



Minnesota Department of **Human Services**

---

## **Minnesota Department of Human Services Child Safety and Permanency Division**

### **Program Improvement Plan**

**Revised Version  
12/07/2009**

**Introduction**

Minnesota views the federal Child and Family Review (CFSR) process as an integral part of assessing and improving the quality of the child welfare system. Integration of CSFR findings, with ongoing planning and evaluation conducted by the state and its county partners to improve the experience of children and families served, is a shared objective.

The child welfare system in Minnesota is state supervised, county administered. Within this system, the Department of Human Services (department) establishes child welfare policy direction through legislation and oversees program development that directly impacts county agencies and the children and families they serve. Case related services are administered, delivered and primarily funded at the county level. A cooperative working relationship between the department and counties is essential to maintaining a responsive child welfare system. Successful child welfare initiatives in Minnesota are all rooted in a common formula. Promising child welfare approaches are identified, effectiveness of the approach demonstrated through pilot programs and statewide implementation plans are crafted by state and county partners. In addition to developing related legislation and policy, the department provides regional technical assistance to support successful implementation and ongoing sustainability. Examples of successful initiatives that employed this process include; Family Assessment Response, Structured Decision Making, Children's Justice Initiatives and Minnesota Child and Family Service Review process. For the state's program improvement plan to be successful, the same high level collaboration and equality among partners is necessary.

The department is currently involved in a broad initiative to define a child welfare practice model across all child safety, permanency and well-being program areas. In addition to engaging county and community partners in this endeavor, alignment of the state training and quality assurance systems to successfully support implementation is critical. This includes ensuring that institutions of higher education adequately prepare the public child welfare workforce, appropriate training curricula is developed and available, and organizational effectiveness throughout the child welfare system is regularly assessed and supported. Minnesota is working with the National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement, American Public Human Service Association and consultants from Eastern Kentucky University to develop and implement this initiative. Although these efforts are not included in the program improvement plan, they provide a framework for systemic and practice improvements supportive of the PIP.

## **Program Improvement Plan**

A PIP Advisory Team comprised of approximately 50 county, court, tribal and community partners was convened three times in early 2008 to review the preliminary CSFR findings and develop the PIP. Several members of the PIP team had served on the SWA assessment team and some served as case reviewers during the onsite review. In addition to the work completed by the PIP Advisory Team, smaller work teams, with expertise specific to each of the overarching strategies, further evaluated and refined the PIP document. A data team analyzed the state's performance on each of the federal measures and provided valuable information throughout the entire PIP process. Individual county performance on the federal child safety and permanency measures was calculated and regression analysis used to further understand the composition of the children impacting performance within each of the federal performance measures.

## Identified Challenges

Based on the state's performance on the federal child safety and permanency data profiles, input from stakeholders and performance on the 64 cases reviewed, the following systemic and practice challenges were identified.

**Timely response and quality assessment:** CFSR items 1, 4 and 17 examine assessment practice across the life of child welfare cases. Respectively these items evaluate the timeliness of child protection assessments, determination and management of risk to children, and identification of needs and services for children, parents and foster parents. Items 21, 22 and 23 respectively evaluate the assessment of children's educational, physical and mental health needs. The state's performance on each of these items was below acceptable levels. Improving assessment practice is specifically addressed in the program improvement plan and is also addressed in the state child welfare practice model.

Caseworker visits with parents (Item 20) was rated strength in 48 percent of the cases reviewed, while caseworker visits with children (Item 19) was rated strength in 78 percent of cases reviewed. Caseworker visits provide an ongoing opportunity to assess the needs of family members which directly inform case planning and monitoring progress.

**Father involvement:** The onsite case review revealed that a lack of identification, engagement and/or provision of services for fathers significantly lowered the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children and Well-being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs. Greater consistency in promoting relationships between fathers and their children in foster care and more fully engaging fathers in case planning and service delivery process emerged as primary review themes.

**Outcomes for older youth:** Performance on Permanency Outcome 1 (P1): Children have permanency and stability in their living situations, varied considerably across the three county review sites. The final CFSR report did not identify any common systemic or practice themes that contributed to areas needing improvement ratings for P1 items, but findings from the state's quality assurance reviews have revealed that achieving permanency for older youth in care is key to improving overall performance.

**Case review system:** Item 25 (Ensure that all children have a case plan jointly developed with parents) and Item 29 (Ensure that foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, relative caregivers and children in care are notified of, and have an opportunity to be heard in review hearings) were rated areas needing improvement. Some stakeholders indicated these practices were not occurring on a consistent basis. Case review findings for Item 18 (Child and family involvement in case planning), similar to Item 25, also indicated that parents, particularly fathers, were not regularly engaged in case planning. Strategies to improve family involvement in case planning will apply to both performance items.

**Service array:** The child welfare service array was determined not in substantial conformity with CFSR standards for the second round, which is contrary to findings from the state's first CFSR and county MnCFSRs conducted from 2003 through 2008. Research over time is clear that the strongest predictor of positive outcomes for children, youth and families is to engage and involve them throughout the

assessment and case planning process. Providing effective services for child and families depends in large part on adequate assessment, individualized case plans and ongoing, quality caseworker contact

**Consistent practice:** At the CFSR exit conference, the Children's Bureau indicated the state's child welfare policies, practices and services were essentially well-developed without any major gaps. No glaring deficiencies in the child welfare system were noted, rather more uniformity in promoting improved client outcomes was needed. The primary challenge identified for the department and its county partners was to ensure greater consistency in child welfare practice both across and within counties. PIP strategies focused on improving child welfare supervision are key to improving consistent practice.

## Primary PIP Strategies

Three primary strategies address the domains of child safety, permanency and child and family well-being respectively. A fourth primary strategy is designed to achieve sustainable improvement across all seven outcomes and systemic factors through increased support for child welfare supervisors. Some program improvement strategies will be implemented and evaluated on a statewide basis while other strategies are targeted to counties based on selection criteria. The fifth strategy addresses improvements needed in service array.

**Promote child safety and well-being across the life of the case:** This strategy is designed to enhance child safety by improving case practice across the child welfare continuum. In addition to focusing greater attention on the timeliness of initiating child protection assessments, the PIP promotes improved child protection assessment/investigations and ongoing case work that includes: use of standardized assessment tools, such as Structured Decision Making and Child Well Being tools to improve child safety and risk decision making, to better identify the educational, mental and physical health needs of children and inform the case planning process.

**Locate and support a stable family for every youth in foster care:** The CFSR Final Report noted that sometimes when children/youth are served by more than one program area, caseworker's roles become unclear and children's needs inconsistently addressed. In some cases, children and families are not fully engaged in case planning, service delivery is fragmented and permanency petitions are not filed in a timely manner. Applying best practices in concurrent permanency planning for all age children and youth is a goal for addressing permanency performance.

Consistent with Minnesota's CFSR, the state Judicial Council adopted a policy that each judicial district and its county CJI teams accept shared responsibility for monitoring performance on federal child welfare measures and develop and implement local plans to implement such performance. Goal B of this Primary Strategy outlines a process for developing CJI Team plans for improving performance on the four federal permanency composites and related court processes.

**Enhance the capacities of families to care for their children:** Expanding application of Family Group Decision Making, improving the frequency and quality of case worker visits with children and their parents, and effectively engaging and supporting fathers are the principle components of this strategy. The SWA clearly identified the positive impact FGDM had on outcomes for children and families. During the CFSR, cases where FGDM was provided were rated significantly higher across permanency

and well-being outcomes and performance items. Improving the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and children is a priority and an effective practice for improving child and family assessment, case planning and monitoring service delivery. The need to increase the engagement and inclusion of fathers was identified through the state quality assurance reviews, as well as the federal CFSR. The department will make concerted efforts to collaborate with counties, community stakeholders and father's groups to promote father involvement with their children over the life of the case. Collectively these goals and related action steps are designed to enhance the state's performance across both Permanency Outcomes and Well-being Outcome 1. Timely permanency, with greater stability and connection for children in foster care, along with supporting families to better meet the needs of their children are the primary objectives of this strategy.

