as a data element and as a report.

#### **3rd Quarter Report:** No report. See 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Response

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** System reporting feature to be available upon completion of the CPRS by 12-31-03. Reporting system to produce an exception report should be in place by the 5<sup>th</sup> quarter report.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The measurable benchmark for this action step is 'timely filing of TPR.' Does the State have a baseline?

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Getting a baseline for timely filing of TPRs has proved most difficult. The counties can currently produce reports

from CPRS that identify children that have case plans that are over one year old and beyond. Both the courts and the DFCS offices can produce these reports. Looking at case plans of children over a year old is a starting point for measuring which cases need to be heading toward TPR and which ones are served best by other permanency options. The state will continue to strive to measure this baseline.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The CPRS produces an exception report that lists all the children's cases by name when the child's case plan has been in the system for over a year. This report is broken down by county and is quite extensive and difficult to effectively manage for purposes of measuring the timely filings of TPRs. At a meeting on April 2, 2004 with participants who included the CPRS developer and CPRS managers from the court and DFCS, it was determined that a new exception report would be developed from CPRS. This exception report will list all children who have a blank "TPR file date" when those children fall under the ASFA regulations of actual time in excess of 15 months of last entry in foster care, abandoned infant, murder or aided murder of another child or serious bodily injury of another child and the child is not excluded by an exception category from appearing on the list. (Exceptions such as living with a relative, no provision of services and compelling reasons are excluded)

A second exception report, broken down by county, will be produced and will list all the children who have a non-reunification plan. These reports will be posted on a protected website requiring user ID and password, but will be available to all DFCS and the courts to determine whether TPRs are filed timely.

A contract will be signed for the work on the development of these reports. The report feature will be completed by the June deadline as stated in the PIP.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** E4: The State requested revision of the benchmark from 'timely filing of TPRs' to 'production of an exception report.' It appears that the request is based upon the State's inability to produce a baseline. Has the State sought and obtained appropriate TA (NRCITCW) before abandoning the effort?

E4: There appear to be some flaws in the extraction rules: 1) is entry into care or duration of case plan used for the initial select, 2) does CPRS have data fields for all of the exceptions identified, and 3) if the second exception report limits the select to children with a non-reunification plan, it will bypass those children who have had a goal of reunification for extended periods of time.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved E4:** The request from the State to change the benchmark from "Timely Filing of TPRs" to "Production of Exception Report" is based on the fact that the action step of E4 is to develop measures to determine that TPR is filed according to ASFA and policy. In addition, the action step is to develop capacity within CPRS or another reporting system to produce an exception report when TPR and non-reunification are not filed timely. Therefore the measurable benchmark should be the development of reporting measures.

The Case Plan Reporting System has been enhanced and effective July 2004, the Date TPR filed is a new field that county staff will be able to use to record the filing date. Counties will receive written instructions on completing the field prior to the update to the system. An exception report can then be produced which will use four data elements to determine cases where TPR filing has not been timely. The four data elements will include (1) Date Child Entered Care (Removal Date) where they have been in care 15 months or longer, (2) the ASFA screen has a “yes” selected for any of the other circumstances requiring TPR, (3) no exceptions to filing are noted on the ASFA Regulations screen, and (4) TPR filed date field blank. The report will not be restricted to a certain plan type because, as noted in the ACF 6<sup>th</sup> quarter response, some children could be overlooked.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

Current data is not available. Contract needs to be put in place to develop this new feature in the CPRS for DHR.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter:** No barrier

<b>E6 ACTION STEPS:</b>		<b>Develop strategies in partnership with the law department that will urge the SAAGS to file TPR within 30 days of receipt of complete legal services referral and prepare court orders within 15 days of termination hearing:</b> Develop a protocol for counties to report overdue petitions and court orders to DFCS Legal Services to address with law department. Problems in complying with this requirement will be reported to the Commissioner.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Sept. 2002	July 2004	Vivian Egan, Linda Doster, DFCS Social Services Section	Decrease in length of time to file TPR. <b>5th Quarter Report:</b> Requesting to revise benchmark to "Creation of the reporting document". Reason: to place more emphasis on the action step.

#### **ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

##### **Goal achieved and ongoing.**

As of August 2002, reports of delayed court orders are received from county departments on existing forms used to monitor Title IV-E compliance. Delays are reported to the Law Department by the Legal services Office. A form to be used by counties to report delayed

terminations will be prepared and included in the Foster Care manual distributed to county departments.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** This step is noted as achieved based on development of policy and protocol packets. However, there is also a measurable benchmark of decreasing length of time to file TPR. Was this benchmark (also the goal for this work plan) placed in this step in error? If not, State must show progress on this benchmark as well, before this step is noted as achieved.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The benchmark 'Decrease in length of time to file TPR' was placed in this step in error. The appropriate benchmark should be: 'Creation of the Reporting Document.'

This step was reported as achieved and documentation of the SSMT dated 4-21-03 that included protocol packets was included in the documentation submitted in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Progress Report. However, we have found the counties are not complying with the request to report overdue petitions and court orders to DFCS Legal Services. A new mandatory reporting form has been developed and will be sent to the county DFCS Directors and Field Directors in February 2004. Memo to DFCS Directors and Field Directors will be attached in the 6<sup>th</sup> quarter report.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DCOUMENTATION:**

Reporting Form - Monthly Termination Legal Progress Report

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Monthly Termination Legal Progress Report was transmitted to Field Directors and County Directors on February 19, 2004. The first reports were received in mid-March to document/track issues with completion of TPR petitions, hearings and court orders. A system to compile the data will need to be completed in order to assess patterns and issues. However, this has not delayed the goal of reporting issues that have caused delays with the Law Department.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

Reporting Form-Monthly Termination Legal Progress Report and Instructions

E Mail to the Field Managers from Janet Oliva, Division Director

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Will you be able to compile the data needed to assess patterns and issues by July 2004?

E6: The State will need to continue to report progress until the system is fully implemented, particularly as this work is also referenced in E22.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The state considers this action step achieved. County DFCS staff are submitting the new mandatory reporting forms. The 1<sup>st</sup> quarter documentation provided the protocol developed and the 5<sup>th</sup> quarter documentation provided a copy of the Monthly Termination Legal Progress Report form.

The reports for March, April and May have been received and reviewed by our Legal Services Office. It has been noted that delays in filing petitions after DFCS referral to the SAAG is primarily concentrated in specific areas represented by a small percentage of the SAAGs. Referrals have been made by our Legal Services Section to the Law Department to address these issues with the identified SAAGs. The Law Department has been cooperative in addressing the concerns with the appropriate SAAGs and working with individual SAAGs in corrective action or termination. In three counties action was taken to replace the SAAG or add new ones.

This action step, developed to enable the DFCS Legal Services Section to identify the SAAGs who were not timely in filing petitions and preparing court orders in order to bring these issues to the attention of the Law Department, has been accomplished. This accomplishment was made possible by the development of protocol and a system for the counties to report legal milestones to the State DFCS Legal Service Section. The Division does not have an automated method to calculate the length of time from the SAAG receiving the Legal Services Referral to filing of TPR; however, manual review of the form has enabled the state to identify areas of concern. The state recognizes the advantages of an automated version of this system to more broadly assess pattern and trends.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

***Goal: Reduce lengthy time periods to finalize adoptions.***

<b>E10 ACTION STEPS:</b>		<b>Determine statutory changes needed that will impact length of time to achieve adoption (this action strategy was previously attached to the above strategy):</b> Recommend change to section 15-11-103(d) of the O.C.G.A. to require post termination reviews every six months rather than annually.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
June 2002	May 2002 (completed) Previously reported completed May 2002. This completion was	DFCS Social Services, Vivian Egan, LaMarva Ivory, Office of Adoptions, Legislation Team, and, Jim Martin	Introduction of statutory change. Passage of statutory change



	<p>reported in error.          Requesting approval          to re-negotiate          completion date to          June 2004.          Provide reason(s) for          requesting extension.          Georgia's Reply: See          3rd Quarter Report          for explanation. 3rd          Quarter Federal          Response: Identify          alternate action step/s          or indicate how this          action step would not          impact the overall          goal of achieving          substantial          conformity of this          item.</p>	
--	---	--

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: Same as 2nd Quarter Report and below.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved. No report is due for this quarter.** Office of Adoptions submitted proposal of recommended changes to Chapter 19-8 of the O.C.G.A to the DHR Commissioner's Office in August 2002. The recommendations were forwarded to the Governor's Office for consideration. As of April 2003, this proposed change has not been included in any legislation presented to the General Assembly. A sponsor has not been secured. Current plans are to reconvene group to discuss need for statutory change and discuss alternatives to achieve goals.

**3rd Quarter Report:** 2003 Legislative session ended without introduction of this proposed change. An extension was requested so action step could be reviewed by workgroup to determine its appropriateness. Additionally, Georgia's General Assembly will not reconvene until January 2004.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Office of Adoptions has again submitted proposal of recommended changes to Chapter 19-8 of the O.C.G.A. to be considered for legislative priorities for the 2004 General Assembly Session which begins January 2004. We are currently complying with court order for annual review and policy requires an administrative review every 6 months. If we can't accomplish court review semiannually through legislation, the Model Court Project has already incorporated more stringent standards that require review every three months for Juvenile Court Judges. Refer to document presented in Action Step E. 24.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Office of Adoptions submitted proposal of recommended changes to Chapter 15-11-03 of the Official Code of Georgia. HB 1322 has been introduced and hopefully will be passed during the 2004 legislative session that ends in March 2004.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** HB1322

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Office of Adoptions submitted proposal of recommended changes to Chapter 15-11-03 of the Official Code of Georgia. HB 1322 successfully passed both legislative houses of the Georgia General Assembly and has been submitted to the Governor for signature.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

HB 1322 and Bill History

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** E10: Reports that HB 1322 has been submitted to the Governor for signature -- please verify in next report whether the Governor signs as anticipated.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** HB 1322 was signed by the Governor on 5/13/04. Refer to the attached documentation.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

Changes to Code require Legislative approval; Changes in State government Leadership have caused delay in new legislation being introduced; Securing a legislator to sponsor proposed changes; Legislative session will end without proposed legislation being introduced; Varying opinions and concerns over need for this statutory change

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Will these activities just not be accomplished, if legislative approval is not granted?

**Georgia's Reply 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter:** Statutory changes cannot occur without legislative approval.

<b>E12 ACTION STEPS:</b>		<b>Include post termination requirements in CPRS review: Pilot in Dekalb County.</b>	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Mar. 2002	July 2002 <b>5th Quarter:</b> The State Request an extension to July 2004. Reason: to further examine training and data quality issues.	Michelle Barclay, Kelli Stone, Office of Adoptions	Measure of success of utilization in pilot area for improved outcomes. Measure the effectiveness of the new information provided by CPRS for judicial decision making by qualitative interviews with judges.

#### **ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** The prototype, including adoption policy, was piloted in Dekalb County. It is now being implemented statewide. Both panel and court reviews can now be completed on line within the CPRS system for all staff with access to view. An adoption checklist has been added for children who are post-termination and awaiting adoption. A users group of the CPRS made up of judges and caseworkers is being established. The first phone conference/meeting for the group will occur in January 2003.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report: Goal Achieved.** The prototype, including adoption policy, was piloted in Dekalb County. It is now implemented statewide. Both panel and court reviews can now be completed on line within the CPRS system for all staff with access to view. An adoption checklist has been added for children who are post-termination and awaiting adoption. A users group of the CPRS made up of judges and caseworkers is being established. The first phone conference/meeting for the group occurred in January 2003.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** What can the State give us to show completion?

**Georgia Reply 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter:** See DOCUMENTATION

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** The prototype, including adoption policy, was piloted in DeKalb County. It is now implemented statewide. Both panel and court reviews can now be completed on line within the CPRS system for all staff with access to view. An adoption checklist has been added for children who are post-termination and awaiting adoption. A users group of the CPRS made up of judges and caseworkers is being established. The first phone conference/meeting for the group occurred in January 2003.

**DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 3<sup>RD</sup> Quarter:** Attached screen print of prototype

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** For this step, E12 and E13, progress narratives for all 3 quarters are exactly the same despite the fact that progress is noted as 'partially achieved' and 'achieved.' Noted as achieved but no information is given regarding impact of this system in pilot county (measurable benchmark). For this step to be achieved, State has to provide some information regarding effectiveness of this CPRS enhancement in improving outcomes.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The report from the CPRS shows that of the over 16,000 case plans in the CPRS, 2555 record Adoption as the Permanency goal (attached). However only 76 case plans include the Adoption checklist that records the steps taken toward adoption within the CPRS. The State will explore training and data quality issues by next quarter.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

PIP Results 2/18/2004 - Adoption

PIP Results 2/18/2004 -- Permanency Goal for Child

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The CIP staff interviewed Judge Robin Nash of Dekalb County Juvenile Court, the pilot site for the CPRS. Judge Nash reported that the adoption checklist looked promising when used during the pilot phase last year. However, Judge Nash observes that the checklists are no longer being completed and the ones previously completed are not being updated. Upon further review of the checklist, he agrees that it would be a useful tool in measuring if the plan is on track and the checklist is correctly used. We have data from last quarter's report which documents only 76 checklists have been completed although there are 2555 children who have the permanency goal of adoption checked within the CPRS.

**Refer to E-13 for the proposed solution.**

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The relevance of the number of permanency goals by type is unclear. Either the State is including permanency goals for children in closed cases or there is some other explanation as to the significant difference between the State's AFCARS reporting (see below) and the 16 000 case plans.

Children in care on the first day of the year:

2002: 12, 812

2003: 12, 986 (preliminary)

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved** - The adoption checklist is a part of CPRS. Effective April 2004, the adoption checklist now has a link in the main navigational toolbar, which makes it much easier to find. Workers are introduced to the checklist during New Worker

Training. Supervisors are receiving instruction in regional supervisors meetings statewide - on the importance of using the checklist to improve outcomes for children through timely finalization of adoption. The courts have agreed that the tool is helpful, and the judges have been encouraged to request workers to utilize the checklist for any case with a TPR.

The ACF 6th quarter response points out a discrepancy of the numbers between CPRS and IDS. IDS is the official reporting system for AFCARS information. The number of plans in CPRS is higher due to several factors. During the migration of plans from the original CPRS to CPRSv2, duplicate cases were created. The counties were not aware that they needed to close the original plan, so the duplicate plans remain. Other plans should have been closed when their case was closed. The Division is now providing training to supervisors on how to identify plans that need to be closed and how to close them. Additionally, supervisors and workers are receiving training on how to create a new plan and review existing plans. The developer for the system will review the system for “junk plans” and delete as appropriate.

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

E13 ACTION STEPS:		Include post termination requirements in CPRS review: Reviews should be completed by agency staff and provided to judges at time of post termination reviews.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
July 2002	June 2004	Michelle Barclay, Kelli Stone, Office of Adoptions	Measure the effectiveness of the new information provided by CPRS for judicial decision making by qualitative interviews with judges.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved.** Qualitative interviewing of usage and functionality of the judges began in February 2003.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** Usage of the system has increased monthly. Feedback has come forth and has produced one report of requests for changes to better serve their business process. A second focus group feedback session for the CPRS is scheduled for Friday, April 18, 2003 and a 2<sup>nd</sup> report will be produced from that session.

**3rd Quarter Update:** Surveys from the judges indicate they are not yet using the aftercare information as a part of their case management business process. CPRS is in the early adoption phase by the courts and therefore the primary use and training of the system is on active case plans for non-terminated cases. More focused training and use of the aftercare plan feature is needed in order to assess its effectiveness. That initiative will be forthcoming in 2004. It is anticipated that more work will need to be done in CPRS to accommodate the business process of the courts regarding aftercare plans. For example, the ability to print aftercare plans in a formal report will likely be required.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Training on use of the post termination requirements is ongoing. A Juvenile Court Judge has joined the staff's training efforts thus helping tremendously. Better printing functionality needs to be put in place to help the users. Plans are to address this need once the CPRS is completed 12-31-03.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** For this step, E12 and E13, progress narratives for all 3 quarters are exactly the same despite the fact that progress is noted as 'partially achieved' and 'achieved.'

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The report from the CPRS shows that of the over 16,000 case plans in the CPRS, 2555 record Adoption as the Permanency goal. However only 76 case plans include the Adoption checklist that records the steps taken toward adoption within the CPRS. The State will explore training and data quality issues by next quarter. Qualitative interviews with judges have not been done since it has taken longer than anticipated to get enough adoption of the usage of CPRS in order to get quality information. Interviewing will be done by next quarter.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Same as E12

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Staff of the CIP conducted interviews with ten judges. Findings were similar to the report from Judge Nash who participated in the pilot in Dekalb County (refer to E-12).

Question 1. Are you seeing the adoption checklist used in your work? Answer: No

(Only one reported seeing a checklist).

After reviewing the checklist with the judge the following was asked:

Question 2. Do you think this checklist would be helpful in your making a judicial decision regarding a case? Answer: Yes, if it is filled out and kept current.

A meeting on April 2, 2004 was held with participants who included the CPRS developer and CPRS managers from the court and DFCS to discuss the non-utilization of the checklist by staff. Three decisions were made as a result of this discussion.

1. The adoption checklist will be placed in a more prominent position within the CPRS. (Currently may be too hard to find)

2. Technology will be added to prompt caseworkers to use the adoption checklist when indicated.
3. We will emphasize the use of the adoption checklist with new worker and ongoing training of caseworkers.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Report on progress in the next quarter.

E13: When does the State expect to complete the location change of the checklist in CPRS and when will the prompt to workers be implemented?

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** In April 2004, the adoption checklist now has a link in the main navigational toolbar, which makes it much more visible. Workers are introduced to the checklist during New Worker Training. Supervisors are receiving instruction in regional supervisors meetings statewide - on the importance of using the checklist to improve outcomes for children through timely finalization of adoption. The courts are being introduced to the checklist and are encouraged to ask the workers to complete the checklist once the first TPR is granted.

Criteria for the prompt to remind workers to use the adoption checklist when indicated have been defined and the prompt is under development.

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

<b>E16 ACTION STEPS:</b>		<b>Examine foster care and adoption policy requirements for impact on length of time to achieve adoption:</b> Make addition to six month CPRS instrument to require agency to report steps taken to achieve permanency goal.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Mar. 2002	Mar. 2003 <b>5th Quarter:</b> The State requests an extension to July	Michelle Barclay, Kelli Stone	Measure the effectiveness of the new information in the CPRS for judicial and agency decision making for permanency by qualitative interviews.

	2004. Reason: to explore training and data quality issues.		
--	--	--	--

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**Goal Achieved.** The CPRS has been amended to include functionality allowing the agency to document steps toward achieving the permanency goal. This information is located in the Aftercare section of CPRS.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Noted as achieved based on amendment of CPRS. However, the State will need to report on the effectiveness of this information in decision-making for permanency.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The report from the CPRS shows that of the over 16,000 case plans in the CPRS, 2555 record Adoption as the Permanency goal. However only 76 case plans include the Adoption checklist that records the steps taken toward adoption within the CPRS. The State will explore training and data quality issues that will be addressed by next quarter.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Documentation:** Same as E12

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Refer to E-13

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** 6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Refer to E-13

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** In April 2004, the adoption checklist now has a link in the main navigational toolbar, which makes it much more visible. Workers are introduced to the checklist during New Worker Training. Supervisors are receiving instruction in regional supervisors meetings statewide - on the importance of using the checklist to improve outcomes for children through timely finalization of adoption. The courts are being introduced to the checklist and are encouraged to ask the workers to complete the checklist once the first TPR is granted.

Criteria for the prompt to remind workers to use the adoption checklist when indicated have been defined and the prompt is under development.

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:



**Goal: Determine if court delays are impacting length of time to achieve adoption.**

<b>E22 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Court Improvement Project (CIP) will complete assessment of juvenile court processes through surveys and interviews of judges and case file review to identify specific barriers.	
		What are you going to do about the barriers identified in this report?	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
June 2002	Sept. 2002 <b>5th Quarter:</b> The State requests an extension to July 2004. Reason: to explore specific causes of delay for adoption permanency.	Michelle Barclay, Doris Walker	Identification of barriers and needs. Report of findings and recommendations.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**Goal Achieved.**

A report was completed in January 2003 and is posted on the CIP website:

<http://www.state.ga.us/courts/supreme/cpp/>

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Noted as achieved but State did not respond to RO's question about what they will do about the barriers identified in the CIP report. The goal for this and subsequent steps is: 'Determine if court delays are impacting length of time to achieve adoption.'

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** At this time, the CIP does not have definitive knowledge of whether court delays alone are impacting length of time to achieve adoption. There are of course courts that do cause delays, but there are also delays because of appeals, delays in getting orders done, delays in attorneys and caseworkers filing paperwork and high caseloads. The CIP staff will continue to strive to find specific performance measures to discover what causes delays for children whose permanency goal is adoption.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** We have begun some collection of information that will help identify cases in which delays are occurring after filing of TPR. Refer to E-6 and to the Monthly Termination Legal Progress Report. If we determine from these reports that there are delays between filing of petition and hearing/disposition date, we will begin conducting interviews with the judges and court staff to determine causes of the delays and court's perception of the problem. These interviews will begin in May 2004.

In addition we have been successful in the passage of statute changes that will impact the court's involvement with adoption timeliness. HB 1322, passed in the 2004 legislative session, requires a judicial review every six months after TPR to review the agency's progress in adoption planning for a child. Prior to the passage of this bill, the court review was on an annual basis. (Refer to E-10). In the 2003 legislative session, we were successful in the passage of a bill which allows an agency adoption hearing be conducted immediately after filing the adoption petition. Prior to the passage of that law it was required that the hearing had to be held at least 60 days after the filing of the petitions. (Refer to E-9).

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** E22: see comments on E6 and E10

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** In reviewing ACF response, we don't understand the reference to E-10 in this action step. E-10 refers to the review of cases after TPR to determine progress in the agency placing the child for adoption.

Further clarity is needed in order to address the relationship between E-10 and E-22.

The measurable benchmark in this action step is to identify barriers and needs and to complete a report of findings and recommendations. The report has been completed and referenced in 4<sup>th</sup> quarter report that provided the web site for the report. We are attaching a copy of the report. On Page 7 of the report there is key information in terms of findings and recommendations. Below each finding are recommendations for the barrier identified. These recommendations in the report should address the ACF question "what are you going to do about the barriers identified in the report?" The implementation of the reported recommendations is on going. The CIP is currently addressing and working with the Carl Vinson Institute of Government to research and write a report on Juvenile Court Improvement by Accountability; the CIP has received a Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts of America grant and is working with OJJDP and the Center for Children on the Law to institute court performance measures to better information about timeliness and permanency status on children.

The state contends that we have met this action step as we have completed the stated benchmark.

## **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---



## Work Plan Detail F -- Item 10, Permanency Goal of Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement

<b>F3 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Review all guardianship laws in Georgia to determine if any changes are needed to allow for greater compliance with the permanency goals established by ASFA. (Guardianship as defined by ASFA includes all legal arrangements that are permanent and self-sustaining, thus the relationship outlives the jurisdiction of a court). Evaluation: DHR will propose changes in guardianship laws as necessary.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Sept. 2002	Mar. 2004	Vivian Egan, TA: Karen Worthington	A report on the current state of guardianship laws will be prepared.

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** Ongoing research and dialogue is occurring to identify what is being done in other states and what practice issues are being used or prohibiting courts in Georgia from utilizing this permanency plan option.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:**-No report is due this quarter.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** What is the status?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report/Georgia's Reply:** Senate Bill 236 was passed during the past legislative session. This bill allows for the placement of children, post termination of parental rights, in the home of a guardian that is appointed by the court. Further dialogue with DFCS SAAG's required during the next training to assure that the use of this provision in the law is use, if applicable, and allows for children to achieve permanency.

**DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 3<sup>RD</sup> Quarter:** Senate Bill 236, Section 5 and DFCS Social Services policy Foster Care: Legal 1013.9

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Achieved

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The goal was to review GA guardianship laws to determine if changes are needed to allow for greater compliance with ASFA. The State concludes that this goal has been achieved because Senate Bill 236 was passed which allows for placement of children, post TPR, in the home of a guardian that is appointed by the court. State needs to clarify how the passage of this law is helping the State achieve greater compliance with ASFA. For example, if a TPR has been achieved, why wouldn't the State move the child to adoption vs. guardianship? Is this a subsidized guardianship?

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The state considers this action step **Achieved**.

An explanation was requested as to how Georgia's new guardianship and custody orders create custodial relationships, which meet the federal requirements of ASFA. As background, Georgia law does permit a temporary guardianship that continues until a child reaches the age of 18 unless revoked by the parent. A guardianship order can be granted by the juvenile court and the probate court. Senate Bill 236 amended OCGA Section 15-11-103 to permit a guardian of the person to be appointed after termination of parental rights. Thus, a guardian may be appointed for a child at any stage in a juvenile court case. Guardianship orders do not expire. In addition, O.C.G.A. 15-11-58 now permits the juvenile court to give custody of a child, until he or she reaches the age of 18; to an individual after a non-reunification order is entered. (This change was also a part of SB 236 in the 2003 session.) Previously, custody orders that remained in effect until the child reached 18 could only be granted to relatives. Custody orders cannot be revoked and can only be changed by order of the court. Thus, there are two methods by which non-DFCS custodians or guardians may obtain custody/guardianship over a child *which will not expire until the child reaches 18 and will not require that the court re-issue the order upon the filing of a pleading at set intervals*. These dispositional alternatives are considered viable means to achieve permanency for certain children.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** F3: The State has not provided information as requested by ACF regarding subsidy status/opportunities for these children. When the court utilizes one of the two methods described, is DFCS also released from responsibility and terminates its intervention with the child and custodians or guardians at that time?

