



OREGON

Child and Families Services Review

FINAL REPORT
August 2001

**U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
Seattle Regional Office**



Department of Health and Human Services *Administration for Children and Families*
Seattle Regional Office

Telephone: (206)-615-2547 FAX: (206)-615-2574
E-Mail: ACF-Seattle@ACF.DHHS.GOV

2201 Sixth Avenue, Suite 600
Seattle, WA 98121-1827

Bobby Mink
Director
Oregon Department of Human Services
500 Summer St. NE E15
Salem, OR 97301-1097

August 3, 2001

Dear Mr. Mink:

The Administration for Children and Families in collaboration with the Oregon Services to Children and Families (SCF) recently completed a review of Oregon Child and Family Services (CFS) program to determine substantial conformity with the State plan requirements found in titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act. This review was initiated in December, 2000 with an assessment by SCF of areas seen as critical to the effective functioning of the State's child welfare system and an analysis of data related to the safety, permanency, and well-being of children served by SCF. During the week of June 4, 2001, an on-site review was completed. 50 cases were reviewed, and interviews and focus groups were conducted with approximately 130 key stakeholders. The final report on this CFS Review is enclosed.

We appreciate the amount of time and effort that your staff committed to the planning and implementation of the CFS Review. We wish to commend Ramona Foley, SCF Administrator, for her leadership throughout the entire review process. Her commitment to utilizing this process to improve outcomes for children and families was a major factor in the success of Oregon's review. We also wish to recognize the contributions of our state partners, especially Shelley Jones, Mickey Serice and Cheri Emahiser. Their hard work throughout a very complex process was invaluable.

The State can take pride in the strength of its child welfare system. We have determined that SCF is operating in substantial conformity in one outcome area and five systemic areas that comprise the CFS reviews. Also, as indicated in the report, we have identified six outcome areas and two systemic factors that are not in substantial conformity. As you know, under the regulations, financial penalties associated with these findings are held in abeyance pending successful completion of a Program Improvement Plan (PIP). The PIP process is detailed in our regulations at 45 CFR 1355.35. We estimate Oregon's maximum potential penalty liability to be approximately \$620,000.

The regional office is ready to assist you in developing a PIP. We will work with your staff to jointly establish the timeframes and evaluation process applicable to the PIP.

We wish to remind you that the Federal regulations, at 45 CFR 1355.37, require that the State make available for public review and inspection all statewide assessments, reports of findings, and PIPs developed as a result of a CFS review. The Administration for Children and Families is obliged to respond to inquiries regarding such information as well.

Page 2 – Bobby Mink

In accordance with our regulations, at 45 CFR 1355.32(b)(2), we plan to conduct the next full CFS review two years from approval of the Program Improvement Plan.

John Henderson will be in contact with your staff regarding the development of the PIP and to assist in identifying federal and other resources available to address your needs. Please be assured that we will continue to work collaboratively to assist you in your efforts to ensure the safety, permanency and well-being of children and families in Oregon

Sincerely,

/s/

Stephen Henigson
Regional Administrator

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Key Findings For Systemic Factors	3
Key Findings For Safety, Permanency And Well-Being Outcomes	7
Summary Of Findings.....	12
Part 1: Performance Outcomes On Safety, Permanency And Well-Being.....	12
I. Safety	12
II. Permanency	20
III. Child And Family Well-Being	36
Part 2: Seven Systemic Factors	46
1. Statewide Information System	46
2. Case Review System	48
3. Quality Assurance System.....	53
4. Training.....	56
5. Service Array.....	60
6. Agency Responsiveness To The Community	64
7. Foster And Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, And Retention	68
Appendix A Summary of Findings Chart.....	73
Appendix B Oregon Review - Penalty Calculation Estimate.....	74
Appendix C Acronyms	75
Appendix D Oregon Child And Family Services Review Team	76

Introduction

A review of the State of Oregon child and family services programs was completed pursuant to section 1123A of the Social Security Act and 45 CFR 1355.31 through 1355.37. These sections charge the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) with the review of such programs. The purpose of the reviews is to determine substantial conformity with State plan requirements and other program requirements under titles IV-B and IV-E of the Act.

The reviews cover the range of child and family services funded through titles IV-B and IV-E, including child protective services, foster care, adoption, independent living, and family support and preservation services. The review process evaluates seven specific safety, permanency and well-being outcomes of services delivered to children and families. In addition to reviewing for case outcomes, the review process also examines seven systemic factors that affect the State's capacity to deliver services in a manner that promotes positive outcomes for children and families.

The review process features two major phases. The first phase consists of the development of a State Profile, derived from data for FFY 1999 contained in the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) and for CY 1999 from the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS). This data profile provides information on the key indicators relating to safety and permanency for children entering the child welfare system. States develop their Statewide Assessment using this data and other sources of information. The assessment analyzes the process, procedures and policies of the State's child protective services, and foster care and adoption programs. This assessment also focuses on the systemic factors that are in place, which enable the State to carry out the process, procedures and policies of the program.

The second phase is the Onsite Review that includes intensive reviews of a sample of cases and interviews with state and local stakeholders in the provider and service delivery community. Information from both phases of the review is used to determine the State's substantial conformity with the requirements under review.

In reviewing for outcomes and systemic factors, the review process is designed to identify both the strengths and areas needing improvement in the State's programs. For those areas in which the State is determined not to be operating in substantial conformity with the requirements under review, the State has the opportunity to implement a Program Improvement Plan (PIP) designed to correct the areas of nonconformity. According to 45 CFR 1355.34(b)(3) for the first state CFS review, each outcome must be substantially achieved in 90 percent of the cases examined during the Onsite Review in order to be determined in substantial conformity. Although the State is advised of applicable penalties associated with the degree of nonconformity, the

penalties are not assessed until the State has had an opportunity to correct the area of nonconformity through the Program Improvement Plan.

The period under review for the Child and Family Service Onsite Review in Oregon was from April 1, 2000 to June 8, 2001. The review process consisted of the following activities:

- The State completed the Statewide Assessment in April 2001 in consultation with the ACF Regional Office.
- The State and the ACF Regional Office selected three locations in the State for the Onsite Review: Lincoln, Multnomah, and Umatilla counties. The Onsite Review was conducted during the week of June 4-8, 2001.
- A State and Federal review team of 51 persons reviewed a total of 50 cases. Review teams at each site consisted of a site leader from the Federal staff, a co-site leader from the State staff, and two-person State/Federal case review teams. These teams reviewed and rated the services provided these children and families in relationship to safety, permanency and well-being. This was done by conducting a review of the case records, and interviewing those involved with the case such as parents, caseworkers, foster parents, service providers, and when appropriate, the children themselves.
- The teams also conducted interviews and focus groups with approximately 130 State and local stakeholders, including foster parents, managers, caseworkers and supervisors, citizen review boards, judges, and other community partners.

The results of the Statewide Assessment, the Onsite Case Review and the Stakeholder Interviews were compiled and used to make a determination about the State's substantial conformity with regard to each of the seven outcomes and each of the seven systemic factors.

This report summarizes the information obtained from the review pertaining to each outcome and systemic factor, and the performance indicators used to evaluate them. The ACF Regional Office will be working with Oregon Services to Children and Families (SCF) to develop a Program Improvement Plan that addresses those areas not in substantial conformity.

Key Findings for Systemic Factors

Each of the seven systemic factors was rated on a scale from "1" to "4" on the basis of review information on state performance on multiple state plan and program requirements associated with that particular systemic factor. If all the requirements for a systemic factor were met, the systemic factor was rated a "4". If all except one requirement was met, the systemic factor was rated a "3". A rating of "3" or "4" resulted in a determination that the State was in substantial conformity on that factor.

If some of the requirements for a systemic factor were in place but more than one (or, in the case of the information system systemic factor, one) were rated as an area needing improvement, the systemic factor was rated a "2" and resulted in a determination that the State was not in substantial conformity on that factor.

1. Statewide Information System

This Systemic Factor was rated "3" and is in substantial conformity.

Oregon has a sophisticated data system (FACIS) which can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of children in foster care. The system is able to provide helpful case information to caseworkers and supervisors and is beginning to be used to provide outcome-based reports to the community and SCF managers. FACIS could be better utilized to provide managers and supervisors with sufficient reports on field practice. Currently use is limited by significant data accuracy, completeness and consistency problems and the lack of a culture that values data and uses the system.

2. Case Review System

This Systemic Factor was rated "2" and is not in substantial conformity.

In many cases the use of Family Decision Meetings (FDMs) and strength/needs-based planning engaged families in the case planning process and resulted in individualized plans. However, some cases did not have current plans and/or did not have meaningful plans. This was particularly true in cases in which System of Care/FDM practices were not used and in cases of children in longterm foster care or residential treatment. As a result, case planning was identified as an area needing improvement.

Timely periodic reviews held by the Citizen Review Board (CRB) were rated an area of strength. Both internal and external stakeholders were familiar with ASFA timeframes and noted that court hearings were resulting in more movement towards permanency. At the same time, they noted a lack of clarity and purpose in the conduct of

permanency hearings and expressed serious concerns about some permanency decisions made. Permanency hearings were rated an area needing improvement.

A process is in place and utilized for meeting the ASFA TPR requirements. This item was rated a strength.

Foster parents are receiving regular notice of their opportunity to be heard in reviews and hearings. A significant number are attending and are being heard. This item was rated a strength.

3. Quality Assurance

This Systemic Factor was rated "4" and is in substantial conformity.

SCF has a formal quality assurance process used to regularly review each branch. This process is inclusive and results in comprehensive findings used for program improvement. Stakeholders expressed serious concern that this process might be discontinued in the new biennium. Continued attention must be given to ensure that the State has a consistent outcomes-based quality assurance process.

4. Training

This Systemic Factor was rated a "2" and is not in substantial conformity.

SCF has a strong program to provide training through the Portland State Child Welfare Partnership and has good core training. However, most staff are not receiving the initial in-service training prior to carrying cases, and many staff do not participate in ongoing training. Consequently, these items were rated as an area needing improvement.

Foster parent training was rated as a strength. Most foster parents felt their training met their needs. Foster parents did note a need for childcare to participate in training and suggested computer based training that could be completed at home.

5. Service Array

This Systemic Factor was rated a "3" and is in substantial conformity.

A wide array of services is available for families and children in Oregon. Safety nets provide early preventive services and SCF provides formal and informal services to families served by SCF. However, the review team noted service needs of several

types. Services to teens are lacking, residential treatment resources were in short supply, and the independent living program needed improvement. Stakeholders also noted a lack of foster homes and therapeutic foster homes in two of the sites reviewed. This was rated as an area needing improvement.

Service accessibility and individualization of services, however, were noted strengths. While service provision is challenging in rural areas, System of Care flexible funds and Title IV-E waiver funds are used to meet individual needs.

6. Agency Responsiveness to the Community

This Systemic Factor was rated "4" and is in substantial conformity.

Stakeholders indicated SCF Central Administration is responsive and that SCF shares information with community partners and actively seeks input. Tribal stakeholders noted positive examples of agency responsiveness to their concerns.

7. Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment and Retention

This Systemic Factor was rated "4" and is in substantial conformity.

SCF has implemented new certification standards emphasizing health and safety. These standards are applied to all homes caring for children. SCF obtains criminal background checks as required by federal law.

SCF diligently recruits foster and adoptive parents that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in SCF care. SCF in one site has a successful practice recruiting through churches and in another site is developing a neighborhood based foster care program.

SCF utilizes strategies to maximize access to cross-jurisdictional resources and is recognized as a leader in making out-of-state placements.

Key Findings for Safety, Permanency and Well-being Outcomes

In order for a state to be determined to be in substantial conformity on any given outcome, the outcome must be substantially achieved in 90% of the cases reviewed in the State's first CFSR. In addition, the State must meet the national standard for the statewide aggregate data indicators related to that particular outcome.

I. SAFETY OUTCOMES

1. Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

This Outcome is not in substantial conformity.

- 86% of the cases reviewed substantially achieved Safety Outcome 1.
- The statewide data indicator for repeat maltreatment is at 6.81% and does not meet the national standard of 6.1%
- The statewide data indicator for maltreatment of children in foster care is at .796% and does not meet the national standard of .57%

Emergent high-risk reports of abuse and neglect were responded to promptly and investigated within agency requirements. Staff demonstrated persistent and effective efforts to contact families. Overall, in two thirds of the cases in which reports were received during the review period, investigations met the required state timeframes. In the remaining one third of the applicable cases reviewed, caseworkers did not have face to face contact within required timeframes due to delays in assignment or worker response.

