

Attachment A
Children's Bureau
Child and Family Services Reviews
Program Improvement Plan
Suggested Standard Format

States are encouraged to use this Program Improvement Plan (PIP) standard format to submit their PIP to the Children's Bureau Regional Office. The standard format includes the following sections:

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

I. PIP General Information

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

State:

Lead Children's Bureau Regional Office Contact Person:	Telephone Number:
	E-mail Address:

State Agency Name: <i>Department of Human Services, Division of Child and Family Services</i>	Address: <i>195 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City, Utah 84116</i>
	Telephone Number: <i>(801) 538-4100</i>

Lead State Agency Contact Person for the CFSR: <i>Linda Wininger</i>	Telephone Number: <i>(801) 540-5889</i>
	E-mail Address: <i>lswininger@utah.gov</i>

Lead State Agency PIP Contact Person (if different): <i>Linda Wininger</i>	Telephone Number: <i>(801) 540-5889</i>
	E-mail Address: <i>lswininger@utah.gov</i>

Lead State Agency Data Contact Person: <i>Navina Forsythe</i>	Telephone Number: <i>(801) 538-4045</i>
	E-mail Address: <i>nforsythe@utah.gov</i>

State PIP Team Members* (name, title, organization)
1. Aaron Bettinson, Reviewer, Office of Services Review
2. Amber Perkins, Southwest Region/Cedar Quality Improvement Committee Chair
3. Aude Bermond-Hamlet, Practice Improvement Coordinator, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
4. Brad McGarry, Director, Office of Services Review
5. Brent Platt, Director, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
6. Carol Baumann, Northern Region Director, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
7. Carol Miller, Program Support Specialist, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
8. Carolyn Jensen, Children's Justice Center, State Quality Improvement Committee Member
9. Casey Christopherson, Western Region Director, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
10. Charri Brummer, Deputy Director, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
11. Chris Chytraus, Fostering Healthy Children Program, State Quality Improvement Committee Member
12. Cosette Mills, Federal Revenue Coordinator, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
13. Daryl Melton, Northern Region Quality Improvement Committee Chair
14. Debbie Hofhines, Southwest Region/Washington Quality Improvement Committee Chair
15. Del Bircher, Domestic Violence Program Administrator, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
16. Diane Moore, Salt Lake Valley Region Director, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
17. Geri Winkler, Eastern Region/Moab Quality Improvement Committee Chair
18. Heidi Valdez, Prevention Program Administrator, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
19. Jeff Harrop, Practice Improvement Coordinator, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
20. Jenny Arm, Utah Pride Center, State Quality Improvement Committee Member
21. Judy Hull, Kinship Program Administrator, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
22. Julie Steele, FNP, Department of Pediatrics, U of U, State Quality Improvement Committee Co-Chair
23. Karen Buchi, Department of Pediatrics U of U, State Quality Improvement Committee Member
24. Karen Payne, Southwest Region/Sevier Quality Improvement Committee Chair
25. Karla Pardini, Jewish Community Center, State Quality Improvement Committee Member
26. Katie Gregory, Assistant Juvenile Court Administrator, State Quality Improvement Committee Member
27. Katy Larsen, Professional Development Coordinator, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
28. Kelly Peterson, CEO, Utah Foster Care Foundation
29. Kevin Jackson, In-Home Services Program Administrator, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
30. Kobi Marchello, Eastern Region/Price Quality Improvement Committee Chair
31. Kristin Lambert, Associate Director, Office of Services Review
32. Linda Wninger, Director of Practice and Program Improvement Team, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
33. Lisa McDonald, The Christmas Box International, State Quality Improvement Committee Member
34. Lori Orton, Southwest Region Director, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
35. Marissa Douglas, Southwest Region/Sevier Quality Improvement Committee Co-Chair
36. Marnie Maxwell, CPS Program Administrator, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
37. Marty Shannon, Adoption Program Administrator, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
38. Mike Hamblin, Salt Lake Valley Region Quality Improvement Committee Chair
39. Mike Scholl, Casey Family Programs
40. Misty Butler, Court Improvement Project Administrator
41. Navina Forsythe, Director of Data Research and Reporting/SAFE, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services

State PIP Team Members* (name, title, organization)
42. Paul Smith, Former Eastern Region Director, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
43. Rick Smith, Guardian ad Litem, State Quality Improvement Committee Chair
44. Rodger Williams, Indian Child Welfare Program Administrator, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
45. Sally Jones, Northern Region Quality Improvement Committee Co-Chair
46. Sarah Houser, Constituent Services Representative, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
47. Shawn Jack, Eastern Region Director, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
48. Staci Ghneim, Deputy Director, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
49. Tanya Albornoz, Foster Care Program Administrator, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services
50. Tina Groves, Indian Walk-In Center, State Quality Improvement Committee Member
51. Wendy Bunnel, Western Region Quality Improvement Committee Chair
52. Wendy Thompson, Contracts Manager, Utah's Division of Child and Family Services