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State still considers this action step **Achieved**, but provides the following information to answer the above federal response:

There is no subsidized guardianship in Georgia when a child is placed post-termination, in the home of a guardian. In order to make this disposition, the court must determine that such placement is most appropriate for the child and find that it is in the best interest of the child. The granting of guardianship (per Senate Bill) is only made once the court considers the other priorities for placement in a hierarchy (with adoption being the highest priority). The juvenile court, granting the guardianship continues to review the placement and requires the guardian to report to the court as ordered. The agency is released from responsibility and terminates its intervention with the child and guardian.

The other alternative in Georgia relates to the dispositional alternative once the court has entered a non-reunification order. Extended temporary custody of a child may be granted until he or she reaches the age of 18. Such orders will not expire. Should the child be placed with a relative, the state may provide a Relative Care Subsidy payment to support the family financially. The agency may or may not be involved in submitting a report to the court every 36 months concerning the continued suitability of the custodian.

A report on the current state of guardianship laws was prepared to meet the measurable benchmark of this action step. (See below.)

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** See “*Georgia Guardianship Laws and ASFA Compliance*” prepared by the Barton Law Clinic.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

\_\_\_\_\_

## Work Plan Detail G -- Item 12, Placement with Siblings

<b>G2 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Goal #2 Step 1: Supervisory Review Form will be adapted to include efforts to place siblings together.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
June 2002	June 2004	Consultation and Support, Nancy Bruce and Education and Research	Revisions to Form and standards adapted

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: Goal 2, Steps 1 - 4:** A workgroup is being formed to address changes needed to improve the Supervisory Review Form and implementation process. The committee is aware of PIP requirements to place siblings together, if possible or feasible. They expect to revise the Supervisory Review Form to document efforts to place siblings together.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report\_-** No report for this quarter.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** A work group, consisting of social services professionals, is reviewing the Supervisory Review Form to assure it properly measures specified outcomes for service delivery. This team of professionals provides a broad array of expertise in child welfare policy, procedures and practice issues. The review form is being revised in accordance with state policy mandates. One of the mandates requires documentation of efforts to place siblings together.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Partially Achieved. Efforts to revise the Supervisory Review Form and standards continue. Revisions include documentation of efforts to place siblings together.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved.** The state has made the decision to discontinue using the Supervisory Review Guide and replaces it with the Child Placement Services E & R Social Services Review Guide, developed by the Evaluation and Reporting (E & R) Section. This instrument is already developed and available to the staff. Also, it incorporates PIP requirements for Georgia. It includes a reference to efforts to place siblings together (under Item 28). According to the first round of QCRs efforts to place siblings together was documented in 10 of the 13 applicable cases. See the attached Qualitative Review Report for October 2003 -- December2003.

### **5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

Child Placement Services -- E & R Social Services Review Guide, Item 28.

Social Services Quarterly Report -- Qualitative Case Reviews, October 2003 -- December 2003.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: ACHIEVED.** The CPRS Basic Training and the CPRS advanced training both have a component that discusses places siblings together. In SFY 2003, 1200 workers and their supervisors were trained in either Basic or Advanced training. In SFY2004, 377 additional workers and supervisors were trained in Basic, Advanced or Supervisory training. In each session, placement of siblings was stressed and staff were instructed on how to document their efforts in the Case Plan Reporting System. New Worker Training includes training on documenting the efforts to place siblings together in the CPRS.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

Social Services Quarterly Report -- Qualitative Case Reviews, January 2004 -- March 2004.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** G2: Please provide the referenced training components of CPRS Basic CPRS Advanced Trainings.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter REPORT: Achieved.** The CPRS Basic Training and the CPRS Advanced Training both have a component that discusses placing siblings together. Woven throughout the training documents are references to and instructions on how to input and retrieve information pertaining to children in placement. This content includes specific references to efforts to place siblings together.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Please refer to the following attachments pertaining to this item:

- Case Planning and Review for Placement Services to Children (PLC) pages 4, 6-10;
- Case Plan Reporting System “Supervisory Training Agenda” page 2;
- Case Plan Reporting System “Advanced Training Agenda” page 2;
- Conducting Supervisory Review of CPRS Case Plan page 2;
- Social Services Data and Technology Issues—Agenda page 2; and
- [www.gacaseplan.org](http://www.gacaseplan.org), which describes the function and purpose of various topics incorporated into the case plan.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---

<b>G3 ACTION STEPS:</b>	Goal #2 Step 2: Supervisors are trained to include efforts to place siblings together in their reviews.
-------------------------	--



START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Feb 2003	June 2004	Consultation and Support, Nancy Bruce and Education and Research	All placement supervisors will be trained on the revised Supervisory Review form and standards to document efforts to place siblings together. Efforts to place siblings in the same home will be documented in at least 90% of cases by June 2004.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: Goal 2, Steps 1 - 4:** A workgroup is being formed to address changes needed to improve the Supervisory Review Form and implementation process. The committee is aware of PIP requirements to place siblings together, if possible or feasible. They expect to revise the Supervisory Review Form to document efforts to place siblings together.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** The requirements for exhaustive efforts to place sibling groups together were emphasized in CPRS training sessions completed in February 2003 for staff statewide. All staff are required to document efforts to place siblings together.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** What can the State give us to show this has been achieved?

**Georgia's Reply 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter:** The state respectfully requests to change the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report from 'Achieved' to reflect, 'Partially Achieved'. This request is being made because, while all supervisors were trained to document efforts to place siblings together on the CPRS, the actual Supervisory Review form (stipulated under the Measurable Benchmarks) is still in process of revision.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response: OK.**

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved.** Efforts to revise the Supervisory Review Form continue as indicated above, under Goal # 2, Step # 1.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Partially Achieved. Efforts to revise the Supervisory Review Form continue, as indicated above under Goal # 2, Step # 1.

#### DOCUMENTATION:

Please see attachment CPRS Screen printout, Permanency 2, Item 12, which confirms efforts to place siblings together are properly documented in case files. Also, see attachments, CPRS v2, Trained by County & Region -- Detail and PRS v2, Trained by Training Date -- Detail, which show that staff from all 159 Georgia counties have been trained to include efforts to place siblings together in the case plan.

**5th Quarter Report: Partially Achieved.** The state has made the decision to discontinue using the Supervisory Review Guide and replaces it with the Child Placement Services E & R Social Services Review Guide, developed by the Evaluation and Reporting (E & R) office. This instrument is already developed and available to the staff. Also, it incorporates PIP requirements for Georgia. It encompasses the same information contained in the previous Supervisory Review Guide, and includes a reference to efforts to place siblings together (under Item 28). The E & R Review Guide is already available to staff and requires no additional training. According to the first round of QCRs efforts to place siblings together was documented in 10 of the 13 applicable cases. See the attached Qualitative Review Report for October 2003 -- December 2003.

**6th Quarter Report:** The most recent Qualitative Case Review for January 2004 – March 2004 indicates an increase in the number of siblings placed together. Of 37 cases examined, 23 were relevant to the placement of siblings together. Documentation of efforts to place siblings together was indicated in 21 cases (91.30%).

**7th Quarter Report: ACHIEVED.** This item was achieved with the previous report. Our failure to indicate it was an oversight. Supervisors have been trained to include efforts to place siblings together in their reviews. Training will continue to be extended to supervisors as needed or when updates/improvements to the system are made.

**7th Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** A cumulative Qualitative Case Review for the 10 month period 10/03 – 06/04 shows that in 45 relevant cases, 38 cases (84.44%) were rated as a “strength”. This item was rated “needs improvement” in seven cases (15.56%). Forty cases involved siblings where, if appropriate, the agency should have made attempts to keep siblings together. The report indicates that the agency made diligent attempts to keep siblings together in 34 of the 40 cases (85.00%).

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

<b>G5 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Goal #2 Step 4: Caseworkers are trained to include efforts to place siblings together in case plan.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>

Feb. 2003	June 2004	Consultation and Support, Nancy Bruce and Education and Research	All placement caseworkers will be trained on the revised Supervisory Review form and standards requiring documentation of efforts to place siblings together. By June 2004, 90% of sibling group cases will document efforts to place siblings together.
-----------	-----------	--	--

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** The requirements for exhaustive efforts to place sibling groups together are being emphasized in CPRS training sessions currently being held for staff statewide. The Case Plan has been amended to include efforts to place siblings together. The statewide CPRS training is completed.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response: What can the State give us to show this has been achieved? Georgia's Reply:**

**Georgia's Reply:** The state respectfully requests to change the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report from 'Achieved' to reflect 'Partially Achieved'. This request is being made because, while all caseworkers were trained to document efforts to place siblings together on the CPRS, the actual Supervisory Review form (stipulated under the Measurable Benchmarks) is still in process of revision.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** Efforts to revise the Supervisory Review Form continue, as indicated above under Goal # 2, Step # 1.

#### DOCUMENTATION:

Please see CPRS Screen printout, Permanency 2, Item 12, which confirms that efforts to place siblings together are properly documented in case files. Also, see attachments, CPRS v2, Trained by County & Region -- Detail and CPRS v2, Trained by Training date -- Detail which show that staff from all 159 Georgia counties have been trained to include efforts to place siblings together in the case plan.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Partially Achieved. Efforts to revise the Supervisory Review Form continue, as indicated above under Goal # 2, Step # 1.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved.** The state has made the decision to discontinue using the Supervisory Review Guide and replaces it with the Child Placement Services E & R Social Services Review Guide, developed by the Evaluation and Reporting (E & R) office. This instrument is already developed and available to the staff. Also, it incorporates PIP requirements for Georgia. It encompasses the same information contained in the previous Supervisory Review Guide, and includes a reference to efforts to place siblings together (under Item 28). The E & R Review Guide is already available to staff and requires no additional training. As new staff are hired and trained, this is incorporated into their training components as well.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Documentation:** See Documentation under action step G2

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The most recent Qualitative Case Review for January 2004 – March 2004 indicates an increase in the number of siblings placed together. Of 37 cases examined, 23 were relevant to the placement of siblings together. Documentation of efforts to place siblings together was indicated in 21 cases (91.30%).

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** G5: Continue to report progress

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: ACHIEVED.** This item was achieved with the previous report. Our failure to indicate it was an oversight. Caseworkers have been trained to document efforts to place siblings together in the case plan. CPRS training will continue to be extended to caseworkers as needed or when updates/improvements to the system are made.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** A cumulative Qualitative Case Review for the 10 month period 10/03 – 06/04 shows that in 45 relevant cases, 38 cases (84.44%) were rated as a “strength”. This item was rated “needs improvement” in seven cases (15.56%). Forty cases involved siblings where, if appropriate, the agency should have made attempts to keep siblings together. The report indicates that the agency made diligent attempts to keep siblings together in 34 of the 40 cases (85.00%).

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---

<b>G7 ACTION STEPS:</b>	<p>Goal #4</p> <p>Step 1: Develop foster parent training to include specialized segments on managing sibling groups.</p> <p>Step 2: Evaluate effectiveness of respite care funding as a strategy to prevent placement disruptions.</p> <p>Step 3: Develop resource homes to support foster parents and children in placement.</p> <p>Evaluation: Determine the number of foster parents who will accept sibling groups and establish a percentage of the additional homes needed.</p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/re negotiations, the State requested to change the evaluation statement to 'As a result of improved recruitment strategies, 5% of all new foster homes will accept sibling groups'. Reason: The original language was vague, as it did not specify how the State would measure success with this initiative. Providing a percentage of the total population recruited for a specific time period allows the</p>
-------------------------	--

State to determine whether or not the goal is met.			
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Mar 2002	June 2004	Foster Care Unit, Placement Resource Development Unit	Documentation of efforts to develop resource homes accepting sibling groups, ongoing through June 2004 By June 2004, a significant number of homes accepting sibling groups will be developed.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** Adequate emphasis is being made in all aspects of our program to carefully assess and address the needs of sibling groups. This includes our efforts to develop and provide training focused on improving the caregiver's skills in managing sibling groups. Currently, foster parents may complete their annual training requirements locally and/or by attending the Annual Staff and Foster Parent Institutes and the Adoptive and Foster Parent Association of Georgia's Annual Conference.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.**

Added emphasis is being made in all aspects of our program to carefully assess and address the needs of sibling groups. This includes our efforts to develop and provide training focused on improving the caregiver's skills in managing sibling groups. Currently, foster parents may complete their annual training requirements locally and/or by attending the Annual Staff and Foster Parent Development Institutes and the Adoptive and Foster Parent Association of Georgia's Annual Conference. On-going.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response: What can the State give us to show this has been achieved?**

**3rd Quarter Report/Georgia's Reply:** This goal is Achieved.

Please refer to the attached Staff and foster Parent Development Institutes, and the Adoptive and Foster Parent Association of Georgia's Annual Conference material. All included components on the importance of placing siblings together.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The State indicates that this step has been achieved. The State has completed activities to recruit and train foster homes for sibling groups, but has there been an actual increase in homes available for siblings? The State's evaluation method in the PIP is to 'Determine the number of foster parents who will accept sibling groups and establish a percentage of additional homes needed.' Has this been done?

**5th Quarter Report/Georgia's Reply to Federal Response:** Yes, there has been an increase in the number of recruited homes that commit to accepting sibling groups. Almost all newly recruited homes are willing to accept sibling groups. The State does not consider the availability of a foster home willing to accept a sibling group in isolation. It should be noted that when siblings cannot be placed together, it is most often not because a home willing to accept siblings was not available. Instead, the decision to place or not

place siblings together is also impacted by other issues, pertaining to their overall well-being and functioning, (such as their medical, social-emotional (behavioral), educational needs, along with the proximity of an available foster home to their parents, etc.). The psycho-social/sexual behavior of some children is so provocative that placing their siblings with them compromises their safety and well-being.

Documenting the number of newly recruited homes willing to accept sibling groups is an on-going process. While Georgia directs considerable attention to its foster home recruitment efforts, the percentage and types of homes needed statewide is very difficult to accurately establish and track. This is partly due to the fact that children in need of care are a fluid population, meaning that it is unpredictable how many children will come into care at a given time; how many of them are part of a sibling group; how many have issues or circumstances requiring separate and/or specialized placements, etc. Georgia recognizes that as many children requiring placements into approved foster homes with their siblings are entering care, still others are exiting care, returning to their birth families, thus freeing up foster homes. Simultaneously, Georgia gives priority to placing children with their family members first, which means that relative resources cannot be identified until the child/children come into care.

#### **5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

Foster Care and Adoption Services Recruitment Statistics -- Fulton and Appling County DFCS

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The state considers this item achieved. The curriculum for training foster parents is being revised and will include a specialized segment on managing sibling groups. The revisions are scheduled to be completed by June 30, 2004. Monitoring our progress in this regard will be on-going as new homes are recruited and approved.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** State should continue to monitor the progress in this area in the subsequent quarterly reports.

G7: As per the State's request to renegotiate an evaluation method for the benchmark, the State must produce information verifying that '5% of all new foster homes will accept sibling groups.' A baseline will need to be established.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The recruitment of placement resources is an on-going activity within the Division. Therefore, our efforts and accomplishments continue to be monitored. The most recent data from the Foster Care and Adoption Recruitment Quarterly Reports for April 2004 – June 2004 indicates that of 3,020 approved and active foster homes, 1,284 were identified as accepting of sibling placements. This represents fifty-four (54) per cent of the total population. During the second quarter, of 2,382 approved and active homes, 1,289 (54%) were willing to accept siblings. During the first quarter 2, 693 approved and active homes were identified, of which 1,440 (54%) were willing to accept sibling groups.

In an effort to establish a baseline, as requested by the federal agency, we reviewed the totals for the first three quarters and determined that an average of fifty-three (53) per cent of all approved and active homes are willing to accept sibling groups. We

continue to assess our data sources to resolve issues pertaining to duplicate counts and any other data or documentation issues in an effort to arrive at a baseline for this item.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** The primary barrier with this goal is identifying enough resources that are willing to take multiple children, particularly, sibling groups. As many homes are lost due to becoming a permanent home for a child. Replenishing homes continues to be an on-going challenge for the state.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response: HOW DID YOU INTEND TO OVERCOME THIS BARRIER?**

**Georgia's Reply 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter:** The goal is Achieved.

There is no one-time remedy or solution to this problem. For this reason, there will always be a challenge to expeditiously identify and approve relatives, willing, able and eligible to be a placement resource. However, Georgia will continue to assertively seek and pursue extended family resources first, for all children entering agency custody. Georgia will, also, continue its outreach efforts to identify and recruit homes for children entering foster care by informing citizens of their placement needs and available services to support their placement. Heightened emphasis will be placed on placements pertaining to sibling groups.

---

## Work Plan Detail H -- Item 13, Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

<b>H5 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Goal #2 Step 4: Caseworkers are trained to include documentation of visits in case plan. Evaluation : Visits between parents and children and location of visits will be documented in at least 90% of cases by June 2004.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
June 2002	June 2004	Consultation and Support, Nancy Bruce and Education and Research	Step 4: Caseworkers trained to document child and parent visitations.

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** See Step 1 above

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** No report due this quarter.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved.** All caseworkers were trained to document parent and child visitation efforts in the CPRS. However, as policy changes occur and/or new staff are hired, the training will have to be repeated.

Please see attached CPRS Screen printout, Permanency 2, Item 13, which confirms that parent child visitation is properly documented in the Case Plan. Also, see attachments, CPRS v2, Trained by County & Region -- Detail and CPRS v2, Trained by Training date -- Detail, which show that staff from all 159 Georgia counties have been trained to include parent and child visitation arrangements in the case plan.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: ACHIEVED.** This item is considered achieved, because the goal/measurable benchmark has been met. Please see the documentation referenced above under 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. .The CPRS training will be repeated as policy changes occur, or new staff are hired.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** It appears the State has not completed the evaluation aspect of this action step. Were 100% of the staff trained? How many staff were trained?

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Yes, all staff was trained. Additionally, as new staff is hired, this component is also included in their training curriculum.



**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The CPRS Basic Training and the CPRS advanced training both have a Visitation screen that is designed to document the visitation plan for children with their parents. In SFY 2003, 1200 workers and their supervisors were trained in either Basic or Advanced training. In SFY2004, 377 additional workers and supervisors were trained in Basic, Advanced or Supervisory training. In each session, visitation of parents and children was stressed and staff were instructed on how to document the visitation plan in the Case Plan Reporting System. New Worker Training includes training on documenting the visitation plan in the CPRS.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Are you going to evaluate visits between parents and children and the location of visits by June 2004?

H5: Continue to report progress

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Reply:** The Action Step and benchmark speaks to documenting the occurrence and location of visits in the case plan. A cumulative Qualitative Case Review for the 10 month period 10/03 – 06/04 shows that in 60 relevant cases, 51 cases (85.0%) indicated that visitation took place. These visits took place in a variety of venues that included agency offices, the parents' home and were supervised by agency staff or relatives. Other visits took place in restaurants or treatment facilities. The State recognizes that we are currently 5% behind in goal achievement of this action step. However, the baseline from the ACF Final Report was 66.6%, the 85.0% indicates a significant increase. Training efforts will continue to reinforce the importance of preserving family connections and emphasize documentation as the appropriate measure of success.

AFCARS Data Frequency Report for Foster Children (10/01/2003 - 03/31/2004) reports a total number of 19, 426 children receiving foster care service during this time period. There are a total of 12,378 visitation plans documented in CPRS. The number of case plans in CPRS is exaggerated due to several factors. During the migration of plans from the original CPRS to CPRSv2, duplicate cases were created. The counties were not aware that they needed to close the original plan, so the duplicate plans remain. Other plans should have been closed when their case was closed. The division is now providing training to supervisors on how to identify plans that need to be closed and how to close them. Additionally, supervisors and workers are receiving training on how to create a new plan and review existing plans. The developer for the system will review the system for “junk plans” and delete as appropriate. In addition, even though the State has mandated CPRS usage it is questionable that data input is occurring, as it should. To date the State has been not been able to fund the additional staff resources needed to monitor staff input. Another factor impacting Georgia’s challenge with capturing and evaluating this information via CPRS is that even though the case plans may document the requirement for visitation, all the cases may not adequately document each time and location a visit occurred, nor whether the occurrence and quality of visits is in compliance with the court order. Thus far, the QCRs seem to be the better approach to measure whether the visits are occurring and evaluating the quality of the visits.

The CPRS Basic Training and the CPRS Advanced Training both have a component that discusses visitation. Woven throughout the training documents are references to and instructions on how to input and retrieve information pertaining to children in placement. This content includes specific references to efforts to assure sibling visitation and documentation of the visits.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

Please refer to the following attachments pertaining to this item:

- Case Planning and Review for Placement Services to Children (PLC) pages 6 & 9;
- Case Plan Reporting System “Supervisory Training Agenda” page 2;
- Case Plan Reporting System “Advanced Training Agenda” page 2;
- Conducting Supervisory Review of CPRS Case Plan page 2;
- Social Services Data and Technology Issues—Agenda, page 2; and
- [www.gacaseplan.org](http://www.gacaseplan.org), which describes the function and purpose of various topics incorporated into the case plan. Visitation is among the requirements documented in the case plan.
- Also attached is a copy of the relevant pages from the Georgia Child and Family Service Plan, Annual Progress and Services Final Report for FFY 2000-2004. It captures Georgia’s Time Limited Reunification Services, which includes various approaches to facilitate, support and monitor visitation.

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

H6 ACTION STEPS:		Goal #3 Step 1: On-going training and professional development will include segment on importance of visitation. Evaluation: Evaluations of caseworker training will reflect understanding of importance of visitation.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
July 2002	Feb. 2003 <b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation requested to extend to July 2004. Reason: Additional time will allow the State to more	Foster Care Unit	Caseworker documentation indicates increase in parent/child and sibling visitations.

	adequately assess success in achieving the benchmark.		
--	---	--	--

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved.** The Foster Care Unit is currently conducting First Placement Best Placement training for all placement and child Protective services staff, along with private providers. The importance of and requirements for parent and child visitation is being emphasized at each of these sessions. Funding options, suggestions for locations of visits, where visitation centers are non-existent, frequency of visits, and documentation requirements are among the topics covered in the training. It is expected that all staff and interested private providers will be trained by the end of January 2003.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** The Foster Care Unit completed First Placement Best Placement training for all placement and Child Protective Services staff, along with private providers. The importance of parent and child visitation was emphasized at each of these sessions. Funding options, suggestions for locations of visits, where visitation centers are non-existent, frequency of visits, and documentation requirements were among the topics covered in the training.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Are you saying all the action steps have been fully achieved? Or partially achieved? What can the State give us to show this has been achieved?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report: Georgia's Reply: Yes.** The FPBP training was provided to 2,900 staff and private providers 17 times between July 2002 and February 2003. The importance of parent and child visitation was emphasized in each of the training sessions.

C&S consultants are mentoring case managers, with less than 12 months of experience to shape their knowledge of the Georgia child welfare system. Emphasis is placed on parent and child visitation during their consultation and training sessions.

#### DOCUMENTATION:

Please see attached CPRS Screen printout, Permanency 2, Item 13, which confirms that parent child visitation is properly documented in the Case Plan. Also, see attachments, CPRS v2, Trained by County & Region -- Detail and CPRS v2, Trained by Training date -- Detail which show that staff from all 159 Georgia counties have been trained to include parent and child visitation arrangements in the case plan in addition to the FPBP training.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved.** Even though statewide training of all staff was completed, Georgia recognizes its need to have more time to accurately measure the performance outcomes of staff implementing this requirement, by documenting the required information on visitations in the case records.

## **5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

PIP Results 02/18/2004 -- Visiting with Parents and Children in Foster Care Report.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved.** Qualitative Case Reviews were completed on 37 cases between January 2004 and March 2004. Of this number 29 cases pertained to visits with parents and siblings in foster care. Twenty-four cases indicated that visitation took place between the child, parents and siblings. This reflects 82.76% of the cases reviewed. The state will continue its efforts to improve these outcomes.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** What is the State projected goal?

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** The ACF Final Report states that 66.6% of cases reviewed for Item 13 were rated as a strength. This is the baseline the State is using. A cumulative Qualitative Case Review for the 10 month period 10/03 – 06/04 shows that in 60 relevant cases, 51 cases (85.0%) indicated that visitation took place. Visitation was not occurring in nine cases (15%).

