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• Supporting and strengthening families so that children are raised in safe and nurturing homes is a common goal we share

• Ensuring all children and families are treated equitably and with respect for our differences is a basic right we must all work on

• Families and young people with lived experience, as well as other stakeholders, must drive systems and practice change

• Using data and evidence is what guides us in assessing, focusing, improving, and monitoring
Agenda

- Round 4 General Information
- Engagement of stakeholders and court/agency collaboration
- Statewide Assessment
- Case review criteria for State-Led Reviews
- Technical Bulletin 13 and sampling/measurement
- Next steps and supports in place to assist states
• CFSR Round 4 to kick off with distribution of Data Profiles in August 2022

• Onsite case reviews and interviews would likely start in early 2023

• Year 1 schedule will be finalized this fall
  • States that incurred a penalty will be prioritized for year 1
  • States should not expect Round 4 review schedule to parallel Round 3
• Encourage states to continue and enhance continuous quality improvement (CQI) processes

• Integrate data indicator metrics into measurement of state performance

• Support use of sound measurement principles using relevant evidence to assess system performance

• Assure meaningful, authentic, and ongoing stakeholder engagement, especially of youth, families, and legal and judicial communities

• Encourage states to consider the experiences of populations within the state that may experience bias, inequities, or underservice—either in their communities or by the systems seeking to serve them
CFSR Round 4 Enhancements

- Stakeholder Engagement
- Statewide Assessment
- Data and Evidence
- Technical Assistance
- Data Indicators
- OSRI
- PIP
Stakeholder Engagement
• The child welfare system is broader than the child welfare agency

• Systems change and improvement must be connected to an overall vision for child welfare

• Broad, meaningful involvement of system partners and professionals throughout the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) including persons with lived experience is necessary in order to change systems

• Relevant evidence from multiple systems must be used to assess system functioning and to identify strategies to address underperformance
• Continue and expand on the legal and judicial systems integration
  • Round 3 introduced an enhanced expectation of integration with the legal and judicial communities in the Program Improvement Plan (PIP) process
  • All aspects of the CFSR beginning with the Statewide Assessment
  • Including representation and voices of multiple judges and lawyers as well as Court Improvement Program (CIP)

• IM 19-03: Family and youth voice are critical to a well-functioning child welfare system and should be included in program planning and improvement efforts
  • Joint responsibility of agencies, CIPs, and courts
• Stakeholders should include those who experience bias, inequities, and are underserved

• Data from multiple sources included to inform the Statewide Assessment

• Voices from a broad array of individuals within various stakeholder groups to inform CFSR planning efforts, the Statewide Assessment, case-level interviews, stakeholder interviews, PIP development and implementation, and be a part of any exit conferences and other ongoing system improvement efforts
Statewide Assessment (SWA):

Approach and Overview of SWA Template
Revisions to Statewide Assessment Process

- R4 process includes a **framework for a more rigorous Statewide Assessment on the front end of the CFSR process** to facilitate a more timely, targeted, and effective PIP development process.

- **Strengthen the analysis regarding performance** on the outcomes and systemic factor functioning by providing specific guiding questions to support states in providing high-quality data and information.

- **Meaningful stakeholder engagement** is emphasized throughout the assessment process.

- **Specific recommendations about using a broad range of evidence**, including stakeholder data and information, court and CIP data, and qualitative information from focus groups or surveys.
1. **Stakeholder Involvement** – Offers additional detail and recommendations on which stakeholders to involve and how they might participate in the process.

2. **Capacity to Complete a Quality Statewide Assessment** – Offers a series of self-assessment questions to support states in preparing and enhancing their capacity for the SWA process.