Stakeholders and reviewers noted concerns about consistency related to screening decisions, response time designations, application of threat of harm, and investigative/assessment disposition.

In terms of the repeat maltreatment measure, both the State data indicator and cases reviewed demonstrated that State performance is close to meeting the national standard.

2. Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

This Outcome is not in substantial conformity.

- 80.4% of the applicable cases reviewed substantially achieved Safety Outcome II.

Services to families in-home are both a focus and strength in SCF. Family Support Teams typically produced exceptional case assessment, management and service delivery. Family Decision Meetings were for the most part associated with comprehensive and risk-related/strength-based case plans and services. Cases reflected a broad array of agency and community based services. Local office discretionary funding and special projects provide strength based and family focused resources. However, available family focused resources and services were not consistently applied to all cases.

In some cases, services were not matched to risk, and re-assessment of risk factors was absent at critical decision-making junctures such as reunification or case closure. Stakeholders expressed concern regarding services and monitoring available post-reunification and inappropriate delegation of some aspects of child safety to community partners.

II. PERMANENCY OUTCOMES

1. Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

This Outcome is not in substantial conformity.

- 85.7% of the applicable cases reviewed substantially achieved Permanency Outcome I.
- The statewide indicator for foster care re-entries is at 20.41% and does not meet the national standard of 8.6%.
- The statewide indicator for length of time to achieve reunification is at 79.06% and meets the national standard of 76.2%.
- The statewide indicator for length of time to achieve adoption is at 24.22% and does not meet the national standard of 32%.
- The statewide indicator for stability of foster care placements is at 83.65% and does not meet the national standard of 86.7%.

Foster care re-entry rates raised data discrepancy issues that the State elected not to resolve prior to completing this report. Although the State data profile reported a 20.41% re-entry rate, there were no re-entry cases identified during the review period. Data integrity and/or MIS/SACWIS program logic will require exploration to determine possible explanations of the discrepancy. This will be a PIP expectation.

Stability of foster care placements was a noted strength. Relative resources, neighborhood foster care projects and support to foster parents contributed to this result which is close to meeting the national standard.

Relative and foster-adopt placements are substantial resources for adoption and often enabled preservation of family and community connections. Stakeholders observe that establishment and implementation of permanency plans is moving much more rapidly, and attribute this to the State's implementation of the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA). However, crowded court calendars delays in setting termination trials and court continuances were concerns expressed across the three sites.

Oregon continues to face challenges in achieving timely appropriate permanency plans. Concurrent planning tends to be a sequential rather than parallel process. Stakeholders attributed some delays to a lack of Attorney General involvement prior to termination of parental rights (TPR) resulting in technical oversights and legal insufficiency. Stakeholders and the review team also noted a lack of urgency post-TPR to complete the adoptive process.

A significant number of children have permanency plans other than reunification or adoption. Some children with serious behavioral/mental health problems were considered unadoptable and subsequently efforts were not made to identify adoption resources.

The perceived or real disparity between foster care maintenance reimbursement and adoption subsidy was cited as another cause for delay and sometimes resulted in an alternate permanent plan of longterm foster care being established in lieu of adoption.

2. The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

This Outcome is in substantial conformity.

- 94.3% of the applicable cases reviewed substantially achieved Permanency Outcome II.

Proximity of foster care placements to the child's family was a substantial and consistent strength. Placement and visits with siblings, visits between parents and their children and preserving connections were also strengths. Family decision meetings and System of Care resources supported positive outcomes as did major initiatives such as Family to Family and Neighborhood Foster Care. In relevant cases, there was good practice and effort related to working with tribes and meeting Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) requirements.

Both SCF staff and foster parents focus on and contribute to maintaining the parent-child relationship. Relatives and extended family often play a role as well. Open adoptions that often have utilized mediation in the process further support this practice.

III. CHILD AND FAMILY WELL-BEING OUTCOMES

1. Families Have Enhanced Capacity To Provide For Their Children's Needs.

This Outcome is not in substantial conformity.

- 76% of the cases reviewed substantially achieved Well-being Outcome 1.

Oregon uses strengths/needs based practice, family decision meetings, and flexible funds successfully to meet the needs of children and their families. However, Oregon continues to face challenges in serving families that are not motivated to engage in services and in serving older youth. Meeting the needs of children and families was identified as an area needing improvement.

Including families in case planning is standard practice in Oregon. In almost all cases families and children (where appropriate) were involved in case planning.

Oregon has made frequent contact with children and families a priority in a new policy effective January 15, 2001. As a result foster parents and some families noted positively a marked increase in the numbers of worker/child visits in the last few months. However, over one third of the applicable cases did not have sufficient visits between workers and children and one fourth did not have adequate visits between workers and parents. Consequently, visitation between the agency and child/parent was identified as an area needing improvement.

2. Children Receive Appropriate Services To Meet Their Educational Needs.

This Outcome is not in substantial conformity.

- 82.1% of the cases reviewed substantially achieved Well-being Outcome 2.

While foster parents and some social workers successfully advocated to obtain services to ensure children's educational needs were met, some children's educational needs were not met. SCF needs to more consistently address identified educational needs either by follow-up, referral, advocacy or services.

3. Children Receive Adequate Services To Meet Their Physical and Mental Health Needs.

This Outcome is not in substantial conformity.

- 83% of the cases reviewed substantially achieved Well-being Outcome 3.

In most of the cases reviewed children had health care screenings and assessments and their physical health needs were met. Access in some cases was difficult, especially for dental care, but foster parents persisted in securing the needed services.

Most cases had mental health screenings and mental health assessments. However, this item was rated as needing improvement because some of the children for whom treatment needs were identified did not receive the services they needed.

Summary of Findings

Part 1: Performance Outcomes on Safety, Permanency and Well-being

I. SAFETY

Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.					
Number of cases reviewed by the team according to degree of outcome achievement:					
	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	22	11	10	43	86%
Partially Achieved	0	1	2	3	6%
Not Achieved or Addressed	4	0	0	4	8%
Not Applicable:	0	0	0	0	0
Conformity of Statewide data indicators with national standards:					
	National Standard	State's Percentage	Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
Repeat maltreatment	6.1%	6.81%		X	
Maltreatment of children in foster care	.57%	.796%		X	

Status of Outcome S-1: Not in Substantial Conformity. Of the applicable cases reviewed, 86% substantially achieved Safety Outcome 1, less than the required 90%. Neither of the statewide indicators for repeat maltreatment or maltreatment of children in foster care met national standards.

Item 1. Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment

___ Strength **X** Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:**State Assessment**

Reports are "screened" to determine whether a face-to-face contact will occur and then the information is recorded in the data system. Based on the reported information, if SCF believes that children are safe, these reports are entered and closed at screening. Some of these reports are referred to community partners for service. Reports that place a child at a high risk of harm as defined by agency policy IB2.2 require an immediate plan for intervention and safety. Non-emergency reports require a face to face contact within 7 days. Assessments are to be completed within 30 days. Concern has been expressed by stakeholders that some decisions appear to be made regarding child safety (primarily at screening) without a face-to-face contact with the child and family, that assessment is sometimes delayed or incomplete, or that there are too many referrals prior to a family receiving services. SCF is concerned about the quality of the front-end process for screening and length of time to complete assessments and would like improve the specificity of the criteria and increase the number of reports that are assessed within 24 hours.

In some communities in Oregon, law enforcement agencies respond to referrals involving child maltreatment after normal work hours and on weekends. It is a practice which sometimes results in a short term removal of a child from the home until trained protective service staff can conduct the assessment regarding child safety and well-being.

SCF notes an increase in CA/N reports over the last three years in conjunction with an increasing proportion of reports being screened-out. The increase in screen-outs is in part attributed to "triage" at intake used to effect workload management in the face of increasing reports and unchanged staffing levels. The issue of workload may well be having an effect on timelines of initiating investigations.

Onsite**Strengths:**

- For 21 applicable cases, 14 were rated "strength".
- In the majority of cases where timelines were met, emergent cases typically received a same day response while non-emergent assessments were initiated within 3 days.
- Staff at times demonstrated persistent and effective efforts in contacting less than readily available clients.
- Response to reports of threat-of-harm is viewed by some stakeholders as a strength although some inconsistency in application of screening/assignment decisions was noted as well.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 7 out of 21 applicable cases did not meet investigative timelines.
- Extending the screening process and delaying assignment was a problem identified by stakeholders and consistent with some case findings. Workload and vacant positions were associated with a delayed intake/assignment process.
- In some instances new information that may have constituted a new report of maltreatment was noted in the record by the assigned worker but not officially input as a new CA/N report and thus was not subject to the usual intake, screening and assessment protocols. Similarly, records review of both in-home and foster care cases raised concern that some reports from law enforcement were not officially recorded as reports. At times those enforcement reports were slow in being sent to SCF. These issues were raised by stakeholders or evident through case review across the three sites.
- Documentation of response time/date assigned and face to face contact was at times less than adequate.
- Some written reports/information received through intake was not date stamped and it was not clear when the information had been made available to SCF.
- Some stakeholders expressed concern regarding the “triaging” of cases at intake and perceive only the more serious cases screen-in. There were some noted differences between offices regarding screening criteria and response time designation.
- Stakeholders and reviewers noted general concerns regarding consistency between offices in intake and screening response time designations, and investigative/assessment disposition.
- Stakeholders expressed some concern that while threat-of-harm is viewed positively by the community in terms of proactive intervention, the potential workload threatens the agency's capacity and quality of existing services.
- Stakeholders observe that CA/N reports regarding teens are not well served and often are not assigned for assessment.
- Some tribal stakeholders reported that they felt the intake screen was higher for native children and families in terms of imminent risk and some reports as a result did not receive an assessment or placement.

Item 2. Repeat maltreatment

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS: **State Assessment**

This data element is an indicator of the percentage of all the children in Oregon who were victims of substantiated or indicated child abuse and or neglect during the first six months following the substantiation of the initial abuse or neglect. In the 1999 data set, 428 of the recorded 6,295 child abuse victims experienced a recurrence of maltreatment. This is 6.80 % of the total child abuse victim population. This figure exceeds the national standard set at 6.1%. The total number of children who suffered a recurrence of maltreatment included children in their own homes who had not been placed in foster care.

Statewide aggregate data indicates 89 out of 11,186 children (.796%) were subject to maltreatment while in foster care. This rate exceeds the national standard (.57%) and therefore does not conform to the national standard. The state is concerned regarding this data indicator and raises questions related to the state's policy of "threat of harm" possibly skewing data. Possible inflation of data from "threat of harm" does not however seem to entirely explain the difference between state and national performance.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Of 50 applicable cases, 46 were rated "strength".
- There were no case reviews noting maltreatment in foster care.
- The rate of repeat maltreatment appears to be a decreasing trend over the last few years.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 4 out of 50 cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- This 8% repeat maltreatment rate is close to the State data of 6.8%, for which program improvement is required.
- In some instances, case reviews found that new allegations of CA/N on open cases were treated simply as information noted in the record and were not processed as a new intake subject to screening, risk assessment, assignment and investigative timelines. This raises some safety concerns for those cases and may result in under-reporting of maltreatment.
- Although the relatively few cases needing improvement did not establish a substantial pattern, it appears that when considering these cases and others outside the review period, that most recurrence occurred within the context of neglect cases in which there had been no out-of-home placement. Not infrequently the recurrence arose post-case closure. These recurring cases tended to begin with low to moderate risk and escalate in severity over time. Some cases demonstrated a substantial and escalating prior history.

Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.					
Number of cases reviewed by the team according to degree of outcome achievement:					
	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	19	9	9	37	80.4%
Partially Achieved:	2	1	2	5	10.9%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	3	1	0	4	10.8%
Not Applicable:	2	1	1	4	

Status of Outcome S2-Not in Substantial Conformity: Of the applicable cases reviewed, 80.4% substantially achieved Safety Outcome 2, which is less than the required 90%.

Item 3. Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal

 X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

The System of Care initiative and IV-E waiver project as well as the Community Safety Net program provide a variety of innovative and flexible services to children in home and to prevent removal. Services are provided through SCF and through use of community partners.

Community Safety Net programs are now available to all Oregon communities. SCF may refer low risk reports to the Safety Net program from screening, or following assessment and disposition (some may be founded). The Safety Net program connects families to existing systems throughout Oregon, providing outreach and community service.

Domestic Violence referrals which may be included in the founded reports of threat of harm may receive services from programs other than SCF such as domestic violence treatment /outreach programs and community health nurse services.