The CPRS Basic Training and the CPRS Advanced Training both have a component that discusses the importance of visitation. The training content includes specific references to efforts to assure sibling visitation. On-going training incorporates and emphasizes the importance of visitation between parents and children and children and with their siblings. The importance of documenting the outcome and location of each visit is also emphasized.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Report, Qualitative Case Reviews, October 2003 - June 2004

## **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---

## Work Plan Detail I -- Item 17, Needs and Services of Child, Parents, Foster Parents

<b>I6 ACTION STEPS:</b>	<p>Four Foster Care consultants and other stakeholders will receive training on how to complete the qualitative review process that is similar to the CFSR. <u>NEW ACTION BASED ON ACF SUGGESTION/APPROVAL OF 1<sup>ST</sup> QUARTER REPORT</u></p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:</b> Requesting ACF approval to change this action step to: Qualitative Case Review's similar to CFSF will be conducted on a representative sample of approximately 180 cases by the end of September 2004.</p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:</b> Based upon Annual Evaluation / Renegotiation Report action step to read: Qualitative Case Reviews will be conducted on a representative sample of cases.</p>		
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
<p>July 2003 3rd Quarter: Requesting a start date change to October 2003 The State will not be outsourcing to conduct the reviews. The DFCS Evaluation and Reporting and the Consultation and Support Sections will conduct the qualitative reviews for Georgia. More preparation and planning time is needed to initiate the reviews. O.K.</p>	<p>December 2003 3rd Quarter: Requesting a change in the completion date to September 2004 3rd Quarter Federal Response: We anticipate to measure your progress in this area by the end of 4th Qtr.</p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report: Completion date is changed to July 2004.</p>	<p>Alice Marie Hutchison, Leslie Cofield, Dianne Yearby, 3rd Quarter: (With ACF approval, these four names above to be deleted), and replaced with E &amp; R and Consultation and Support Sections,</p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report:, Responsible Persons: Evaluation &amp; Reporting Section and Consultation and Support Unit</p>	<p>Provide training to consultants and stakeholders by July 2003.</p> <p>3rd Quarter: With ACF approval new benchmark: Quarterly Qualitative Review Reports to State and Federal Teams. (The first report will be made available January 2004 and quarterly reports will follow through the end of this PIP period.)</p>

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** No report due for this quarter.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Identify any progress made so far.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** The Division of Family and Children Services Evaluation & Reporting and Consultation & Support Sections are planning and developing their approach to the Qualitative Reviews. Plans remain on target to begin the reviews October 2003.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Response:** Plans remain on target and the Qualitative Reviews began in October 2003, conducted by the Evaluation and Reporting Section. Three counties, Lowndes, Franklin and Clayton have been identified as initial counties to go through the review process. Four records will be pulled from both Clayton and Lowndes and one record from Franklin. The Consultation and Support Section will complete the stakeholder interviews. This is an ongoing action, and the first report will be made available January '04.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** This has not been achieved yet. One concern is the low #s of cases that the State is proposing to review as part of its QA process (only 9 cases). It's not clear if the State is just piloting its QA process -- or if it's QA process only includes review of 9 cases in 3 counties.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** At least 100 cases will undergo Qualitative Review by the end of September 2004. The initial counties identified in the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter report only represent the first wave of the process. In the first wave of reviews, 25 cases were selected from 12 counties. The first report has been forwarded to the ACF Regional office. Based upon these initial reviews, the Qualitative Review instrument has undergone a few revisions.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Quarterly Report, Qualitative Case Reviews, October 2003 -- December 2003

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Evaluation and Reporting Section continues to perform Qualitative Reviews. From January-March 2003, sixteen county departments and a total of 37 cases were reviewed. A total of 62 cases have been reviewed by Evaluation and Reporting since the process began.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** January- March 2003 Social Services Quarterly report (QCR) is attached.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Continue to report on progress until completion of this item.

I6: Please provide the Regional Office a copy of the revised instrument.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Evaluation and Reporting Section continues to perform quarterly Qualitative Reviews. A cumulative Qualitative Case Review for the 10 month period 10/03 - 06/04 applied the needs and services indicator to 67 records. Fifty-eight cases (86.57%) received a strength rating. The State notes that the second QCR reported a 10% decrease from the first QCR (90.48% down to 80.00%). The largest county was included in the second QCR and this may have attributed to the decreased percentage.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Documentation:** (1) Social Services Report - Cumulative Qualitative Case Reviews, October 2003 - June 2004 and (2) the Revised Qualitative Reviewer Handbook (this is the review instrument)

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>I7 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Complete a monthly county-by-county report as it relates to the initial assessment of the First Placement/ Best Placement Comprehensive Assessment and the identified types of placements needed and available and permanency plans of children. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation: Requested to change Action step to: Complete a quarterly county by county report as it relates to the initial assessment component of the Comprehensive Child and Family Assessment (First Placement/Best Placement) and the identified types of placements needed and availability and permanency plans for the child.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
June 2002	October 2003 <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiations , requested to extend completion date to July 2004.	Alice Marie Hutchison , Leslie Cofield, Dianne Yearby, Betty Wrights	Complete a report as to findings.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Response: This was partially achieved.** A study of the initial seven pilot FP/BP counties was completed in September 2002. A report of the findings will be available in February 2003. This study compares the seven pilot counties to non-participating FP/BP counties. The study was conducted from January 1, 1998 through October 31, 2001 prior to the statewide implementation of FB/BP assessments for all children entering foster care. Completion date December 2002.

In February 2001 counties were required to complete a comprehensive FP/BP assessment on all children entering care. A contractor needs to be selected to conduct will be selected to conduct a study on the efficacy of FP/BP using data from all 159 counties.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** No report is due this quarter. Due to limited funds for contracts, this work group will meet to develop a survey to capture types of placements needed and available and permanency plans of children based on FP/BP assessments.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** How will this impact implementation?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** The Foster Care Unit is moving towards developing an access database to assist in identifying placement resource gaps. The Division's implementation of the Assessment component of First Placement/Best Placement will continue to provide information on needs and services of children, parents and foster parents for reporting.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** A monthly-by-monthly report has not been implemented. An Access database has not been developed to assist in identifying placement resource gaps, however with CPRS, tracking the types of placements recommended from the MDT will be available in 12/03. Consideration will also be given to capturing the actual placement recommended and the actual type of placement available for the child. Also through CPRS, information on permanency recommendations will be captured along with all information recommended from the MDT meeting. Once, CPRS is updated with these features, a quarterly report will be feasible for the department instead of a monthly report.

The department is moving toward a leveling system of all children when they enter foster care. This will entail an assessment of the child's emotional and physical needs to determine an appropriate placement. The child will have a comprehensive child and family assessment within thirty days of placement in foster care, which will reinforce the initial placement recommendation, or support the need for an alternative placement.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** This has not been achieved. The completion date was December 2003. State requested for a change in completion date to September 2004. RO would consider July 2004.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** CPRS will be available for inclusion of the required information by December 2003 (data fields will be available). Reports will then be automatically generated. Quarterly reports will be established. Some refinements in reporting requirements are still necessary. However, reporting should begin in January 2004.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** CPRS does have the necessary fields added to address this action step. However, training to the county staff must be implemented so that the fields will be utilized. Currently, county staff are not using the fields and thus, no reports are available. Additionally, CPRS planning meetings have been held to ensure that permanency planning for non-reunification and adoption goals and planning for aftercare are updated in CPRS.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** I7: Subsequent to the provision of training, the State will have to allow time for usage and then build a report. Is the renegotiated goal date reasonable? Given extensive delays in beginning the work for I6 and I7, it is possible that these steps will not be completed prior to the close of the PIP implementation period.



**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Dekalb County DFCS and Troop County DFCS were selected to participate in the pilot of the Child and Family Comprehensive Assessment (First Placement/Best Placement) CPRS enhancements. In June, Georgia's Court Improvement Project (CIP) provided pilot training to seventeen (17) approved provider agencies on entering the assessment information into the CPRS system. After this training, fourteen (14) provider agencies agreed to partake in the execution of the pilot, which will extend through August 30, 2004.

Implementation of the pilot will provide an opportunity to determine if the MDTs are occurring and if the post substance abuse counseling, monitoring and support are being identified in CPRS. The quality of service provision remains with the QCR reporting. The pilot will also examine the effect if any on the judicial process once the Juvenile Court Judge reviews the assessment information from the CPRS system.

Technical Assistance will be provided to staff and approved FP/BP providers participating in the pilot. At the conclusion of the pilot, reports will be developed and generated from CPRS and an evaluation of the service needs of children and families will begin to determine the TA needed by county staff and private providers. Also, the QCR reviews will assist in monitoring the coordination of services for children and families as recommended in the FP/BP Comprehensive Child and Family Assessment.

Once the pilot is complete, the state will assess from the reports the recommended placements for children and the permanency recommendations. The gaps in services will be determined by examining the recommended placement to the actual placement of the child after the assessment is complete.

It is unlikely that this action step will be completed prior to the close of the PIP implementation period. The State will not abandon the efforts of the action step should completion not occur.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---

<b>I15 ACTION STEPS:</b>	Recommend additional training and policy changes. <b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter:</b> ACF Approval requests same as above to delete this Action Step. <b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:</b> Refer to above statement. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:</b> Per Annual Evaluation / Renegotiation Report Action Step is changed to:
--------------------------	---

Recommend additional training and policy changes as a result of QCRs in action step I-6.			
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Nov. 2003	June 2004 and on-going	Joe Wassell, Betty Wrights, Gloria Patterson, Millicent Houston, Linda Ladd, Linda Doster, Alice Marie Hutchison, Dianne Yearby, Leslie Cofield	Within 60 days of completing additional on-site case reviews, provide a written report, if appropriate. <b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation / Renegotiation Report, requested to change Measurable Benchmark to: Within 60 days of receiving the Qualitative Case Review Report, a written report will be provided, if appropriate, on future training needs and policy changes.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The State indicates a plan to remove this from the PIP. Why?

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** This step has not been removed. The State's first QCR report has been forwarded to the ACF Regional Office and is documented as a part of the 5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Progress Report.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Evaluation and Reporting Section continues to perform Qualitative Reviews. From January-March 2003, sixteen county departments and a total of 37 cases were reviewed. A total of 62 cases have been reviewed by Evaluation and Reporting since the process began.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Quarterly Report Qualitative Case Reviews January 2004 - March 2004

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** I15: State has agreed to, and requested a number of changes from quarter to quarter.

6<sup>th</sup> Quarterly Reporting is inconsistent with the benchmark.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Social Services Quarterly Reports to date were reviewed/compared and implication for additional training is evident. It was noted that areas in Child and Family Well-Being and Permanency saw a decline in compliance. As the QCR process continues, unchanged and declining areas will be targeted for training (and policy changes if applicable).

There has been a steady increase in the number of children entering the foster care system, which also increases the case manager to client ratio. This may have a negative impact on the needs and services indicator. Additionally, the State has an abundance of new case managers and supervisors. The Division is working with all nine urban counties of the State to identify solution focused plans to help decrease the number of children who may needlessly be coming into the foster care system rather than receiving in-home

services. It is anticipated that the plans will help the Division to know what works and what doesn't work before moving into any statewide implementation of change.

The Division's restructure created Regional Specialists positions (former State Office employees) to assist in local case consultation and training. Results of the QCRs will be shared with the Regional Specialist to reinforce policy, new worker training and other state training initiatives. A vendor has been contracted to review, assess and evaluate all of the States' child welfare policy. The first draft of that evaluation has been disseminated and is under review by the newly formed Program Planning and Policy Development Unit of the Division. The review should be complete prior to the close of this PIP reporting period. An outcome of the States' review should help in determining the need to change policy as it relates to improved outcomes for needs and services.

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

<b>I16 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Test whether needs and services to children and families changes after training and policy changes. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:</b> Per Annual Evaluation / Renegotiation Report request to change Action Step to read: 'Determine' whether needs and services to children and families changes after training and policy changes. Reason: The word 'test' implies a more formal research effort than was intended.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Jan 2003	June 2004	Alice Marie Hutchison, Joe Wassell, Betty Wrights, Gloria Patterson, Millicent Houston, Linda Ladd, Stakeholders, Leslie Cofield, Dianne Yearby	Complete additional case reviews, if appropriate.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** Foster Care Consultants have started to visit counties within their assigned area(s), to monitor progress on permanency issues and provide training and technical assistance.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** Monitoring continues.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** We will utilize the information gleaned from the Qualitative Reviews to assess whether the needs and services to children and families improve following training and policy changes. Information from Qualitative Review report findings will help determine future training and policy needs.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** See same comments under Step I6 related to QA.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** At least 100 cases will undergo Qualitative Review by the end of September 2004. Reports from the reviews will be available beginning January 2004.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Quarterly Report, Qualitative Case Reviews, October 2003 -- December 2003.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Evaluation and Reporting Section continues to perform Qualitative Reviews. From January-March 2003, sixteen county departments and a total of 37 cases were reviewed. A total of 62 cases have been reviewed by Evaluation and Reporting since the process began.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Quarterly Report Qualitative Case Reviews January 2004 - March 2004

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** I16: State has changed the benchmark! 5<sup>th</sup> Quarterly reporting is inconsistent with the benchmark the state modified and also with the States to delete/ collapse several of the goals listed above.

I16: When will the State provide the written report referred to?

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State **did not** change the benchmark. The Action Step was revised and approved by ACF during the Annual Evaluation/Renegotiations process. ACF also approved collapsing Action Steps I-13 and I-14 into Action Step I-6.

The report referred to in the Benchmark was contingent upon there actually being training and policy changes based upon QCR results. To date the QCRs have not lead to training or policy changes, thus the State has not provided a report.

## **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---

<b>I17 ACTION STEPS:</b>	Identify if appropriate, other factors that may contribute to the needs and/services of children and families not
--------------------------	---

		being met while in foster care. Evaluation: Please see Evaluation for Items 3 & 4, page B-2.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Jan. 2003	June 2004 <b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation / Renegotiation Report, requested to extend completion date to July 2004.	Alice Marie Hutchison, Joe Wassell, Betty Wrights, Gloria Patterson, Millicent Houston, Linda Ladd, Stakeholder, Leslie Cofield, Dianne Yearby	Complete a report to the team.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** No report due this quarter.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Identify progress made so far.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Response:** Qualitative Case Review reporting will assist in meeting this goal. First qualitative review report is due January 2004. In addition, the CPRS will help to identify factors that may contribute to needs and services of children and families not being met while in foster care.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** We will be better able to determine this information after several of the Qualitative Review reports are received. The first report is scheduled for January 2004.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** See comments under Step I6 related to QA.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** At least 100 cases will undergo Qualitative Review by the end of September 2004. Reports from the reviews will be available beginning January 2004. See documentation under Action Step I-16.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Evaluation and Reporting Section continues to perform Qualitative Reviews. From January-March 2003, sixteen county departments and a total of 37 cases were reviewed. A total of 62 cases have been reviewed by Evaluation and Reporting since the process began.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Quarterly Report Qualitative Case Reviews January 2004 - March 2004

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** I17: Reporting is inconsistent with the goal.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Social Services Quarterly Qualitative Case Review is referenced in this item because it is used to determine compliance with standards/policy/quality. As a result, factors that contribute to needs of families and children not being met can be identified.

The implication for additional training is evident. As the QCR process continues, unchanged and declining areas will be targeted for training (and policy changes if applicable).

There has been a steady increase in the number of children entering the foster care system, which also increases the case manager to client ratio. This may have a negative impact on the needs and services indicator. Additionally, the State has an abundance of new case managers and supervisors. The Division is working with all nine urban counties of the State to identify solution focused plans to help decrease the number of children who may needlessly be coming into the foster care system rather than receiving in-home services. It is anticipated that the plans will help the Division to know what works and what doesn't work before moving into any statewide implementation of change.

The Division's restructure created Regional Specialists positions (former State Office employees) to assist in local case consultation and training. Results of the QCRs will be shared with the Regional Specialist to reinforce policy, new worker training and other state training initiatives. A vendor has been contracted to review, assess and evaluate all of the States' child welfare policy. The first draft of that evaluation has been disseminated and is under review by the newly formed Program Planning and Policy Development Unit of the Division. The review should be complete prior to the close of this PIP reporting period. An outcome of the States' review may help in determining the need to change policy as it relates to improved outcomes for needs and services.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---

## Work Plan Detail J -- Item 18, Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

**Goal:** *Families will have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs*

<b>J1 ACTION STEPS:</b>	<p>Training curriculum for caseworkers will include provision to specifically address child and family involvement in case planning. Special attention will be paid to involving fathers and older children. The committee and selected contractors will revise, field test and implement the Social Services New Worker curriculum. The revised curriculum will place additional emphasis on family centered practice. Completion Date: In November 2002 competencies were identified for New Worker Training. The Advisory Committee reviewed the first draft of the revised curriculum based on CWLA competencies. Georgia is on schedule to have the new curriculum completed by October 2003.</p>		
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
April 2002	<p>Sept. 2002</p> <p>3rd Quarter: Because of delays imposed through the contracting and RFP process we request ACF Approval to change date to July 2004</p> <p>3rd Quarter Federal Response: We anticipate to measure your progress in this area by the end of 4th Qtr.</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to extend to July 2004 to allow for training implementation and the evaluation.</p>	Education and Research TA: Ed Fuller	<p>All curricula will include those provisions</p> <p>Evaluation: Survey sampling of caseworkers and supervisors will be done to measure understanding.</p> <p><b>6<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> The State request to change benchmark to read "The Qualitative Case Reviews will be used as an ongoing measure to evaluate whether case managers are practicing the involvement of families in case planning.</p>

## ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> and 2nd Quarter Reports: Achieved.** The DFCS Professional Development Section (PDS) established a Social Service Curriculum Advisory Committee to address the training needs of Social Services staff. Committee members include state and county staff, and other community stakeholders. Completion Date: In November 2002 competencies were identified for New Worker Training. The Advisory Committee reviewed the first draft of the revised curriculum based on CWLA competencies. Georgia is on schedule to have the new curriculum completed by October 2003.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** ACTION STEPS NEED TO BE ADDRESSED IN ORDER TO INDICATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS. What can the State give us to show this has been achieved?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Georgia Report:** The state incorrectly reported this action step as achieved. A draft of the competencies were reviewed and received input from the Advisory Committee in November 2002. The DFCS Professional Development Section in consultation with an external consultation group combined the feedback from the Advisory Committee and providing their input developed the Georgia specific competencies based upon the CWLA competencies. The final listing of Georgia specific competencies for new worker curriculum was completed in the spring quarter 2003. The Professional Development Section currently has the Curriculum Plan for Competency Based Core Curriculum for Child Welfare Case Managers. This Plan represents the content and the process for the final curriculum. The current Curriculum Plan does not specify family centered practice. We will incorporate specific content regarding involvement of fathers and older children.

**DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 3<sup>RD</sup> Quarter:** Please see the attached Competency Based Core Curriculum for Child Welfare Case Managers Trainer's Manual I, II, III, and IV.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The status of this action step is not clear. The State references an attachment related to competency based curriculum. Does this mean that the curriculum has been completed and the action step completed? It appears the evaluation piece of this action step has not been completed.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State considers this action achieved. Yes, the training curriculum does include provisions that address child and family involvement in case planning. The reference is week 4, day 3, Section 4 of the New Worker Training Curriculum. The first round of QCRs indicates that of the 23 cases to which this indicator applied, 18 (78.26%) were rated as strengths. For more details please see the attached QCR Report.

### **5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

Social Services Quarterly Report, Qualitative Case Reviews, October 2003 -- December 2003



**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The second QCR indicates that of the 36 cases to which this indicator applied, 23 (63.89%) were rated as a strength. For more details please see the attached QCR report.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Quarterly Report, Qualitative Case Reviews, January 2004 - March 2004

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** J1: The State reports as achieved in Q5 based upon QCR results which are inconsistent with the benchmark. Q5 reporting is also inconsistent with the request to renegotiate completion date to 7/04.

J1: State is requesting another renegotiation to change the benchmark to 'use QCR's...as an ongoing measure.' It appears as if the State consistently requests changes until it finds something achievable. They have gotten far away from the sound initial goal of 'surveying staff to measure understanding' which would provide the basis of practice change.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** In the 6<sup>th</sup> Quarter, the State had requested a change in the benchmark for this action step. It appears that the federal response was to continue using the benchmark of “surveying staff” about family centered practice as a more effective way of measuring understanding. Beginning April 2004, the State’s training curriculum again underwent a major revision. While based on family-centered practices, it is too early to “measure” staff understanding of family involvement. The first certification class had not completed the 16 weeks of our new worker training process. Again, the State asserts that the Qualitative Case Review (QCR) measures the understanding of staff through direct practice; i.e., the actual involvement of families as measured by case record reading and child and family interviews. The cumulative results of the QCR dated October 2003 - June 2004, indicates that 48 cases (70.59%) out of 68 cases read rated involvement of the family as strength. Improvement has been demonstrated from the last QCR reporting period. The QCR is an on-going measure of this action step. The second QCR included the States’ largest county. This may attribute to the decreased percentage. The State recognizes the decline in Well-being outcome 1 and will continue to emphasize the good practice of child and family involvement in case planning.

There has been a steady increase in the number of children entering the foster care system, which increases the case manager to client ratio. This too may have a negative impact on the involvement of child and family in case planning indicator. Additionally, the State has an abundance of new case managers and supervisors. The Division’s restructure, relocated former State Office staff to Regions as Specialists, to assist in case consultation and training. These positions became effective July 1, 2004. Results of the QCRs will be shared with the Regional Specialist to reinforce policy, new worker training and other state training initiatives.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** See *Social Service Report, Qualitative Case Reviews* (October 2003 – June 2004).

## **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>J2 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Judicial training will highlight the findings of the federal review on this item and the need for making sure that families and children are involved in their case planning. Evaluation: Survey sampling of judges will be done to measure compliance. A class on the federal PIP will be scheduled for the Spring 2003 Council of Juvenile Court Judges conference, May 4-6.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
April 2002	Nov. 2003	Eric John, TA: Michelle Barclay	Annual training will include session on the federal review.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** The federal PIP was presented at the judge's conference during the pre-conference meetings. It has also been distributed via the web on the Georgia juvenile court judge's list serv. A class on the federal PIP was conducted during the Child Placement Conference in the fall of 2002, which was attended, by judges, caseworkers, attorneys and CASAs. A class on the federal PIP was conducted during the Child Placement Conference in the fall of 2002, which was attended, by judges, caseworkers, attorneys and CASAs.

**3rd Quarter Report:** The survey regarding judge's knowledge of the PIP will be completed by the end of the summer.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** A survey assessing judges' knowledge of the PIP is presently being created. It will be distributed to judges by the end of November 2003.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The completion date in the PIP is November 2003. Has the State now completed this? We need more clarification on the evaluation piece.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Survey sampling was conducted which revealed that judges involvement in the PIP varies widely. A few judges were very involved but most others were not very familiar with the PIP. Surveying has not been done to measure whether judges are making sure that children and families are involved in their case planning. The last six months have been spent working on adoption of the CPRS statewide by both judges and caseworkers. The first report from the CPRS, on this data point, shows that of 16,080 case plans in the system, 11,690 documented that families participated in the development of the case plan.

#### 5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:

Program Improvement Plan-Random Survey of 10 GA Juvenile Court Judges  
PIP Results 2/18/2004 from the CPRS -- Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** The survey results were submitted last quarter. The judges were again presented with federal findings and information regarding the PIP at their November 2003 Conference. Reinforcement training is a continuous need. The survey results were extremely poor. (Only two of the judges surveyed were familiar with the PIP.) Other strategies employed have been to send out information on the judge's list serve. Since state efforts continue, the state requests an extension to July 2004.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** J2: State assesses as achieved, but also requests a new goal completion date of 7/04. Please clarify.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State assesses that the item is Achieved. It was not necessary to request a new goal completion date of 7/04. Please disregard. (The intent here had been to continue state efforts to improve understanding of the judges via various strategies, including Internet postings and training events.)