3. **Availability and Use of Quality Data and Information** – New section provides information on how to think about relevant evidence to inform the state’s assessment of outcome and systemic factor functioning.
State-Led Case Review Criteria
Case Review Criteria

- Appendix A of the *Procedures Manual* sent with the letter
- Major change to criteria relates to timing when states must show case review is in place and functioning
- Only federal Onsite Review Instrument and Instructions (OSRI) can be used – must have consistency across states how federal requirements and practices are being assessed
- CB continues to encourage states to be a State-Led Review – allowing State-Led Reviews was in response to states’ input after Round 2 CFSR
- State-Led Reviews have built enormous capacity in our field for states to be self-assessing, have your own knowledge of practice with families, and establish functioning CQI systems
CFSR Measurement
What Stays the Same for CFSR Case Reviews

- Sites and samples reflective of state case population and practice
- Minimum 65-case sample (40 FC and 25 IHS cases)
- State-Led Reviews and option for larger sample size
- Measurement and Sampling Committee (MASC) validation of example sampling frames and selection of random samples for Children’s Bureau (CB)-Led Reviews
- MASC consultation/endorsement of sampling plans
- Individuality of state plans
Changes for CFSR Case Reviews

- Foster care population: Same as Round 3
- In-home services population: Open 45+ days
  - Cases opened for services and/or case management
  - Trial Home Visit cases 45+ days from start of sample period as the only placement setting
  - Non-foster care cases specified in Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) (federally funded programs)

* IHS case population will not include families that only received a child protective services (CPS) investigation/assessment response
Use of Data Profiles in Round 4
Use of the Statewide Data Indicators

• Statewide Data Indicators (SWDIs) will be used in addition to case review performance to determine substantial conformity for Safety Outcome 1 and Permanency Outcome 1

• National performance values will be established prior to, and remain fixed throughout, Round 4
Changes to Statewide Data Indicators

- New measure for “Re-entry to foster care”
  - *Of all children who exit foster care in a 12-month period to reunification, live with relative, or guardianship, what percent re-entered care within 12 months of their discharge?*
PIP Measurement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Outcome 1</th>
<th>Safety Outcomes 1 and 2</th>
<th>Aggregate Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Maltreatment in foster care</td>
<td>• Item 1 Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment</td>
<td>Optional for Item 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recurrence of maltreatment</td>
<td>• Item 2 Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-Entry Into Foster Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Item 3 Risk and Safety Assessment and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanency Outcome 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permanency in 12 months for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children entering foster care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permanency in 12 months for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children in foster care 12 to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permanency in 12 months for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children in foster care 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-entry to foster care in 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Placement stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Being Outcome 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Item 12 Needs and Services of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child, parents, and foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Item 13 Child and Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement in Case Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Item 14 Caseworker Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Item 15 Caseworker Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Baselines and goals set using observed performance; national caps/floors will be set and fixed for each indicator

• Two pathways to achieve required amount of improvement:

  Pathway 1: Observed performance meets or exceeds the improvement goal

  Pathway 2: Risk-Standardized Performance is better or no different than National Performance
Case Review
Required
Amount of Improvement

• Adjusted based on the state’s baseline performance
• Two simultaneous pathways to achieve required amount of improvement:
  • Sustained Improvement Goal: Meet or exceed using any three PIP measurement periods
  • High-Performance Value: Set above the sustained improvement goal; meet in any one PIP measurement period

* Calculation steps detailed in CFSR Technical Bulletin 13
Item 1
Aggregate Data
Measure

• Encourage states required to measure Item 1 to use statewide aggregate data
• Adjust required amount of improvement based on state’s baseline performance
• Goal achievement: Meet or exceed the goal in any single measurement period (same as Round 3)
Minimum 3.5 years for PIP measurement:

- 2-year PIP Implementation Period
- 18-month Post-PIP Evaluation Period (previously referred to as non-overlapping evaluation period)
- States that receive only one data profile with new safety performance during the Post-PIP Evaluation Period will receive updated safety performance data during the following 6 months to make a final determination that the required amount of improvement was achieved
Next Steps and Supports to States

• Procedures Manual

• Statewide Assessment Documents
  ▪ Systemic Factor Briefs
  ▪ Stakeholder Interview Guide

• OSRI Reviewer Briefs

• Updates to Training Opportunities

• Technical Assistance from the Capacity Building Center for States and for Courts