More and more Family Decision Meetings (FDMs) are being held with families where the child is not removed from the home. Through this process SCF staff and families work together to meet the child's safety and well-being needs, while maintaining the child in their own home and preventing removal.

Improved or additional prevention services, placement resources, visitation services, alcohol and drug treatment, domestic violence support and batter's treatment are needed in some areas. See also Section VIII Service Array.

Over the past few years Oregon notes the increasing complexity of cases reported which tend to involve several areas of risk factors. This trend is accompanied by a slight increase in cases assigned and a growing percentage of cases screened-out. Triaging cases for assignment as a workload management method for local offices is also noted as a likely outcome of increasing workload and relatively unchanged staffing resources.

Maintaining children in their own homes is supported through a variety of services, practice and collaborations with community partners. System of Care, Family Decision Meetings, Family Support Teams and locally designed IV-E Waiver projects enable efforts to maintain and reunify families.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Of 20 applicable cases, 15 were rated "strength".
- Involvement of the Family Support Team typically produced exceptional case assessment, management and service delivery.
- Cases utilizing Family Decision Meetings were for the most part associated with comprehensive and risk-related/strength based case plans and services. Families in these situations tended to be open to and co-operative with services.
- Generally speaking, there appears to be a broad and flexible array of services available to children and families either through community-based services or SCF resources including several discretionary funds at the local level. Resources through SOC and IV-E waiver projects are evident and useful.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 5 out of 20 cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- In some cases in each of the branches, services arranged did not address pertinent risk factors. At times both drug/alcohol abuse and domestic violence concerns were not addressed through specific services.
- There was little documentation in records regarding reassessment of risk while services were being provided or at case closure. Similarly, stakeholder interviews and case reviews noted that some families appeared to receive services without resulting in real change and that the risk did not appear to be reassessed nor was a change in parent behavior or skill evaluated.
- Stakeholders express concern about the adequacy of safety plans in reunification cases and the availability of services and supports after reunification. This is particularly noted when a child with high needs return to parents with minimally adequate parenting skills and resources. Stakeholders perceive that re-entry tends to be characterized by children 10 years and older with very difficult behaviors and insufficient support to the home.
- Stakeholders expressed concern that some aspects of a child's safety were inappropriately delegated to community partners and that SCF should clearly retain primary responsibility for follow-up to ensure a child's safety.

Item 4. Risk of harm to child

____ Strength **X** Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:**State Assessment**

From 1997 through 1999 CA/N reports made to the agency increased 23.8 yet the number opened for assessment remained relatively the same. The number of cases that were closed at screening increased 54.6% from 1997 (10,988) to 1999 (16,989). The SA indicates that SCF efforts to manage increasing CA/N referral workload may be resulting in a screening triage and an increasing proportion of referrals screened out.

Oregon's abuse law lists physical abuse, sexual abuse and exploitation, neglect, mental injury, child selling, and threat of harm as child abuse. The distribution of founded reports for 1999 shows that most categories of abuse declined. However, 54.7% of reports were coded threat of harm. Threat of harm is defined in ORS 419B.005 as "subjecting a child to a substantial risk of harm to the child's health or welfare."

Threat of harm has been interpreted differently across the state. Confusion over threat of harm cases may be resulting in an inappropriately high number of founded cases, some of which may not be opened for service. Some of this is confusion over how to treat children in families with domestic violence. Staff are asking for more definitions and training on dispositional decisions and coding reports, including threat of harm situations. Oregon is revising its policies and procedures concerning dispositional decisions and anticipates that the number of cases coded threat of harm will be reduced as a result.

At initial screening, Oregon considers a number of factors to determine if a case will be assigned for investigation. The category "threat of harm" has proved challenging in terms of consistent definition and application of decision-making at intake across the state. Currently a substantial project is underway to study and clarify this issue. There is a variety of community based and SCF supported programs and services directed towards families wherein concerns with respect to potential CA/N exist but don't meet the threshold for SCF intervention.

Onsite**Strengths:**

- Of 45 applicable cases, 36 were rated "strength".
- In a number of cases, SCF staff made excellent use of relative/extended family resources to provide additional support, respite, monitoring and placement.
- Many cases demonstrated excellent assessments, match of services, monitoring and very positive outcomes.

- In-home services included very effective use of self-enhancement and basic needs type services in addition to the more conventional counseling/parenting services.
- In-home case families often enjoyed a very positive working relations between the SCF worker and family members.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 9 out of 45 cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- Some cases did not include interviews with child victims or other siblings in the home who would have been considered at risk.
- For older adolescent youth, service plans did not continue to address or attempt to maintain involvement with the youth’s family. Risk to the youth was generally not re-assessed.
- Stakeholders believe some families superficially comply with requirements in order to see their children returned but there is little substantive change, intergenerational issues are not resolved and children re-enter the system. Underlying issues are not addressed or change assessed.
- Stakeholders believe both policy and practice needs improvement in assessing, designing and implementing safety plans, assessing parents capacity to follow the plan and make changes. A change-based approach is needed in working with families and to determine when a case would be appropriately closed. These same observations were found through the case reviews.
- In some cases there were shortcomings related to matching assessed or evident risk with appropriate services particularly when substance abuse and domestic violence were occurring within the same family. These cases tended to not have subsequent re-assessment of risk or a determination of parental change resulting from treatment intervention. These cases co-exist in the same office or unit with cases demonstrating excellent practice and suggest that newer staff or staff turnover may be impacting quality of assessment and case management.
- Some stakeholders express concern that safety in foster homes may be effected by type and number of children placed in a given home even when placements are within the licensed capacity.

II. PERMANENCY

Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.
Number of cases reviewed by the team according to degree of outcome achievement:

	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	16	8	6	30	85.7%
Partially Achieved:	1	1	1	3	8.6%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	0	1	2	5.7%
Not Applicable:	8	3	4	15	
Conformity of Statewide data indicators with national standards:					
	National Standard	State's Percentage	Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	
Foster care re-entries	8.6%	20.41%		X	
Length of time to achieve reunification	76.2%	79.06%	X		
Length of time to achieve adoption	32%	24.22%		X	
Stability of foster care placements	86.7%	83.65%		X	
Length of stay in foster care*					

*Not used to determine substantial conformity.

Status of Permanency Outcome P-I: Not in substantial conformity. Of the cases reviewed, 85.7% substantially achieved the required outcome. Statewide data indicators for foster care re-entry, length of time to achieve adoption, and stability of foster care placements did not meet national standards while length of time to achieve reunification met the national standard.

Item 5. Foster Care re-entries

____ Strength **X** Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:
State Assessment

Statewide aggregate data indicates that for FY1999 20.41% of children in foster care had multiple entries within the previous 12 months. The Oregon re-entry rate of 20.41% significantly exceeds the national standard of 8.6%.

The relevance of certain programmatic resources such as System of Care, Safety Net, and other family based services should be considered in light of service needs associated with foster care re-entry.

SCF efforts to evaluate its assessment process for determining whether it is safe for a child to remain home and to determine when it is appropriate to return home will impact both initial placement and reunification practices.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Of 35 foster care cases reviewed, none experienced foster care re-entry within the review period.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Data integrity or MIS/SACWIS program logic needs exploration to develop and provide reliable information to management and the field in order to assess current performance and future PIP progress.
- While cases were rated only for the period under review, each site noted re-entry outside the period of review. As a result of the sampling method it appears likely that re-entry was not “experienced” during the period of review by relatively short-term cases or those longer-term cases wherein permanency had for the most part been established or the current placement was the intended permanent plan.
- Review team members and stakeholders noted that some decisions to reunify were not based on substantial change in parenting capacity and noted such cases had a high potential for re-entry.
- Review team members noted some reunification cases that were closed shortly after return home without ongoing services or follow-up, a situation that could result in later re-entry.

Item 6. Stability of foster care placement

 X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Statewide aggregate data indicates that 83.65% of children in foster care during the previous 12 months had two or fewer placements, which is less than the national standard of 86.7% for this indicator.

The State Assessment (SA) indicates that possible reasons for multiple placements are Oregon's practice of viewing initial placements as short-term and second, unplanned disruptions due to the foster parents' inability to care for a child. Oregon is in the process of gathering more information on placement disruptions; information from this evaluation will be available in the summer of 2001.

Oregon is below the national standard in this element and attributes possible reasons for multiple placements as related to the not uncommon practice of short-term "receiving care" which often requires a second placement if the child is not returned home in a very short period of time. Additionally, potential mismatches between a foster home's ability and resources to provide special care for the sometimes very difficult and challenging children entering foster care contribute to placement changes.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Of 35 applicable cases, 30 cases were rated "strength".
- This item demonstrates considerable strength and is in close proximity to meeting the national standard. This is reflected in the many cases demonstrating placement stability often over the entire placement period.
- Utilization of relative resources is a substantial contributor to both capacity and stability. SCF staff seeks out and identifies suitable relative placements.
- Often both relative and non-relative foster families demonstrated very strong commitments to the children in their care with many developing into permanent resources when reunification was not appropriate.
- Neighborhood foster care projects were viewed as a positive initiative with considerable potential.
- In one review site, family foster care capacity is adequate and enables opportunities to thoughtfully match children with the most appropriate foster home.
- In a number of cases support services provided to the foster parent supported placement stability.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 5 out of 35 cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- This 85.72% rate of placement stability, like the State data rate of 83.65%, is close to, but does not meet, the national standard of 86.7% and program improvement will be required.

- Those cases showing the most placement volatility were characteristically older adolescent youth whose placement histories would include repeated shelter placements, numerous and short-lived foster care placements including specialized foster homes, and intermittent placements with relatives or family. Those histories were interspersed with episodic and repeated runaways.
- Some placement disruptions were attributed to children with very challenging behavioral problems being placed in foster homes without the experience or expertise necessary to safely care for the child. At times, these caretakers did not feel they had adequate support from SCF to assist them with additional services or support
- The practice/policy of placing all infants in special medical foster care may be unnecessarily contributing to multiple placements.

Item 7. Permanency goal for child

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Oregon has had difficulty maintaining accurate permanency plan goals in the information system and completed a massive clean-up in late 2000. Thus data on this item must be viewed with caution.

According to the data, the percentage of children with reunification as their permanency goal fell from 70% in 1998 to 54.8% in 1999. This is attributed to Oregon's 1997 "Best Interest of the Child" legislation which included provisions similar to those of ASFA limiting the length of time for reunification. Concern is expressed in the SA that the shift to adoption and long-term foster care goals, may be attributed to the changes in SB 689 but also may reflect a dearth of appropriate, available and culturally responsive services for families that could assist them in achieving the goal of reunification.

The median length of time to reunification was 3 months in 1999. 79% of children reunited with their parents were reunited in less than 12 months from the latest removal from the home, exceeding the national standard of 76.2%. (The possible relationship between Oregon's short median length of time to reunification and Oregon's rates of re-entry are explored in Item 5 above.).

The median length of stay in foster care in Oregon is 16.36 months due to Oregon's efforts both to reunite families quickly and to efforts to implement other permanency plans for children. During the past few years Oregon particularly emphasized permanent plans for children who would not be returning home, especially adoption. Oregon has had a dramatic change in the percentage of children with a goal for adoption from 16.5% in 1998 to 25.2% in 1999.

Guardianship as a permanency goal nearly doubled from 77 to 144 children between 1998 and 1999 but still is a very small program.

Data reports only .7% of children had a permanency goal of living with a relative.

A need identified by the Juvenile Rights project and other child advocates is to carefully consider a child's attachment and other well-being issues when determining the most appropriate permanency plan for the child who is unable to be reunified with parents.

The state assessment noted possible permanency coding errors related to those children who met the 15/22 months ASFA termination of parental rights (TPR) filing criteria. It also noted that of 3,596 cases reviewed, 42% or 1,496 had compelling reasons not to file a TPR. Overall, there appears to be an increasing number of children whose permanent plans are other than return home. This is attributed to both state and federal legislative changes.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Of 34 applicable cases, 21 were rated "strength".
- Some cases with the permanency goal of reunification demonstrated focused and consistent efforts over time, complimented by very appropriate and effective services array to successfully achieve the goal in a timely fashion.
- Stakeholders note improvement in timely movement towards termination of parental rights when appropriate.
- Some stakeholders reported the use of compelling reasons not to file TPR were appropriate.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 13 out of 34 cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- Several cases noted delays within the case management process that were attributed to changes in assigned workers. Sometimes this included abrupt change in the permanency plan itself while at other times this related to certain tasks.