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>J3 ACTION STEPS:</b>		SAAG training will highlight the findings of the federal review on this item and the need for making sure that families and children are involved in their case planning. Evaluation: Survey sampling of judges will be done to measure compliance.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
April 2002	Aug. 2002 <b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Evaluation/Renegotiation Report, the State requested an extension to July 2004 to allow for monitoring via a survey	Vivian Egan, TA: Michelle Barclay	Annual training will include session on the federal review.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**Achieved.** SAAG's received training regarding the findings of the Federal Review.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The State articulates that this has been achieved, but provides no information. When was the training done? How many SAAGs were trained? We need more clarification on the evaluation piece.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** It was decided that a measure of just basic SAAG performance should be done first and that the local DFCS offices would be a better source of information than the judges. After getting 100% response rate from the DFCS counties, it was discovered that just a small core of SAAGS were not meeting with their own clients. The results are posted on the website:

**<http://www.gachildadvocate.org/gasurveyresults.html>**

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** The evaluation process was modified to yield more useful results. See results posted at the above website.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** J3: Information reported in Q5 and Q6 is inconsistent between the two and with the benchmark. Furthermore, the survey which the State cites was developed to assess DFCS' satisfaction with SAAG representation on behalf of the agency. It has nothing to do with child and family involvement in case planning.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State has **Achieved** this action by the following means:

(1) SAAG training has been conducted to review the findings of the federal review, including this item on family involvement in case planning. The plans for annual SAAG training could not be met due to budgetary constraints. The next training event is planned for July 26, 29, and 30, 2004. Documentation of the States Legal...is attached

(2) A sample of judges has been surveyed to measure compliance. The Court Improvement Project staff conducted the most recent survey of judges. Of the ten judges interviewed, most were aware that families and children should be involved in the case panning. However, most said that they just assume that the SAAGs and caseworkers are involving families and children in their case planning. One judge reported that in order to ensure involvement, he holds a case plan hearing one month after the case plan is signed to make sure that there is mutual understanding about the case plan expectations. See survey results below.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Meeting the Requirements of Title IV-E of the Social Security ACT, page 10... Presented at SAAG training conference 2003
2. SAAG Conference - Seminar Agenda 2002

3. SAAG Conference – Seminar Agenda 1999

4. Survey of Ten (10) Judges

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---

<b>J4 ACTION STEPS:</b>		The CPRS will be mandated to make sure that documentation of parental involvement be collected statewide. Evaluation: A report documenting parental involvement will be generated from the CPRS and distributed monthly to supervisors and county directors. A quarterly report will be presented to the Regional IV staff after review and approval by Division, SOA and Commissioner.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
April 2002	July 2003 <b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Evaluation/Renegotiation Report, the State requested an extension to July 2004	Kelli Stone, TA: Michelle Barclay	All case plans will be entered into the CPRS.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** Response as of 12/13/2002: There is an ongoing implementation plan for CPRS that will eventually include all 159 counties. Currently, 104 of 159 counties have been trained to use the new system. After the implementation plan is complete at the end of January 2003, the monthly reports will begin.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** Response as of 4/16/2003: All 159 counties have been trained. All the judges have been trained. The courts have hired a manager full time to serve the judge's needs for the system. For the month of March 2003, there were 2154 successful logins to the system. As of 4/16/2003 there are 11, 884 case plans in various states of revision in the system. A monthly report of parental involvement has NOT been created as of yet, due to other functionality needs of the system, which had to be addressed first.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** The Case Plan Reporting System has been trained and implemented in all 159 Georgia Counties. Use of CPRS is now required by DFCS policy. The system is available on the Internet at [www.gacaseplan.org](http://www.gacaseplan.org). There is also a link on this website that allows the user with no ID or password to access a demo version of CPRS. The system collects documentation about the participation of the parent and child in the development of the case plan. See attached the documentation CPRS 'Participation' screen print.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Action Steps have not been fully addressed.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The build of the report function has been requested.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The State articulates that completion of the report function is delayed due to CPRS staff involvement in other projects. The due date was June 2003. What is the new due date that the State is requesting?

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** July 2004 is the new due date. The first report from the CPRS on this data point (see documentation referenced in J4) shows that of the 16,080 case plans in the system 11,690 documented that families participated in the development of the case plan.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The last CPRS Report was run in February. The next report will not be run in time for an update on this measure. Results will be documented in the next PIP reporting period.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** J4: Requests extension of completion date to 7/04.

J4: Why weren't statistics provided from the 2/04 report run? The PIP Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report informs ACF that 'additional time for the reporting function to be built into the system is necessary.' Is the required functionality build complete?

**7<sup>TH</sup> Quarter Report:** In response to the above federal request for information, the State now has a reporting function that has been built into the CPRS Report. Data is collected for the following characteristics: “at least one parent and at least one child participated”; “at least one parent participated”; “at least one child participated”; and “no parental or child participation”. The 5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report did provide the first statistics (See documentation of Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning, dated February 18, 2004). The report has been run again and now appears on a website designed for counties to pull up statistics related to CPRS data fields. The new website and postings, however, contain duplications due to several factors. Specifically, during the migration of plans from the original CPRS to CPRSv2, duplicate cases were created. The counties were not aware that they needed to close the original plan, so the duplicate plans remain. The division is now providing training to supervisors on how to identify plans that need to be closed and how to close them. Additionally, supervisors and workers are receiving training on how to create a new plan and review existing plans. The developer of the system will review the system for “junk plans” and delete as appropriate. These strategies will assist the division in “cleaning up” the data. For reporting purposes, see documentation of printouts that the new CPRS Report will provide counties.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** See CPRS reports, Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning, designed to generate to capture family involvement in case planning.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Completion of the report function is delayed due to CPRS staff involved in other projects.

<b>J5 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Family group conferencing must be done at the 30-day case plan with multi-disciplinary staffing to ensure parental involvement in case planning. Evaluation: Sample spot checks with counties will occur to see if counties are in compliance.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
July 2002	June 2004	County Supervisors	Family group conferencing will take place with all foster care cases.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Reports:** **Achieved.** All DFCS staff and FP/BP providers have received training on Family Team Conferencing and Multi-Disciplinary Team Meetings (MDT). Additional training will be offered to DFCS staff and FP/BP providers in January 2003, June 2003 and September 2003.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** What can the State give us to show this has been achieved?

**DOCUMENTATION:** See attached PIP Items 7,9,12,18,21,23

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Progress needs to be addressed.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Beginning the spring of 2004 additional training will be provided to county case manager and supervisor staff on MDT and Family Conferencing.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The State indicates that this step has been achieved. They have provided training. However, the goal is to ensure that family group conferencing is done at the 30-day case plan and that parental involvement met. The State plans to evaluate by conducting spot checks for compliance. We need more information. How does the State know that parental involvement

has increased and that family group conferencing is done at the 30-day case plan? Have they done reviews? If so, what are the results?

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State is requesting to delete this action step. Reason: Limited resources do not allow the State to conduct the family group conferencing. The overall goal is being met. The State believes that deleting this action step will not adversely impact the goal.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Request is to delete this as an action step. Although the state recognizes the value of the family team conferencing process as an aid in the development of a comprehensive case plan, there are in place in the state other methods by which this is achieved. The multi-disciplinary team meetings (at which agency and other professional staff involve family members in case planning and decision making) is widely used by providers and agency staff at the culmination of the comprehensive assessment. Family members also have an opportunity to provide input and participate in the planning process during the development of the initial 30-day case plan.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** J5: State requests deletion of the action step 'due to limited resources' and also asserts that the 'overall goal is being met.'

Q6 reporting disputes the above as evidenced in the most recent QCR data.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** In response to the federal comment above, the State still requests the deletion of this item. As pointed out, the QCR for the last reporting period, in addition to the most recent QCR (a cumulative report ending June 2004), does demonstrate an increasing involvement of the child and family in the case planning process. (See documentation below regarding the review of 68 cases, of which 70.59% indicated this item as a strength). In addition, Item 17 of this same document reveals that out of 67 cases read, 66 cases received a Child and Family Comprehensive Assessment (First Placement Best Placement). The Multi-Disciplinary Team staffing is part of the process and is very similar to the “concept” of family group conferencing, except that a team of professionals also participates in the staffing with the family. Either strategy involves families in planning. The State’s earlier strategy of a “family group conference” is duplicative.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** QCR, October 2003 – June 2004 (Cumulative Report)

## **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---



<b>J6 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Family Group Conferencing and First Placement/Best Placement projects will get sufficient support, leadership and project management to ensure successful implementation and maintenance. Evaluation: Feedback will be sought quarterly from the project managers on progress and needs for continued successful implementation.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Jan. 2002	July 2002	Juanita Blount-Clark, Social Services Section Director	A project manager will be assigned to both programs with full support for implementation.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** Four Foster Care staff has been assigned to work with providers, county staff and other state office consultants to manage, monitor and provide technical assistance to counties and providers on Family Team Meetings and FP/BP services.

**Completion date:** December 2002.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Were you able to obtain feedback in the last quarter from the project managers on progress and needs for continued successful implementation.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report/Georgia's Reply:** Yes, the four foster care staff provides regular reporting regarding the progress and needs for successful Family Group Conferencing and FP/BP activities.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The State indicates that this step has been achieved. However, we need more information regarding the evaluation piece of the action step.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State is requesting to delete this action step. Reason: Limited resources do not allow the State to conduct the family group conferencing. The overall goal is being met. The State believes that deleting this action step will not adversely impact the goal.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report—**Please see action Step J5.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** J6: State requests deletion of the action step 'due to limited resources' and also asserts that the 'overall goal is being met.'

J6: Same as J5.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** See J5 above for response. The State requested that this action step be deleted. Earlier in the PIP reporting, the benchmark was met with the assignment of (4) project managers around the state to provide leadership and support. This strategy is no longer possible due to staff resources being needed elsewhere. The State maintains that deleting this step for the reasons cited earlier will not negatively impact the overall achievement of support for family group conferencing and the child and family comprehensive assessment model (First Placement Best Placement) as evidenced by the results of the QCR concerning First Placement Best Placement utility which includes MDT.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** (Same as J5)

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---

## Work Plan Detail K -- Item 19, Worker Visits with Child

*Goal: ICPC compliance with quarterly requirements*

<b>K6 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Review of ICPC policy compliance for quarterly reports to ensure appropriate contacts are being made.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
April 2002	<p>June 2003</p> <p>Requesting a date change to July 2003.</p> <p>This will allow the approval and printing of policy material, as well as training for C &amp; S Consultants 7/18/03. The Online Supervisory Review Guide continues being field- tested.</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter Federal Response:</b> We anticipate to measure your progress in this area by the end of 4th Qtr.</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested an extension to July 2004 to allow for the implementation of the On-line Review Guides</p>	Foster Care Unit, Local County Department	Track ICPC approved placements to assure that quarterly reports have been submitted.

## ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: Partially achieved.** See Action Step 2 above re: revised contact standards. Online Supervisory Review Guide to include as a compliance item (3/03). Supervisors will randomly select cases and review for compliance. Also exploring the use of the ICPC Tracking System to determine if reports are received quarterly in the State ICPC Unit.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** Nor report is due this quarter. **Partially achieved.** Policy revisions emphasizing the receipt of quarterly reports finalized and are ready for distribution. Measurement methods include Online Supervisory Review Guide questions that are currently being field-tested. Statewide implementation of the Review Guide is planned by June 2003.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report: Partially achieved.** Policy revisions emphasizing the receipt of quarterly reports have been distributed to the field. Measurement methods include Online Supervisory Review Guide questions that are currently being field-tested. Statewide implementation of the Review Guide is planned by September 2003.

**4<sup>th</sup> quarter Report: Partially Achieved:** Revised strategy for monitoring progress to include the use of the data from Qualitative Reviews which were initiated in October, 2003. The measurement collection tool will be published in a quarterly report Safe Futures: A Child Welfare Reform Plan Monitoring Progress Matrix. This report is shared within the organization and up through the chain of command to the Governor. Additionally, the social services web page has been established that will allow for the publication and the collection of data related to Supervisory Review Guides and other CSFR/PIP related goals.

## DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 4<sup>TH</sup> Quarter:

See attached for Supervisory Review Guide and Monitoring Progress Matrix.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response: State is behind in completion date of this action step.** Progress on this action step is contingent upon the QR.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Online Supervisory Review Guide is implemented (see action step K3). The first round of QCR is completed and the report is made a part of the 5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Progress report. However, the QCR did not divulge any information upon which to measure progress or the lack thereof regarding ICPC. Tracking of ICPC approved placements occurs through the ICPC Automated Reporting and Tracking System. Quarterly reports are being submitted to the sending State compact office and to the applicable county DFCS offices.

#### **5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

Quarterly Statistical Report: Placements **Into** An ICPC State

Quarterly Statistical Report: Placements **Out** Of An ICPC State

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Achieved.** In addition to the above-mentioned tracking systems, Georgia has also implemented an online **Social Supervisor's Handbook**. Mandatory supervisory training occurred January and February 2004, to reinforce the role of DFCS supervisors with respect to case management activities and compliance with policy and good practice. See documentation of the Supervisor's role to monitor the quarterly receipt of ICPC reports. Also see the "Unfulfilled Requests" Report generated by the ICPC Automated Reporting and Tracking System that flags the cases of children placed out-of-state on whom the quarterly report has NOT been received so that contact with the receiving state can be initiated.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Supervisor's Handbook, p. 18 re: ICPC tracking, "Unfulfilled Requests" (sample page only from the ICPC Tracking System) which flags any exception to the quarterly receipt of supervisory reports of the receiving state.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** K6: The State has rated the step as achieved, but Q6 reporting is inconsistent with the goal and benchmark. The step does not appear to be achieved.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State maintains that the step is **Achieved**. Clarification is provided as to how the state perceives that it has met the goal and benchmark by its' accomplishments to date:

The two methods of monitoring and/or reviewing the timely receipt of quarterly reports are:

- (1) State Level tracking via the ICPC Automated Reporting and Tracking System which generates an exceptions report called "Unfulfilled Requests; and the
- (2) County Level tracking and review of quarterly reports via the Social Services Supervisor's Handbook. As reported in 6<sup>th</sup> quarter, mandatory supervisory training occurred in January and February 2004 to reinforce the supervisory responsibilities, including ICPC compliance with quarterly requirements.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---



## Work Plan Detail L -- Item 20, Worker Visits with Parents

*Goal: Reduce caseload size*

*Goal: To have meaningful and purposeful visits between parents and case managers*

*Goal: ICPC compliance with quarterly reporting requirements. (6<sup>TH</sup> QUARTER REPORT: WORK PLAN ACHIEVED)*

**Work Plan Detail M -- Item 21, Educational Needs of the Child (6<sup>th</sup> QUARTER REPORT: WORK PLAN ACHIEVED)**



## Work Plan Detail N -- Item 22, Physical Health of the Child

**Goal:** ICPC compliance with quarterly reporting requirements.

<b>N2 ACTION STEPS:</b>	Georgia will continue to require all providers to complete a Multi Discipline Team Meeting for each Comprehensive Child and Family Assessment to determine the appropriate health needs and services of all children entering foster care program within the first 30 to 60 days of the child entering care.		
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
April 2002	Dec. 2002 and on-going 5th Quarter: Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to extend the completion date to July 2004 to allow for CPRS enhancements	Joe Wassell, Betty Wrights, Millicent Houston, Leslie Cofield, Dianne Yearby, Patricia Nealy, Alice-Marie Hutchison, Linda Ladd	Review at each annual on-site review. 5th Quarter: Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiations the State requested to change to: 'Review Statistical Data Quarterly as provided through the CPRS system'. (See PIP Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report)

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**Achieved:** As Part of the First Placement/Best Placement initiative in February 2001 policy was implemented that requires every child that enters foster care in Georgia and remains in foster care after 72 hour hearing to have a First Placement, Best Placement Assessment. With the assessment it is also required that a MDT meeting is held to determine the service needs of the child and family. The MDT meeting is held within the first 30 to 60 days of a child's placement in foster care. To monitor the effectiveness of the FPBP assessment as well as the MDT, four foster care consultants have been assigned to the 12 regions. These consultants will conduct onsite reviews, which are scheduled to begin in February 2003. CPRS will also provide a monitoring mechanism in which case manager are required to enter the date the FPBP assessment was initiated and the date the MDT meeting was held and any service needs and recommendations of the child and family. The four consultants will conduct onsite reviews of randomly selected cases with various counties along with Fulton County to assess if the private providers are meeting the standards for the FPBP assessment and if the county staff is implementing the service recommendations indicated for the child and family at the MDT team meeting with the use of wrap around funds. The reviews will aide in determining if the county staff is initiating assessments on every child that enters and remains in foster care after the 72-hour hearing. **Actions for next quarter:** The onsite reviews are not scheduled to begin until February 2003 after training of DFCS staff and private providers. Once the reviews are conducted, compilation of data collected is

needed to determine if Multi Disciplinary teams are being conducted after the completion of the First Placement Best Placement Assessment. The field in CPRS to report the service needs and recommendations of the child from the Multi Disciplinary Team is needed to adequately measure the benchmark.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The enhancements for CPRS were added in 12/03. The system now has the capability to capture data reported from the Multi-Disciplinary Team Meeting such as the service needs and recommendations of the child. A pilot of county staff is projected for April 2004 after which the reporting capability will be introduced statewide. The reporting mechanism for CPRS is expected to be available in April 2004 with the projected reports the system will be able to provide with the addition of the enhancements to capture specific data from the comprehensive child and family assessment.

**6th Quarter Federal Response: State is required to continue reporting on the progress of this action step.**

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Dekalb County DFCS and Troop County DFCS were selected to participate in the pilot of the Child and Family Comprehensive Assessment (First Placement/Best Placement) MDT component of CPRS enhancements. The enhancement allows the assessment providers to access and key the MDT date and make service recommendations. In June, Georgia's Court Improvement Project (CIP) provided pilot training to seventeen (17) approved assessment provider agencies on entering the assessment information into the CPRS system. After this training, fourteen (14) provider agencies agreed to partake in the execution of the pilot, which will extend through August 30, 2004.

Implementation of the pilot will provide an opportunity to determine if the MDT meetings are occurring and if the health needs and services are being identified for children in foster care. The QCR's will address the appropriateness of the identified services.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

\_\_\_\_\_

<b>N5 ACTION STEPS:</b>	Georgia will complete technical assistance to DFCS staff and private providers as to how to use the collected information to meet the child's needs as it related to post substance abuse counseling, monitoring and support as a part of the early intervention process and/or in -- home intensive treatment services. The team will need to determine the accuracv of information in the CPRS svstem regarding the service needs of children and families
-------------------------	--

<p>indicated at the MDT meeting. During the next quarter, the team will monitor the data collection from CPRS and the selected contractor. This information will steer the efforts of the FPBP consultants assigned to regions to begin training, consulting, and supporting the needs of county DFCS staff and private providers.</p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation, the State requested to change part (2) of the Action Step to read 'Once CPRS has the capability to capture data, the state office team will determine accuracy of information in the CPRS system regarding the service needs of children and families indicated at the MDT meeting'. Reason: Changes in management at the Division and Unit levels have resulted in the reassignment of the four consultants responsible for managing the Child and Family Comprehensive Assessment (First Placement/Best Placement).</p>			
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
July 2002	<p>February 2003</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter:</b> Requesting a date change to December 2003 to allow for the enhancements of the CPRS system.</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter Federal Response:</b> We anticipate to measure your progress in this area by the end of 4th Qtr.</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to extend the date to July 2004 to allow for CPRS enhancements</p>	Leslie Cofield	Provide 11 county site training to staff and providers beginning in 7/2002.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved:** The CPRS System will have features added to allow the collection of data on the number of assessments completed within a county and the service recommendations for the family and child from the MDT meeting. The compilation of this information will allow the team to determine the counties that may require consultation, support or training. The collection of the monthly county reports and the dissemination of the monthly invoices by the selected contractor will assist the four foster care consultants in identifying if the Assessment information is used by the counties to begin providing post substance abuse counseling and support. The data collection from the onsite reviews will also give concrete results on the counties ability to utilize the assessment information to determine if early intervention is necessary for post- substance abuse counseling, monitoring or support.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** First Placement/Best Placement Program Consultants assigned to monitor the PIP are providing ongoing technical assistance, training, and support to county staff at the request of the County Director, Field Director, supervisors, C & S consultants and placement and resource development staff.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** EXPLAIN WHY THIS GOAL HAS NOT BEEN FULLY ACHIEVED

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** The enhancements to the CPRS system are 33% complete. In December 2003, the system will have the capacity to capture and report on the number of children and families recommended to receive post substance abuse counseling and intervention.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** As reported in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter report the enhancements to the CPRS system are pending completion in December 2003. The Foster Care Unit has developed a training plan for 2004. Foster Care Consultants will train DFCS staff, private providers and other community partners in representative areas of the state. Networking sessions will also be planned to allow for sharing of information about intervention and preventive services to children and families involved in the foster care system in Georgia. In these sessions, post substance abuse counseling, monitoring and support will be discussed.

The Department of Family and Children Services and the Public Health Collaborative effort has expanded to include private physicians and a representative of the Department of Community Health. Through this collaboration, public health will begin to track and monitor the health care services of children in foster care. The Collaborative will determine an electronic tracking mechanism for recording health care services, recommendations, and diagnosis for children in foster care. This information will be available to Medicaid approved health care providers in the state. Public Health and DFCS will team up to provide training to DFCS and Public Health employees. A Collaborative session with representatives from County DFCS offices and Public Health Districts was held on August 19, 2003. This endeavor will focus on meeting the overall health needs of children in foster care in Georgia.

**DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 4<sup>TH</sup> Quarter:**

See 'Children in Foster Care An Emerging Partnership between Public Health and DFCS'.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The enhancements to the CPRS system are incomplete.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The enhancements for CPRS were added in 12/03. The system now has the capability to capture data reported from the Multi-Disciplinary Team Meeting such as the service needs and recommendations of the child. A pilot of county staff is projected for April 2004 after which the capability will be introduced statewide. The reporting capabilities for CPRS is expected to be available in April 2004 with the projected reports the system will generate as a result of the addition of the enhancements which allow for the collection of specific data from the comprehensive child and family assessment.

The Department of Public Health, Department of Community Health (DCH) and the private physicians collaborative with DFCS will begin training initiatives for state staff to include identifying and reporting abuse for Public Health staff and health care services available through the local public health department for DFCS staff. Also, training will focus on the importance of collecting medical history from the family at the first point of contact with the family.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Letter Dated January 15, 2004 to Janet Oliva, Director, Division of Family and Children Services, from Kathleen E. Toomey, M.D. M.P.H., Director, Georgia Division of Public Health

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The introduction to the field and pilot of the features added to CPRS to capture the recommendations from the MDT meeting and the service recommendations for children in foster care has been delayed. It is anticipated that training for select county staff will occur in May followed by statewide training and employability in June.

The Department of Public Health, The Department of Community Health (DCH), and the private physician collaborative recommended to the Division's policy simplification task force the need for collection of pertinent medical information when a child enters foster care and the need to share the information with community partners i.e. (physicians and local health departments). Information such as if a child has allergies, medications, and medical equipment is critical to the ongoing care of a child and will assist in equipping the foster parents and other childcare providers in meeting the needs of the child. The recommendations are being considered in a new process for obtaining information on children beginning at the initial intake process.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** N5: State requested extension of the completion date and revision of the benchmark in its Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report. The reason given for the benchmark revision was 'reassignment of the four consultants,' but the original benchmark did not specify consultants. Has ACF approved the request?

N5: Does the training discussed in the Q6 Report include TA specified in the Action Step or is it limited to usage of CPRS? Q6 reporting does not adequately address the entire action step. Furthermore, if 'employability' of CPRS will not occur until 6/04, the State will be unable to complete the action step by the renegotiated date of 7/04. Please step out your plan for full completion.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** ACF approved the extension of the completion date and the revisions to what the State called “part 2” of the Action Step during the Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report. Part 2 was changed from “The team will need to determine the accuracy of information in the CPRS system regarding the service needs of children and families indicated at the MDT meeting...” to the ACF approved statement of “Once CPRS has the capability to capture data, the state office team will determine accuracy of information in the CPRS system regarding the service needs of children and families indicated at the MDT meeting”. The intent of the Action Step is to focus on how to use collected information (CPRS) regarding post substance abuse counseling and how to apply service recommendations as indicated from the MDT meeting. The “team” as identified in the original PIP no longer existed as a result of reassignments. The benchmark was not changed from the originally approved PIP for this Action Step. The benchmark remained the same because the 11 county site trainings did occur. Technical assistance continues to date regarding the MTD meetings, the Comprehensive Assessment and for CPRS. The “team” concept as originally designed was disbanded. The first part of the Action Step did not change.

Dekalb County DFCS and Troop County DFCS were selected to participate in the pilot of the Child and Family Comprehensive Assessment (First Placement/Best Placement) CPRS MDT enhancements. In June, Georgia’s Court Improvement Project (CIP) provided pilot training to seventeen (17) approved provider agencies on entering the assessment information into the CPRS system. After this training, fourteen (14) provider agencies agreed to partake in the execution of the pilot, which will extend through August 30, 2004.

Implementation of the pilot will provide an opportunity to determine if the MDTs are occurring and if the post substance abuse counseling, monitoring and support are being identified in CPRS. The quality of service provision remains with the QCR reporting. The pilot will also examine the effect if any on the judicial process once the Juvenile Court Judge reviews the assessment information from the CPRS system.

Technical Assistance will be provided to staff and approved FP/BP providers participating in the pilot. At the conclusion of the pilot, reports will be developed and generated from CPRS and an evaluation of the service needs of children and families will begin to determine the TA needed by county staff and private providers. Also, the QCR reviews will assist in monitoring the coordination of services for children and families as recommended in the FP/BP Comprehensive Child and Family Assessment.

The DFCS/Department of Public Health (DPH)/Department of Community Health (DCH) collaboration continues regarding the coordination of health care services for children in foster care. DCH encountered technical difficulties with their electronic systems and therefore was delayed in providing the roster of Medicaid eligible children in foster care to DPH. Now that the roster is available, efforts will begin to assure that there is appropriate follow-up and sharing of communication between DFCS and DPH. A training session has been scheduled on 7/28/04 in Forsyth County with DPH staff to discuss the next steps for DPH and DFCS collaboration.