**Promote quality supervision:** Improving the capacity and skills of child welfare supervision, providing timely and useful child welfare performance data and conducting regular quality assurance reviews are the fundamental elements of this strategy. The CFSR Report accurately reflected the need for greater consistency in caseworker practice and service delivery and the department recognizes that effective supervision is critical to achieving consistent, quality caseworker practice within counties and across the state. The quality assurance and training systems will actively support county supervisors in developing county program improvement plans.

**Improve service array:** The PIP includes a separate strategy for working with counties through the MnCFSR process to assess and improve service array. More importantly, improvements for service array are integrated across the PIP through activities that will achieve improved assessment of needs, including improved use of standardized assessment tools; enhanced access to post-permanency supports; improved involvement/engagement of fathers; expanded application of Family Group Decision Making; and improved supervisor practices.

## Methods of Evaluation

Minnesota is required to establish an improvement goal for Permanency Composite 1: Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification. Baseline performance for Permanency Composite 1 is based on FFY 2008AB data profile.

Minnesota is required to establish improvement goals for Performance Items 1, 3, 4, 7, 17, 18, 19 and 20. Baseline performance for these performance items will be determined retrospectively using 12 months of findings from the state quality assurance reviews immediately preceding PIP implementation including findings from the quality assurance review conducted in Hennepin County in October 2009. Case samples for the performance baseline will be comprised of 20 cases from the Hennepin County quality assurance review and approximately 150-170 cases from quality assurance reviews that have been conducted in small, medium and large counties that represent all geographic areas and diverse populations statewide.

Minnesota conducts quality assurance reviews of county agencies using a similar review model and instrument as the CFSR. There are some exceptions to adherence with the federal review instrument when necessary to reflect state performance requirements, such as completion of children's mental health screening and/or 30-day physical exams. MnCFSR's are conducted in four to five counties per

quarter and the number of cases reviewed in each county ranges from six to 15 cases, based on county child population. In most counties, in-home cases comprise approximately one-third of the case sample, and foster care cases comprise the other two-thirds. The case sample for foster care cases is stratified to include older youth in foster care.

Findings from the MnCFSRs will be reported on a “rolling quarter” basis starting with the first quarter following the establishment of our baseline, as a measure of performance on Items 1, 3, 4, 7, 17, 18, 19, and 20.

**Minnesota  
Child and Family Services Review  
Program Improvement Plan  
2009**

The Plan includes the following sections:

- I. PIP General Information
- II. PIP Strategy Summary, TA Plan, and Quality Assurance Checklist
- III. PIP Agreement Form (authorizing signatures)
- IV. PIP Matrix

**I. PIP General Information**

CB Region:  I  II  III  IV  V  X  VI  VII  VIII  IX  X

State: Minnesota

Lead Children's Bureau Regional Office Contact Person: **Barbara Putyra**

Telephone Number: **312-353-1786**

E-mail Address: [Barbara.Putyra@acf.hhs.gov](mailto:Barbara.Putyra@acf.hhs.gov)

State Agency Name: **Minnesota Department of Human Services**

Address: **444 Lafayette Road North, St. Paul, Minnesota 55164-0962**

Telephone Number: **651-431-3857**

Lead State Agency Contact Person for the CFSR: **Larry Wojciak**

Telephone Number: **651- 431-4702**

E-mail Address: [larry.wojciak@state.mn.us](mailto:larry.wojciak@state.mn.us)

Lead State Agency PIP Contact Person (if different): **Christeen Borsheim**

Telephone Number: **651-431- 3857**

E-mail Address:  
[christeen.borsheim@state.mn.us](mailto:christeen.borsheim@state.mn.us)

Lead State Agency Data Contact Person: **Carole Johnson**

Telephone Number: **651-431-4977**

E-mail Address: [carole.johnson@state.mn.us](mailto:carole.johnson@state.mn.us)

State PIP Team Members\* (name, title, organization)

1. Ann Ahlstrom, Attorney, Children's Justice Initiative

2. Kami Alvarez, DHS Training System
3. Debra Anthony, Ramsey County
4. Nan Beman, DHS Social Services Information System (SSIS)
5. Debra Beske-Brown
6. Alex Beutel, DHS
7. Chris Bray, Department of Corrections
8. Ann Broskoff, DHS QA
9. Peggy Brown, Ramsey County
10. Judith Brumfield, Scott County
11. Dave Bucher, DHS
12. Ruth Burns, Dakota County
13. Cindy Cesare, Anoka County
14. Ruth Clinard, DHS
15. Jackie Crowshoe, DHS
16. Tina Curry, Ramsey County
17. Richard Dean, DHS Training System
18. Lynda Erickson, Crow Wing County
19. Terry Gromala, DHS Data
20. Muriel Gubasta, Ombudsperson for Latino Families
21. John Hanna, DHS
22. Chris Harder-Mehl, DHS QA
23. Ann Hill, Ombudsperson for African American Families
24. Deb Huskins, Hennepin county
25. Dean Johnson, St. Louis County
26. Kathleen Johnson, Kittson County
27. Amy Jones, Guardian ad litem
28. Ila Kamath, DHS
29. Dan Koziolk, Carver County
30. Dave Lee, Carlton County
31. Traci LaLiberte, University of Minnesota
32. Suzanne Leiwica, Mille Lacs County
33. Brenda Lockwood, DHS
34. Sue Lohrback, Olmsted County

35. Brenda Mahoney, Stearns County
36. Tom Maki, Dakota County
37. Paul Masiarchin, MN Fathers & Families Network
38. Edward McBrayer, DHS
39. Ralph McQuarter, DHS
40. Penny Messer, Redwood County
41. Theresa Mov, Former Foster Youth
42. Lori Munsterman, DHS QA
43. John Nalezney, Washington County
44. Tracy Nielson, Anoka County
45. Judy Nord, Children's Justice Initiative
46. Dan Papin, Washington County
47. Dick Pingry, St. Louis County
48. Mary Potter, Yellow Medicine County
49. Rose Robinson, Leech Lake Tribal Social Services
50. Randy Ruth, Minnesota Foster Parent Association
51. Don Ryan, Hennepin County
52. Rob Sawyer, Olmsted County
53. Linda Schlichte, Hennepin County
54. Michelle Selinger, Carver County
55. Pam Selvig, Scott County
56. Hon. Waldemar Senyk, Judge
57. Melissa Sherlock, DHS Adoption
58. Pat Simerson-Wallfred, Hennepin County Corrections
59. Cheryl Smetana McHughs, Therapeutic Services Agency, Inc.
60. Chris Sorenson, Lincoln, Lyon, & Murray Counties
61. Ann Stackpool Gunderson, Isanti County
62. Diane Stang, Dakota County
63. Erin Sullivan Sutton, DHS
64. Dave Thompson, DHS
65. Jean Thompson, DHS
66. Hon. Judith Tilsen, Judge
67. Brad Vold, Ottertail County

68. Jill Von Holtum, DHS Adolescent Services
--

69. Steve Vonderharr, DHS
---------------------------

70. Esther Wattenberg, University of Minnesota
--

71. Susan Wells, University of Minnesota
--

72. Gwen Wildermuth, DHS
--------------------------

73. Bill Wyss, DHS
--------------------

\*List key individuals who are actually working on the PIP and not necessarily everyone who was consulted during the PIP development process.