- Stakeholders observe there are many multi-problem children in long-term foster care that have been in the system for several years. They suggested looking at cases to determine what might have been done earlier in the life of the case to prevent or ameliorate the development of such severely damaged children. There is concern that these children's long stays in non-permanent and changing homes may be negatively contributing to their adjustment and well being.
- Children with significant behavioral problems would sometimes have case plans primarily aimed at remediating that issue and in the interim recruitment or identification of potential permanent placement resources was not actively pursued pending the child's improvement.
- Concurrent planning is more often a sequential rather than a parallel process. While concurrent plans may be identified, there is no evidence of putting time and effort into both possible plans.
- Stakeholders believe some practice is driven by perception or anticipation of what the court would do, as opposed to taking the child's best interests forward.
- Stakeholders noted that the lack of AG involvement pre-TPR petition is a disadvantage. This sometimes results in delaying the establishment of a permanency plan other than return home, issues of legal sufficiency, and/or technical oversights that should have been addressed and resolved early in judicial proceedings.
- Compelling reasons for not filing TPR were sometimes not documented. Compelling reasons appear to have been used more frequently with older cases and less frequently with newer cases.
- The longer children remained in care the less likelihood that adoption would be the accomplished plan. At times, the permanency plan appeared substantially influenced by the available placement. If a child had adoption as a plan over several years and at some point a resource for long-term foster care became available, then the plan might change accordingly. This was more evident with older children.
- Some cases noted delays in completing adoption homestudies due to the adoptive family's recalcitrance or SCF workload.
- There is a general lack of urgency post-TPR to finalize the adoptive process. Similarly, when other non-reunification permanent plans are established, there is less urgency to complete and finalize the plan.
- Some case related interviews as well as case notes noted the disparity between foster care maintenance and adoption subsidy as delaying or causing foster parents to be disinclined to choose adoption. Again, in some situations the permanency plan then might shift to long-term foster care.

Item 8. Independent Living Services

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Some confusion exists with community partners and SCF regarding the extent to which SCF serves teens. SCF has indicated that it serves abused and neglected children ages 0-18 and some youth up to age 21, if they are finishing high school or in the Independent Living Program. SCF is trying to make sure this message is reinforced to all staff.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Of 4 applicable cases, 3 were rated "strength".
- Of the three cases with children age 16 and older, there was demonstrated and specific attention to the youth's ILP needs. Case plans were reflective of appropriate services.
- Foster parents in some cases were making substantial contributions to skills training and preparation for emancipation. In those situations, the foster parents tended to take the initiative and were strong advocates.
- Some of the ILP providers were considered excellent service providers.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 1 out of 4 cases was rated "area needing improvement".
- In this case, IL services were not offered and an IL plan was not completed because service delivery was viewed as contingent on placement stability.
- Some areas of the state do not have contracted ILP providers. Those areas without contracted providers can sometimes receive services from neighboring counties but those arrangements were viewed as fragmented and not adequate. See also Item 35.
- There is a general perception by stakeholders across the sites that teenagers are not well served by the agency.
- Adolescents were visited less often by their assigned worker than younger children. Consistent with this, those teens had less attention from the worker insofar as permanency planning, ILP services, or on-going assessment of other needs.

Item 9. Adoption

___ Strength **X** Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:**State Assessment**

The percentage of children who exited foster care to finalized adoption within 24 months in Oregon is 24.22 percent, and is less than the national standard of 32%.

Oregon attributes this lack of conformity to a number of factors including:

- an initiative to move children in care the longest into adoption,
- the fact that parents relinquishing infants for adoption are referred to licensed private agencies,
- the impact of appeals and other court delays,
- the lack of representation for the agency at court hearings,
- the past Oregon policy on placement supervision prior to finalization,
- lower adoption payment rates than the high special foster care rates for some children,
- some staffing factors, and
- the time needed subsequent to the passage of state legislation and ASFA to see an impact on adoption.

The SA notes that the adoption program is centrally administered which encourages more standardized practice. However, staff first were allocated to the field without a corresponding increase in the central Adoption Unit, creating a bottleneck during the 1997-1999 biennium.

The SA identifies as a strength the family selection process, which carefully matches waiting children with adoptive families. The SA also notes as a strength the additional staff allocated by the legislature to focus on adoption and the additional recruitment staff. However, these positions are slated to end at the end of this biennium. The ARMS database is cited as a valuable tool in identifying and tracking waiting children but, the SA notes, the continued need to complete the planned roll-out of the ARMS as a companion to the FACIS system.

Onsite**Strengths:**

- Of 12 applicable cases, 9 were rated "strength".
- Both relative and foster adopt placements are substantial resources for adoption that clearly meet the child's best interests. These resources often enabled preservation of family and community connections.
- For many children, their first placement was their permanent placement.

- Stakeholders note that establishing and implementing permanency planning is moving much more rapidly under ASFA.
- The combination of mediation/voluntary relinquishment was seen as a very positive strength and effecting both positive and timely outcomes.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 3 cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- Some delays in the adoption process were attributed to the paperwork and case flow between the local office and centralized adoption. TPR referral packets would at times go back and forth for additional work. Homestudies/certifications were not infrequently delayed for lack of completion of certain forms or information. Subsidy applications sometimes required considerable length of time to complete and approve.
- Delays were also sometimes attributed to the adoptive foster or relative parent not completing necessary paperwork related to the homestudy or subsidy application. This issue was sometimes impacted by the disparity between foster care support and anticipated reduction in services and financial support post-adoption.
- Homestudy delays were also attributed to workload and lengthy delays for staff to complete the required study and report.
- Crowded court calendars and delays in setting TPR trials was an expressed concern across the state.
- Court continuances, sometimes repeatedly granted, were attributed to defense attorneys not being prepared.
- Stakeholders reported the length of time to finalize the adoption after TPR is too long. Paperwork passed back and forth between the local office and centralized adoption delays the adoption finalization and is considered a frequent occurrence.

Item 10. Permanency goal of other planned permanent living arrangement

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

In the group of 1,496 children reviewed by the state permanency specialists and determined to have compelling reasons for not filing for TPR, nearly half are in planned permanent living arrangements other than adoption and guardianship.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Of 13 applicable cases, 11 were rated "strength".

- Several cases demonstrated clear and sound decision-making often in the context of compelling reasons not to file TPR and to establish permanent plans other than adoption. These included relative placements wherein the maintenance of family connections, attachment between the child and bio-parents and the child's expressed preference were deciding factors.
- Cultural considerations were respected and practiced and in ICW cases children were in stable long-term arrangements as an alternative to adoption.
- Several cases demonstrated appropriate inclusion of the child or youth in the case planning and decision making process.
- There were stable long-term foster care placements both with relatives and foster parents.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 2 out of 13 cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- For children and youth with significant mental health/behavioral issues, the permanent plan often was planned permanent living arrangements, such as permanent foster care. The mental health/behavioral issues were considered as precluding purposeful effort to identify adoptive resources and it appeared that these children were considered unadoptable. As a result, no efforts were made to identify an adoption resource. See also item 7.
- An alternative plan was established in some cases when a placement resource indicated an interest in long-term foster care and thus the child's permanent plan was defined by virtue of the available resource.
- For some children, unresolved mental health issues are a barrier to adoption.
- In some cases, permanency planning was put on hold until treatment was completed rather than planning while the child was in treatment.
- Some concern was raised with respect to children of a very young age having established permanent plans other than adoption, e.g. long-term foster care.
- Case record review demonstrated the need to regularly assess the appropriateness of the permanent plan of permanent foster care. Improvements in child behavior, changes in foster parent, child or birth family attitudes about adoption, and the availability of the guardianship program were all noted as appropriate reasons to review the permanency goal.

Outcome P2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.
Number of cases reviewed by the team according to degree of outcome achievement:

	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	17	9	7	33	94.3%
Partially Achieved:	0	0	1	1	2.9%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	1	0	0	1	2.9%
Not Applicable:	8	3	4	15	

Status of Permanency Outcome P-2: Achieved. Of the 35 applicable cases reviewed, 94.3% achieved substantial conformity, more than the required 90%.

Item 11. Proximity of foster care placement

X Strength ___ Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

It is SCF’s policy to place children as close as possible to birth parents. Usually this means the children remain in the same county as the parents. Special needs or relative placement may result in a child placed out of county.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Of 32 applicable cases, all were rated "strength".
- This item is considered a substantial and consistent strength across the state.
- In cases where the child was not placed in close proximity, there was clearly documented and sound rationale based on the child’s best interests. Relative and specialized residential treatment placements at times resulted in out-of-area placements.
- In those cases where a child was not placed in close proximity to their family, SCF staff would typically make constructive and creative efforts to maintain visitation and contact as appropriate.

Areas Needing Improvement:

N/A

Item 12. Placement with siblings

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

It is SCF's policy to place siblings together unless it is not the best interest of the children.

The SA indicates that a shortage of foster homes in some areas has lead to a lack of choice among placement resources making placement of siblings together sometimes not possible.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Of 24 applicable cases 20 were rated "strength".
- This item is considered a substantial strength across the state with few exceptions.
- When siblings were separated, there was well-documented rationale and usually efforts and services developed related to maintaining contact and visitation between siblings.
- Foster parents made significant contributions in this area in terms of transportation, visitation arrangements and supporting on-going contact between siblings.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 4 out of 24 cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- In the few cases noted as needing improvement, the decision to separate siblings was not based on the needs of the children.
- When siblings were separated, there was no indication that subsequent consideration or effort was made to obtain a placement for all the siblings together.
- Foster home capacity limited opportunities for sibling placement, particularly in Lincoln County.

Item 13. Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care

 X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

SCF policy requires that workers assure visits occur between parents and child. Title IV-E waiver funds have been used to increase the contact between children and parents and siblings.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Of 34 applicable cases, 31 were rated "strength".
- This item is a substantial strength and with few exceptions consistent across the state.
- Visitation arrangements were to a great extent reflective of staff efforts to develop schedules and transportation that would best accommodate the family's needs and resources.
- Creative projects at the local level were impressive and again, very family focused and friendly.
- Relatives and foster parents were often involved in planning, providing, monitoring and otherwise supporting visitation.
- HSA staff were credited with highly professional work with excellent documentation skills.
- In those few cases noted as needing improvement, visits between siblings were absent or infrequent, or older adolescent youth did not have an active or effective visitation plan. There were no noted barriers in these instances and other similar case situations were rated as strengths as visitation was arranged and regular.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 3 out of 34 cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- In those few cases noted as needing improvement, visits between siblings were absent or infrequent, or older adolescent youth did not have an active or effective visitation plan. There were no noted barriers in these instances, and other similar case situations were rated as strengths as visitation was arranged and regular.

Item 14. Preserving Connections

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Family Decision Meetings and SOC practice support family and community connections. In addition two major initiatives, Family to Family in 3 branches and the Neighborhood Foster Care Project in Portland seek to preserve a connection to family and community.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Of the 34 applicable cases, 32 were rated "strength".
- The use of mediation was an effective service enabling maintenance of connections in open adoptions and relative placement situations.
- In relevant cases, good practice efforts and outcomes related to working with tribes and ICW requirements including notification, case staffing and planning were noted.
- Foster parents often demonstrated considerable effort and advocacy for the child, enabling on-going community and family connections.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 2 out of 34 cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- In one case where a child did not meet tribal enrollment criteria, there could have been more effort to assess and pursue possible culturally related connections.

Item 15. Relative Placement

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Overall, 28% of the children in placement are with relatives. This is an increase from 25.5% in 1999. In February 1998, SCF issued a policy memo, "Relatives First and Alone." This was the precursor of the 1999 OAR change (revised in early 2001) regarding the consideration of relatives as the placement of preference for children requiring out-of-home care and the requirement to conduct an early and diligent search and assessment of relatives as potential temporary or permanent caregivers.

A significant need in Oregon is for more equitable financial treatment of relative care providers regardless of the child's IV-E eligibility. Relatives are not paid foster care unless the child is eligible for IV-E federal funding. On average only 45% of the relative caregivers receive payment as foster parents.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Of 34 applicable cases, 33 were rated "strength".
- Relatives are generally considered and/or searched for early in the case.
- ICPC is readily utilized for out-of-state considerations.
- Relatives receive full background checks.
- In some areas, the licensing process is expedited for relative placements.
- Family Decision Meetings are cited as an important practice method and forum for relative inclusion and contribute to relatives' involvement as a placement resource.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 1 out of 34 cases was rated "area needing improvement".

Item 16. Relationship of child in care with parents

 X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

SOC initiative emphasizes individualized planning for children with services designed to meet the child's safety and attachment needs including maintenance of the parent-child relationship.