## **7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:**

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>N6 ACTION STEPS:</b>		<p>Complete a monthly county-by-county report as it relates to the initial assessment of the First Placement/ Best Placement Comprehensive Assessment and the identified types of placements needed and available and permanency plans of children.</p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to change this action step to read: 'Complete a quarterly county-by county report as it relates to the initial assessment of the comprehensive assessment and the identified types of placements needed and available and permanency plans of children'. Reason: The source reports are designed to be generated on a quarterly basis.</p>		
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>	
June 2002	<p>February 2003</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter:</b></p> <p>Requesting a date change to October 2003 to complete work activity on the survey discussed in the 3rd Quarter Report.</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter Federal Response:</b> We anticipate to measure your progress in this</p>	Leslie Cofield, Dianne Yearby, Patricia Alice-Marie Hutchison	3rd Quarter: Complete a report as to findings.	

	<p>area by the end of 4th Qtr.</p> <p><b>4th Quarter Report:</b> It is anticipated that Georgia will be requesting to renegotiate this item.</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to extend completion date to July 2004 to allow for CPRS enhancements.</p>		
--	--	--	--

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report: Partially achieved.** The initial focus of this action step was to conduct a study of the seven pilot FP/BP counties, a review of the FP/BP Comprehensive Assessment process to assure that the physical health needs of children were addressed in the assessments and to assure that the placements were appropriate to meet the child's needs. However, further and careful review of this action step indicates that a completed SACWIS supported by random case record reviews is necessary in order to monitor the benchmark. In the absence of the SACWIS system at this time, the four foster care consultants will randomly select cases to review this benchmark with county supervisors in their assigned areas to monitor benchmarks. Consultants are providing ongoing support, training, and technical assistance at the request of the County Director, Field Director, Supervisor, and Placement and Resource Development Staff.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** The four foster care consultants assigned to monitor the PIP will receive training in the qualitative review process by previously trained staff. After which, the Consultants will train County Supervisors on the process and assist with the review of cases.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** EXPLAIN WHY THIS GOAL HAS NOT BEEN FULLY ACHIEVED

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** The Foster Care Unit is moving towards developing an Access database to assist in identifying placement resource gaps. The Division's implementation of the Assessment component of First Placement/Best Placement will continue to provide information on placement needs and services of children, parents and foster parents for reporting. The CPRS System has been



enhanced to require documentation about the dates of the last medical, dental and psychological assessments. If any of these fields are missing an explanation is required. Additionally, CPRS allows for a free form field to record other relevant medical and psychological information.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Have you completed monthly-by-monthly county report?

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** A monthly-by-monthly report has not been implemented. An Access database has not been developed to assist in identifying placement resource gaps, however with CPRS, tracking the types of placements recommended from the MDT will be available in 12/03. Consideration will also be given to capturing the actual placement recommended and the actual type of placement available for the child. Also through CPRS, information on permanency recommendations will be captured along with all information recommended from the MDT meeting. Once, CPRS is updated with these features, a quarterly report will be feasible for the department instead of a monthly report.

The department is moving toward a leveling system of all children when they enter foster care. This will entail an assessment of the child's emotional and physical needs to determine an appropriate placement. The child will have a comprehensive child and family assessment within thirty days of placement in foster care, which will reinforce the initial placement recommendation, or support the need for an alternative placement.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** State is behind in the original projected completion date of this action step. A monthly-by-monthly report has not been implemented.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The enhancements for CPRS were added in 12/03. The system now has the capability to capture data reported from the Multi-Disciplinary Team Meeting such as the service needs and recommendations of the child. A pilot of county staff is projected for April 2004 after which the capability will be introduced statewide. The reporting mechanism for CPRS is expected to be available in April 2004 with the projected reports the system will be able to provide with the addition of the enhancements to capture specific data from the comprehensive child and family assessment.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The introduction to the field and pilot of the features added to CPRS to capture the recommendations from the MDT meeting and the service recommendations for children in foster care has been delayed. It is anticipated that training for select county staff will occur in May followed by statewide training and employability in June.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** N6: N2: State requested extension of completion date and revision of the benchmark in its Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report.

N5: See comments for N5. Additionally, in the Q5 revision request the reason given was 'the source reports are designed to be generated on a quarterly basis.' Can't the programming code parameters be simply modified to generate monthly reports? The State may want request TA to explore this issue.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** ACF approved the extension of the completion date and revision of the Action Step in the Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation. The benchmark was not changed.

The State will explore the feasibility of reports being generated monthly. However, the pilot discussed in Action Step N5 will help the State to determine the feasibility of monthly vs. quarterly reporting.

Once the pilot is complete, the state will assess from the reports the recommended placements for children and the permanency recommendations. The gaps in services will be determined by examining the recommended placement to the actual placement of the child after the assessment is complete.

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

N7 ACTION STEPS:		Complete a monthly county-by-county report as it relates to the First Placement/ Best Placement Wraparound Services used for each child in foster care.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
June 2002	October 2003 <b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to extend to July 2004	Leslie Cofield, Dianne Yearby, Alice-Marie Hutchison	<b>3rd Quarter:</b> Complete a report as to the findings.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** The same as above

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** The same as above

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** The Foster Care Unit continues to provide technical assistance to counties with regards to the appropriate use of funds to provide identified Wrap-Around services for children, families and foster parents. Local county offices continue to provide monthly reports on a quarterly basis to the Foster Care Unit identifying monthly therapeutic services ordered and paid for on behalf of individual children, parents or foster parents. The Foster Care Unit continues to receive monthly Grant -In-Aid Budget Vs. Expense Reports which detail by county, the current service provision pattern and totals for each Wrap-Around service provided. The Division's implementation of the Wrap-Around services component along with the First Placement/Best Placement Assessment process will continue to provide information on which we will base reporting.

The Foster Care Unit is moving towards developing an access database to assist in identifying placement resource gaps. The Division's implementation of the Assessment component of First Placement/Best Placement will continue to provide information on needs and services of children, parents and foster parents.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Have you completed monthly county-by-county report?

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** A monthly report has been generated. This report identifies by county the number of clients served each month with the specific type of wrap-around service.

#### **DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 4<sup>TH</sup> Quarter**

See UAS: First Placement Best Placement Assessment Services

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State considers this action step achieved. See 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report and documentation.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** N7: N2: State requested extension of completion date and revision of the benchmark in its Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report. Did ACF approve?

N7: Now the State rates the step as achieved despite what is in Q5 Report. Please explain.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State did not request any changes to this Action Step or benchmark. The request to extend the completion date was approved by ACF during the Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation. The state did not report in the 5<sup>th</sup> quarter as it determined the action step was achieved. As indicated in the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter report, The Administrative Services Section generates a monthly report, which details the use of Child and Family Comprehensive Assessment (First Placement/Best Placement) provider services and Wrap-Around services throughout the state. The monthly reporting in this Action Step is different than in Action Step N6. The N7 Action

step refers to reporting Wrap-Around services. The N6 Action Step refers to reporting placement types and permanency recommendations. The Wrap-Around received services are obtained from a different data source and not CPRS.

It is approximated that between SSFY 1999 and 2004 twenty three thousand (23,000) children have had a Child and Family Comprehensive Assessment (First Placement/Best Placement) completed.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** UAS First Placement Best Placement 511 and 518 Report (May 2004)

## **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>N8 ACTION STEPS:</b>	<p>Georgia will complete an annual statewide review of the First Placement/Best Placement Program to include on site case reviews of 50 randomly selected cases. This review will be similar to the federal on site review. Children, caregivers/families and other stakeholders will be interviewed. Fulton will be included at each annual review. <b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter addition per ACF request:</b> The qualitative review process will allow the team to determine the following: the effectiveness of the First Placement, Best Placement assessment in reducing the number of moves a child experiences while in foster care; the percent of children who re-enter foster care, the length of time to achieve permanency; the percentage of children in foster care who are abused and neglected; and the success of case managers implementing the service recommendations for children and families indicated in the FP/BP assessment. Georgia will continue to assess the effectiveness and impact of the First Placement/Best Placement Program and Wraparound Services Program. The plan for Qualitative Reviews will be in place by June 2003. The reviews will begin by October 2003.</p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Request to Change this Action Step to:</b> Qualitative Case Review's similar to CFSF will be conducted on a representative sample of approximately 180 cases by the end of September 2004.</p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to change this action step to read 'Qualitative Case Reviews similar to CFSR will be conducted on a representative sample of cases'. Reason: The original plan to outsource this effort and utilize the First Placement Best Placement Consultants to conduct QCRs has changed due to budget restraints and changes in leadership management. Therefore the Evaluation and Reporting and the Consultation and Support Sections will be conducting the OCRs. It should be noted that</p>
-------------------------	---

QCRs will not focus on analyzing the Comprehensive Child and Family Assessment (First Placement/Best Placement) model but rather how well the State is addressing health care services to the targeted population.			
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
<p><b>2nd Quarter Request:</b> Oct. 2003 Requesting a change in start date</p> <p><b>2nd Quarter Federal Response:</b> Explain the reason(s) for this request.</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter Report:</b> The State will not be out-sourcing to conduct the reviews. The DFCS Evaluation and Reporting and the Consultation and Support Sections will conduct the qualitative reviews for Georgia. More preparation and planning time is needed to initiate the reviews.</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/renegotiation the State requested to change the date to Oct. 2003 as this is when the QCRs began.</p>	<p>October 2003</p> <p><b>2nd Quarter Request:</b> Requesting a date change to Sept. 2004</p> <p><b>2nd Quarter Federal Response:</b> EXPLAIN WHY YOU ARE REQUESTING A GOAL CHANGE AGAIN IN THE BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT COLUMN</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter Report Georgia's Reply:</b> No Barriers to report but rather a change in approach to the reviews.</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to extend the completion date to July 2004.</p>	<p><b>3rd Quarter:</b> (With ACF approval, these four names to be deleted), Leslie Cofield, Dianne Yearby Alice-Marie Hutchison,</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter Federal Response:</b> Indicate the supplemental names instead of deleting the other names.</p> <p><b>4th Quarter Georgia Reply:</b> E &amp; R Staff, C &amp; S staff</p>	<p>Complete at least 50 case reviews beginning 1/2003.</p> <p>3rd Quarter: Quarterly Qualitative Review Reports to State and Federal Teams. (The first report will be made available January 2004 and quarterly reports will follow through the end of this PIP period.)</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to change to 'Quarterly Qualitative Review Reports will be made available to State and Federal teams'.</p>

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** Partially Achieved. The FPBP team will need to send out the re-enrollment applications to the private providers and the surveys to the county DFCS offices. Once the information is received

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** The re-enrollment applications were sent out with the return date of 4/30/03. The FP/BP team will begin review of the enrollment contents in May 2003.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Concerns that the State is asking for an extension to September 2004. We agreed to it, but this is close to the end of the PIP. Will the State start the reviews in October 2003 and then have a report by 2004?

**Georgia's Reply 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter:** Yes, see 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report below.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** The enrollment process concluded as of June 30, 2003. Seventy-One applications were received from Private Providers across the state. A report on the findings and conclusions of the re-enrollment process will be complete in October 2004 after phase II of the process is complete. In addition, we believe that the attached report 'First Placement/Best Placement Evaluation Final Conclusions' dated February 1, 2003, completed by Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, addresses the review of the First Placement/Best Placement Assessment Model. Descriptive statistics were completed to assess the following primary program evaluation measures: 1). Whether or not children received the placement recommended by the multi-disciplinary team after the assessment. 2). The stability of placements. 3). The length of time children spend 'in care' from time of removal. Additionally, the qualitative case review process will indirectly tell us about our assessment practice in Georgia.

Qualitative Reviews similar to CFSR will be conducted on a representative sample of approximately 180 cases by the end of September 2004. Reviews will begin October 2003 and the first report will be available January 2004.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** There were approximately sixty six (66) Private Providers approved to continue as First Placement/Best Placement providers for the state. Phase II of the re-enrollment process (field visits) has been postponed until February 2004. An information and technical assistance session was held for approximately eight (8) providers who were not approved as they did not meet the standards and or requirements. As a result of this technical assistance session, at least six of the providers were approved following this session. Reviewing the applications and assessments from the Private providers assisted the state in determining if the providers are following the standards and guidelines for completing comprehensive assessments and providing wrap-around services.

The E & R unit has selected three counties to begin qualitative reviews (Clayton, Franklin, and Lowndes). Four (4) cases will be selected from Lowndes and Four cases from Clayton County. One case will be selected from Franklin County. The Consultation and Support unit will provide assistance in this process by interviewing the stakeholders. A report will be available in January 04. Reviews will continue until approximately 180 cases are selected from across the state by September 2004.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** State is behind in completion date of this action step.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The QCRs will continue until all counties have been reviewed. The first report was available in January 2004 see attached. Twelve County Departments were reviewed during the reporting period.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Quarterly Report, Qualitative Case Reviews, October 2003 -- December 2003.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Social Services qualitative case reviews were conducted in sixteen (16) county department offices during January through March 2004. Fulton County DFCS was included in this review. A report on the Qualitative Review is attached. Evident in the reviews is that children in foster care have a comprehensive child and family assessment. An identified strength from the reviews is the array of services provided to parents to support their case plan goals such as, alcohol/drug assessments and treatment. In 29 of the 37 cases reviewed, the indicator was rated as a strength. Children received routine medical and dental care and follow-up as required. The eight cases identified as needing improvement-lacked evidence of appropriate medical and dental care for children.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Quarterly Report, Qualitative Case Reviews, January 2004 - March 2004

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** N8: N2: State requested extension of completion date and revision of the benchmark in its Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report. Did ACF approve? State reports that 'twelve County Departments were reviewed' -- see General Comment #7.

N8: The QCR data cited in the Q6 report indicates a 13 percentage point decline from the previous QCR!

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** ACF approved the requested changes during Annual Evaluation/Renegotiations. In the 6<sup>th</sup> report above, the State reported that 16 county offices (thirty-seven cases) were reviewed and not 13 as indicated in the ACF response. For clarity, during the Oct. – December 2003 QCR 12 county offices (twenty-five cases) were reviewed and reported on. During the January – March 2004 QCR 16 county offices (thirty-seven cases) were reviewed and reported on. The second review indicated a 13-percentage point decline for those counties in the review as noted by ACF. The second review included the largest county and this may have been a contributing factor to the decline during the January - March reporting period. The State will continue to monitor this outcome via QCR. The State has agreed with our ACF Regional Oversight staff to include the largest county in all subsequent QCR. This agreement came at the close of the third QCR.

A cumulative Qualitative Case Review for the 10 month period 10/03 - 06/04 rated meeting the child's physical health needs as a strength in 59 cases (85.50%).

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Report, Qualitative Case Reviews - October 2003 - June 2004

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>N12 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Examine policy and training effectiveness for DFCS staff and private providers. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested to change this action step to 'Determine policy and training effectiveness for DFCS staff and private providers, if necessary'.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Nov. 2003	June 2004 and on-going	Leslie Cofield, Patricia Nealy, Dianne Yearby, Alice-Marie Hutchison	Within 60 days of completing additional on-site case reviews, provide a written report, if appropriate. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the state requested to change to 'A Report from the Qualitative Reviews will be available at least sixty days (60) days following the completion of reviews'.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**Achieved:** The four consultants, county, and other stakeholders will monitor this action step and provide case consultation, and training assessments as part of their county assignments. This is considered an ongoing task.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** How do you plan to examine policy and training effectiveness for DFCS staff and private providers?

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** After analysis of accumulative reports from the QCR reviews, the state will determine the training and policy needs of the county staff. With the part II of the reenrollment process, the state will determine the training needs of private providers. The first QCR Report is attached as a part of the 5<sup>th</sup> Quarterly progress report

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** A review of the trends from the Qualitative Case Reviews completed during January and March will be completed to assist with determining training needs of county staff.

Training of First Placement/Best Placement providers has continued ongoing. Revisions in the Comprehensive Child and Family Assessment standards were completed in December 2003 and approved for circulation to county staff and private providers in January 2004. Training incorporated the policy revisions and integrated deficiencies noted in assessments reviewed by the State Provider Review Committee during the re-enrollment in 2003.



**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** N12: State requested extension of completion date and revision of the benchmark in its Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report.

N12: When will the 'review of the trends' be completed? The original action step is sound and should be maintained if ACF has not already approved the Q5 request.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** ACF approved the extension of completion date and revisions to the Action Step and benchmark in the Annual Evaluation/Renegotiations.

A review of trends has not occurred. The report referred to in the Benchmark was contingent upon there actually being training and policy changes based upon the QCR. To date the QCRs have not lead to training or policy changes, thus the State has not provided a report. The State believes that the Child and Family Comprehensive Assessment (First Placement Best Placement) training that occurred statewide in July 2002 and again in February 2003 had a positive impact on the provision of health care services. The training was provided for case manager staff and providers of services. The State will not abandon a review of the trends to determine additional training needs. It is not likely that a trends review report (from the QCR data) will occur during this PIP implementation period. In October 2003 a Trend Analysis Report was produced via the States' regular case record desk reviews. A copy of that report is attached.

A cumulative Qualitative Case Review for the 10 month period 10/03 - 06/04 rated meeting the child's physical health needs as a strength in 59 cases (85.50%).

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Social Services Report, Qualitative Case Reviews - October 2003 - June 2004

Trend Analysis Report State Fiscal Year 2003

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>N13 ACTION STEPS:</b>	Recommend additional training and policy changes. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report the State requested to change this action step to read: 'If necessary, recommend additional training and policy changes as a result of QCRs completed'.
--------------------------	--

START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Nov. 2002	June 2004 and on-going <b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report the State requested to extend date to July 2004.	Joe Wassell, Betty Wrights, Millicent Houston, Linda Ladd, Linda Doster, Leslie Cofield, Alice-Marie Hutchison, Dianne Yearby, Patricia Nealy	Within 60 days of completing additional on-site case reviews, provide a written report, if appropriate. <b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report the State requested to change to 'If appropriate, within sixty (60) days of receiving the Qualitative Reviews Report from the E & R Section, a written report will be provided with recommended training needs and policy changes.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**Achieved:** Same as above

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Action step and measurable benchmarks are not addressed

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Since, the QCRs will continue as an ongoing process for evaluating and monitoring the state's child welfare system, the effectiveness of training will be measured in the comparison of the first reports from the reviews and the reports from the second set of reviews. The reports from the reviews will be analyzed and compared to determine the training needs of staff. These training needs will be recommended to the newly established Education and Research Section to develop and implement training for county staff.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** A review of the trends from the Qualitative Case Reviews completed during January and March will be completed to assist with determining training needs of county staff.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** N13: State requested extension of completion date and revision of the benchmark in its Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report.

N13: When will the 'review of the trends' be completed? The original action step is sound and should be maintained if ACF has not already approved the Q5 request.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** ACF approved the extension of completion date, revision of the Action Step and benchmark during the Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation.

A review of trends has not occurred. The report referred to in the Benchmark was contingent upon there actually being training and policy changes based upon the QCR. To date the QCRs have not lead to training or policy changes, thus the State has not provided a

report. The State believes that the Child and Family Comprehensive Assessment (First Placement Best Placement) training that occurred statewide in July 2002 and again in February 2003 has had a positive impact on the provision of health care services. The training was provided for case manager staff and providers of services. The State will not abandon a review of the trends to determine additional training needs. However, it is not likely that a trends review will occur during this PIP implementation period.

A cumulative Qualitative Case Review for the 10 month period 10/03 - 06/04 rated meeting the child's physical health needs as a strength in 59 cases (85.50%).

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

<b>N14 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Test whether needs and services to children and families changes after training and policy changes. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report the State requested to change this action step to read: 'If necessary, determine whether needs and services to children and families changes after training and policy changes'.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Jan. 2003	June 2004 and on-going <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report the State requested an extension to July 2004	Joe Wassell, Betty Wrights, Millicent Houston, Linda Ladd, stakeholders, Leslie Cofield, Alice-Marie Hutchison, Dianne Yearby, Patricia Nealy	Complete additional case reviews, if appropriate by 12/2002. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report the State requested to change to 'complete additional case reviews'.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**Achieved:** Same as above

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Action step and benchmarks needs further clarification regarding progress to date.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Since, the QCR reviews will continue as the ongoing process for evaluating and monitoring the state's child welfare system. The effectiveness of training will be measured in the comparison of the first reports from the reviews and the reports from the second set of reviews. The reports from the reviews will be analyzed and compared to determine the training needs of staff. These training needs will be recommended to the newly established Education and Research Section to develop and implement training for county staff.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** A review of the trends from the Qualitative Case Reviews completed during January and March will be completed to assist with determining training needs of county staff.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** N14: State requested extension of completion date and revision of the benchmark in its Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report.

N14: The State will be unable to achieve this step within the PIP implementation period given the significant delays/modifications in previous foundational steps. Further discussion is needed.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State believes that the Child and Family Comprehensive Assessment (First Placement Best Placement) training that occurred statewide in July 2002 and again in February 2003 has had a positive impact on the provision of health care services. The training was provided for case manager staff and providers of services. The Benchmark was contingent upon there actually being training and policy changes based upon the QCR. To date the QCRs have not lead to training or policy changes. The State will not abandon the intent of this action step.

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

<b>N15 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Identify if appropriate, other factors that may contribute to the needs and/services of children and families not being met while in foster care.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Jan. 2003	June 2004 and on-going	Joe Wassell. Bettv Wrights. Millicent	Complete a report to the team.

	<p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report the State requested to extend to July 2004.</p>	<p>Houston, Linda Ladd, stakeholders, Leslie Cofield, Alice-Marie Hutchison, Dianne Yearby, Patricia Nealy</p>	<p>Evaluation: Please see Evaluation for Items 3 &amp; 4 on page B-2.</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report the State requested to change to read 'Reports from the first round of qualitative reviews will be made available in January 2004 and each quarter thereafter to the State and Federal partners'.</p>
--	---	--	---

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**Achieved:** Same as above

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Action step and benchmarks needs further clarification regarding progress to date.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** In the analysis of the QCR reports, 2 cases of the 24 read indicated areas of needing improvement. There may be identified health needs and services of children that are not being met while in foster care.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** It appears from the Social Services Quarterly Report on Qualitative Case Reviews conducted in January through March, that there were no identifiable factors that contributed to the needs and services of children and families not being met while in foster care. The report concluded from the sample of case reviewed in this report that parents were provided with an array of services to meet their case plan goals and children were referred for services and appropriately follow-up occurred to assure service implementation when needed in all but seven cases rated as needing improvements.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** N15: State requested extension of completion date and revision of the benchmark in its Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report. Did ACF approve?

N15: Q6 reporting is inconsistent with the action step.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** ACF approved the extension of completion date and revision of the benchmark in the Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation.

There has been a steady increase in the number of children entering the foster care system, which also increases the case manager to client ratio. This may have a negative impact on the provision of health needs being met. Additionally, the State has an abundance of new case managers and supervisors. The Division is working with all nine urban counties of the State to identify solution focused plans to help decrease the number of children who may needlessly be coming into the foster care system rather than receiving in-home services. It is anticipated that the plans will help the Division to know what works and what doesn't work before moving into any statewide implementation of change.

The Division's restructure created Regional Specialists positions (former State Office employees) to assist in local case consultation and training. Results of the QCRs will be shared with the Regional Specialist to reinforce policy, new worker training and other state training initiatives. A vendor has been contracted to review, assess and evaluate all of the States' child welfare policy. The first draft of that evaluation has been disseminated and is under review by the newly formed Program Planning and Policy Development Unit of the Division. The review should be complete prior to the close of this PIP reporting period. An outcome of the States' review may help in determining the need to change policy as it relates to improved outcomes for the provision of health services.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

\_\_\_\_\_

## Work Plan Detail O -- Item 23, Mental Health of the Child

**Goal:** Identify or develop a uniform process to ensure that children have access to a statewide mental health assessment that is timely and comprehensive.

**4TH QUARTER REPORT: IT IS EXPECTED THAT GEORGIA WILL RE-NEGOTIATE THE ENTIRETY OF ITEM 23**

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The work plans below represent Georgia's requests for re-negotiations.

<b>O2 ACTION STEPS:</b>		1. Using the CPRS, develop a process to evaluate completion of assessments for all children entering foster care.  2. Assess and report current percentage of completed and timely assessments of children entering care.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Mar. 2002	Feb. 2004 <b>5th Quarter:</b> The State requests an extension to July 2004. Reason: allow for accumulative QCR data and more user utility of CPRS.	Betty Wrights, Dawne Morgan, Nancy Bruce	Utilizing the same reporting procedure, the percentage of timely assessments completed will increase to at least 80%. <b>5th Quarter:</b> The State request to change to the following: Utilizing the QCR data, evaluate the completion of mental health assessments. Report completed and timely assessments of children entering care via CPRS. Increased completed and timely assessments to at least 80%.

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** The Case Plan Reporting System (CPRS) presently does not have the capability to collect information regarding the timely completion of First Placement/Best Placement (FP/BP) Assessments. Timely completion is defined as assessments completed in thirty days with initiation of assessment beginning no sooner than the completion of the 72-hour Juvenile Court hearing.

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** **MOVE UNDERLINED TO BARRIERS COLUMN.**

An entire section devoted to FP/BP statistics is being developed for CPRS. FP/BP fields to be added to CPRS include: Date of Removal; Date of Referral; Date of Completion; Date of MDT Meeting; DSM Iv Diagnosis; Mental Health Recommendations; Date of Referral to Mental Health; Date of Mental Health Report; Date of Closure of Mental Health Service. The addition of these fields will ensure that CPRS is able to capture and report information about Mental Health assessments of children entering foster care.