## II. PIP Strategy Summary, TA Plan, and Quality Assurance Checklist

### A. PIP Strategy Summary and TA Plan Instructions

States are strongly encouraged to develop a PIP Strategy Summary and TA Plan, using the format that appears on the next page. Using this format helps to both provide a focus on overarching reforms and simplify the PIP document. The PIP Strategy Summary and TA Plan comprises three elements:

- **Primary Strategies:** In this section of the PIP Strategy Summary and TA Plan, the State summarizes the broad strategy approaches that address the key concerns from the review and serve as a framework for goals/negotiated measures, benchmarks, and action steps. These approaches include the overarching reforms and continuing strategies that build on prior program improvement plan activity. The primary strategies should reflect integration with the timeframes of other plans, such as the CFSP. Primary strategies should be assigned unique numbers to allow cross-walking to action steps and benchmarks.
- **Intended Results:** In this section, the State summarizes the improvements necessary to address key concerns identified through the CFSR and included in the Final Report.
- **TA Resources Needed:** In this section, the State identifies the TA resources needed to carry out the provisions of the strategies for each year of the PIP. The source, frequency, and duration of the TA should be summarized, including both Federal and non-Federal sources.



## II. PIP Strategy Summary and TA Plan

Primary Strategies	Intended Results	TA Resources Needed
<p>Promote child safety and well-being across the life of the case</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve timeliness of initiating assessments</li> <li>• Improve quality of safety, risk, strengths/needs assessments and access to service array               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Standardized tools</li> <li>○ Safety-focused family partnerships</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Improve timeliness of assessments (Item 1).</p> <p>Improve consistency in delivering services and addressing safety concerns for all children in the family (Item 4, 17 and Service Array).</p> <p>Provide pre- and post-reunification/permanency services that focus on child safety (Items 3 and 4, Composite 1/Measure 4, and Service Array).</p> <p>Improve safety planning and ongoing assessment of risk (Items 3, 4, 19, 20).</p> <p>Improve assessment of risk and delivery of services when children/families are served by more than one service provider or program area, such as children’s mental health or juvenile corrections (Item 4, 17).</p> <p>Ensure safety issues are adequately addressed before case closing (Item 4, 19, 20, Composite 1/Measure 4)</p> <p>Assess risk and provide services that address child safety during trial home visits (Item 4, Composite 1/Measure 4,</p>	

	<p>and Service Array).</p> <p>Conduct comprehensive assessments of parent and child needs and provide services in response to their needs (Items 14, 17 and 18; Case Review and Service Array).</p> <p>Assess needs and provide services to meet children’s educational, physical and mental health needs (Items 21, 22 and 23; Service Array).</p>	
<p>Locate and support a stable family for every youth in foster care</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand Concurrent Permanency Planning (CPP) to older youth in care</li> <li>• Enhance judicial collaboration and oversight</li> <li>• Extend foster care benefits to age 21</li> </ul>	<p>Improve stability for children in foster care, especially for older youth in care for long periods of time (Item 6, and Service Array).</p> <p>Establish appropriate permanency goals in a timely manner and provide services to support their achievement (Items 7, 8 and 9).</p> <p>Improve permanency planning for youth served by more than one program area, such as children’s mental health or juvenile corrections (Items 7, 8, 9).</p> <p>Address delays in filing Termination of Parental Rights petitions (TPRs) and make concerted efforts to recruit adoptive homes; make active efforts to identify children’s tribal</p>	<p>National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice and Permanency Planning</p>

	<p>membership (Items 9, 14, 25 and 29).</p> <p>Improve relative search and provide services necessary to support stable placements (Items 6, 12, 14, 15 and 17; Service Array).</p>	
<p>Enhance capacity of families to care for their children</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve capacity for engaging and supporting fathers</li> <li>• Expand application of Family Group Decision Making (FGDM)</li> <li>• Improve frequency and quality of caseworker visits</li> </ul>	<p>Engage fathers in case planning, promote visitation between fathers and their children in foster care, and improve frequency and quality of contact between social workers and fathers (Items 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 20; Case Review and Service Array).</p> <p>Improve consistency in delivering services and addressing safety concerns for all children in the family (Item 17 and Service Array).</p> <p>Improve coordination in delivering services and addressing safety concerns for children who are served by more than one program area, such as children’s mental health or juvenile corrections (Item 4, 17, Service Array).</p> <p>Provide pre- and post-reunification/ permanency services that focus on child safety (Items 3, Composite</p>	<p>Minnesota Father and Families Network</p>

	<p>1/Measure 4, and Service Array).</p> <p>Assess needs and provide services necessary to support parents to care for their children with mental health and/or developmental disabilities (Items 17, 18; Case Review and Service Array).</p> <p>Improve frequency and quality of visits between social workers and children (Item 19).</p> <p>Improve coordination of frequent/quality visits between social workers and children who are being served by more than one program area, such as ICWA, children's mental health or juvenile corrections (Item 19).</p>	
<p>Support quality supervision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve the capacity and skills of child welfare supervision.</li> <li>• Improve supervision through access to performance data</li> </ul>	<p>Support consistent and quality child welfare practice within and across counties on CFSR measures and key performance indicators (All CFSR Items).</p> <p>Monitor and improve performance on federal indicators and other performance measures, i.e. caseworker contact, timely assessment (Permanency Composite 1; Items 1 and 19).</p>	<p>National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement</p> <p>National Resource Center for Child Welfare Data and Technology</p>

Assess and improve service array <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assess and improve service array through QA process</li></ul>	Improved availability, access and individualized service array and delivery of services (WB1 and Service Array).	

## **PIP Quality Assurance Checklist**

State child welfare agency staff and their external partners may use the following quality assurance checklist to review the State's PIP to determine whether it meets the requirements necessary to contribute to a successful PIP process that will result in improvements to child welfare practice:

Did the State negotiate with the Children's Bureau Regional Office the level of improvement to be achieved for each outcome and systemic factor determined not to be in substantial conformity, including a percentage of improvement for statewide data indicators that did not meet the national standards?

Does the plan contain action steps for each goal that build on strengths identified in the Summary of Findings (Final Report on the CFSR)?

Does the plan identify the person(s) responsible for overseeing the development, implementation, and oversight of each action step for achieving the goals?

Does the plan contain realistic timeframes for implementing the action steps and achieving the goals?

Have the goals been prioritized to ensure that action steps for achieving the most important goals (for example, those related to safety) are implemented first and within the timeframes outlined in the PIP instructions?

Does the plan explain how action steps targeted to one jurisdiction will lead to positive outcomes and adequate systemic functioning statewide?

Does the plan include benchmarks for measuring the progress of improvements towards goal achievement?

Are those benchmarks consistent with the level of effort required to improve performance and achieve PIP goals?

Does the plan include the State's method for evaluating the progress being made toward the goals and action steps?

### III. PIP Agreement Form

The PIP should be signed and dated by the Chief Executive Officer of the State child welfare agency and by the Children's Bureau Regional Office responsible for the State. The approved PIP with original signature must be retained in the Children's Bureau Regional Office. A hard copy of the approved PIP must be submitted to the following parties immediately upon approval:

- State child welfare agency
- Children's Bureau (Child and Family Services Review staff)
- Child Welfare Review Project, c/o JBS International, Inc.
- 

#### **Agreements**

The following Federal and State officials agree to the content and terms of the attached Program Improvement Plan:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of State Executive Officer for Child Welfare Services      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Children's Bureau      Date

This section should be completed only in the event of renegotiations regarding the content of the PIP, pursuant to 45 CFR 1355.35(e)(4). The specific renegotiated content should be inserted in the PIP Matrix under the appropriate section being replaced or modified. A summary by the action step, benchmark or improvement goal can be listed below. Copies of approved, renegotiated PIPs should be retained and distributed as noted above immediately upon completion of the renegotiation process.