Onsite**Strengths:**

- Of 27 applicable cases, 25 were rated "strength".
- Staff clearly places significant value on the parent-child relationship both in reunification and other permanency plan situations.
- Foster parents make a strong contribution in this area demonstrating a willingness and ability to support and enable parent-child contact and co-parenting while sharing parenting activities and tasks.
- Relatives and extended family engage in supporting and enabling positive and active relationships between the child and parents, both in reunification and other long-term or permanent placement.
- Open adoptions including mediation as part of the process typically support long-term parent-child relations that are appropriate and in the child's best interests.
- FDMs clearly support and enable best practice in this area.
- When maintenance of the parent-child relationship was contrary to the child's best interests, subsequent decision-making provided a carefully considered rationale.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 2 out of 27 cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- In those few cases that the parent-child relationship was not evidently being supported, there was no indication as to why this circumstance continued.

III. CHILD AND FAMILY WELL-BEING

Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.					
Number of cases reviewed by the team according to degree of outcome achievement:					
	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	17	10	11	38	76%
Partially Achieved:	6	2	1	9	18%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	3	0	0	3	6%
Not Applicable:	0	0	0	0	

Status of Outcome WB-1: Not in substantial conformity. 76% of cases were rated in substantial conformity, less than the required 90%.

Item 17. Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents

____ Strength X Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

System of Care and Family Decision Meetings emphasize strengths/needs based planning and provide flexible funds for this purpose. The SOC initiative is being implemented over an 8-year period with the last counties implementing in the 2001-2003 biennium. The SA indicates that emphasis has been on the child's safety needs, and less emphasis has been given to the other life needs children, including educational, social and well being. The State indicates that advanced SOC training is needed, with a focus on more skill development rather than philosophy and more focus on child well being including education, physical needs, and mental health.

The SA indicates the state continues to struggle to have enough adequate services. See Items 3 and 23 and Section VIII Service Array.

Onsite

Strengths:

- 34 of 50 cases reviewed were rated "strength".
- Cases rated as strengths frequently included well-crafted strengths/needs based service plans, assessing the needs of both parents and children and providing flexible services.
- Appropriate match of needs and services in some cases resulted in enhanced capacity for parents to meet children's needs.
- In the majority of foster care cases, foster parent needs were met. Foster parents identified caseworker contact, assistance locating resources, respite care, training and support groups as helpful to them. Some foster parents received individualized services to help them meet the needs of the children in their care. Services included: mediation, counseling, and behavior management, as well as flexible funds to meet practical family needs. Services to foster parents were particularly strong in Multnomah County.

- Specialized assessments were used to obtain more information in some cases.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 16 of 50 cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- In 8 of these cases, the service needs of children were not adequately assessed and/or not met. This was particularly noted as a concern for older youth in foster care whose needs received little attention.
- In some cases rated as needing improvement, parents or youth were not motivated to participate in assessment or services. Additional attention was needed in these cases to help families or youth acknowledge needs and engage in services. Additional effort was also needed to address barriers to participation, to follow-up to ensure service needs were met, and to periodically evaluate progress.
- In some cases there was an incomplete assessment of parents' needs and a failure to have families adequately address issues of risk. Some of these cases had service plans in which families were to engage only in superficial services of their choice, avoiding more serious issues such as substance abuse and sexual abuse.
- Some stakeholders noted a need to ask foster parents what they need rather than relying on foster parents to speak up.
- See also Section VIII Service Array.

Item 18. Child and family involvement in case planning

 X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Oregon statute stipulates that SCF shall adopt the plan the family develops. FDMs are a primary tool used to identify needs and develop service plans.

See also Item 25, case plans.

Onsite

Strengths:

- In 41 of 45 applicable cases reviewed, parents and children (where appropriate) were involved in case planning.

- Cases with active involvement in case planning were more likely to have had family decision meetings or family unity meetings. These meetings were recognized as a key element in successful planning with families.
- Including families in planning is standard practice in Oregon. In one site all cases reviewed were rated "strength" on this item; in another site all except one were rated "strength".

Areas Needing Improvement:

- SOC philosophy was not reflected in the case planning approach used with a few families who reported they were told what to do or who reported that their needs or the needs of their children were not addressed in the case plan.
- Of the 4 cases that lacked involvement in case planning, 2 were cases in which youth were not actively involved and FDMs and SOC practice not utilized.

Item 19. Worker visits with child

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Oregon has made frequent and quality contact with children and families a high priority in new policy standards (January 15, 2001) for visiting. For children receiving in-home services and for most children in foster care face to face contact now is required every 30 days. Previously the foster care policy required contact by phone every 30 days and a face to face contact every 90 days. Branches are currently discussing ways to see children more often by re-prioritizing work.

When children are placed within the State but in another county, the sending and receiving branches negotiate the roles and responsibilities. This policy needs to be updated to include current contact expectations consistent with the new policy.

Onsite

Strengths:

- 32 of the 49 applicable cases reviewed were rated "strength".
- Foster parents and some families noted positively a marked increase in the number of worker/child visits in the last few months, evidence of implementation of the new agency policy. Increased contact is credited with enhancing the

agency's ability to develop relationships, identify and meet service needs and better accomplish the goals of the case plan.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Of the 49 applicable cases reviewed, 17 were rated "area needing improvement".
- This was particularly true in the largest metropolitan area where approximately two-thirds of the cases did not have adequate worker/child visits.
- There were strong indications that high caseloads, particularly in the urban site, were a barrier to regular visits.
- Youth in particular were visited infrequently. Children in permanent foster care were seen less frequently than every 90 days (State policy).
- In some cases there was too much reliance on service providers and a lack of caseworker involvement in visits.
- In some cases caseworker turnover impacted timeliness of visits.

Item 20. Worker visits with parents

____ Strength X Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

See Item 19.

Onsite

Strengths:

- 21 of 28 applicable cases were rated "strength".
- Some parents reported frequent phone contact with workers in addition to visits and spoke positively of their relationship to their worker.
- Many service providers are seeing families frequently.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- In 7 out of 28 applicable cases reviewed, workers visited parents infrequently.
- All of these were in-home cases. There is a reliance on treatment providers to see families and a lack of understanding by workers of the importance of continuing to visit parents until the in-home case is closed.

Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.					
Number of cases reviewed by the team according to degree of outcome achievement:					
	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	17	8	7	32	82.1%
Partially Achieved:	2	0	2	4	10.3%
Not Achieved or Addressed:	2	0	1	3	7.7%
Not Applicable:	5	4	2	11	

Status of Outcome WB-2: Not in substantial conformity. Of the cases reviewed, 82.1% substantially achieved the outcome, less than the required 90%.

Item 21. Educational needs of the child

____ Strength X Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

A significant barrier to school success, identified by 70% of respondents, was “frequent school changes as result of out-of-home placement”. This most likely is related to the limited options for placement.

SCF workers are not routinely trained to assess the education needs of children entering foster care nor to make written referrals for special education services, although policy requires them to do so. SCF also has no organized mechanism to assist foster parents in identifying and ensuring these needs are met.

Citizen Review Boards review whether SCF is meeting the educational needs of children and their families. School information is required in the child's service plan and educational needs are discussed in FDMs. 60% of children testing below grade level have Individual Education Plans (IEPs) in place.

Onsite

Strengths:

- 32 of the 39 applicable cases reviewed were rated "strength".
- School services such as IEPs, school counseling, HeadStart, special education services, one-on-one assistance in the classroom, and mentor services were provided by schools to meet the needs of children in foster care.
- Foster parents are credited in many cases as the "driving force" to ensure that services are obtained to meet the children's educational needs.
- In some cases SCF social workers were excellent advocates to ensure educational needs were met. Cases included examples of caseworkers collaborating with a school district to get services to address a child's lack of social skills, persistence in an in-home case in getting a mother to enroll a child in HeadStart, working with foster parents to get child into a therapeutic school setting, requesting educational evaluation, and making referral and completing assessment for early intervention services.
- Over two-thirds of children in applicable foster care cases reviewed were not enrolled in multiple schools as a result of being in foster care.
- Over three-fourths of the children in applicable foster care cases reviewed were reported to be at grade level.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 7 of the 39 applicable cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- In 3 of these cases there was no attention being given to meeting the educational needs of foster youth that are not in school and/or not following through with plans for a GED.
- The remaining 4 cases had unmet educational needs due to failure of caseworkers to follow through when needs were identified and worker action (paperwork, referral, or advocacy) were needed.
- Over half of the applicable foster care cases did not have school records in the case file.
- Approximately one-third of cases reviewed had no indication that educational records had been provided to foster parents.

Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.					
Number of cases reviewed by the team according to degree of outcome achievement:					
	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Total Number	Total Percentage
Substantially Achieved:	22	8	8	38	80.9

Partially Achieved:	4	3	1	8	17
Not Achieved or Addressed:	0	0	1	1	2.1
Not Applicable:	0	1	2	3	

Status of Outcome WB-3: Not in substantial conformity. Of the cases reviewed, 80.9% achieved substantial conformity, less than the required 90%.

Item 22. Physical Health of the Child

 X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

- 1) All children in SCF care receive immediate health care coverage through the Oregon Health Plan and have physical, mental health and dental coverage.
- 2) Policy requires a physical exam in 30 days and requires documentation of related health information in narrative and case plan. The CRBs report that this information is sometimes incomplete.
- 3) The SA indicates a lack of understanding of the complicated managed care system by both SCF staff and foster care providers. This results in varied practice across the state.

To provide medical coverage, the state has specialized staff in place at the local branch level, provisions for exceptional costs for meeting needs outside the managed care system and is piloting a project with ASF to ensure non-paid relative providers receive a medical card automatically.

Onsite

Strengths:

- 39 of 44 applicable cases reviewed were rated "strength".
- Almost all of the foster care and in-home cases had health screenings and assessments, and physical health needs met.
- Foster parents were determined to see that children's dental needs were met and made significant effort to find creative ways to get these needs met.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- 5 of 44 applicable cases were rated "area needing improvement".
- Most cases in which improvement is needed were cases in which medical or dental needs were identified but treatment not provided because of a lack of agency resolution to barriers to service or a lack of agency follow-up.
- Stakeholders reported obtaining dental care for foster children was extremely difficult. Foster parents reported spending a considerable amount of effort trying to convince dental providers to serve their children.
- Stakeholders noted screenings are not as thorough as under the past EPSDT program and questioned how well needs were being identified. (This applied to Item 23, Mental Health Needs, as well.)

Item 23. Mental health of the child

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Community partners including the Juvenile Rights Project (JRP) and the Citizen Review Board (CRB) agreed with SCF staff that timely access to mental health services for youth generally were lacking statewide. Our JRP partners felt that the complex relationship between the county, SCF, MHDDSD, MHOs, local providers, and other state and local agencies were highly problematic.

In addition, SCF staff perceived the quality of those services as "good" in urban areas and "fair" in rural areas. The "barriers" to mental health services for youth most often mentioned included a need for specialized services (e.g., culturally competent, dual diagnosis, domestic violence, family counseling, developmental specialties, etc.), the "waiting list" for youth who need mental health services, and the state managed care system. Also, staff noted that youth placed out-of-county of jurisdiction had more difficulty finding mental health services.

Personal care or special rate assessments and care plans are provided to meet the special needs of 60% of the children in care. The SA indicates community stakeholders are concerned about the care of children with emotional, mental or behavioral disorders. Stakeholders expressed concern that in their view foster parents skills to serve such children vary widely and foster parents receive no consistent training or consultation when caring for children with a DSM-IV diagnosis.

Stakeholders expressed concern that children with special needs are not always placed in specific homes on the basis of the foster parents' skills and abilities to provide appropriate care, structure and supervision for them.

Onsite

Strengths:

- 38 of 43 applicable cases were rated "strength".
- Most cases had mental health screenings and mental health assessments.
- Many children were receiving mental health services
- We noted from cases reviewed and from stakeholders that flexible funding is used to meet mental health needs because of a commitment to meet children's needs in a timely manner.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Some children for whom treatment needs were identified did not receive the services needed.
- Barriers to meeting children's mental health needs included difficulty accessing services, treatment that was not consistent nor at an adequate level to address needs, and a lack of follow through.
- Rural communities do not have resources for specialized need and complex child mental health cases and require travel to larger metropolitan areas.
- Stakeholders noted a concern that foster care re-entries tend to be children whose complex emotional and behavioral needs cannot get addressed in-home because families have difficulty accessing appropriate services.
- Stakeholders noted a need for mental health practitioners whose expertise can address the needs of foster children.