**Method for measuring achievement:** Information needed to evaluate the timely completion of FP/BP assessments is available in the FP/BP monthly report. Until the fields are added to the CPRS a hand count will be used to review the FP/BP assessments completed

each month by county offices. The FP/BP monthly reporting process requires that each count office report to their assigned foster care consultants the number of assessments ordered and paid including a copy of the invoice. The invoice includes the date of referral, date of removal and date of completion of assessments. A hand count of these figures will be compared to the Internal Data System (IDS) which tracks total number of children in care. The CPRS needs additional fields to capture the statistical data of this goal. Actions to be taken next quarter: CPRS is in the process of design regarding FP/BP. The work schedule is set to begin March 2003 and conclude in December in December (~~delete underline~~) 2003. 1. Team Meetings will begin with the CPRS developer in March 2003 to discuss changes to the system. 2. A final plan of all improvements to CPRS will be finalized by April 2003.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** Two meetings were held with the CPRS consultant and developer during this reporting period. The work plan should be finalized by May 2003. An entire section devoted to FP/BP statistics is being developed for CPRS. FP/BP fields to be added to CPRS include: Date of Removal; Date of Referral; Date of Completion; Date of MDT Meeting; DSM Iv Diagnosis; Mental Health Recommendations; Date of Referral to Mental Health; Date of Mental Health Report; Date of Closure of Mental Health Service. The addition of these fields will ensure that CPRS is able to capture and report information about Mental Health assessments of children entering foster care. Method for measuring achievement: Information needed to evaluate the timely completion of FP/BP assessments is available in the FP/BP monthly report. Until the fields are added to the CPRS a hand count will be used to review the FP/BP assessments completed each month by county offices. The FP/BP quarterly reporting process requires that each county office report to their assigned foster care consultants the number of assessments ordered and paid including a copy of the invoice. The invoice includes the date of referral, date of removal and date of completion of assessments. A hand count of these figures will be compared to the Internal Data System (IDS) which tracks total number of children in care. The CPRS needs additional fields to capture the statistical data of this goal.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** The Case Plan Reporting System (CPRS) has been trained on and implemented in all 159 Georgia counties. DFCS policy mandates its use. Functionality to capture data about First Placement Best Placement is being added to CPRS by 12/03. Reporting will assist in data collection about recommendations made during the comprehensive assessment and the state's ability to provide the recommended resources. This information will be available by county, region, and state. Currently, the system has been enhanced to capture dates that children receive health, psychological, and dental exams.

#### **DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 3<sup>RD</sup> Quarter:**

Screen Print - Child and Family Well-Being 3 -- Item 23

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved.** The CPRS is capable of reporting the number of case plans with a 'Date of Last Psychological Evaluation'. To date, CPRS reports that 8,598 case plans indicated a date in the field 'Date of Last Psychological Evaluation'. There were 8,063 case plans where date was not indicated. The State believes that the QCR process is a better method for



evaluating the completeness of assessments for children entering care. The first round of QCRs were favorable, in that of the 21 cases reviewed, 80.95% were rated as strength.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Achieved.** To date, CPRS reports that 9323 case plans (51.67%) indicated a date in the field 'Date of Last Psychological Evaluation'. There were 8721 case plans where a date was not indicated. The State believes that the QCR process is a better method for evaluating the completeness of assessments for children entering care. The second round of QCRs continues to be favorable, in that of the 37 cases reviewed, 85.71% were rated as strength.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** O2: State requested extension of completion date and revision of the benchmark in its Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report. Additionally, the State has included an evaluation method of 'increased completed and timely assessments to at least 80%.' What baseline is the State using? Did ACF approve -- the request seems inconsistent with the goal?

O2: Q6 reporting refers to a seemingly arbitrary CPRS data field. Further discussion with the State is needed.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Continues as partially achieved.** From the Final Report of the July 2001 CSFR on-site review, a benchmark of 63.2% of children having received adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs was established. The State set the goal to increase the timeliness and completion of mental health assessments to 80%, which did not change from the originally approved PIP.

The data element in the CPRS of 'Date of Last Psychological Evaluation' is the one that most closely measures the action step of 'completion of assessments for all children entering foster care'. The State's request to add the QCR data as a measurable benchmark reflects the State's belief that the internal quality case review process reflects a more thorough method of evaluating the mental health assessment process. The QCR process will assist with data collection on recommendations made during the Child and Family Comprehensive Assessment (First Placement Best Placement) and the State's ability to provide the recommended resources.

To date CPRS reports that 10,274 case plans (51.92%) indicated a date in the field 'Date of Last Psychological'. There were 9,511 case plans where a date was not indicated. The State believes that the QCR process is a better method for evaluating the comprehensiveness of mental health assessments for children entering care.

A cumulative QCR report for the 10 month period 10/03 – 6/04, continues to show a favorable trend, in that of the 72 cases reviewed, 88.89% were rated as a strength. One QCR review period included the States' largest agency and another also included a large urban county.

## **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report per ACF Request:** The Case Plan Reporting System (CPRS) presently does not have the capability to collect information regarding the timely completion of First Placement/Best Placement (FP/BP) Assessments. Timely completion is defined as assessments completed in thirty days with initiation of assessment beginning no sooner than the completion of the 72-hour Juvenile Court hearing. Plans presented to the developer must be determined to be feasible and then actualized.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** HOW DO YOU INTEND TO OVERCOME THIS BARRIER IN OTHER TO ACHIEVE ACTION STEPS/MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Georgia Reply:** We expect to accomplish the capability to collect information regarding timely completions of assessments by our target completion date and do not currently foresee any barriers.

<b>O4 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Develop and enforce statewide multi-agency protocol for assessment, including necessary confidentiality safeguards. Determine utilization by all counties of approved instruments pursuant to protocol. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> The State request to change this action step to: "Development and implement statewide multi-agency protocol for assessment, including necessary safeguards". Reason: Major leadership changes at multiple levels and across agencies will require redrafting and renegotiations of a protocol.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Mar. 2002	June 2004	Betty Wrights, Dawne Morgan, Juanita Blount-Clark, Governor's Action Group, <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Social Services Director, DFCS Division Director, MHDDAD Division Director, FPBP Assessment Coordinator	Development and enforcement of formal agreements between agencies to use common assessment protocol. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> The State request Develop and implement protocol for sharing information. <b>6<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> To better clarify the 5 <sup>th</sup> Quarter request, the State request to change the benchmark to read "Develop and implement protocol for sharing information".

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** In January 2002, Georgia Governor Roy Barnes named 32 individuals from the public and private sector to form The Governor's Action Group for Safe Children. The final report was published December 30, 2002. One of their charges was to develop a unified state vision regarding children's services including creating a system of data and information sharing among agencies, providers, advocacy groups and the courts. This Interagency Agreement was the first step in bringing together all Georgia

agencies that provide programs and services to children and their families, with the express purpose of providing an enforceable road map for coordinated service delivery. The intent is to formalize the State's commitment to break down real and perceived barriers to this coordination. This Agreement laid out outcomes, timelines, and specific deliverables related to achieving this goal. This has resulted in tentative (unsigned) agreements between the Department of Human Resources, Department of Juvenile Justice, Department of Community Health, Department of Education, Georgia Technology Authority, Council of Juvenile Court Judges, Family Connection and the Office of the Child Advocate. If the assessment protocol is developed, it will need to be determined how to ensure that all counties are utilizing the tool. . A common assessment protocol is needed in order to have a seamless, effective and efficient system of service provision. **Actions** for next reporting quarter: The agreement between the different agencies has not been ratified. A common assessment protocol has been discussed but is yet to be developed including necessary confidentiality safeguards. A copy of the final report has been provided to incoming Governor Perdue and his transition team. Governor Perdue's plans to address this need is under consideration at this time.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** Accomplishing this goal is contingent upon selecting validated instruments for risk assessment as well as more comprehensive diagnostic assessments for mental health, mental retardation and substance abuse, which is in progress. Representatives from DFCS, MHDDAD, DPH and DJJ are meeting regularly this reporting period. Once the screening/assessment efforts have concluded and recommendations formulated, a draft protocol will be presented to the appropriate commissioners. The protocol will encourage partnership with other agencies in accepting their screening / assessment tools.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** Same as Action Step 3.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:**

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Standards for the First Placement Best Placement Comprehensive Child and Family Assessment have been updated and sent to the field. A copy is attached. HIPPA issues have been resolved. A HIPPA compliant release form has been added to program forms.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DCOUMENTATION:** Social Services Manual Transmittal No.2004-02

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** O4: State requested extension of completion date and revision of the benchmark in its Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Achieved as noted in the 6<sup>th</sup> Quarter report. The State did not request an extension of the completion date. The State requested a revision to the action step and the benchmark.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

The legal and HIPAA implications of sharing information across agencies needs to be explored. Issues of confidentiality, releases of information and similar matters is being discussed with the legal teams of each agency.

**HOW DO YOU PLAN TO OVERCOME THIS BARRIER, OR RESOVLED THIS BARRIER?**

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Respond to above question.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** HIPPA issues have been resolved. A HIPPA compliant release form has been added to program forms.

**Goal:** Case managers have the capacity to work closely with children and families in order to ensure sustained access to needed treatment resources.

<b>O6 ACTION STEPS:</b>	1. Revise Case managers' job requirements to ensure focus on mental health needs of the child and family as defined in the comprehensive assessment (streamline and eliminate duplicative requirements). Job requirements will be more specific to meeting the needs of the family. 2. Conduct study of caseworker caseloads using only the positions actively working a caseload in order that a true and accurate caseload accounting can be made. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> The State request to change the action step to 'Revise case managers' Performance Management Plan (PMF) to ensure focus on mental health needs of the child and family as defined in the Comprehensive Child and Family Assessment (First Placement Brest Placement). Performance Management Plans will be more specific to meeting the needs of the family'.		
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Jan. 2003	June 2004	Jim Martin, Juanita Blount-Clark, <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Division Director, Social Services Director, County Directors, County Supervisors	Funding appropriated to hire enough staff to keep caseloads manageable. Caseloads will decrease dramatically toward meeting CWLA standards. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:</b> Incorporation of information into the performance management plan to ensure focus on the mental health needs of child and family.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** Case managers job requirements have not been revised to ensure focus on mental health. At this time, preliminary data is being compiled to accomplish this goal. The latest data available for caseload studies was taken over a twelve-month average ending June 30, 2002. At that time the current caseload for staff in Child Protective Services was eighteen and in Placement was twenty-one. The rates did not reflect the impact of case distribution due to employee absence for extended sick leave or family leave. Additionally, the Georgia Office of the Child Advocate completed a detailed survey September 15, 2002 with a 100% response from the 159 counties regarding caseloads, staffing and education/experience. The survey found that caseloads varied from 19 to 30 depending on the size of the county with the average statewide being 25.36 per worker. This information will assist in the process of gaining a true and accurate caseload accounting. **Method for measuring accomplishments:** Current IDS caseload accounting, survey completed by the Office of the Child Advocate and Social Services Series job descriptions. Completed job study analysis and functionality in current accounting system to provide accurate caseload numbers. Currently, the numbers available for caseload count are based on allocated positions and average number of cases for a specific period. Actions to be taken next quarter: 1. A job study analysis will be completed. 2. Functionality in the computer system will be addressed to determine if more accurate caseload accounting is possible. The start date for this goal is January 2003. Thus the preliminary work accomplished is reasonable.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** The latest data available for caseload studies was taken over a twelve-month average ending June 30, 2002. At that time the current caseload for staff in Child Protective Services was eighteen and in Placement was twenty-one. The rates did not reflect the impact of case distribution due to employee absence for extended sick leave or family leave. Additionally, the Georgia Office of the Child Advocate completed a detailed survey September 15, 2002 with a 100% response from the 159 counties regarding caseloads, staffing and education/experience. The survey found that caseloads varied from 19 to 30 depending on the size of the county with the average statewide being 25.36 per worker. This information will assist in the process of gaining a true and accurate caseload accounting.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** Due to changes in staff and leadership for this action step, additional time is necessary to further evaluate the role of case managers in relation to the focus on the mental health needs of the child and family. It is evident that with a current average caseload of 25.36 per worker the ability to focus more intently in this area may be minimal. The Division with the support from the legislature through appropriated funds has been able to increase staff assignment to the various counties for 2004 through allocated 100 positions. The total increase over the past four years is 471 positions.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: ACHIEVED.** Although restructuring continues, the performance management plans for case managers are revised to include focus on the mental health needs of the child and family as noted by the Child and Family Comprehensive Assessment (First Placement Best Placement). The new performance management plans are in effect for the State FY 2005.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** (Performance Management Plans for Social Services Case Managers – Placement; and Social Services Supervisors - Placement) SSCM Supervisor – Placement 5/20/2004 Section 3: Job and Individual Responsibilities. Under Performance Expectations, see number 2, which is specific about focus on mental health assessment.

## BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

Case managers job requirements have not been revised to ensure focus on mental health. Currently, the numbers available for caseload count are based on allocated positions and average number of cases for a specific period.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Major restructuring of the Division of Family and Children Services is occurring. The Division Director is committed to creating a professional services staff to better provide services. It is expected that this action step can be accomplished by the stated completion date

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Restructuring continues. It is expected that this action step can be accomplished by the stated completion date.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** O6: State requested extension of completion date and revision of the benchmark in its Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report.

O6: Requires further dialogue with the State.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter:** The State did not request an extension of the completion date. The revision of the benchmark was requested and approved in the Annual Evaluation/ Renegotiation Report.

---

**Goal: Development of a statewide vision for coordinated service delivery system to children and families.**

<b>O8 ACTION STEPS:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Begin development of statewide database on children's mental health resources -- focusing on needs identified (in assessment process) for which no service is currently available</li><li>2. CPRS will be amended to include data collection for recommendations made during the assessment process.</li></ol> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> The State request to delete this action step. Reason: The State cannot support financially a statewide database on mental health resources. Additionally, it is believed that Action Step O9 will help to address this issue. The State believes that deleting this action step will not adversely impact the goals.</p> <p><b>6<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> For clarity, the state wishes to delete number 1 of this action step.</p>
-------------------------	--

START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Sept. 2002	June 2004	Jim Martin, Juanita Blount-Clark, Georgia Technology Ass. (GTA), Office of Planning and Budget, John Hurd <b>6<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Change the above to: Nancy Bruce, Brad Pasto	Improved cross-agency data on children's mental health, mental retardation and substance abuse needs become available and is used by multiple agencies when budget planning. <b>7<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> To further clarify the 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> Quarter request for changes to the action steps, the State requests to change the benchmark to read "Improved agency data on children's mental health, mental retardation and substance abuse needs becomes available and is accessible to multiple agencies during budget planning." The state removed "cross-agency".

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** The Georgia Association for Homes and Services for Children has established an online database at [www.referralcentral.info](http://www.referralcentral.info), which is the logical starting point for this benchmark. Also, [www.caresolutions.com](http://www.caresolutions.com) carries the list of Safe and Stable Families resource guide, which is also a starting point. **Method for measuring achievement:** A comprehensive list of county-by-county resources compiled and distributed via internet and hardcopy. Provisions for continual updating to be included. Activities have been directed toward gathering information currently available. **Action for next quarter reporting:** 1. A listing of resources both in hard copy and via Internet will be compiled. 2. A county-by-county survey of available resources to be initiated. 3. A meeting with the United Way, other database maintainers and stakeholders will be initiated to determine the most effective and efficient manner to meet this goal. 4. Determination will be made as to how to best disseminate information to case managers.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** The following resources are social services resources are on-line: Referral Central hosted by the Georgia Association for Homes and Services for Children ([www.referralcentral.net](http://www.referralcentral.net)). This resource is a statewide database of First Placement Best Placement providers, Shelters, Family Preservation providers, counseling services, psychiatric hospitals, foster and group homes and other services. The complete Promoting Safe and Stable Families guide is available for on-line viewing at [www.caresolutions.com](http://www.caresolutions.com). PSSF's service area covers the entire state with prevention, intervention, preservation, reunification and adoption services. Additionally, the Division of Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities and Addictive Diseases has a comprehensive listing of its community service boards, private providers and health departments. CPRS is in the process of being revised. Meetings have been held with the developer to discuss amending the system to collect

recommendations from the First Placement Best Placement Assessment and to determine how the recommendations are ultimately reflected in the case plan.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** Revisions to the CPRS are underway and expected completion date is 12/03

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** CPRS has been amended to include First Placement Best Placement functionality. A pilot county will be selected April 2004.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** O8: State requests deletion based upon 'limited resources.'

O8: Q6 reporting is inconsistent with Q5 reporting -- please clarify.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State requested deletion of #1 within Action Step O8 based on the fact that the cost of maintenance and continued development of the web sites noted could present a barrier. Further, since the web sites are hosted by contract (Care Solutions) and private providers Georgia Association of Homes and Services for Children (GAHSC) the control of the content, frequency of updates, security and other Internet issues are outside of DHR control. The Division no longer has contract relationship with either Care Solutions or GAHSC.

Even though number 1 in the Action Step has been deleted, the State believes that number 2 will enable the State to have data to bring to the table during Statewide planning in support of mental health resources.

CPRS has been amended to include the Comprehensive Child and Family (First Placement Best Placement) mental health assessment functionality. The pilot counties of DeKalb and Troup have been selected. Training is currently in process for these counties. The pilot will begin when training is completed.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

The cost of maintenance and continued development of the websites could present a barrier. Further, since the websites are hosted by contract (Care Solutions) and private providers (GAHSC) control of the content, frequency of updates, security and other Internet issues are outside of DHR control.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response: WILL THIS IMPACT THE ABILITY TO ACHIEVE YOUR INTENDED OUTCOME IN THIS AREA?**

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Yes, see request to withdraw this action step above.



<b>O9 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Identify through database the areas most in need of resource development and begin development strategies to meet those needs. A listing of resources both in hard copy and via the internet will be started. A visual representation of available resources will be developed along with a paper analysis to determine service gaps and geographical areas in need of service. <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> The State requests to change this action step to read 'Identify the areas most in need of resource development and initiate development strategies to meet those needs.'	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Sept. 2002	June 2004	Jim Martin, Juanita Blount-Clark, John Hurd, <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Change the above to: Roger Smith, Amy Hale, Linda Ladd, Ann Dennard Smith	Agencies jointly identify critical systems gaps and recommend budget priorities as a system <b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> The requests to change to 'Identification of areas most in need of services and recommendation of budget priorities made'.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** The database has not been developed. Thus, studies on gaps in available resources have not been determined. The internet and hard copy resources currently in use may be adequate to initiate a gap analysis. A comprehensive list of county-by-county resources needs to be compiled and distributed.

**Actions for next quarter:** 1. A listing of resources both in hard copy and via the internet will be started. 2. A visual representation of available resources will be developed along with a paper analysis to determine service gaps and geographical areas in need of service.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** The following resources are social services resources are on-line: Referral Central hosted by the Georgia Association for Homes and Services for Children ([www.referralcentral.net](http://www.referralcentral.net) )  
This resource is a statewide database of First Placement Best Placement providers, Shelters, Family Preservation providers, counseling services, psychiatric hospitals, foster and group homes and other services. The complete Promoting Safe and Stable Families guide is available for on-line viewing at [www.caresolutions.com](http://www.caresolutions.com).  
PSSF's service area covers the entire state with prevention, intervention, preservation, reunification and adoption services. Additionally, the Division of Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities and Addictive Diseases has a comprehensive listing of its community service boards, private providers and health departments. Since, there is not a singular database, the information from all sources needs to be merged with existing paper database information to determine service gaps

and geographical areas in need of service.

**3rd Quarter Federal Response:** 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report: ???

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** This new work team has not had an opportunity to meet. However, the State expects to meet its completion date.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Department of Human Resources (DHR) and the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) worked with Georgia's providers of residential care to implement a Level of Care (LOC) system March 2004 that purchases placement services based upon a child's needs. There are six levels of care that cover the entire continuum of out-of-home care provided by the private sector, from basic Institutional Foster Care through Intensive Residential Treatment. The LOC system also approves levels of service delivery for providers that match the six specific levels of need. Requests for placement assistance have already shown the need for additional emergency or assessment level resources as well as increased capacity at Level 4. In addition to resource development for specific levels of service, we are beginning to identify placement needs based on geographical data.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** O9: State requested extension of completion date and revision of the benchmark in its Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation Report.

O9: Q6 reporting is inconsistent with the action step.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The State did not request an extension of the completion date. The 6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report supports the revision of the action step and the benchmark and demonstrates the State's efforts to work jointly with other Departments and private providers to identify the areas most in need of resource development and initiate development strategies to meet those needs.

The State believes that Q6 reporting is consistent with the revised action step. The LOC system is the State's strategy to identify both service gaps and geographical needs. Based on these identified areas of need, the State will be able to make recommendations for budget priorities.

The State continues to implement the LOC system and gather data on areas in need of resource development. The LOC system has just begun its 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of operation. Data collection remains in the initial stages.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

All existing resources have not been accounted for. Efforts need to continue around data collection before a determination is made about service gaps. The database has not been developed. Thus studies on gaps in available resources have not been determined.

<b>O10 ACTION STEPS:</b>		<p>Strengthen and make mandatory the Case Plan Reporting System to ensure that information about the child's mental health is documented to eliminate breaks in mental health services. Provide additional support and training so case managers can use the system effectively. (1) A tool to assess quality of the CPRS case plans needs to be developed. (2) Monthly comparisons of IDS entries with CPRS case plans initiated will be conducted. The information gathered in 1 and 2 will be used to determine the need for technical assistance to specific counties.</p> <p><b>5<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> The State requests to delete (1) and (2) above. Reason: The State currently does not have the manpower resources to develop a tool to assess the quality of CPRS case plans and/or make monthly comparisons of the two databases. However, the State has supported continued CPRS training efforts. The State believes these deletions will not adversely impact the goals. Additionally, the QCRs and the Supervisory Review instruments address documentation of mental health services.</p>	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Mar. 2002	<p>October 2003</p> <p><b>3rd Quarter:</b> Requesting to extend the date to June 2004 to allow for comparisons and a structured assessment of the quality of case plans in CPRS. We anticipate to measure your progress in this area by the end of 4th Qtr.</p>	<p>Juanita Blount-Clark, Linda Doster, Kelli Stone, Consultation &amp; Support Unit, Mentor Unit, County Directors, County Supervisors</p> <p><b>6<sup>th</sup> Quarter:</b> Change the above to: Nancy Bruce, Brad Pasto</p>	<p>Issue a policy statement requiring all new 30-day case plans to be completed in CPRS. Strengthen training and support of CPRS.</p> <p>Examine existing case plans to assure appropriate use of data fields by case managers.</p> <p>Evaluation: Compare current numbers of Case Plans completed per month in CPRS and compare with the number of children entering care that same month.</p> <p>Conduct a structured assessment of quality on case plans in CPRS.</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> The State request to delete the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs above.</p>

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** A memo was issued July 2002 to all county DFCS Directors and Field Directors mandating the use of the Case Plan Reporting System. Statewide training of case managers in use of CPRS will conclude in February 2003. **Method for measuring**

**achievement:** 1. The Internal Data System (IDS) will be used to compare number of children entering care with the number of case plans initiated in CPRS. Additionally, the case plan will be individualized, measurable, and focused on the permanency objective. 2. A tool to assess the quality of CPRS case plans with previously documented case plans may need to be developed. **Actions to be taken next quarter:** 1. Complete CPRS training by February 2003. 2. Develop tool to assess quality of CPRS case plans. 3. Begin monthly comparisons of IDS entries with CPRS case plans initiated. Use information gathered to determine need for technical assistance to specific counties.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** A memo was issued July 2002 to all county DFCS Directors and Field Directors mandating the use of the Case Plan Reporting System. Statewide training of case managers in use of CPRS concluded in February 2003. Once monthly on going comparisons of IDS entries with CPRS case plans is initiated, the information gathered can determine the need for additional technical assistance to counties.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** The policy material is complete (see attached policy Foster Care Services: Case Plan PIP Items 7, 9, 12, 18, 21, 23)

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Achieved. See 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Reports.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Beginning May 2004 all new children entering care will have case plans entered into CPRS and will be tracked in IDS. As ongoing case plans are due, the updated plan will be entered into CPRS. All will be able to be tracked in the system by November 2004.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The CPRS is able to import identifying information from the IDS data system to reduce data entry time and to reduce errors. This allows reports to be run on the IDS side and on the CPRS side so that comparisons of case plans completed with the number of children entering IDS can be made. Currently, the number of plans in CPRS is higher due to several factors. During the migration of plans from the original CPRS to CPRSv2, duplicate cases were created. The local county users were not aware that they needed to close the original plan, so the duplicate plans remain. Other plans should have been closed when the case was closed. The Division is now providing training to supervisors on how to identify plans that need to be closed and how to close plans that need to be closed. Additionally, supervisors and workers are receiving training on how to create a new plan and review existing plans. The CPRS developer for the system will review the system for “junk plans” and delete as appropriate so that the comparisons between the two data bases (IDS and CPRS) can be made as discussed in the benchmark evaluation statement. Even though the State has mandated the use of CPRS (see 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report), it is questionable that data entry is occurring at the rate the State desires. The State believes that at best the comparison will never really exactly match because the level of usage is not what it should be. The State will continue to mandate the use of CPRS. As for the quality of the case plans, as it relates to mental health services for children in CPRS, that information can be ascertained from the QCRs and action is reported on in Action Step O-2.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

The Internal Data System (IDS) will be used to compare number of children entering care with the number of case plans initiated in CPRS. These are two separate, non-networked databases thus the number comparisons will have to be done manually. Thus, no automatic checks occur to ensure that entering children (IDS) are reflected in the number of new case plans in (CPRS).