The renegotiated content of the attached PIP, as summarized below, has been approved by State personnel and the Children’s Bureau Regional Office with authority to negotiate such content and is approved by Federal and State officials:

<b>Renegotiated Action Steps, Benchmarks, or Improvement Goals</b>	<b>Date Renegotiated</b>	<b>Approval of State Executive Officer for Child Welfare Services</b>
		<b>Approval Children’s Bureau</b>

**Part A: Strategy Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report**

<b>Primary Strategy A:</b> Promote child safety and well-being across the life of the case				<b>Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors:</b> S1, S2, WB1, WB2, WB3, Case Review, Service Array	
<b>Goal A1:</b> Improve performance on timeliness of initiating assessments				<b>Applicable CFSR Items:</b> 1	
Action Steps/Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Qtr Due	Qtr Done	Quarterly Update
<b>Action Step 1:</b> Use performance data and technical assistance to improve compliance with legislation enacted in 2006 and 2007 which amended and clarified timelines for initiating child maltreatment response, including requirements for face-to-face contact with children, and timelines for screening child protection reports.					

<p><b>Operational benchmarks (targeted):</b>  <b>A1.1.</b> Use CY2008 <i>Timeliness of Initiating Assessments</i> performance reports as a baseline to identify 7-10, medium to large child population counties (child population over 5000) that are in the lowest quartile of performance.</p>	D. Thompson	7-10 counties are identified	Q1		
<p><b>A1.1.a.</b> Conduct further assessment in the 7-10 counties for potential barriers to performance and the county's need for technical assistance. Following the assessment, identify a minimum of 5 counties that have technical assistance needs for improving performance.</p>	D. Thompson	Report on assessment for TA needs and 5 counties that will receive targeted technical assistance.	Q2-Q3		

<b>A1.1.b.</b> Prepare a plan to refer or deliver technical assistance, based on the needs assessment, which includes assisting the county to develop a brief action plan for monitoring implementation and improving performance.	D. Thompson	Submit brief action plans for 5 counties for monitoring implementation and tracking improvement.	Q4-Q5		
<b>A1.1.c.</b> <i>Review Timeliness of Initiating Assessments</i> performance reports each quarter to monitor effectiveness of improvement strategies in targeted counties.	D. Thompson	Provide quarterly performance reports for targeted counties.	Q6-Q8		
<b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b> <b>A1.2.</b> Distribute legislative update bulletin to all county and tribal child welfare agencies.	D. Thompson	Bulletin is issued	Q1		
<b>A1.2. a.</b> Develop and distribute a quarterly performance report, <i>Timeliness of Initiating Assessments</i> , to state staff and county agencies.	D. Thompson A. Beutel	Provide quarterly statewide performance reports	Q1-Q8		
<b>A1.2.b.</b> Present statewide VPC training on timeliness of initiating assessments and screening requirements to county child welfare agency supervisors.	L. Munsterman	Report on VPC content, # of attendees, # of counties represented, and evaluation of training.	Q1		

<p><b>A1.2.c.</b> Inform and support county social workers/supervisors, through SSIS mentor meetings and SSIS newsletter updates, on required SSIS data entry and documentation to improve the accuracy of timeliness of assessment reports, as needed.</p>	<p>M. Zinda N. Beman</p>	<p>Provide agendas of mentor meetings and copies of SSIS newsletters that include topics of data entry for initiating assessments reports.</p>	<p>Q1 and Q5</p>		
<p><b>A1.2.d.</b> Facilitate a peer learning model through a minimum of 2 (1 per year) regional/quarterly, supervisor/caseworker meetings to share lessons learned and successful efforts for improving timeliness of initiating assessments across the state.</p>	<p>D. Thompson</p>	<p>Provide agendas for regional meetings that focus on lessons learned for improving timeliness of initiating assessments, handouts and attendance at regional/quarterly, supervisor/caseworker meetings.</p>	<p>Q4 and Q8</p>		
<p><b>A1.3.</b> Update child welfare training system curriculums with new response and screening timeline requirements.</p>	<p>R. Dean</p>	<p>Provide updated curriculums.</p>	<p>Q1</p>		

<p><b>Continuous quality improvement:</b>  <b>A1.4.</b> Conduct MnCFSR's in 4-5 counties per quarter to evaluate county performance on timeliness of initiating assessments; and provide technical assistance to counties who are required to develop a program improvement plan for Item 1. (Where appropriate, coordinate PIP development with plans developed under A1.1.b.)</p>	L Wojciak	Report counties reviewed and required to write a PIP for Item 1. Submit county PIP's for Item 1.	Q1-Q8		
<p><i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i></p>					

<p><b>Goal A2:</b> Improve quality of assessments, case planning and access to service array to address child safety and well-being</p>				<p><b>Applicable CFSR Items:</b> 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 35, 36, 37</p>	
<p><b>Action Steps/ Benchmarks</b></p>	<p><b>Person Responsible</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence of Completion</b></p>	<p><b>Qtr Due</b></p>	<p><b>Qtr Done</b></p>	<p><b>Quarterly Update</b></p>

<b>Action Step 2. Provide technical assistance to improve caseworker competencies, and improve the quality and consistency of using standardized assessment tools, such as Structured Decision Making (SDM) tools and Child Well-Being (CWB) tool, to guide key decisions about case planning, access to service array and coordination of services across programs and/or providers to achieve child safety and well-being.</b>					
--	--	--	--	--	--

<p><b>Operational benchmarks (targeted):</b>  <b>A2.1.</b> Develop and implement a case-reading protocol for assessing the quality and consistency of using standardized assessment tools in the context of case planning, access to service array and coordination of services across programs and/or providers.</p>	D. Thompson	Case reading protocol for assessing the quality and consistency of using standardized assessment tools in the context of case planning, access to service array and coordination of services across programs and/or providers is developed.	Q1		
<p><b>A2.1.a.</b> Use 2009/2010 MnCFSR findings to identify 3 to 5 medium to large child population counties (child population over 5000) with performance needing improvement on Items 3, 4, 17 and 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23; include counties whose performance on these items is impacted by cases where children are being served by more than one program area.</p>	L. Wojciak	3 to 5 counties (approximately 1 per quarter) are identified based on MnCFSR findings.	Q2-Q6		

<p><b>A2.1.b.</b> Conduct case-readings for a sample of cases in the identified counties to assess the quality and consistency of using standardized assessment tools to develop individualized case plans, provide access to service array, and coordinate services across programs and/or providers to meet child safety and well-being needs.</p>	<p>D. Thompson</p>	<p>Case reading assessments and analysis of findings for 3 to 5 counties are reported.</p>	<p>Q2-Q6</p>		
<p><b>A2.1.c.</b> Assist counties to develop an action plan, as indicated by the case-reading/assessment, for improving the quality and consistency of using standardized assessment tools for developing individualized case plans, providing access to service array, and coordinating services across programs and/or providers to meet child safety and well-being needs (Items 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23) as part of the county's over all MnCFSR program improvement plan.</p>	<p>D. Thompson</p>	<p>Action plans are developed in 3 to 5 counties as part of their overall PIP.</p>	<p>Q3-Q7</p>		
<p><b>A2.1.d.</b> Review quarterly program improvement reports submitted by the county agency as part of their overall MnCFSR PIP, to monitor effectiveness of improvement efforts for Items 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23.</p>	<p>D. Thompson L. Wojciak</p>	<p>Report selected county's quarterly PIP reports for Items 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23.</p>	<p>Q4-Q8</p>		

<p><b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b>  <b>A2.2.</b> Facilitate a peer learning model through a minimum of 2 (1 per year) regional/quarterly, supervisor/caseworker meetings to share lessons learned and successful efforts from counties that received targeted technical assistance for improving quality and consistency of using standardized assessment tools.</p>	D. Thompson	Provide agendas for regional meetings that focus on lessons learned for improving quality and consistency of using standardized assessment tools, handouts and attendance from 2 regional/quarterly, supervisor/caseworker meetings.	Q4-Q8		
<p><b>A2.3.</b> Report overall findings from case-readings/assessments of quality and consistency of using standardized assessment tools to the child welfare training system.</p>	D. Thompson	Provide report on changes needed based on key findings of case readings.	Q7		
<p><b>A2.3.a.</b> Assess child welfare training system curriculums, in response to reported findings, and update if indicated to improve caseworker competencies for using standardized assessment tools.</p>	R. Dean	Report on assessment of curriculums and updates if indicated.	Q8		