Part 2: Seven Systemic Factors

1. STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Rating of Review Team Regarding Substantial Conformity			
Rating	Not in Substantial Conformity		Substantial Conformity
	1	2	- 3 -
			4

This systemic factor is rated "3 and is in substantial conformity.

Item 24. State is operating a Statewide information system that, at a minimum, can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is (or within the immediately preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care.

 X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

State Family and Child Information System (FACIS) is a comprehensive client intake, screening, assessment, eligibility, and case management tool. The system provides accessible information to state managers and local staff including information on the status, demographic characteristics, location and goals for the placement. The system provides a variety of reports to all levels of SCF for purposes of case management, workload, decision-making and program modification. The SA identifies a need to train branch supervisory and management staff about how to work with and use data.

While the accessibility and usefulness of the information has resulted in more accurate data, completeness and accuracy continues to need improvement. The SA indicated that maintaining accurate permanency planning goals is a particular challenge. The SA indicates examination and modification of the tracking report used to notify branches when permanency hearings are due is needed.

Onsite

Strengths:

- State has a sophisticated data system (FACIS) which can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of children in foster care.
- FACIS is noted as being particularly helpful at the case level to access historical information useful in screening and to access information from other counties for improved safety planning. FACIS is recognized as being useful at the supervisory level to review cases on-line. Both supervisors and managers found caseload status reports helpful as a supervisory tool to track cases in terms of goals and time frames.
- FACIS data is beginning to be used to provide information to the community, is beginning to be used to provide more outcome-based data reports, and is beginning to be used as a tool for more outcomes-based discussions with branch managers. Branch managers spoke positively about the new data report cards and indicated they wanted more outcomes based data.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Barriers to fully utilizing the data system include serious problems in data integrity. Internal stakeholders noted that there is a significant need for improvements in data accuracy, completeness and consistency. Stakeholders indicated that SCF needs to develop a culture that values data and ensure that there is a strong management mandate to use the system. They also noted the lack of use by field staff and the need for training and a feedback loop at the field level.
- The review team noted a need for clearer policy and training concerning what constitutes the official record, since neither the FACIS system nor the hard copy record are complete. In particular, improvement is needed in practice concerning case notes that are not regularly in the file or FACIS system. Caseworkers noted that the FACIS system for case notes was not very useful since case notes cannot be read sequentially and workers lose historical perspective.
- FACIS is not being fully utilized to monitor and support outcomes-based practice. FACIS does not provide managers and supervisors with sufficient reports on field practice in areas such as timeliness of investigations, permanency benchmarks, and face to face contacts.

2. CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

Rating of Review Team Regarding Substantial Conformity				
Rating	Not in Substantial Conformity		Substantial Conformity	
	1	- 2 -	3	4

This systemic factor is rated "2" and is not in substantial conformity. Two of the four items, case plan and permanency hearings, were rated "area needing improvement".

Item 25. Provides a process that ensures that each child has a written case plan to be developed jointly with the child's parent(s) that includes the required provisions.

____ Strength X Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

State policy requires a case plan be completed within 60 days of placement, requires that family members be given an opportunity to participate in the development of the service plan and requires a minimum of one face-to-face client interview for this purpose.

SA indicates while case plans generally are completed, some branches are having trouble completing them in 60 days. Reviews/quality assurance reports indicated a need for training and support to enhance recording of essential information in the case plan document and a need for consistent supervisory review of the written case plan. Improvements are needed in meaningfulness, individualizing, completeness of health and education information, and updating the case plan.

Family Decision Meetings (FDMs) are identified in the SA as a hallmark of state practice. These occur with approximately 60% of families.

Efforts are currently underway to hold FDM Early Safety Meetings early in the case in order to focus on early engagement of the family and better initial placements for children.

Onsite

Strengths:

- The use of FDMs for many cases results in the development of case plans which identify individual needs and specialized services. SOC strengths-based planning successfully engages many families in the case planning process.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Some cases did not have current case plans. Others had case plans that were descriptions of current status rather than real plans. Such problems were more common in cases which did not have FDMs and/or in which SOC practices were not utilized. This was particularly true for children in long-term permanent foster family care and for children in residential treatment. Youth in these cases were also less likely to be involved in the case planning process. (See also Item 18.)

Item 26. Provides a process for the periodic review of the status of each child, no less frequently than once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review.

X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Timely periodic reviews are held by the Citizen Review Board (or in some cases the court) for all children in foster care. Every child in substitute care is reviewed at least every 6 months. Depending on the scheduling of court hearings for the case, administrative reviews are sometimes held in court, rather than before the CRB to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort.

In addition, SCF conducts in-house 30 day reviews to approve placement and to ensure that other requirements such as those required by ICWA and ASFA are in place.

The State Assessment indicated continued and improved collaborative efforts are needed with SCF workers and supervisors and the CRB coordinators and volunteers to enable the CRB and SCF to work more closely as a team to ensure that child safety and permanency is achieved.

Onsite

Strengths:

- The 6-month periodic reviews are conducted by the Citizen Review Board. Stakeholders noted that reviews are held in a timely manner, no less frequently than every 6 months.
- Stakeholders in one site reported good participation of parents, relatives, foster parents and court appointed special advocates in reviews.
- Stakeholders report that the CRB reviews help keep cases moving toward timely permanency.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Stakeholders at two sites reported that the CRB is holding reviews more frequently than every six months (e.g. every 3 months) in at least some of the cases. Stakeholders also reported that some courts are holding frequent review hearings. The result is an increasing number of court and CRB reviews, with some caseworkers attending both hearings and CRBs in the same month. Some stakeholders indicated that there is a protocol for canceling CRBs when hearings are held. However, it appears that this protocol has not been effective in addressing this possible duplication of effort.
- Some stakeholders reported some tension between the CRB and SCF. They emphasized a need to work together in a way that respects all participants.

Item 27. Provides a process that ensures that each child in foster care under the supervision of the State has a permanency hearing in a qualified court or administrative body no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

____ Strength **X** Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

State data per the self-assessment indicates between 9%-15% of permanency hearings are overdue. While there are some tracking and data integrity concerns related to these figures, it appears a number of cases may not receive timely permanency hearings.

SCF policy requires that the division develop a permanency plan and an alternate permanency plan for each child in SCF custody within 60 days of placement. SCF reviews the permanency plan internally for each child at 8 months of placement to assess case readiness for a 12-month review or permanency hearing. The 12-month CRB review may also serve the purpose of preparing a case for the permanency hearing; however, many of these reviews are cancelled when the time frame to conduct the CRB review coincides with the court review. Despite these efforts, some stakeholders felt that the state does little or no pro-active work on the permanent plan prior to the hearing.

Several issues were identified with respect to timely permanency hearings including data input and tracking problems, need for training for both judicial and SCF staff, and lack of knowledgeable legal representation for the state.

The Oregon Court Improvement Project has been developing a benchbook including pattern forms for across state jurisdictions to utilize and has and will continue to provide training and join or initiate collaborative efforts in this arena.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Both internal and external stakeholders were knowledgeable about the ASFA requirements and indicated ASFA timelines for permanency hearings are being met. They indicated that court involvement is resulting in more movement toward permanency and in services being offered earlier.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Some stakeholders expressed concern about some permanency decisions made in hearings. The lack of legal representation for the agency, particularly in difficult and challenging cases, may be a contributing factor.
- Stakeholders noted a lack of consistency in requesting attorneys be appointed for children.
- A number of stakeholders, particularly at one site, noted a lack of clarity about the purpose and conduct of permanency hearings and provided examples demonstrating a serious need for judicial training.
- The onsite review identified some cases in which subsequent permanency hearings appeared not to reexamine the appropriateness of the permanency goal regardless of changes in a child's circumstances, particularly in the case of children in long-term foster care. See also Item 10.

Item 28. Provides a process for termination of parental rights proceedings in accordance with the provisions of the Adoption and Safe Families Act.

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Consistent with the State ASFA implementation effective date, the State of Oregon has in place since August 1999, rules for filing for termination of parental rights (TPR) consistent with the federal ASFA requirements. The Oregon legislature provided four ASFA Permanency Implementation Specialists who identified children in care at least 15 of 22 months and staffed each of these children. 41.6% of the children staffed have a documented compelling reason for not filing. Nearly half of these children are in planned permanent living arrangements. 214 children became fully free and 711 children had voluntary relinquishment or TPR in process.

The SA identifies consistent legal services statewide for termination cases as a strength.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Stakeholders indicated that a process is in place and utilized for meeting the ASFA TPR requirements.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- While TPR filings appear to be occurring, internal stakeholders noted a lack of familiarity of the field with the 15 of 22 tracking report and noted a lack of understanding of compelling reasons and requirements for accurate documentation of it in the FACIS system. Review team members also noted a lack of formal case file documentation of compelling reasons in cases reviewed.

Item 29. Provides a process for foster parents, preadoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care to be notified of, and have an opportunity to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child.

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

SA indicates overall foster parents receive notice of their opportunity to participate but local systems have not been put in place consistently to fully implement the policy. Branch notice is by mail, phone or in person with no consistent way of documenting this in the case record. Foster parents agree that they do receive notices by mail most of the time and notice by mail seems to work for most branches. CRB indicates that at times they receive inaccurate information regarding the involved parties on a case, causing a failure in the notification process.

Onsite

Strengths:

- While there is no one consistent method of notice, regular notice is being provided to foster parents and a significant number are attending reviews and hearings and being heard.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- There continues to be a need for training of SCF staff and foster parents on the value of foster parent participation to further increase foster parent attendance.

3. QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Rating of Review Team Regarding Substantial Conformity				
Rating	Not in Substantial Conformity		Substantial Conformity	
	1	2	3	- 4 -

This systemic factor is rated "4" and is in substantial conformity

Item 30. The State has developed and implemented standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect the safety and health of the children.

 X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

The State has recently revised its certification standards, its policy on placement expectations, and a policy that directs best case practice, "Ensuring Quality in Foster Homes." SCF has strict certification policies for all foster care including paid and unpaid foster care and adoptive homes, both relative and non-relative. These policies have required some significant practice and system changes; it is taking time for SCF and partners to accept and adjust to these changes. See also Items 41 and 42.

The SA further raises a concern that limited foster care capacity at times results in placements in less than optimal situations

Onsite

Strengths:

- State has new certification standards, which emphasize child safety and health. These standards are applied to all foster homes, relative and non-relative, paid and unpaid homes.
- The State is using a contractor to review every home in every county to ensure homes are adequately able to meet the health and safety needs of children.
- State has comprehensive standards for criminal background checks for foster and adoptive parents.

Areas Needing Improvement:

N/A

Item 31. The State is operating an identifiable quality assurance system that is in place in the jurisdictions where the services included in the CFSP are provided, evaluates the quality of services, identifies strengths and needs of the service delivery system, provides relevant reports, and evaluates program improvement measures implemented.

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Oregon has conducted regular comprehensive branch reviews since 1997, on a two to three-year cycle. The reviews have consisted of interviews with community partners and staff, and case file reviews. The reviews provide the branches, the local communities, and SCF with a written report which itemized strengths, identified items for corrective action, and provided recommendations for both branch action and for division-wide action. In response, the branches developed corrective action plans based on the report provided to them. Subsequent reviews have documented improvement in some areas of practice.

While these reviews document strengths and issues in case management, the SA indicates the process should focus more on safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes for children and families.

See also "1. State Information System" concerning need for improved QA of data and use of data reports.

Onsite

Strengths:

- The State has developed a formal quality assurance (QA) process used to regularly review each branch. Stakeholders described this process as a "very inclusive process", professional" and with "comprehensive findings" leading to program improvement.
- Stakeholders noted positively the increased emphasis on outcomes and statistical data in this process recently.
- This QA process was noted as a key component to statewide consistency in practice and as a positive link between the program office and field practice.
- Some supervisors/branches have developed successful formats such as regular meetings to coach staff both on good practices and state policy and procedures.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Many stakeholders expressed great concern over the anticipated loss of QA positions effective July 1, 2001 and fear that this helpful process will be abandoned.
- Stakeholders expressed concern over the large numbers of staff supervisors have in their units, which limits their ability to do QA and limits staff access to them.

4. TRAINING

Rating of Review Team Regarding Substantial Conformity				
Rating	Not in Substantial Conformity		Substantial Conformity	
	1	- 2 -	3	4

This systemic factor is rated "2" and is not in substantial conformity. Initial training was rated as needing improvement because it is not provided timely; ongoing training is rated "area needing improvement" because it is not occurring for all staff as needed.