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** HOW DID YOU INTEND TO ACHIEVE ALL THE ACTION STEPS, OR RESOVLED THIS?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Georgia Reply:** Manual comparisons will be required.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** See requests in action step and benchmark.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Currently data is being manually entered. Division restructuring has impacted the hiring of staff.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter:** The State is attempting to determine if the budget can accommodate hiring staff to assist in performing CPRS data quality issues as well as assessing usage.

  


## Work Plan Detail P -- Item 24, Statewide Information System

**Goal: Build reliability and consistency in IDSONLINE**

### *Current System Enhancements Achievements*

In an effort to address the "Areas Needing Improvement" as outlined in the Final Child and Family Services Review Report for Georgia, and to justify a request to delete SACWIS development and implementation from the PIP, the State has engaged in massive enhancements to the IDS to address user friendliness, data inconsistency, and data utility. The state believes that with these changes, IDS can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for children in placement. Below is a description of the enhancements. **(ACF is concern about deleting the SACWIS development and implementation from the PIP!)**

**Child Welfare Enhancement System Project (CWESP):** Over the past several years, DFCS has created a Master Index, which allows for screening for any person in the state who has received services from the Division of Family and Children Services. Links have also been created to three criminal records databases for workers to conveniently search.

The agency has merged the Protective Services Data System (PSDS) with its Internal Data System (IDS) so that the reports for CPS investigations are collected in a searchable database, which will also allow for NCANDS data reports. IDS is equipped with an alert function for identification of families and/or children that disappear. When counties screen in Master Index for new cases, a red alert appears for those families or children that have disappeared while needing services.

IDS offers a function called Placement Central, which allows the agency to track all children in care, and provide a report of their current placement and placement history.

Efforts are underway to link IDS with the state accounting system to support authorization of per diem payments to private vendors.

Targeted Case Management (TCM) is also reported in IDS to allow the agency to bill Medicaid for TCM services provided to eligible customers.

On April 19, 2004 the Case Plan Reporting System (CPRS) will be able to import data from IDS to reduce data entry time required and to reduce data entry errors. This will allow reports to be run both on the IDS side and on the CPRS side to be sure all children in IDs have case plans in CPRS, and all children with case plans in CPRS will be counted for AFCARS in IDS.

CPS case plans are not being completed in CPRS at this time, but discussion is under way regarding the most effective way to accomplish CPS case planning process.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The State's request to 'delete SACWIS development and implementation from the PIP' reporting throughout both the Q5 and Q6 Quarterly Reports is inconsistent with what is reported in Q6, Section P. The State must fully justify that the enhancement is in place to readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for children in placement.

Despite assertions that IDS and CPRS have been enhanced to the degree that concerns raised in the Final Report are addressed, the State reports throughout the quarterly reports that it is unable to establish simple baselines for measurement. It does not utilize CPRS enough for the State to produce critical reports, while training on the systems are delayed, etc. It appears that CPRS does not adequately address those issues. Missing data fields related to key AFCARS elements is concerning.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter State Report/Response:** Although the State cannot implement a SACWIS within this current PIP implementation period, Georgia has NOT abandoned plans for a SACWIS and is reporting progress in this quarterly report. However, the State maintains that its' Internal Data System (IDS) enhancements address the concerns raised in the ACF Final Report. Georgia currently collects data and reports on all AFCARS elements. The State has found NO references in the ACF responses to its' quarterly PIP reporting that GA cannot establish simple baselines for measurement until these 6th quarter comments. All baselines established by GA throughout the PIP process have been accepted by ACF. IDS is Georgia's official system for AFCARS data collection and reporting as well as other reporting purposes. All counties input data into IDS and reports are regularly produced and used by county, regional, division, and DHR management including the DHR Board Chair. The Division has added a data quality manager to assist counties with data integrity.

With the enhancement of IDS Placement Central no counties are having to track child placement manually. There are no missing data fields related to key AFCARS elements.

The agency has merged the Protective Services Data System (PSDS) with its Internal Data System so that the reports for CPS investigations are collected in a searchable database, which will also allow for NCANDS data reports. The IDS is equipped with an alert function for identification of families and/or children that flee. When counties screen in Master Index for new cases, a red alert appears for those families or children that have disappeared while needing services.

Documentation is attached which describes IDS and enhancement specifications. Included in the documentation are the following reports from IDS Placement Central: the Current Placement report of a sample county and a sample placement history of a child in Placement Central.

CPRS is a case plan reporting system designed by the Court Improvement Project of the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Division of Family and Children Services to assist judges and case managers with joint case planning for children in placement, with a common goal of permanency for children in foster care. **CPRS is not used to collect data for any AFCARS reporting.**

Supervisors are receiving training statewide in regional meetings on the interpretation and utility of all reports available in IDS and CPRS. Both systems have on-line User's Guides. The IDS User's Manual is available to all users with system access. The CPRS User's Guide is available to anyone accessing the CPRS web site. The web site for CPRS is [www.gacaseplan.org](http://www.gacaseplan.org)

In the 6th quarter ACF response, a discrepancy of the numbers between CPRS and IDS was pointed out. The IDS is the official reporting system for AFCARS information. The number of plans in CPRS is higher due to several factors. During the migration of plans from the original CPRS to CPRSv2, duplicate cases were created. The counties were not aware that they needed to close the original plan, so the duplicate plans remain. Other plans should have been closed when their case was closed. The division is now providing training to supervisors on how to identify plans that need to be closed and how to close them. Additionally, supervisors and workers are receiving training on how to create a new plan and review existing plans. The developer for the system will review the system for "junk plans" and delete as appropriate. **CPRS does not capture data on children/families receiving in-home services.** Even though the State has mandated the use of CPRS, it is questionable that data entry is occurring at the rate the State desires. The State will continue to mandate the use of CPRS and work with DFCS managers as well as juvenile court judges and the Administrative Office of the courts until 100% compliance is achieved.

Documentation is attached which describes the high level specifications for CPRS.

Georgia's approach to SACWIS development has changed since the original PIP was approved in September 2002. As referenced in the original PIP, SACWIS development and implementation remains contingent upon federal PAPD and IAPD approvals. Such approvals have not been received to date. Georgia is submitting an IAPD at the end of July that proposes to use transfer technology. The ACF Regional Staff will meet in Fulton County DFCS on July 30, 2004 for a demonstration of the IDS ONLINE system and the Placement Central component.

### **7<sup>th</sup> Report DOCUMENTATION:**

Internal Data System (IDS) High Level Description

Functions of the Internal Data System

IDS Report of Current Placements

IDS Placement Central Client Information Report

IDS Source Document Form 590

IDS Online System Manual

IDS Online Handbook (developed to assist staff in reading, understanding and using the IDS Online data reports)



GA Case Plan Reporting System - a shared system

Case Plan Reporting System - High Level Description

[www.gacaseplan.org](http://www.gacaseplan.org) CPRS Components Description

Social Services Data and Technology Issues - Training Agenda

Case Plan Reporting System v3.2, Guide for Caseworkers

<b>P10 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Field Demonstration of State Design and Revise FS Model/Design as required. Work with vendor to develop project schedule Baseline project schedule Track/Monitor vendor activities and deliverables development Review deliverables Secure approval of deliverables	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Oct. 2002	July 2004 4th Quarter: Request date change to Nov 2004 due to extension of vendor contract	Kelley Harmon	Evaluation of Model (11/02) (Jan 2004). Evaluation: Revised Plan

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

Safe Futures Program Improvement Statement of Need finalized and released 1/13/03

Vendor selected 3/10/03

Contract awarded 3/11/03

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter:** Track/Monitor vendor activities and deliverables development through weekly status meetings

Original project schedule baselined 6/24/03  
Conducted entrance conferences 7/03  
Interviewed/shadowed participant case managers 7/03  
Developed training material for future state model 7/03  
Scheduled training sessions 7/03  
Conducted validation site visits to discuss issues/concerns and to confirm activities 7/03  
Presented future model training overview to executive sponsors 8/03  
Trained test groups on new model 8/03  
Began validation process at validation sites 8/03  
Full implementation of new model within test groups 9/03  
Continue to work with team members and supervisors on roles and responsibilities 9/03

**Data/resources available /needed to measure improvement:**

Safe Futures Program Improvement Model deliverables (underway-see above)  
Future State Model validation (began 8/03)  
GAP Analysis  
Revised Future State Model (Revisions will begin 11/03)

**Methods of measuring improvements:**

Project Manager review of deliverables

**Action to be taken to meet project goals:**

The above underlined should be moved to Action Steps.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Report:** 3<sup>rd</sup>. Qtr progress?

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Track/Monitor vendor activities and deliverables development through weekly status meetings

Original project schedule baselined 6/24/03  
Conducted entrance conferences 7/03  
Interviewed/shadowed participant case managers 7/03  
Developed training material for future state model 7/03  
Scheduled training sessions 7/03  
Conducted validation site visits to discuss issues/concerns and to confirm activities 7/03  
Presented future model training overview to executive sponsors 8/03  
Trained test groups on new model 8/03  
Began validation process at validation sites 8/03

Full implementation of new model within test groups 9/03

Continue to work with team members and supervisors on roles and responsibilities 9/03

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** State is requesting completion date change outside of the PIP review period. The time period for completing the PIP will not exceed 2 years.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Progress not reported in the last two quarters!

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter:** This action step was associated with a project to assess the value and validity of a new case management approach recommended by the DFCS BPR (completed in late 2002). Because of the potential expense and service disruption associated with a major change to the DFCS case management model, the Program Practice Improvement Project (PIIP) selected three pilot counties to test and validate the new case management model (Generalist – teaming model) prior to its implementation statewide. After training DFCS staff in the three counties and evaluating the value/impact of the new model, it was determined that this proposed approach would be difficult and expensive to implement statewide. Therefore, this project was terminated in February 2004.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>P11 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Work with vendor to develop project schedule Baseline project schedule Track/Monitor vendor activities and deliverables Review deliverables Secure approval of deliverables Development of Safe Futures Program Improvement Change Management Plan .	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Oct. 2002	July 2004 4th Quarter Report: Request date change	Kelley Harmon	Improvement Plans developed. Evaluation: Plans presented and approved by DFCS Management Team.

	to Nov 2004 due to extension of vendor contract		
--	---	--	--

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Developed as part of Safe Futures Program Improvement SON (SFPI-SON)

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** Safe Futures Program Improvement Statement of Need finalized and released 1/13/03

Vendor selected 3/10/03

Contract awarded 3/11/03

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** What can the State give us to show this has been achieved Contract award announcement  
(See attachment)

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Track/Monitor vendor activities and deliverables development through weekly status meetings

Original project schedule baselined 6/24/03

Change orders to extend contract have been approved by executive sponsors 09/03

Provided project overview to SACWIS planning vendor 8/03

Continue to capture field validation data throughout the quarter

Met with SACWIS planning vendor to discuss requirements 9/03

#### **Data/resources available/needed to measure improvement:**

Project Management

SFPI-SON vendor

Revised Future State Model

Future State Model validation

Current/future state gap analysis

#### **Method of measuring improvement:**

SPFI project status reports

SFPI deliverable approval

#### **Actions to be taken to meet goal:**

Move to Action steps column.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response: 3<sup>rd</sup>. Qtr progress?**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Track/Monitor vendor activities and deliverables development through weekly status meetings

Original project schedule baselined 6/24/03

Change orders to extend contract have been approved by executive sponsors 09/03 Provided project overview to SACWIS planning vendor 8/03

Continue to capture field validation data throughout the quarter

Met with SACWIS planning vendor to discuss requirements 9/03

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** State is requesting completion date change outside of the PIP review period. The time period for completing the PIP will not exceed 2 years.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Progress not reported in the last two quarters!

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter:** This action step was associated with a project to assess the value and validity of a new case management approach recommended by the DFCS BPR (completed in late 2002). Because of the potential expense and service disruption associated with a major change to the DFCS case management model, the Program Practice Improvement Project (PIIP) selected three pilot counties to test and validate the new case management model (Generalist – teaming model) prior to its implementation statewide. After training DFCS staff in the three counties and evaluating the value/impact of the new model, it was determined that this proposed approach would be difficult and expensive to implement statewide. Therefore, this project was terminated in February 2004.

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

P12 ACTION STEPS:		Safe Future Program Improvement Contract Management	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
April 2003	July 2004 4th Quarter Report: Request date change to Nov 2004 due to extension of vendor	Kelley Harmon	Scheduled Deliverables

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

Vendor on Board 4/03

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Track/Monitor vendor activities and deliverables development through weekly status meetings

Original project schedule baselined 6/24/03

Field validation extension proposal reviewed 8/03

Original project Plan submitted to executive sponsors for review 8/03

Original project plan, budget, and schedule were approved by executive sponsors 9/03

Change orders to extend contract have been approved by executive sponsors 09/03

Coordinating DHR internal approval of amended contract 10/03

Currently evaluating draft team model in two counties 10/03

Data resource available/needed to measure improvement:

Deliverable submission by Vendor and approval by DHR/DFCS

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response: 3<sup>rd</sup>. Qtr progress?**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Vendor on Board 4/03

Track/Monitor vendor activities and deliverables development through weekly status meetings  
Original project schedule baselined 6/24/03

Field validation extension proposal reviewed 8/03

Original project Plan submitted to executive sponsors for review 8/03

Original project plan, budget, and schedule were approved by executive sponsors 9/03

Change orders to extend contract have been approved by executive sponsors 09/03

Coordinating DHR internal approval of amended contract 10/03

Currently evaluating draft team model in two counties 10/03

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** State is requesting completion date change outside of the PIP review period. The time period for completing the PIP will not exceed 2 years.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Progress not reported in the last two quarters!

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter:** This action step was associated with a project to assess the value and validity of a new case management approach recommended by the DFCS BPR (completed in late 2002). Because of the potential expense and service disruption associated with a major change to the DFCS case management model, the Program Practice Improvement Project (PPIP) selected three pilot counties to test and validate the new case management model (Generalist – teaming model) prior to its implementation statewide. After training DFCS staff in the three counties and evaluating the value/impact of the new model, it was determined that this proposed approach would be difficult and expensive to implement statewide. Therefore, this project was terminated in February 2004.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>P14 ACTION STEPS:</b>		SACWIS Technical Design Development.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Oct 2002	Feb. 2003 4th Quarter Report: Request federal approval to delete this action step. Reason for request: This action is being tracked as part of P17-Develop IAPD/RFP because it was eliminated from the SACWIS Planning SON at ACF's request. If deletion approved.	Michael Lynch Colleen Mousinho	Detail Functional Requirements Detail System Requirements Information Architecture Hardware/Software Requirements Evaluation: Present Detailed Future State Design for approval.

	will combine measurable benchmarks for this action with the benchmarks for P17.		
--	---	--	--

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**Eliminated from SACWIS Planning SON at ACF request.**

**Track as part of SACWIS IAPD/RFP Development activity**

**(DOES THIS STATEMENT REPRESENT ACCOMPLISHMENT?)**

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Georgia Reply:** No

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** 3<sup>rd</sup>. Qtr progress?

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** State is requesting to delete this action step, because the action is being part of P17. State should document achievement

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase, which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval.

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase, which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>P15 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Complete SACWIS Feasibility Study.	
<b>START</b>	<b>COMPLETION</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>MEASURABLE</b>



DATE	DATE	PERSON(S)	BENCHMARKS
Oct. 2002 4th Quarter: Actual start date: Oct 2003. Previously requested date change to July 2003 Reason for actual date change: Planning vendor's actual start date was delayed to 8/03 and this shifted all previously reported deliverable dates. Earlier 10/02 start date was based on ACF approval of the Planning Vendor contract in 10/02 and Actual ACF planning vendor contract approval in 5/03.	4th Quarter: Requesting date change to Nov 2003. Previously requested date change to Sept. 2003 Reason: Planning vendor's actual start date was delayed to 8/03 and this shifted all previously reported deliverable dates. Previously reported 11/02 completion date was based on ACF approval of the Planning Vendor contract in 10/02 and actual ACF planning vendor contract approval in 5/03.	Michael Lynch Colleen Mousinho	Completed System Alternative Analysis. Evaluation: Presentation of Alternatives and approval of system acquisition.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Statement of Need (SON) for SACWIS Planning and IV&V included in 6/02 PAPD submitted to ACF for approval.  
DHR agreed with ACF recommendations to incorporate detailed technical design information into IAPD/RFP under an approved PAPD.  
SACWIS Statement of Need released 11/26/02 for vendor to develop RFP and IAPD.  
Completed review of vendor proposal and submitted vendor recommendation 3/03  
Vendor recommendation approved 3/03  
Submitted Planning Vendor SON/Procurement documents, Vendor Proposal, and updated PAPD budget to ACF for review and approval 3/03.

Received ACF approval of contract for the planning phase 5/03

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** SACWIS APAPDU submitted to ACF 7/03

Completed contract negotiations and signed contract with planning vendor 7/03

Received detailed work plan from vendor 9/03

Alternatives analysis started 9/03

Feasibility study started 10/03

Planning vendor began work with Program Improvement vendor to discuss current state and future state model and conduct impact analysis 9/03

ACF approved SACWIS APAPDU 9/03

**Data /resources available/needed to measure improvement:**

Project Management structure (approved by ACF in APAPDU 9/03)

SACWIS Safe Futures Project structure needed (approved by ACF in APAPDU 9/03)

ACF decision regarding Georgia's Planning Vendor Procurement process Received 5/03

SACWIS Planning vendor contract (completed 7/03)

DFCS Case Management Future State design/automation requirements (workflow review session conducted in 10/03)

**Method of measuring improvement:**

Response from ACF Received 5/03

Planning Vendor start

IAPD/RFP Deliverables

Monitor status of required approvals

**Actions to be taken to meet projected goals:**

Move to Action steps column.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response: 3<sup>rd</sup>. Qtr progress?**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** SACWIS APAPDU submitted to ACF 7/03 Completed contract negotiations and signed contract with planning vendor 7/03

Received detailed work plan from vendor 9/03

Alternatives analysis started 9/03

Feasibility study started 10/03

Planning vendor began work with Program Improvement vendor to discuss current state and future state model and conduct impact analysis 9/03

ACF approved SACWIS APAPDU 9/03

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Has state developed system alternate analysis?

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval.

**7<sup>th</sup> Report:** The target IAPD submission date to ACF is July 2004.

#### BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:

P16 ACTION STEPS:		Complete Cost Benefit Analysis. Evaluation: Presentation of Cost/Benefit.	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Oct. 2002 Actual start date: Oct 2003. Previously requested date change to July 2003 Reason: Planning vendor's actual start date was delayed to 8/03 and this shifted all previously reported deliverable dates. The earlier	4th Quarter: Requesting date change to Nov 2003. Previously requested date change to Sept. 2003. Reason: Planning vendor's actual start date was delayed to 8/03 and this shifted all previously reported deliverable	Michael Lynch Colleen Mousinho	Completed Cost/Benefit Analysis

10/02 start date was based on ACF approval of the Planning Vendor contract in 10/02 and Actual ACF planning vendor contract approval in 5/03.	dates. Earlier 12/02 completion date was based on ACF approval of the Planning Vendor contract in 10/02 and Actual ACF planning vendor contract approval 5/03.		
---	---	--	--

#### **ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

SON for SACWIS Planning and IV&V included in 6/02 PAPD submitted to ACF for approval.  
SACWIS SON released 11/02 for vendor to develop RFP and IAPD.  
Completed review of vendor proposal and submitted vendor recommendations 3/03.  
Vendor Recommendation approved 3/03  
Submitted Planning Vendor SON/Procurement documents, Vendor Proposal, and updated PAPD budget to ACF for review and approval 3/03  
Received ACF approval of contract for the planning phase 5/03  
**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** SACWIS APAPDU submitted to ACF 7/03  
Completed contract negotiations and signed contract with planning vendor 7/03  
Received detailed work plan from vendor 9/03  
Planning vendor project kickoff 8/03  
ACF approved SACWIS APAPDU 9/03  
Cost Benefit Analysis started 10/03

#### **Data/resources available/needed to measure improvements:**

Project Management structure (approved by ACF in APAPDU 9/03)  
SACWIS Safe Futures Project structure needed (approved by ACF in APAPDU 9/03)ACF decision regarding Georgia's Planning Vendor Procurement process; Received 5/03 SACWIS Planning Vendor contract  
SACWIS Implementation project plan and cost estimates

#### **Method of measuring improvements:**

Response from ACF;  
 IAPD/RFP Deliverables (target date 12/03)  
 Planning vendor start  
 Monitor status of required approvals

**Actions to be taken to meet projected goal:**  
 Move to Action steps column.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** 3<sup>rd</sup>. Qtr progress?

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** SACWIS APAPDU submitted to ACF 7/03 Completed contract negotiations and signed contract with planning vendor 7/03

Received detailed work plan from vendor 9/03

Planning vendor project kickoff 8/03

ACF approved SACWIS APAPDU 9/03

Cost Benefit Analysis started 10/03

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Incomplete Cost Benefit analysis

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase, which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval.

**7<sup>th</sup> Report:** The target IAPD submission date to ACF is July 2004.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

\_\_\_\_\_

<b>P17 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Develop SACWIS IAPD/RFP.		
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>	

<p>Oct. 2002 4th Quarter: Actual start date: Sep 2003. Previously requested date change to July 2003 Reason: Planning vendor's actual start date was delayed to 8/03 and this shifted all previously reported deliverable dates. The earlier 10/02 start date was based on ACF approval of the Planning Vendor contract 10/02; Actual ACF planning vendor contract approval 5/03.</p>	<p>4th Quarter: Requesting date change to Dec 2003. Previously requested date change to Sept 2003 Reason: Planning vendor's actual start date was delayed 8/03 and this shifted all previously reported deliverable dates. Earlier 12/02 completion date was based on ACF approval of the Planning Vendor contract 10/02; Actual ACF planning vendor contract approval 5/03.</p>	<p><del>Michael Lynch</del> Colleen Mousinho</p>	<p>Released IAPD and RFP. Evaluation: Approved IAPD and RFP.</p>
---	--	--	--

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

SON for SACWIS Planning and IV&V included in 6/02 PAPD submitted to ACF for approval.

SACWIS SON released 11/02 for vendor to develop RFP and IAPD.

PAPD approval by ACF 12/02

Completed review of vendor proposal and submitted vendor recommendation 3/03

Vendor Recommendation approved 3/03

Submitted Planning Vendor SON/Procurement documents, Vendor Proposal, and update PAPD budget to ACF for review and approval 3/03

Received ACF approval of contract for the planning phase 5/03

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** SACWIS APAPDU submitted to ACF 7/03

Completed contract negotiations and signed contract with planning vendor 7/03  
Planning vendor project kickoff 8/03  
Vendor provided draft outline of IAPD and RFP 9/03  
Received detailed work plan from vendor 9/03  
Planning vendor began work with Program Improvement vendor to discuss current state and future state model and conduct impact analysis 9/03  
Received detailed work plan from vendor 9/03  
Started technical requirements analysis 9/03  
Completed workflow review sessions for functional requirements 10/03  
ACF approved SACWIS APAPDU 9/03  
Alternatives analysis started 9/03  
Cost Benefit analysis started 10/03  
Feasibility study started 10/03

**Data/ resources available/needed to measure improvements:**

Project Management structure (approved by ACF in APAPDU 9/03)  
SACWIS Safe Futures Project structure needed (approved by ACF in APAPDU 9/03)  
ACF decision regarding Georgia's Planning Vendor Procurement process; Received 5/03  
SACWIS Planning vendor contract  
DFCS Case Management/Child Welfare automation requirements  
ACF decision regarding Georgia's Implementation Vendor Procurement process

**Method for measuring improvements:**

Response from ACF; Received 5/03  
Planning vendor start  
IAPD/RFP Deliverables  
Monitor status of required approvals

**Actions to be taken to meet projected goals:**

Move to Action steps column.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response: 3<sup>rd</sup>. Qtr progress?**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: SACWIS APAPDU submitted to ACF 7/03**

Completed contract negotiations and signed contract with planning vendor 7/03

Planning vendor project kickoff 8/03

Vendor provided draft outline of IAPD and RFP 9/03

Received detailed work plan from vendor 9/03

Planning vendor began work with Program Improvement vendor to discuss current state and future state model and conduct impact analysis 9/03

Received detailed work plan from vendor 9/03

Started technical requirements analysis 9/03

Completed workflow review sessions for functional requirements 10/03

ACF approved SACWIS APAPDU 9/03

Alternatives analysis started 9/03

Cost Benefit analysis started 10/03

Feasibility study started 10/03

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The State is close to one year behind the original projected completion date. The State attributes these barriers to ACF approval of Planning Vendor procurement process and results.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase, which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval.