<p><b>Continuous quality improvement:</b>  <b>A2.4.</b> Conduct MnCF SR's in 4-5 counties per quarter to evaluate performance on safety planning, risk assessment, case planning, access to service array, and coordination of services across programs and/or providers to meet child safety and well-being needs (Items 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23) and provide technical assistance to counties required to develop a program improvement plan for these items.</p>	L Wojciak	Report counties reviewed and required to write a PIP for Items 3, 4, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23. Submit county PIP's for these items.	Q1-Q8		
<p><b><i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i></b></p>					

Action Steps/ Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Qtr Due	Qtr Done	Quarterly Update
<p><b>Action Step 3. Support expansion of the safety-focused family partnership model to improve assessment of needs, engagement with families in case planning, delivery of services, and access to service array to meet child safety and well-being needs.</b></p>					
<p><b>Operational benchmarks (targeted):</b>  <b>A3.1.</b> Initiate a partnership between MnDHS and an expert county(ies) to provide intense orientation, training and support for expanding the safety-focused, family partnership practice model throughout Minnesota.</p>	D. Thompson	Expert county(ies) who agree to partner with DHS are identified.	Q1		
<p><b>A3.1.a.</b> Issue a request for proposals (RFP) to solicit interest from counties to participate with the DHS/expert county partnership to implement safety-focused, family partnership models in their county child welfare practice. Respondent counties must agree to serve as a consultant county to other counties in their region of the state after technical assistance is received.</p>	D. Thompson	RFP is issued	Q1-Q2		

<b>A3.1.b.</b> Select 10-12 counties that meet criteria of the RFP.	D. Thompson	Announce successful county respondents.	Q3-Q4		
<b>A3.1.c.</b> Provide intense orientation, training and support to selected counties to develop their expertise in implementing safety-focused, family partnership practice models through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orientation labs</li> <li>• Site-based training</li> <li>• Peer learning models</li> <li>• Peer review</li> </ul>	D. Thompson	Report orientation, training and support activities.	Q3-Q8		
<b>A3.1.d.</b> Evaluate implementation of safety-focused, family partnerships based on indicators of improved assessment of needs, family engagement in case planning, and access to service array.	D. Thompson	Provide interim and final evaluation reports	Q5 and Q8		
<b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b> <b>A3.2.</b> Expand the safety-focused, family partnership model to interested counties throughout the state by working with an expert county partner to host ongoing orientation and training sessions to a broad county audience.	D. Thompson	Provide the workplan for convening statewide safety-focused family partnership model gatherings.	Q1		

<p><b>A3.2.a.</b> Convene up to four safety-focused, family partnership gatherings during 2009 and 2010, for up to 100 county agency staff per gathering. Use gatherings to share information about the safety-focused, family partnership model and successful practice experiences working in this model.</p>	D. Thompson	Provide agendas, dates and record of attendance at gatherings.	Q1-Q8		
<p><b>Continuous quality improvement:</b> <b>A4.1.</b> Assess child welfare training system curriculums and develop or update curriculum as necessary to address caseworker competencies necessary for achieving successful safety-focused family partnership practice.</p>	R. Dean	Report on curriculum assessment and report updates if indicated.	Q4		
<p><i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i></p>					

<p><b>Primary Strategy B:</b> Locate and support a permanent family for every youth in foster care.</p>				<p><b>Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors:</b> P1, Case Review, Service Array</p>	
<p><b>Goal B1:</b> Expand concurrent permanency planning policy and practice to older youth in care.</p>				<p><b>Applicable CFSR Items:</b> 6, 7, 8, 9</p>	
<p><b>Action Steps/Benchmarks</b></p>	<p><b>Person Responsible</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence of Completion</b></p>	<p><b>Qtr Due</b></p>	<p><b>Qtr Done</b></p>	<p><b>Quarterly Update</b></p>

<b>Action Step 1. Update and support concurrent permanency planning (CPP) policy and practice to meet unique needs of older youth in foster care, including youth served by more than one program area, such as juvenile corrections and mental health.</b>					
---	--	--	--	--	--

<p><b>Operational benchmarks (targeted):</b>  <b>B1.1.</b> Recruit 2-3 counties, that are interested in fully implementing CPP policy and practice for older youth (ages 10-18) in foster care, including youth served by more than one program area such as mental health and/or juvenile corrections programs to improve their performance on achieving permanency for older youth based on the following criteria: 1) medium to large child population counties (child population over 5000) in the lowest quartile of performance on CY2008 National Standards performance report for Permanency Composite 2: <i>Timeliness of Adoptions</i> and Permanency Composite 3: <i>Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care for Long Periods of Time</i>; and counties completing MnCFSR's in 2009/2010 who have performance needing improvement in Permanency Outcome 1.</p>	L. Wojciak	Identify 2-3 counties.	Q1-Q5		
--	------------	------------------------	-------	--	--

<p><b>B1.1.a.</b> Conduct an assessment of the counties' use of CPP for older youth, including youth served by more than one program area such as mental health and/or juvenile corrections programs, and assist counties to develop an action plan that includes the technical assistance, resource development and/or training plans needed to implement CPP as part of the county's overall MnCFSR PIP.</p>	<p>E. McBrayer L. Wojciak</p>	<p>Report on assessment results, including results of the counties' use of CPP for older youth, including youth served by more than one program area such as mental health and/or juvenile corrections programs and provide PIPs from targeted counties.</p>	<p>Q1-Q5</p>		
<p><b>B1.1.b.</b> Review updated performance reports for <i>Timeliness of Adoptions</i> and <i>Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care for Long Periods of Time</i> to monitor effectiveness implementing CPP for older youth in care in selected counties.</p>	<p>L. Wojciak</p>	<p>Provide performance reports for targeted counties.</p>	<p>Q6-Q8</p>		
<p><b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b> <b>B1.2.</b> Convene and facilitate a workgroup to update and/or develop CPP policy and best practice guidance necessary for expanding CPP to older youth, including youth served by more than one program area such as mental health and/or juvenile corrections programs, in foster care.</p>	<p>E. McBrayer</p>	<p>Workgroup is convened. Record of meetings, agendas, and completed CPP guide.</p>	<p>Q1-Q6</p>		

<p><b>B1.2.a.</b> Update policy bulletins and distribute best practice guides to county and tribal agencies to support CPP with older youth, including youth served by more than one program area such as mental health and/or juvenile corrections, in foster care.</p>	<p>E. McBrayer</p>	<p>Policy bulletins are updated and distributed to county and tribal agencies. Best Practice guides are developed and distributed to county and tribal agencies.</p>	<p>Q4-Q6</p>		
<p><b>B1.2.b.</b> Review and update child welfare training system curriculum for CPP to reflect best practice when working with older youth, including youth served by more than one program area such as mental health and/or juvenile corrections.</p>	<p>R. Dean</p>	<p>Curriculum review is completed. Updated curriculum is added to the training system calendar.</p>	<p>Q6-Q8</p>		
<p><b>B1.2.c.</b> Market training to counties through PIP development process and training needs assessments.</p>	<p>R. Dean</p>	<p>Records of attendance at CPP for older youth training.</p>	<p>Q8</p>		
<p><b>Continuous quality improvement:</b> <b>B1.3.</b> Conduct MnCFSR's in 4-5 counties per quarter to evaluate performance on achieving permanency (Items 7, 8, 9). Case review samples will be stratified to specifically include a sample of older youth in foster care. Technical assistance will be provided to counties who are required to develop a program improvement plan for Items 7, 8, or 9.</p>	<p>L. Wojciak</p>	<p>Report counties reviewed and required to write a PIP for Items 7, 8 or 9 based on cases of older youth in foster care. Submit PIP's from selected counties.</p>	<p>Q1-Q8</p>		