Item 32. The State is operating a staff development and training program that supports the goals and objectives in the CFSP, addresses services provided under titles IV-B and IV-E, and provides initial training for all staff who deliver these services.

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

The State provides core training, system of care strengths/needs based training, supervisory and specialized training through the Portland State University Child Welfare Partnership (CWP). Training is provided not only to staff but also to community partners and representatives from Oregon tribes. The SA highlights this partnership which provides integrated child welfare research, training and graduate education as a as a key strength.

SCF and CRB along with judicial partners trained on ASFA, held ASFA planning sessions and the CWP hired 2 ASFA trainers to incorporate ASFA into core trainings.

The State provides core training to new staff. Policy requires staff take the first section within 90 days and the last 2 sections within 9 months. Improving the timeliness of training has been identified as a major priority by the SCF administration.

Some staff have expressed dissatisfaction with core training. Some branches provide additional branch specific new worker training and believe it is a worthwhile investment.

Minimum staff qualifications were changed in 2001 to require a BSW or degree in another related field.

Onsite Strengths:

- Stakeholders noted that Oregon has a core training program, which provides consistent initial training for all new workers statewide. Stakeholders indicated this training meets basic needs.
- Stakeholders in one site noted as a strength that CPS workers in that location were completing the CPS training prior to being assigned to CPS work.
- Workers indicated that Consultant Educators and Trainers (CETs) were helpful as mentors and to connect training to local practice.
- PSU partnership makes great effort to have training available.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Many stakeholders expressed significant concern that most workers do not receive training prior to carrying caseloads, in part due to workload demands. Stakeholders strongly recommended SCF set clear requirements that staff be trained before carrying cases.
- Stakeholders expressed concern about the current lack of training for supervisors, but commended SCF for its plans to reinstitute the supervising for excellence program in August 2001.
- Workers indicated they would like the initial core training to include additional hands-on skill based training such as practice testifying and practice interviewing.

Item 33. The State provides for ongoing training for staff that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

_____ Strength X Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

See Item 33.

Staff are not routinely getting a set number of hours of ongoing training. 52% of staff received 20 hours of development, training, and education during the year. Barriers identified included high workload and the difficulty traveling to Salem for training.

QA reviews and Juvenile Rights Project (JRP) reviews indicate some branches and staff believe the CWP training does not meet their needs. For 2001 the CWP is working to make the training meet more branch and state needs. Training heavily emphasizes safety. CWP with JRP is working to increase emphasis on the well-being and attachment needs of children.

Currently there is not an advanced level of training for staff around strengths-needs based training. Training for newly implementing SOC branches gives staff and management information and training needed to adapt to this way of casework practice but advanced training is needed for fully implementing branches.

Graduate education through the Child Welfare Partnership has grown from 6 slots in 1994 to 70 slots in 2001.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Stakeholders noted as strengths extensive cross-disciplinary ASFA training, effective system of care initial training, the new training on educational advocacy, and the newly developed training for home certifiers.
- The also spoke positively about the opportunity for cross-training which allows workers to attend the core training outside their specialty and to connect what they do to the full range of child welfare practice.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Many staff are not participating in ongoing training.

- A number of stakeholders mentioned the need for more legal training of all parties. More legal training for caseworkers was considered particularly critical given the extensive amount of legal work caseworkers are required to do. They commented that workers have difficulty testifying in court and are not consistently able to use the court process effectively to achieve the best outcomes for children.
- Additional training needs identified include more ongoing information system training, joint worker/foster parent training, training in assessing risk, and more advanced in-service training for experienced workers.

Item 34. The State provides training for current or prospective foster parents, adoptive parents, and staff of State licensed or approved facilities that care for children receiving foster care or adoption assistance under title IV-E that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adopted children.

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Foster parent training is available in a variety of formats including classes, support groups, mentoring, media and distance technology. State policy requires foster parents complete orientation training within the first 30 days and in subsequent years to complete 10 hours or complete an appropriate training plan to meet the needs of the child in their care. Data is not collected on the extent of compliance with this policy. The SA suggests that the State examine what can be accepted as training credits and consider some changes to the content and types of training provided.

Staff in child caring organizations are required to receive training in core competency areas and the organizations are required to certify they have trained their staff in core competencies.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Foster parents complete core training prior to providing care or within 30 days if they are an emergency placement. Foster parents felt the core training met their needs.
- Stakeholders at one site noted as a strength the collaboration with the local community college to provide foster parents training as part of the community college program. Training is listed in the college catalog and college credit is provided.

- Stakeholders noted that training content was consistent with the types of children for whom they were caring.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Stakeholders suggested more formal training plans with some balance of formal content and support group activities.
- Stakeholders noted the need for childcare to participate in training and for computer based training they could complete at home.

5. SERVICE ARRAY

Rating of Review Team Regarding Substantial Conformity			
Rating	Not in Substantial Conformity		Substantial Conformity
	1	2	- 3 -
			4

This systemic factor is rated "3" and is in substantial conformity

Item 35. The 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 home environment, enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency.

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

The state uses inventive combinations of SCF services, System of Care, IV-E waiver and safety net services to provide an individualized array of services.

Throughout the SA there are references to a possible need for more treatment resources for children with extensive needs and for parents. The SA mentions the need for more drug and alcohol treatment, improved or additional prevention

services, more placement resources, and indicates domestic violence support and batterers treatment are critically needed in some areas.

The SA indicates that the ability to successfully engage parents in an effective behavioral change process within ASFA timeframes and sensitive to children's needs for permanency continue to be challenging.

The State is committed to placing children in family-based care situations. Oregon places about 5% of children in residential care while the national rate is about 8%. However, since placement in therapeutic foster care is limited by contract, community partners have raised a concern that some children are placed in family foster care when therapeutic foster or residential treatment might be indicated.

Onsite

Strengths:

- A wide array of services is available for families and children in Oregon. Safety nets provide preventive services to families screened out of the SCF system. Individualized formal and informal services are available for families served by SCF. Adoptive parents noted an improvement in post-adoption support services.
- Stakeholders provided examples of good collaboration with community partners such as HeadStart and Healthy Start to meet service needs of families.
- Stakeholders noted safety nets as a strength in serving families before earlier problems escalate.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Stakeholders noted that services to teens are seriously lacking. They identified a need for appropriate in-home services to teens that are acting out but not part of the delinquency system. They also noted a need for foster care placements for teens and a need for more residential treatment. They noted that access to residential treatment required long waiting lists and the residential system was "clogged" in part due to a lack of post-treatment resources.
- Stakeholders noted the lack of a comprehensive consistent independent living program. They indicated that while some contractors are excellent, current operation of IL as a grant program isolates it from the SCF system. They also noted that IL services are not available in all areas of the state.
- A general lack of foster homes and therapeutic foster homes was noted as a critical need in two sites. This shortage resulted in an overuse of temporary shelter care at one site and inability to place children in an appropriately matched home in the other site. Stakeholders noted that SCF over utilizes some foster homes filling them to the maximum

licensing limit even if some of the children are very difficult and a full number of children/mix of children overloads the family.

- Stakeholders also noted a need for medical and dental services, and mental health services. (See Items 22 and 23). Concern was expressed about the difficulty accessing services.
- Stakeholders noted a need for these services to be designed to better meet the needs of SCF clients. They also noted a need for mental health services to better service young children, and to better address the unique needs of children in foster care.
- They also noted a need for better bilingual and bicultural services.
- Stakeholders noted needs for enhanced drug and alcohol services, less waiting lists, and more residential programs where parents can receive treatment while their children are with them.
- They also noted a lack of services for youth sex offenders in at least one site.
- Stakeholders at one site noted a need for preventive services. Stakeholders also noted the demands on the safety net are increasing and that more families are being referred to the safety net after some initial service from SCF. They noted other preventive resources (not safety nets) need to be available for families with complex needs and families who do not chose to engage in voluntary safety net services.

Item 36. The services in item 35 are accessible to families and children in all political jurisdictions covered in the State’s CFSP.

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

See Item 35. The State considers the interplay of centralized program management with regional and local services, the interplay of governmental services and those provided by the private section and the interplay of general and targeted recruitment activities for both foster care and adoption placements as a strength in delivering an array of services throughout the state.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Stakeholders noted challenges to service provision in rural areas but noted that services are available statewide. This is credited to state creativity and flexibility. Stakeholders noted that in rural areas the title IV-E waiver allows SCF to design services to meet a need for which there is no community resource.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Rural areas indicated clients had to go to a major metropolitan area for some skilled services such as psychological evaluations, specialized mental health services, and intensive treatment resources.
- The most critical unmet need identified in rural areas was transportation to get to the available community services.

Item 37. The services in Item 35 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the agency.

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

See Item 35. Service planning requires that the worker and the family identify the issues facing the family, determine the objectives to be achieved and agree upon the actions to be taken. This process may include a FDM or other meeting and is a process that supports family participation in the development of their plan and services.

The strengths-needs based System of Care (SOC) is in place in 80% of field offices. The worker works with families to assess their strengths and needs and then to create very specific services which will best meet the needs. A very important element to this reform is the access to flexible branch funds which can be used to purchase goods and individual tailored services that meet the specific needs of families

Onsite

Strengths:

- Flexible funds and System of Care funds are used for individualized and creative services.
- System of Care strength/needs approach combined with Family Decision Meetings and flexible funds results in the provision of individualized services.
- Services are creatively designed and both formal and informal supports are used to meet individual needs.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Stakeholders at one site noted that while SCF is engaged in the SOC philosophy, they need contracted service providers to move to this same creative flexible individualized approach.
- Stakeholders emphasized the need for continued emphasis on creativity, and noted the tendency for SCF over time to “institutionalize” flexible funds and use them for traditional services.
- SOC approach needs to be applied not only to reunification cases but also to other types of cases.

6. AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Rating of Review Team Regarding Substantial Conformity				
Rating	Not in Substantial Conformity		Substantial Conformity	
	1	2	3	- 4 -

This systemic factor is rated "4" and is in substantial conformity

Item 38. In implementing the provisions of the CFSP, the State engages in ongoing consultation with tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals and objectives of the CFSP.

 X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

The State consults with many stakeholder groups including the Courts, Citizen Review Boards, Juvenile Rights Project, Oregon Commission on Children and Families, Court Appointed Special Advocates, and agency advisory groups. Regular meetings of stakeholder groups and public meetings on the budget are held. A twenty-one member legislatively mandated SCF Advisory Committee advises SCF on the development and administration of the policies programs and practices.

The State has had tribal title IV-E agreements since 1991, provides extensive consultation and technical assistance and has developed a comprehensive model agreement. Currently, 3 tribes have agreements and the State is working with additional tribes to develop agreements. SCF meets quarterly with tribes and works government to government with tribes on issues of importance to tribes. SCF strives for full ICWA compliance, has an ICWA Manager, has reactivated its ICWA advisory council and is working on an updated handbook.

The SA indicates community stakeholders are involved at many levels from the allocation of funding to the department wide reorganization.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Stakeholders indicated that SCF central administration is extremely responsive and noted that SCF strives for responsiveness at all levels. SCF is trying to provide information to community partners/stakeholders and ask for their ideas. Stakeholders noted that SCF no longer thinks it can “do it alone” and that SCF is getting better at asking for help. Stakeholders report that this was true at all levels-not only the State Office in Salem but also at the branch level and at the individual case level where workers ask more frequently for input before decisions are made.

- SCF is working to improve relationships and services available to tribes. Tribal stakeholders indicated they were pleased overall with state responsiveness and follow-up to their concerns. They cited the Statewide ICWA Manager, quarterly meetings with tribes, local office liaisons, and the annual "Gathering of Nations" conference as examples of positive agency responsiveness. They also noted some improvement in SCF ability to recognize the uniqueness of each tribe.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Some stakeholders, particularly in Multnomah County, indicated that continued improvement is needed in worker/foster parent partnering (see Item 35) and, in some cases, worker/CASA communication.
- Stakeholders indicated there are still a few branches where community/SCF relationships continue to be poor and should be improved.
- Stakeholders noted tribal staff sometimes had to make extra efforts at communication and were not always well informed at the case level. They indicated communication problems increased when the case was handled by a branch geographically distant from the tribe.

Item 39. The agency develops, in consultation with these representatives, annual reports of progress and services delivered pursuant to the CFSP.

 X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

SCF has a participatory CFSP planning process for the development of the 5-year CFSP and Annual Progress and Services Report. The OCCF, the CRB and the tribes in Oregon participate in developing the plan and progress reports. The OCCF has an intergovernmental agreement and receives title IV-B Subpart II funding. The CRB has a IV-E agreement for reimbursement of administrative review expenditures, while three tribes in Oregon have IV-E agreements for tribal foster care programs.