**7<sup>th</sup> Report:** The target IAPD submission date to ACF is July 2004. The target RFP submission date to ACF is November 2004.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** ACF approval of Planning Vendor procurement process and results. Received ACF approval of contract for the planning phase 5/03

<b>P18 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Implementation Contractor Procurement -- new contract approved by ACF. Evaluation: Approved Contract in place.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>



<p>March 2003 4th Quarter: Request date change to March 2004 Reason: Planning vendor's actual start date was delayed to 8/03 and this shifted all previously reported deliverable dates.</p>	<p>Requesting date change to Sept. 2004 Federal Response: Provide reason(s) for requesting a date change Georgia Reply: 12/02 completion date was based on ACF approval of the Planning Vendor contract 10/02; Actual ACF planning vendor contract approval 5/03; Projected vendor start 7/03</p>	<p><del>Michael Lynch</del> Colleen Mousinho</p>	<p>ACF approved SON. Proposals reviewed. Target date to have selected Implementation vendor contract in place 06/04.</p>
--	---	--	--

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Planning SON released 11/26/02. This will lead to RFP development and contractor procurement.

Completed review of vendor proposal and submitted vendor recommendation 3/03

Vendor Recommendation approved 3/03

Submitted Planning Vendor SON/Procurement documents, Vendor Proposal, and updated PAPD budget to ACF for review and approval 3/03

Received ACF approval of contract for the planning phase 5/03

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** SACWIS APAPDU submitted to ACF 7/03

Completed contract negotiations and signed contract with planning vendor 7/03

Planning vendor project kickoff 8/03

ACF approved SACWIS APAPDU 9/03

Data resources available/needed to measure improvement: Addition from federal response

Project Management structure (approved by ACF in APAPDU 9/03)

SACWIS Safe Futures Project structure needed (approved by ACF in APAPDU 9/03)  
ACF decision regarding Georgia's Planning Vendor Procurement process ; Received 5/03  
SACWIS Planning Vendor Contract  
DFCS Case Management Future State design/automation requirements  
ACF decision regarding Georgia's Implementation Vendor Procurement process  
Implementation Vendor contract  
Program Improvement Change Management Plan

Method for measuring improvements: Addition from federal response  
Response from ACF for Planning Vendor; Received 5/03  
IAPD/RFP Deliverables  
Planning vendor start  
Monitor status of required approvals  
Receipt of vendor proposals  
Proposal evaluation results  
Response from ACF for Implementation Vendor

Actions to be taken to meet project goals:  
**Move to Action steps column.**

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response: 3<sup>rd</sup>. Qtr progress?**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** SACWIS APAPDU submitted to ACF 7/03 Completed contract negotiations and signed contract with planning vendor 7/03

Planning vendor project kickoff 8/03

ACF approved SACWIS APAPDU 9/03

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** The State attributes these barriers to ACF approval of Planning Vendor procurement process and results.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase, which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval.

**7<sup>th</sup> Report:** The target completion date for this action step is September 2005.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter:** ACF approval of Planning Vendor procurement process and results. Received ACF approval of contract for the planning phase 5/03

<b>P19 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Release I Evaluation: Release meets stated quality and performance standards.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
June 2003 Requesting date change to June 2004 Reason for requesting date change: 6/03 start date was based on ACF approval of the Planning Vendor contract 10/02; Actual ACF planning vendor contract approval 5/03 Projected planning vendor start 7/03 6/03 start date based on ACF IAPD/RFP approval of Implementation contract 6/03:	Dec. 2003 Requesting date change to June 2005 Reason for requesting date change: 12/03 completion date was based on ACF approval of the Planning Vendor contract 10/02; Actual ACF planning vendor contract approval 5/03 Projected planning vendor start 7/03 12/03 start date based on ACF IAPD/RFP approval of Implementation	Michael Lynch Colleen Mousinho	Selected vendors working on release. Release piloted. Roll out plan approved. Release I operational Statewide.

Projected approval 6/04	contract 6/03; Projected approval 6/04		
----------------------------	--	--	--

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**3<sup>rd</sup>. Qtr progress?**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Start of this action step is preceded by the successful completion of action step P18.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** State is requesting completion date change outside of the PIP Review period. The time period for completing the PIP will not exceed 2 years.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase, which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval.

**7<sup>th</sup> Report:** Same as above

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>P22 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Submit SACWIS IAPD/RFP for ACF approval	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Dec 2003	Dec 2003	Michael Lynch Colleen Mousinho	IAPD and RFP received by ACF

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report**

Start of this action step is preceded by the successful completion of action step P17

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase, which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval. The target IAPD submission date to ACF is July 2004. The target RFP submission date to ACF is November 2004.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>P23 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Receive ACF approval of IAPD and RFP	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Feb 2004	Feb 2004	Michael Lynch Colleen Mousinho	ACF approved IAPD & RFP

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report**

Start of this action step is preceded by the successful completion of action step P22

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase, which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval. The target date for IAPD approval by ACF is September 2004. The target date for RFP approval by ACF is January 2005.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>P24 ACTION STEPS:</b>	Release RFP
--------------------------	-------------

START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Feb 2004	Feb 2004	Michael Lynch Colleen Mousinho	RFP published to vendor community

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:**

Start of this action step is preceded by the successful completion of action step P23

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase, which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval.

**7<sup>th</sup> Report:** The target date for release of the RFP is February 2005.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>P25 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Receive proposals and conduct evaluation	
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Apr 2004	Apr 2004	Michael Lynch Colleen Mousinho	Winning implementation vendor proposal selected

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report**

Start of this action step is preceded by the successful completion of action step P24

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase, which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval.

**7<sup>th</sup> Report:** The target date for completion of this action step is July 2005.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

---

P26 ACTION STEPS:		ACF approval of SACWIS Implementation vendor procurement process		
START DATE	COMPLETION DATE	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)		MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS
Jun 2004	Jun 2004	Michael Lynch Colleen Mousinho		ACF approved the selected implementation vendor proposal

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:**

Start of this action step is preceded by the successful completion of action step P25

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase, which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval.

**7<sup>th</sup> Report:** The target date for Implementation vendor procurement approval by ACF is September 2005.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>P27 ACTION STEPS:</b>		SACWIS Implementation vendor Kickoff	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Jun 2004	Jun 2004	Michael Lynch Colleen Mousinho	Vendor on board executing project activities

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:**

Start of this action step is preceded by the successful completion of action step P26 and P18.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** State is still in the planning phase, which includes the completion and submittal of an IAPD and RFP to ACF for approval.

**7<sup>th</sup> Report:** The target date for completion of this action step is September 2005.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**



**Work Plan Detail Q -- Items 35-37, State has in place an array of services that assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe environment, enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency.**

<b>Q2 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Collaborate with providers, stakeholders and consumers to address gaps in the service array and develop a continuum of services accessible statewide.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Jan. 2003	March 2003 <b>3rd Quarter:</b> Requesting a date change to March 2004 to coincide with the work in Action Step 1. <b>3rd Quarter Federal Response:</b> Progress will be measured in the 4th. Qtr.	Sarah Brownlee, Betty Wrights, Amy Hale, David Hellwig, Ann Dennard Smith	Funding and resource allocation plan to address identified gaps in service array and geographic accessibility.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** The Division hosted the FFY 2003 PSSF Bidders Conference to provide information and technical assistance to public and private non-profit entities and county departments interested in developing or enhancing community service resources for children and families. More than 200 agency representatives in attendance were provided information on the PSSF Program and funding process, federal and state funding objectives and desired outcomes for children and families served by the state of Georgia. Relevant information was shared on the CFSR process, findings and recommendations for program improvement, with particular emphasis on the current array of services and the development of supports and services in under resourced counties.

Targeted funding for the FFY 03 cycle has effectively increased the number, quality and array of services for children and families at-risk and children confirmed as maltreated. PSSF Services are now accessible in 91% of the state with service delivery in 143 counties statewide.

A report of the findings and recommendations born out of the Governor's Action Group for Safe Children was released in January 2003. The report identified corrective systemic options and practices and recommendations.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Report:** The Division hosted a series of four **Regional PSSF Training and Networking Sessions** in March of 2003. More than 500 county department directors, supervisors, cps/placement staff and community based providers attended the regional sessions. Information was provided on the PSSF Program, federal and state funding objectives and desired outcomes for children and families served by the state of Georgia. Relevant information was shared on the CFSR process, findings and recommendations for program improvement, with particular emphasis on the current array of services and the development of supports and services in under resourced counties.

The sessions provided an opportunity for staff and providers to assess on a regional level the current array of supports and services funded by the PSSF program, identify geographical gaps in service accessibility and begin resource development planning discussions to assure that a full continuum of services are accessible statewide.

Targeted PSSF funding for the FFY 03 cycle has effectively increased the number, quality and array of services for children and families at-risk and children confirmed as maltreated. PSSF Services are accessible in 91% of the state with service delivery in 143 out of 159 counties statewide.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** HAVE YOU ACHIEVED THIS TASK? DUE DATE WAS MARCH 2003.  
What can the State give us to show this has been achieved?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report/Georgia's Reply:** Work in process.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** 3<sup>rd</sup>. Qtr progress?

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The Division hosted the FFY 2004 PSSF Bidders Conference in March 2003 to provide information and technical assistance to public and private non-profit entities and county DFCS interested in developing or enhancing community service resources for children and families. More than 200 agency representatives in attendance were provided information on the PSSF Program and funding process, federal and state funding objectives and desired outcomes for children and families served by the state of Georgia. Relevant information was shared on the CFSR process, findings and recommendations for program improvement, with particular emphasis on the current array of services and the development of supports and services in under resourced counties. Counties currently un-served by PSSF Network Providers include Walton, Morgan, Jones, Wilkinson, Crawford, Peach, Marion, Early, Miller, Baker, Turner, Coffee, Bacon, Tattnall and Evans counties.

**Funding and Resource Allocation to fill Gaps:** The Division received two hundred sixty (260) proposals for the FFY 2004 funding cycle, a 38% increase over proposals received FFY 2003. Targeted funding for the FFY 04 cycle has effectively increased the number, quality and array of services for children and families at-risk and children confirmed as maltreated. One hundred and seventy (170) community based agencies were awarded funding for the FFY 04 cycle.

PSSF Network Services are now accessible in 95% of the state with service delivery in 145 of 159 counties statewide. Gaps in seven (7) of the counties identified as un-served by PSSF Network Providers have been filled. Services are now accessible in Wilkinson, Walton, Morgan, Putnam, Jones, and Peach counties. PSSF Resources are also available to all 159 county departments through Mini-Grants.

#### **DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 4<sup>TH</sup> Quarter:**

PSSF Maps: Statewide Service Array and Accessibility

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Accomplishments: 90% Achieved.** Refer to <http://pssfnet.com/servicearray> for maps, which illustrate (1) PSSF statewide service array; (2) Service array by Service Category (Family Support, Family Preservation, Time-Limited Reunification and Adoption Promotion and Foster Care Transitional Support Services)

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response: No documentation of progress achieved in 6<sup>th</sup> Quarter report.**

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

<b>Q4 ACTION STEPS:</b>		Develop curriculum and deliver training to staff and providers to enhance capacity to assess underlying family needs that create safety concerns for children.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
Nov. 2002	October 2003 Requesting a date extension to July 2004 to	Geraldine Jackson-White, Evaluation and Reporting Section, Consultation and Support Section,	As a part of the Annual Qualitative Case Review, a representative sample of cases will be reviewed to determine if there is demonstrated improvement in case

	<p>allow for several reporting quarters of qualitative review reporting and implementation of the training curriculum.</p> <p>3rd Quarter Federal Response: Progress will be measured in the 4th. Qtr.</p> <p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Per Annual Evaluation/Renegotiation the State requested an extension to July 2004 to allow sufficient time to evaluate improvement over several reporting quarters of the QCR.</p>	<p><b>5th Quarter:</b> Research and Education; Evaluation and Reporting; and Social Services Sections</p>	<p>manager's ability to adequately assess underlying family needs as reflected in improved service coordination and outcomes for families.</p>
--	--	---	--

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Response:** In May of 2002, the DHR Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program hosted the 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Safe Families Symposia. The fifth in a series of statewide training and technical assistance conferences, the Symposium provided an opportunity for 241 front line workers, supervisors and community based services providers to expand their practice skills in the areas of assessment driven, family centered practice. The Safe Families Symposium Series has been designed to enhance the practice, supervisory and management skills needed to improve the quality of community-based supports, services and outcomes for children and families. In direct response to **CFSR Systemic Factor -- Item 35 Service Array**, training offerings for the 2002 Symposium addressed the practice improvement recommendations of federal and state child welfare experts identified in Georgia's CFSR. **Improving Outcomes: Comprehensive Assessment and Individual Family Action Plans** was developed and delivered by the **Child Welfare Policy and Practice Group, Montgomery Alabama**. Designed to improve the practice skills of front line workers and direct service providers, the training offered an intensive overview of the interlocking steps necessary to assess and respond through service coordination, to the underlying family needs which create safety concerns for children. Topics covered included strengths-based assessment and solution focused interviewing techniques.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Response:** In May of 2003, the DHR Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program hosted the 6<sup>th</sup> Annual Safe Families Symposia. The sixth in a series of statewide training and technical assistance conferences, the Symposium provided an opportunity for 280 front line workers, supervisors and community based services providers to expand their practice skills in the areas of assessment driven, family centered practice. The Safe Families Symposium Series has been designed to improve the quality of community-based supports and services and outcomes for children and families.

In direct response to **CFSR Systemic Factor -- Item 35 Service Array**, training offerings for the 2003 Symposium addressed the assessment practice improvement recommendations of federal and state child welfare experts identified in Georgia's CFSR.

Workshop Offerings at the 2003 Symposium included:

**Substance Abuse and Family Functioning** developed and delivered by *OASIS Counseling Center*, was designed to explore behaviors, patterns and lifestyle habits typically seen in substance abusing families and presenting family issues. Additional workshop offerings included identification of the relational dynamics present in families affected by parental substance abuse, discussion of the disease concept of addiction, symptoms that make up the diagnosis of chemical dependency and the components of the alcohol and drug assessment.

**Mental Health Issues and Families in Crisis** delivered by Judy Plecko, Director of Family Support and Social Work at the *Marcus Institute of Emory University* trained participants on how to assess the major behavioral indicators of mental illness in a family system, specific mental/brain disorders and effective interventions for improving family resiliency;

**Dynamics of Domestic Violence**, delivered by Nancy Grigsby, Executive Director of the *Georgia Coalition Against Domestic Violence* focused on the child welfare implications of domestic violence, patterns of abuse and barriers to violence-free households, including victim and child socialization, effects of trauma and childhood abuse. The training provided valuable insight into working with families impacted by domestic violence from assessing the danger to coordinated intervention including, screening, risk assessment, child impact, safety and case planning and coordination of family resources.

**Red Flags and Rainbows**, delivered by *Dr. Wendy Hanevold*, licensed clinical psychologist focused on skill development in the areas of family dynamic observation, identification of underlying family issues and appropriate interventions.

**Adolescent Assessment** developed and delivered by Millicent Houston of *Georgia's Independent Living Program* enhanced understanding of the process for the evaluation of youth and the assessment tools used in the development of comprehensive case plan. Particular emphasis was placed in accurate identification of adolescent strengths and weaknesses in developing appropriate support and service plans.

**Mandated Reporting** delivered by Andy Kogerma, Training Manager for the *Georgia Academy for the Georgia Academy for Children and Youth Professionals* provided an extensive overview of the types of child abuse and neglect, the signs and symptoms of maltreatment and what family support service providers, as mandated reporters should do if abuse is suspected.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** HAVE YOU ACHIEVED THIS TASK? IF NOT, WHAT IS LEFT TO DO AND WHEN WILL IT BE DONE?

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report:** The goal is not achieved. Requesting a change in completion date to allow for reporting of the qualitative case reviews and implementation of the new training curriculum. The qualitative case reviews are scheduled to begin in October 2003 and the first report to state and federal partners is scheduled for January 2004 and each quarter thereafter.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** 3<sup>rd</sup>. Qtr progress?

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Evaluation and Reporting Section: The Qualitative Case Review Instrument has been developed. The E&R social services reviewers began using the instrument in October 2003. The priority is to pull placement cases and review the life of the case, including the CPS record. E&R will interview case specific people and work closely with the Consultation & Support Unit as they are completing the stakeholder interviews. All information will be entered into a database. Evaluation and Reporting expects to complete 20-25 Quality Case Reviews by the end of this year. The goal for 2004 is to review approximately 135 QCR and in 2005, to review approximately 150 QCR's. Total of approximately 285 for a 2 year (2004-2005) cycle. These numbers are assuming staff will not be pulled off the schedule for any special type reviews.

**Professional Development:** Late July 2003 the contractor delivered a draft of a partially completed competency based core curriculum for child welfare professionals. Since the contract has ended, state office staff have: (1) analyzed the draft curriculum; (2) identified missing competencies and state specific policies and procedures; (3) refined subordinate skills; and (4) finalized a work plan to complete the curriculum. Additional training material is being developed to address safety and risk assessment as well as underlying family needs that create safety concerns. January 31, 2004 is the target date for final revisions and pilot.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** What is the status of staff training? It appears that completion of this action step is also contingent upon the completion of the QCR

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** The 1<sup>st</sup> through 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter reports do not reflect the full range of assessment training offered to departmental staff. 2900 CPS and Placement staff received training August through February of 2003 on the procedures and guidelines for the conduct of the Comprehensive Child and Family Assessment (First Placement Best Placement) for children in care. All staff received a thorough overview of critical assessment components including child and family, psychological, physical, educational and adolescent components. Advanced skills training was offered to improve staff and provider skill in interpreting assessment data and coordinating services responsive to identified needs.

The first round of QCRs were completed and the report was sent to the ACF Regional oversight personnel and is made a part of 5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Progress Report.

#### **6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report: Staff and Provider Assessment Training**

In February of 2004, the DHR Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program hosted the 7<sup>th</sup> Annual Safe Families Symposia. The seventh in a series of statewide training and technical assistance conferences, the Symposium provided an opportunity for 320 front

line workers, supervisors and community based services providers to expand their practice skills in the areas of assessment driven, family centered practice. The Safe Families Symposium Series has been designed to improve the quality of community-based supports and services and outcomes for children and families.

In direct response to **CFSR Systemic Factor -- Item 35 Service Array**, training offerings for the 2004 Symposium addressed the assessment practice improvement recommendations of federal and state child welfare experts identified in Georgia's CFSR.

**Evaluation:** See Attached Session Evaluations

**Assessment Workshop Offerings at the 2004 Symposium included:**

- **Child Abuse and Neglect**, delivered by Sheila Lewis: This workshop examined the signs and symptoms of child abuse and neglect and its implications for mandated reporting.
- **Infant and Toddler Assessment**, developed and delivered by Dr. Laura Johns, was designed to facilitate early identification of developmental delays in young children.
- **High Risk Indicators of Serious Child Injury or Child Deaths: Special Investigations Unit Trend Analysis**, developed and delivered by Darrell Green, Special Investigations Unit provided an in-depth analysis of documented trends in cases of child deaths and serious injuries. Developed in conjunction with the State Office Child Fatality and Serious Injury Review Team, this workshop focused on current CPS policy, investigative strategies and assessment tools to ensure the safety of children residing in the home.
- **Special Needs of Children in Substance Abusing Families**, developed and presented by E. Douglas Pratt, D.S.W., LMSW of the Child Welfare Practice and Policy Group, Montgomery, Alabama provided opportunity to enhance professional interventions for families in substance abuse recovery. This workshop focused on the impact of adult Alcohol and other Drug (AOD) abuse on children. Content included the thirteen psychosocial traits of children from families with AOD problems and Identification of underlying needs that drive child behaviors; development of family teams to balance positive discipline with strategies to meet underlying needs and family coaching strategies.
- **When Home is not a Safe Haven**, delivered by Claudia Fedarko, MSW and Lisa Ellis, MSW explored the dynamics of child sexual abuse. Participants learned practical strategies for assessing risk, boundaries and family hierarchies, clear risk factors associated with sexual abuse and family dynamics were caretaker abuse has occurred.
- **The Challenging Behaviors of Children in Care**, delivered by Wendy Hanevold, Ph.D. trained on the assessment and dynamics of grief and loss for children in foster care. Participants examined how to discriminate between attention deficit

disorders and grief and loss/trauma reactions. Content included strategies for managing disruptive behaviors before attachments are formed and managing challenging behaviors connected with parent visits for children in care.

- **Strength-based Assessment: Part One – Family Assessment Skills – E. Douglas Pratt, D.S.W., LMSW;** Georgia has been developing a model of family-centered practice for over five years. This model enhances systems of care and individualized multi-agency family support networks. While most child and family practitioners in Georgia have practical knowledge about controlling risks, effective practitioners share common skill-sets for assessment and planning that actively involve family and other supports in ways that leave more families safely in charge of their own teams. This two-part workshop provided participants with concrete skills and strategies to improve their assessment to positively impact family outcomes. Participants skills in family centered assessment and the development of service plans responsive to individual and family needs.
- **Substance Abuse: Reading the Signs, Recognizing the Symptoms,** delivered by Karen Terry, NCAC and Candee Winfield, LPC. Participants were able to identify the relational dynamics present within the family of an addicted person; Content included discussion of the disease concept of addiction, identification of the symptoms associated with a diagnosis of chemical dependency and components of the alcohol and drug assessment instrument and process.
- **When Mental Health Issues Impair Parental and Family Functioning,** delivered by Judy Plecko, Licensed Clinical Social Worker, was designed to focus on the impact of mental illness on parenting capacity, tools and interventions to restore balance to the family system. Participants learned how to identify issues and challenges for children when a parent has a mental illness, recognize specific mental health disorders, their risks and potential severity and effective interventions for helping parents and children cope with the effect of mental illness on the family system.

Seventy-five new workers were trained per month for January, February and March. Attached is a description of course content.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** (1) Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program 2004 Safe Families Symposium. (2) DFCS Training Course Overview, Foundations of Child Welfare (10 1/2 days)

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** State should continue to measure the improvement of this action step in the next subsequent quarterly reports.

#### **BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**





**Work Plan Detail R -- Item 42, The standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or childcare institutions receiving title IV-E or IV-B funds. (6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Work Plan Achieved)**

**Work Plan Detail S -- Item 44, State has in place a process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the State for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed.**

**Goal: Expand placement resource options.**

<b>S6 ACTION STEPS:</b>		F. Develop a protocol with privately operated shelters and child-caring agencies for the implementation of MOUs with county DFCS offices to increase the pool of emergency placement resources for children entering care and to address the broad range of placement needs, which include teen, sibling, therapeutic, and medically fragile care.	
<b>START DATE</b>	<b>COMPLETION DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)</b>	<b>MEASURABLE BENCHMARKS</b>
July 2003	June 2004	GAHSC & non members, ORS, State Treatment & Foster Care Units, PRD Unit, DFCS County Depts.	Meetings with DFCS and private agencies to discuss development of protocol for the placement of children: 7/2003 -- 12/2003. Evaluation: Protocol developed for private agencies and shelters to implement MOU's with county DFACS agencies developed by 2/2004.

**ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report:** A meeting is being scheduled with GAHSC and non-members, and DFCS Foster Care, Placement Resources, and Treatment Units and DFCS County Depts. To initiate discussion around development of protocol by 1-31-03. **Methods for measuring achievements:** Initial meeting held and discussions around protocols for effecting MOU's for emergency placements of children with private agency resources initiated. **Actions to be taken next quarter:** Series of meetings with the above groups held to continue development of protocol for implementation of MOU's. **1st Quarter Federal Response:** (MOVE UNDERLINED TO APPROPRIATE QUARTER)

**3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Report: Partially Complete.** A protocol for the establishment of MOU's for emergency and regular placements with private agencies is established for the state's two largest counties. This will be used as a basis for the development of a statewide protocol for implementing MOU's with private agencies in the placement of children. See Attached MOU for Independent contractors or for Purchase of Service.

**4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Committee discussed issues needing to be considered for both DFCS and private agencies in establishing an MOU protocol. Committee members will review the current MOU used by Fulton and Dekalb counties and e-mail suggestions/concerns to chairperson regarding possible revision for statewide implementation.

**DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED 4<sup>TH</sup> Quarter:**

See MOU Protocol.

**5<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** According to the state's Administrative Office, due to the new requirements by the federal government regarding IV-E expenditures, the use of MOU's with private vendors will be discontinued with private placement providers. Contracts will be established with vendors for the placement of children in child-caring institutions, child-placing agencies and emergency shelters instead of the current MOU's. The general protocol for establishing contractual services for placement with private vendors is currently being drafted by the state's Administrative Office. Specific stipulations based on the type and level of placement (emergency placements are at the Assessment Level) will be included in the individual provider's approval letter. The final version of the contract protocol should be completed by June 2004.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** Achieved. The DFCS Fiscal Office has developed a standard contract and protocol that is used with all private placement providers beginning fiscal year 2005.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter DOCUMENTATION:** Sample contract/protocol used with all private placement providers.

**6<sup>th</sup> Quarter Federal Response:** Have you completed the final version of the contract protocol?

**7<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report:** A standard contract protocol is attached.

**BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT:**

\_\_\_\_\_