<b>B1.3.a.</b> Assess training needs for county agency staff as a component of developing the PIP for Items 7, 8 or 9 and refer staff to training as indicated by the assessment.	L. Wojciak	Provide summary of training needs assessment and recommendations made to Child Welfare Training System.	Q4 and Q8		
<b>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</b>					

<b>Goal B2:</b> Improve judicial and administrative oversight of older youth in foster care.				<b>Applicable CFSR Items:</b> 7, 8, 9, 18, 25, 29, 35, 36, 37	
<b>Action Steps/Benchmarks</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Evidence of Completion</b>	<b>Qtr Due</b>	<b>Qtr Done</b>	<b>Quarterly Update</b>
<b>Action Step 2. Partner with the state Children’s Justice Initiative (CJI) to achieve improvements in court practices that support improved performance on National Standards.</b>					
<b>Operational benchmarks (targeted):</b> <b>B2.1.</b> Develop a CJI quality assurance review component to the state’s MnCFSR process that includes an onsite review, identification of strengths and areas needing improvement and a program improvement plan process.	A. Ahlstrom J. Nord	CJI review protocols are developed.	Q1-Q3		

<p><b>B2.1.a.</b> Pilot the CJI quality assurance review component in 1 large child population county (child population over 50,000) per year.</p>	<p>A. Ahlstrom J. Nord</p>	<p>Report CJI review findings for pilot county.</p>	<p>Q4</p>		
<p><b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b> <b>B2.2.</b> Convene 8 regional, statewide CJI Team meetings, and facilitate the development of CJI Team plans to improve courts performance on achieving permanency as measured by the National Standards, Permanency Composites, as well as improvement on Items 25 and 29 from the CFSR.</p>	<p>A. Ahlstrom J. Nord</p>	<p>Records of 8 regional meetings: agendas and attendance. Samples of CJI team plans that are being implemented from selected counties will be reported.</p>	<p>Q1</p>		
<p><b>B2.2.a.</b> Facilitate a peer learning model for CJI teams by: 1) posting completed best examples of CJI Team plans on the CJI website, 2) convening regional meetings to share lessons learned and successful efforts to improve court practices to achieve improved permanency performance, and 3) providing court practice technical assistance through statewide ITV broadcasts annually.</p>	<p>A. Ahlstrom J. Nord</p>	<p>Website address will be reported. Records of regional meetings. Records of statewide ITV broadcasts.</p>	<p>Q1-Q8</p>		

<p><b>B2.3.</b> Work with the state’s social service information system (SSIS) to implement an electronic notice of children’s moves in foster care process that includes foster parent contact information to improve performance on notification of hearings for foster parents/caregivers.</p>	<p>N. Beman J. Nord</p>	<p>Notification of child moves in foster care is included SSIS.</p>	<p>Q1</p>		
<p><b>B2.3.a.</b> Inform and support county social workers through SSIS mentor meetings and SSIS newsletter updates on the availability of the electronic form and requirement to notify the court of child moves in foster care</p>	<p>N. Beman M. Zinda</p>	<p>Provide agendas of mentor meetings and copies of SSIS newsletters that include the topic of notifying foster parents/ caregivers of hearings.</p>	<p>Q1-Q2</p>		
<p><b>Continuous quality improvement:</b> <b>B2.4.</b> Distribute annual National Standard performance reports to CJI teams to assist their monitoring for performance improvement efforts.</p>	<p>C. Johnson</p>	<p>National Standard performance reports/by county are distributed to CJI teams.</p>	<p>Q4 and Q8</p>		

<p><b>B2.4.a.</b> Conduct stakeholder surveys, including surveys with foster and relative caregivers, in 4-5 counties per quarter as part of MnCFSR process to determine county performance on notifying foster parents/caregivers of hearings, and provide technical assistance to those counties required to develop a plan for program improvement for Item 29.</p>	<p>L Wojciak</p>	<p>Provide copies of stakeholder surveys. Report on counties reviewed, results of stakeholder surveys and counties required to develop PIPs on Item 29. Submit county PIPs for Item 29.</p>	<p>Q1-Q8</p>		
<p><b>Action Step 3. Improve the consistency of policy, practice and access to service array for children/families in court-ordered trial home visits.</b></p>					
<p><b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b>  <b>B3.1.</b> Update the Judges Juvenile Protection Bench Book and develop a checklist for court personnel to guide decisions about appropriate use and implementation of trial home visits, including access to service array.</p>	<p>A. Ahlstrom L. Wojciak</p>	<p>Provide updated “bench book” excerpts and court personnel checklist.</p>	<p>Q4</p>		
<p><b>B3.1.a.</b> Develop policy and guidance for using trial home visits to achieve successful reunification and prevent foster care re-entry, including best practice for access to service array.</p>	<p>L. Wojciak A. Ahlstrom</p>	<p>Policy guidance is completed and distributed to county/tribal agencies.</p>	<p>Q6</p>		

<i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i>					
---	--	--	--	--	--

<b>Action Step B4. Extend provision of foster care benefits to age 21.</b>					
<b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b> <b>B4.1.</b> Develop and issue a policy bulletin to county and tribal child welfare agencies that: 1) defines county/tribal agency responsibilities to inform youth of eligibility of services to age 21; and 2) provides guidance for preparing youth for successful transitions from foster care.	E. McBrayer S. Vonderharr	Bulletin is completed and issued.	Q1-Q2		
<b>B4.2.a.</b> Develop a function in the state information system for providing notice of eligibility for continued services to youth, parents and foster parents.	E. McBrayer S. Vonderharr	SSIS enhancement is completed and operational	Q4		
<i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i>					

<b>Primary Strategy C:</b> Enhance the capacity of families to care for their children.	<b>Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors:</b> S2, P1, P2, WB1, Case Review, Service Array
<b>Goal C1:</b> Increase participation and support father involvement across the child welfare service continuum.	<b>Applicable CFSR Items:</b> 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 25, 35, 36, 37

Action Steps/Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Qtr Due	Qtr Done	Quarterly Update
<b>Action Step 1. Assess and improve the capacity for engaging and supporting fathers in the child welfare system, that includes engagement in case planning and access to service array.</b>					

<p><b>Operational benchmarks (targeted):</b>  <b>C1.1.</b> Use 2010/2011 MnCFSR findings to identify 2-4 medium to large child population counties (child population over 5000) with performance needing improvement on Items 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 and access to service array based on ratings specific to father involvement; and recommend implementation of the father's technical assistance packet in their overall plan for program improvement.</p>	L. Wojciak	2-4 counties are identified and PIPs are developed to include implementation of father's technical assistance packet.	Q4-Q6		
<p><b>C1.1.a.</b> Review quarterly program improvement reports submitted by county agencies as part of their overall MnCFSR PIP to monitor effectiveness of father's technical assistance packet on improvement efforts for Items 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 and access to service array.</p>	L. Wojciak	Report on selected county's quarterly PIP reports for Items 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 and access to service array.	Q6-Q8		
<p><b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b>  <b>C1.2.</b> Convene workgroup of key stakeholders to define and develop a statewide father's policy and best practice guidance for county/tribal child welfare systems.</p>	S. Johnson M. Davis	Workgroup roster, agendas and records of meetings, father's guide is completed.	Q2		

<b>C1.2.a.</b> Develop and implement a multi-disciplinary technical assistance packet to support implementation of father's policy and best practices.	S. Johnson M. Davis	Technical assistance packet is developed.	Q3		
<b>C1.2.b.</b> Develop child welfare system training curriculum to support the father's policy and best practices guide.	R. Dean	Curriculum is developed and added to training system calendar.	Q1		
<b>C1.2.c.</b> Market training to counties through PIP development process and training needs assessments.	R. Dean	Records of attendance at father's policy trainings.	Q1		
<b>Continuous quality improvement:</b> <b>C1.3.</b> Conduct MnCFSRs in 4-5 counties per quarter to evaluate county performance on father involvement and provide technical assistance to counties who are required to develop a program improvement plan for father involvement based on findings for Items 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 and access to service array.	L Wojciak	Report counties reviewed and required to write a PIP to improve father involvement for Items 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 and access to services array. Submit PIPs developed for these items.	Q1-Q8		
<b>C1.4.</b> Conduct thorough assessment of agency, worker, and service provider capacity to engage and involve fathers in the child welfare system in four counties with active Citizen Review Panels (Ramsey, Washington, Chisago and Winona).	A. Keyes	Assessment protocols and tools are developed. Assessments are completed.	Q1-Q2		