Onsite

Strengths:

See Item 38.

Areas Needing Improvement:

N/A

Item 40. The State's services under the CFSP are coordinated with services or benefits of other Federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population.

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

SCF has been engaged in a variety of efforts to coordinate its services with the services and benefits of other public and private agencies serving the same general populations of children and families. SCF has participated in the DHS Service Integration Initiative for the past several years and has partnered with Mental Health, Adult and Family Services, Medicaid, Oregon Youth Authority, Drug and Alcohol Programs, Health Division and with other state and local agencies.

Onsite

Strengths:

- Stakeholders cited numerous examples of positive ongoing collaboration and multi-disciplinary partnerships both at the systems level and the case level.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Despite this collaboration in at least one community it was felt that the community continues to expect SCF to resolve all child/family issues, and some community partners are not taking responsibility for providing community resources to serve families.

7. FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Rating of Review Team Regarding Substantial Conformity				
Rating	Not in Substantial Conformity		Substantial Conformity	
	1	2	3	- 4 -

This systemic factor is rated "4" and is in substantial conformity

Item 41. The State has implemented standards for foster family homes and childcare institutions that are reasonably in accord with recommended national standards.

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

See also Item 30. SCF certifies homes for family foster care, group family foster care, emergency family foster care, relative care, and adoptive families. All of these are covered by the same set of certification standards. The state licenses residential treatment, residential shelter care, and treatment foster care. SCF has had standards in accord with national standards for many years. In March 2001, SCF issued updated certification standards for foster care. Longstanding licensing standards for child caring agencies and residential treatment programs are applied prior to the issuance of a license and are reviewed every two years at renewal.

The SA cites the strict certification/licensing standards and criminal record check requirements for all provider homes as a strength and as evidence of Oregon's strong emphasis on safety.

See also Section VI Quality Assurance.

Onsite

Strengths:

- The state recently implemented new certification standards. Some stakeholders expressed concern that these standards limit the number of children in the care of a provider; however, others noted this as positive change. Overall, community partners view these standards as a positive effort to ensure safety for children.
- Stakeholders reported that the agency is completing timely recertification of providers on an annual basis.
- Several positive licensing practices were noted. Recent improvements in quality of licensing staff has resulted in more active recruitment and support of foster parents and a better understanding of the importance of retention. Use of certification committees in some areas of the state is improving and promoting positive relationships between licensers and foster parents, and is a promising practice more offices are adopting.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Since the licensing standards have recently changed, continued monitoring is needed to identify and address any barriers to implementation

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.

 X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

SCF standards apply not only to homes receiving title IV-E and title IV-B funds but to all placements in which SCF has custody, including foster care, relative care, and adoptive placements. SCF does allow provisional licenses for 30 days but policy does not allow claiming of federal funds during this time. (OAR 413-100-0020 and 0030).

The SA indicates some branches are experiencing difficulty completing all background checks and initial training during the 30 day period. The SA indicates the SCF is monitoring this closely.

Onsite

Strengths:

- The state applies its new standards to both relative and non-relative homes. Licensing staff gives priority to relative certifications to expedite prompt placement of children with relatives.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Continued attention needs to be given to workload impacts from the new requirements. There has been a major increase in workload due to the increase in relative home studies. Staff in one county indicated they are spending up to thirty percent of their time on relative certifications.

Item 43. The State complies with Federal requirements for criminal background clearances as related to licensing or approving foster care and adoptive placements and has in place a case planning process that includes provisions for addressing the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Child caring agencies are required to obtain and act upon criminal background information on program staff. Personnel files are examined during licensing and re-licensing to ensure checks are completed and properly acted upon. State requires criminal background checks for all foster care placements not only title IV-E/IVB placements. There has been an increasing interest by the courts, community, and tribal members in the ASFA regulations regarding criminal history background. In essence, the concern is that criminal history should not be a reason for automatic denial of certification. The issue is most notable in the relative and tribal care of children. The Oregon Legislature is currently considering legislation that would ease some of the language in current law to allow for more exceptions to foster care providers with prior criminal activities on their records.

Onsite

Strengths:

The state is obtaining criminal background checks as required.

Areas Needing Improvement:

N/A

Item 44. The 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.

X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

The SA indicates that a significant strength in Oregon is its aggressive diligent recruitment program at both the branch and state level for both general and targeted recruitment of foster and adoptive homes. Oregon has developed a successful targeted minority recruitment program although there remains a shortage of African American and also Native American foster and adoptive homes needed.

Onsite

Strengths:

- State has made recruitment a priority and increased the number of foster care home certifiers for the last biennium.
- The State is now looking at new strategies. Some stakeholders positively noted plans for neighborhood based foster care.
- Stakeholders at one site identified a successful practice of recruiting through churches, providing immediate response to interested families, and getting them into training quickly.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Stakeholders expressed concern about the discontinuation of funding for additional foster home recruitment specialists (a decision made because there was no demonstrated increase in the number of foster homes).
- Stakeholders noted a continued need for efforts to recruit more foster homes particularly homes reflecting the racial and ethnic diversity of children in foster care.
- Some stakeholders noted the need to focus on retention strategies, meeting the need for mentoring and peer support, respite care, and ensuring foster parents feel valued and an integral part of the team.

Item 45. The State has in place a process for the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptive or permanent placements for waiting children.

 X Strength Area Needing Improvement

BASIS:

State Assessment

Oregon is recognized as a national leader in making and finalizing out-of state placements. However, Oregon continues to have difficulty finalizing placements of children placed by Oregon into other states. Oregon is participating in a federal multi-state demonstration project to address this concern.

Onsite

Strengths:

- SCF utilizes strategies to maximize access to cross-jurisdictional resources including participation in regional exchanges, and extensive relative searches to identify out-of-state placements for children.

Areas Needing Improvement:

- Reviewers noted a need to ensure continued access to needed services when children move from one county to another county or State.

Summary of Findings Chart

Appendix A

For each outcome and systemic factor listed below, mark "Y" where the State is determined to be in substantial conformity and "N" where the State is determined not to be in substantial conformity. For each outcome or systemic factor marked "N", place a check beside the performance indicator, listed by item number in this form, that has been determined to be an area needing improvement.

Safety

 N Outcome S1
 x Item 1
 _____ Item 2

 N Outcome S2
 _____ Item 3
 x Item 4

Permanency

 N Outcome P1
 x Item 5
 _____ Item 6
 x Item 7
 x Item 8
 x Item 9
 x Item 10

 Y Outcome P2
 _____ Item 11
 _____ Item 12
 _____ Item 13
 _____ Item 14
 _____ Item 15
 _____ Item 16

Child and Family Well-Being

 N Outcome WB1
 x Item 17
 _____ Item 18
 x Item 19
 x Item 20

 N Outcome WB2
 x Item 21

 N Outcome WB3
 _____ Item 22
 x Item 23

Systemic Factors

 Y Statewide Information System
 _____ Item 24

 N Case Review System
 x Item 25
 _____ Item 26
 x Item 27
 _____ Item 28
 _____ Item 29

Systemic Factors (cont.)

 Y Quality Assurance System
 _____ Item 30
 _____ Item 31

 N Training
 x Item 32
 x Item 33
 _____ Item 34

 Y Service Array
 x Item 35
 _____ Item 36
 _____ Item 37

 Y Agency Responsiveness to the
Community
 _____ Item 38
 _____ Item 39
 _____ Item 40

 Y Foster and Adoptive Parent
Licensing, Recruitment, and
Retention
 _____ Item 41
 _____ Item 42
 _____ Item 43
 _____ Item 44 _____ Item 45

Oregon Review - Penalty Calculation Estimate

Pool of Funds:*	
Title IV-E Foster Care Administrative Costs	\$15,151,699
	10.00 %
	1,515,170
Title IV-B Subpart 1	3,471,124
Title IV-B Subpart 1	2,679,320
Total Pool	7,665,614

* Based on:

- Title IV-E FY 2001, 2 Quarters actual and 2 Quarters estimated
- Title IV-B FY 2001 Allocation (excludes ITO's)

Final calculation will include Foster Care Administrative costs prior quarter adjustments related to the penalty year.

Estimated penalty per area of non-conformity: \$76,656

**Total estimated Oregon penalty for eight areas of non-conformity:
\$613,248**

The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) is suspending the withholding of funds associated with this penalty during the period of the approved PIP. If ACF determines that the State is successful in rectifying any of the areas that are in non-conformity through successful completion of the PIP, we will rescind the withholding of Federal funds associated with those areas at that time.

Acronyms

ACF -	Administration for Children and Families
AFCARS -	Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System
ASFA -	Adoption and Safe Families Act
CA/N -	Child Abuse and Neglect
CFS -	Child and Family Services
CPS -	Child Protective Services
CRB -	Citizen Review Board
CWP -	Child Welfare Partnership
FACIS -	Family and Child Information System
FDM -	Family Decision Meeting
ICWA -	Indian Child Welfare Act
MIS -	Management Information System
NCANDS -	National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System
PIP -	Program Improvement Plan
SA -	State Assessment
SACWIS -	Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System
SCF -	State Office for Services to Children and Families
SOC -	System of Care
TPR -	Termination of Parental Rights
QA -	Quality Assurance

Oregon Child and Family Services Review Team

Federal Staff:

Carol Overbeck – Review Team Leader
Kathy Admire - CW Program Specialist, DHHS/ACF Region X
Katherine Aguilar - CW Program Specialist, DHHS/ACF Region IX
John Henderson - CW Program Specialist, DHHS/ACF Region X
Tina Johns - CW Program Specialist, DHHS/ACF Region IX
Jerry Milner - Policy Specialist, DHHS/ACF (DC)
Linda Mitchell - CW Program Specialist, DHHS/ACF Region I
Susan Sanders - CW Program Specialist, DHHS/ACF Region X
Elaine Squadrito - DHHS/ACF (DC)
Lois Ward - CW Program Specialist, DHHS/ACF Region X
Rosalyn Wilson - CW Program Specialist, DHHS/ACF Region VII

Peer Reviewers:

Shirley Alexander - Child Protection Program Specialist, Idaho Family and Children's Services
Ann App - CWS Supervisor, Washington DSHS/DCFS
Tim Fox - Statewide Federal Review Coordinator, Alaska DFYS
Sue Haffie - Retired, (Washington DSHS)
Marie Jamieson - Director, Washington Families for Kids Partnership
Ellie Jones - Consultant, California DSS
Eileen Lally - Program Manager, U of AK - Family Services Training Academy
Myrrl McBride - Deputy Director, New Mexico CYF/Protective Services
Shirley Moore - Retired, (Washington DSHS)
Ruthie Morris - Retired, (Washington DSHS)
Mike Sumski - Associate Director of Quality Assurance, Illinois FACS
Theresa Tanoury - Director, Alaska Division of Family and Youth Services
Merlin Weyer - Assistant Administrator, South Dakota DSS/CPS
Winnie Wiatrak - Retired, (Washington DSHS)
Ray Winterowd - Division Director, Casey Family Program

Oregon Staff and Community:

Cheri Emahiser – Review Team Leader
Sandra Adams - Assistant Field Administrator - SCF
Peter Asai - Operations Manager, SCF
Diane Aspengren - CPS Supervisor, SCF
Sarah Claiborne - Intake Supervisor, SCF
Julia Foley - CET-ICWA Specialist, SCF
Dan Herman - Operations Manager, SCF
Maurita Johnson - Permanency Supervisor, SCF

Oregon Staff and Community (Cont.):

Cyndi Kallstrom - CPS Supervisor, SCF
Jenny Landis-Steward - QA/Branch Reviews Program Manager, SCF
Kathy Ledesma - Adoption Manager, SCF
Margie Lowe - Assistant Administrator for Management Operations, SCF
Karin Martin - Casework Supervisor, SCF
Shary Mason - CRB Deputy Director, Oregon Citizen Review Board
Sherri Michel-Singer - Branch Manager, SCF
Joanne Riley - ICWA Manager, SCF
Gloria Sandavol - Certification/Home Studies, SCF
Lynn Schroeder - Special Needs Adoption, Boys and Girls Aid Society
Steve Shanklin - Social Services Supervisor, SCF
Todd Siex - Branch Manager, SCF
Sara Stankey - Permanency Supervisor, SCF
Chip Sudbeck - Trillium Family Services
Kathy Swanson - CET for Protective Services, SCF
Beth Vaagen - SOC Manager, SCF
Jay Wurscher - A&D Services Coordinator, SCF