<b>C1. 4 a.</b> Prepare a report of shared findings from Citizen Review Panel assessments that will include recommendations for county agencies and the Department to improve capacity.	A. Keyes	Report is completed and made available to counties and Department. Department will provide response to the recommendations.	Q4		
<i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i>					

<b>Goal C2:</b> Promote expanded application of Family Group Decision Making across the child welfare continuum.					<b>Applicable CFSR Items:</b> 3, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 25, 35, 36, 37
<b>Action Steps/Benchmarks</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Evidence of Completion</b>	<b>Qtr Due</b>	<b>Qtr Done</b>	<b>Quarterly Update</b>
<b>Action Step 2. Support application of Family Group Decision Making to prevent placements, achieve permanency, coordinate services for children and families served by more than one program area, and/or support post-permanency.</b>					

<p><b>Operational benchmarks (targeted):</b>  <b>C2.1.</b> Use FGDM data from SSIS, findings from MnCF SR Items 3, 17 and 18, and performance on National standards for re-entry and stability to identify 3 medium to large child population counties (child population over 5000), including counties whose performance on these items is impacted by cases where children are served by more than one program area, that are in the lowest quartile of using FGDM for placement prevention and/or post-permanency cases; and are interested in using an expanded application of FGDM as a strategy to improve their performance.</p>	<p>E. McBrayer L. Wojciak</p>	<p>3 counties are identified.</p>	<p>Q4</p>		
<p><b>C2.1.a.</b> Assess barriers to using FGDM for placement prevention/post permanency, including barriers for using FGDM for cases involving youth served by more than one program area and develop brief action plans for increasing FGDM for placement prevention/post permanency cases. In those counties who are developing or implementing a PIP following an MnCF SR, this action plan will be included in their PIP.</p>	<p>E. McBrayer</p>	<p>Assessments are completed, barriers are identified, including barriers for using FGDM for cases involving youth served by more than one program area and action plan is developed for each county.</p>	<p>Q5</p>		

<p><b>C2.1.b</b> Review quarterly SSIS reports to monitor increase in FGDM for placement prevention/post permanency for selected counties. Use PIP update reports to monitor performance on Items 17 and 18 as a result of expanded application of FGDM. Use SSIS reports to monitor performance on re-entry and stability indicators.</p>	<p>E. McBrayer L. Wojciak C. Johnson</p>	<p>Provide quarterly reports for selected counties.</p>	<p>Q5 - Q8</p>		
<p><b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b> <b>C2.2.</b> Facilitate peer learning through up to 2 FGDM facilitator advisory team meetings to share lessons learned and successful efforts for using FGDM in placement prevention/post permanency cases and for working with children served by more than one program area.</p>	<p>E. McBrayer</p>	<p>Provide agendas, handouts and attendance at FGDM advisory team meetings.</p>	<p>Q4 and Q8</p>		
<p><i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i></p>					

<p><b>Goal C3:</b> Improve the frequency and quality of caseworker visits with children.</p>				<p><b>Applicable CFSR Items:</b> 19</p>	
<p><b>Action Steps/Benchmarks</b></p>	<p><b>Person Responsible</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence of Completion</b></p>	<p><b>Qtr Due</b></p>	<p><b>Qtr Done</b></p>	<p><b>Quarterly Update</b></p>

<b>Action Step 3. Improve compliance with state requirements for monthly face to face caseworker visits with children in foster care.</b>					
<b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b> <b>C3.1.</b> Determine common barriers to monthly face to face visits with children in foster care through a statewide survey.	C. Borsheim	Survey is completed and common barriers identified.	Q1		
<b>C3.1.a.</b> Use survey findings to develop a statewide improvement strategy and communicate the improvement strategy to county/tribal agencies.	C. Borsheim	Statewide improvement strategy is developed and communicated to county/tribal agencies.	Q1		

<p><b>C3.1.b.</b> Issue a policy bulletin to county/tribal child welfare agencies that includes policy requirements, findings from the survey and recommendations for improving performance.</p>	<p>C. Borsheim</p>	<p>Policy bulletin is issued to counties/tribes.</p>	<p>Q2</p>		
<p><b>C3.1.c.</b> Provide county/tribal agencies with a reporting feature in the state information system (SSIS) to track ongoing, local performance on monthly face to face visits with children in foster care.</p>	<p>N. Beman</p>	<p>SSIS report is operational</p>	<p>Q1</p>		
<p><b>C3.1.d.</b> Develop and distribute a statewide quarterly performance report on monthly face to face visits with children in foster care to monitor effectiveness of statewide improvement strategies.</p>	<p>C. Borsheim C. Johnson</p>	<p>Quarterly reports are developed and issued to county/tribal agencies.</p>	<p>Q1</p>		
<p><b>C3.1.e.</b> Contact county/tribal agencies that have declining performance or do not demonstrate improvement on monthly face to face visits with children in foster care for over 2 quarters to determine technical assistance needs.</p>	<p>C. Borsheim</p>	<p>Report technical assistance provided to county/tribal agencies.</p>	<p>Q1-Q8</p>		
<p><b>Action Step 4. Improve the frequency and quality of caseworker visits with children in foster care and/or receiving in-home services, including children who are served by more than one program area such as ICWA, mental health, and/or juvenile corrections.</b></p>					

<p><b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b>  <b>C4.1.</b> Convene and facilitate a workgroup to define and develop caseworker visit policy and best practice guide, including policy and best practice for visiting children served by more than one program area, such as ICWA, mental health and/or juvenile corrections.</p>	C. Borsheim	Workgroup roster, agendas, records of meetings. Policy and practice guide, including policy and best practice for visiting children served by more than one program area, such as ICWA, mental health and/or juvenile corrections is completed.	Q1-Q4		
<p><b>C4.1. a.</b> Update or develop child welfare training system curriculums to reflect the caseworker visit policy and best practice guide.</p>	R. Dean	Curriculum is updated or developed.	Q5		
<p><b>C4.1. b.</b> Market training to counties through PIP development process and training needs assessments</p>	R. Dean	Records of trainings held and number of attendees.	Q6-Q8		
<p><b>C4.1. c.</b> Develop brief training videos and deliver to caseworker's email (or other technology options) on specific frequency and quality caseworker visit improvement topics.</p>	C. Borsheim	Videos are developed and distributed.	Q6		
<p><b>C4.1.d.</b> Conduct follow-up evaluations with county agency supervisors on the quality/effectiveness of brief video training.</p>	C. Borsheim	Evaluation instruments are developed and feedback is analyzed.	Q8		

<b>Continuous quality improvement:</b> <b>C4.2.</b> Conduct MnCFSR's in 4-5 counties per quarter to evaluate county performance on caseworker visits with children (Item 19) and provide technical assistance to counties who are required to develop a program improvement plan for Item 19.	L. Wojciak	Report counties reviewed and required to write a PIP for Item 19. Submit county PIP's for Item 19.	Q1-Q8		
<i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i>					

<b>Primary Strategy D:</b> Support supervisory practice that promotes improved outcomes for children and families.				<b>Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors:</b> S1, S2, P1, P2, WB1, WB2, WB3, Case Review, Service Array	
<b>Goal D1:</b> Improve the capacity and skills of child welfare supervision.				<b>Applicable CFSR Items:</b> Applies to all CFSR performance items.	
Action Steps/Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Qtr Due	Qtr Done	Quarterly Update
<b>Action Step 1. Conduct strategic planning process to improve supervision in conjunction with NRCOI and NRC-CWDT and implement the strategic plan in a systematic way.</b>					

<b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b> <b>D1.1.</b> Request technical assistance from the NRCOI/NRC-CWDT to lead strategic planning process for improving supervision.	C. Borsheim	Record request for TA. Record consults and action plan.	Q1		
<b>D1.1.a.</b> Form and convene improving supervision workgroup to participate in the strategic planning process that will include DHS and county and tribal agency membership, representative of urban/rural/geographic regions.	C. Borsheim	Record workgroup meetings.	Q2		
<b>D1.1.b.</b> Develop strategic plan and recommendations for improving the skills and capacity for child welfare supervision.	C. Borsheim	Submit strategic plan and recommendations.	Q4		
<b>D1.1.c.</b> Implement recommendations in 6-8 pilot counties who self-select for participation.	C. Borsheim	Report 6-8 counties who will implement strategic plan recommendations	Q4-Q8		
<b>D1.1.d.</b> Evaluate outcomes of pilot implementation and prepare for systematic implementation statewide.	C. Borsheim	Report outcomes and workplan for statewide implementation.	Q8		
<b><i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i></b>					

Goal D2: Improve the quality, distribution and application of performance data.				Applicable CFSR Items: Applies to all CFSR performance items.	
Action Steps/Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Qtr Due	Qtr Done	Quarterly Update
<b>Action Step 2. Provide quality, up to date child welfare performance data to county agency supervisors to improve their capacity to monitor and improve performance.</b>					
<b>Operational benchmarks (statewide):</b> <b>D2.1.</b> Convene a division-wide work team to oversee the development of performance reports to ensure the distribution, consistency and quality of data and reports provided to county agencies.	C. Johnson	Workgroup roster; record of meetings, agendas and attendance. Data and report guidelines are completed.	Q1		
<b>D2.1.a.</b> Develop and distribute a child welfare quarterly performance data “dashboard” to counties.	C. Johnson	Dashboard format is completed and distributed to county agencies on a quarterly basis.	Q2-Q8		
<b>D2.1.b.</b> Provide training for child welfare supervisors and county agency directors (Tools for Management Training) 3-4 times per year to improve local capacity for applying performance data to program improvement.	R. Dean	Record number of times training is offered and attendance.	Q1-Q8		
<b>D2.2.</b> Update the social service information system Charting and Analysis function to include new CFSR national data indicators.	G. Wildermuth	Updated Charting and Analysis is available to county agencies.	Q1		

<b>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</b>					
---	--	--	--	--	--

<b>Primary Strategy E:</b> Assess and improve service array				<b>Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors:</b> S2, WB1, Service Array	
<b>Goal E1:</b> Require counties to evaluate the array of services in their counties, continue to work to improve the delivery of services necessary to assess and address safety, permanency and well-being needs of children and families, and ensure services are available, accessible and individualized.				<b>Applicable CFSR Items:</b> Items 3, 17, 35, 36, 37	
<b>Action Steps/Benchmarks</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Evidence of Completion</b>	<b>Qtr Due</b>	<b>Qtr Done</b>	<b>Quarterly Update</b>
<b>Action Step 1: Assess and improve service array through the MnCFSR process.</b>					
<b>Continuous quality improvement:</b> <b>E1.1.</b> Conduct MnCFSR's in 4-5 counties per quarter to evaluate service array.	L. Wojciak	Report counties reviewed each quarter.	Q1-Q8		
<b>E1.1.a.</b> Require counties to assess service array through the county self assessment updates that are completed prior to the onsite MnCFSR.	L. Wojciak	Report county self-assessment findings for the counties reviewed each quarter.	Q1-Q8		
<b>E1.1.b</b> Assess service array through stakeholder interviews and/or by administering stakeholder surveys.	L. Wojciak	Report feedback from stakeholder interviews/surveys regarding service array for the counties reviewed each quarter.	Q1-Q8		

<b>E1.1.c.</b> Assess adequacy of service array as part of case reviews for foster care and in-home service cases.	L. Wojciak	Report case review findings for service array for the counties reviewed each quarter.	Q1-Q8		
<b>E1.1.d.</b> Assist counties to develop and implement a program improvement plan for service array when it is determined an area needing improvement through the MnCF SR.	L. Wojciak	Report counties reviewed that are required to write a PIP to improve service array. Submit PIP's developed by counties.	Q1-Q8		
<b>E1.1.e.</b> Communicate findings of service array assessment and lessons learned on successful efforts to improve service array to county agency directors and supervisors.	L. Wojciak	Submit record of communication provided to county agency directors and supervisors.	Q6		
<b><i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i></b>					

**Part B: National Standards Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report**

<b>Safety Outcome 1: Absence of Recurrence of Maltreatment</b>												
National Standard	94.6%											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	95.3% FFY 2005b/2006a											
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	95.3% 2005b/2006a											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	Met the national standard at the time of the CFSR Statewide Assessment and Final Report											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	Not applicable											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Safety Outcome 1: Absence of Maltreatment of Children in Foster Care</b>												
National Standard	99.68%											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	99.63% FFY2005b/2006a											
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	99.61%, FFY 2006ab											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	99.71% - met as of FFY 2008ab profile with a score of 99.71%											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	Not applicable											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Permanency Outcome 1: Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification</b>													
National Standard	122.6												
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	116.0 FFY 2005b/2006a												
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	115.8 FFY2008AB												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	119.2												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	

<b>Permanency Outcome 1: Timeliness of Adoptions</b>													
National Standard	106.4												
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	98.8 FFY 2005b/2006a												
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	96.3 FFY2007AB												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	99.9 – met as of the 2008ab profile with a score of 100.2												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	

<b>Permanency Outcome 1: Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care for Long Periods of Time</b>													
National Standard	121.7												
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	106.2 FFY 2005b/2006a												
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	106.2 FFY 2005b/2006a												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	109.2 – met as of the 2008ab profile with a score of 110.4												

Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
<b>Permanency Outcome 1: Placement Stability</b>												
National Standard	101.5											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	83.2 FFY 2005b/2006a											
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	83.2 FFY 2005b/2006a											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	85.7 – met as of the 2006ab profile with a score of 91.7											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

**Part C: Item-Specific and Quantitative Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report**

<b>Safety Outcome 1: Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect</b>												
<b>Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations/assessments of child maltreatment reports</b>												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	58%											
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	63%											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	68.8%											
Method of Measuring Improvement	MnCF SR											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.</b>												
<b>Item 3: Services to family to protect children in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care</b>												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	76%											
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	89%											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	92.3%											
Method of Measuring Improvement	MnCF SR											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.</b>												
<b>Item 4: Risk assessment and safety management</b>												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	63%											
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	73%											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	77.2%											
Method of Measuring Improvement	MnCF SR											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

<b>Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.</b>												
<b>Item 7: Permanency goal for child</b>												
Performance as Measured in Final Report	74%											

Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	81%											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	85.5%											
Method of Measuring Improvement	MnCF SR											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

**Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs.  
Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents**

Performance as Measured in Final Report	48%											
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	59%											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	63.6%											
Method of Measuring Improvement	MnCF SR											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

**Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs.  
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning**

Performance as Measured in Final Report	48%											
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	45%											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	49.6%											
Method of Measuring Improvement	MnCF SR											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

quarter.)														
-----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs.</b>													
<b>Item 19: Caseworker visits with child</b>													
Performance as Measured in Final Report	78%												
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	71%												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	75.2%												
Method of Measuring Improvement	MnCF SR												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	

<b>Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs.</b>													
<b>Item 20: Caseworker visits with parents</b>													
Performance as Measured in Final Report	45%												
Performance as Measured in Baseline/Source Data Period	64%												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	68.7%												
Method of Measuring Improvement	MnCF SR												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	