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

II. PIP NARRATIVE

Introduction

Over the past two decades Utah's child welfare system has made a series of significant improvements. Utah successfully exited Federal Court oversight and the David C. lawsuit in December of 2008. Many good changes to the system happened as a result of the lawsuit and the commitment that Utah has to improve outcomes for children and families served. These included the development and delivery of training to all employees of the Practice Model, implementation of Child and Family Teams and Child and Family Team Meetings, partnering with the Department of Health to provide registered nurses to monitor and record the health, dental, and mental health assessments and treatment of each child in foster care, the deployment of the SACWIS system ("SAFE") as the database where case record information is recorded and stored, the use of data reports to manage performance, interface with the court database system "CARES", dependency drug courts, the establishment of the Office of the Guardian ad Litem, a Qualitative Case Review (QCR) performed annually on 168 cases statewide and a Case Process Review (CPR) compliance review, and Quality Improvement (QI) Committees made up of community partners in each region of the state. Utah is a model system and it must continue to make improvements to maintain that status. Our focus has been on practice and improved outcomes for families. Utah cannot stand still. It must continue to improve. In these challenging budget times it is important to maintain the quality of the work we do while making sure that we are using the funds we receive in the most effective way. Our focus in the coming years will include organizational competency and improving the infrastructure that supports the practice we expect. Along with this will be improvement in the consistency of practice across the state with training of supervisors in the role of mentoring and coaching workers as well as increased support from administration.

Utah's child welfare leadership meets on a semi-annual basis in a planning meeting. The participants in this meeting include the division director, deputy directors, other managers from the state office, and the region directors from the five geographical areas of the state. This same group also meets on a twice monthly basis for ongoing administration and coordination for the agency. The intention of the planning meetings is to develop strategic goals for the agency and to identify programs and projects needed to support the strategic goals along with the scope, resources, and schedules to guide them. In 2010, the Utah Department of Human Services, Division of Child and Family Services (Child and Family Services) was the focus of a Legislative audit. A number of recommendations were made in that audit and they, along with the findings of the Federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) have been the basis of the strategic goals selected at the planning days as well as the focus for this Program Improvement Plan (PIP).

A. OVERALL STRATEGY FOR PIP DEVELOPMENT

Child and Family Services has developed this PIP in response to the findings from CFSR conducted by the Children's Bureau (CB), Administration for Children and Families (ACF) during the week of June 21, 2010.

Utah is integrating the program improvement process into its Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) processes. First, the Court Improvement Project (CIP) hosted a CIP Summit. Over 500 people associated with Child Welfare in Utah attended. The Summit was a two-day gathering of both Child and Family Services administrators and managers and court personnel. All but two of the Utah Juvenile Court judges were in attendance. Data associated with the CFSR were compiled on a statewide basis and on a court district basis and were presented. Midday on Day 2 the attendees were divided into court districts to review district data and to choose an issue to work on as a district throughout the next year. The data presented to inform the issues were:

1. The proportion of Protective Supervision cases (court ordered In-Home Services) to Foster Care cases.
2. Median Months in Custody for Children Exiting Foster Care.
3. Number and percent of Youth Age 14 and Older Exiting Custody Prior to Emancipation.

4. Placement Stability.

Each district chose an issue and determined action items, persons responsible, and reporting for that issue.

Utah also brought together the state reviewer team that participated in the CFSR. They discussed each of the issues raised in the exit conference and identified the cases they were aware of that contributed to both strengths and areas needing improvement. The group also discussed initiatives currently being developed and implemented and what else might be needed to address the areas needing improvement.

On November 3, 2010 Utah held a webinar meeting to discuss the findings of the CFSR and brainstorm ideas for making improvements in those areas that were identified as areas needing improvement. The webinar was made available at strategic sites across the state. Twelve office sites across the state were set up. Individuals could also participate through their own computers. The number of staff and community partners who participated in the web meeting was over 60. The meeting included the use of virtual whiteboards that the participants could write on to record suggestions about each of the areas being discussed. The meeting was left open for 30 days allowing participants to continue to post their ideas.

In addition, in March 2011 the State Leadership Team held a three-day planning summit to further refine the strategies, goals, and action steps included in the PIP.

Information and ideas from each of these meetings has been incorporated into the PIP.

B. VALUES, STRATEGIES, STEPS, AND MEASUREMENTS

Utah's Child Welfare System is characterized as a continuously improving system. We have been a model for Child Welfare Systems across the country and even in other countries. However, improvements can always be made and we seek to not only maintain our current level of good practice but to improve it. This year Utah is working to improve their change efforts through enterprise portfolio management, program management, and project management.

STRATEGIC GOALS:

1. Strengthen and maintain focus of services on child safety.

This means services focus on:

- Decreasing threats of harm for children;
- Increasing caretaker protective capacity;
- Decreasing child vulnerabilities.

2. Reduce disruptions and improve permanency solutions for children receiving services.

This means:

- Serving more children in-home with their families or with kin;
- Reducing removals, placement moves, time in care, and exit of youth to non-permanence;
- Maintaining connections for children when they are in care.

3. Strengthen organizational competency in business operations and management, oversight, accountability, and CQI.

This means:

- Allocating resources to focus first on funding core services and core administrative structure.
- Improving consistency in service delivery across the state.
- Improving competence and satisfaction of workforce.
- Maintaining current levels of performance and resources.

Child and Family Services has organized its PIP into four themes that will position us for optimal improvement over the next two years:

1. Improve consistency of child welfare practice across the state. Items from the CFSR included in this strategy are:
 - a. Safety Outcome 1, Item 2 Repeat maltreatment.
 - b. Safety Outcome 2, Item 3 Services to protect children from harm.
 - c. Safety Outcome 2, Item 4 Risk of harm.
 - d. Well-being Outcome 1, Item 17 Needs and Services of child, parents, and foster parents.
 - e. Well-Being Outcome 1, Item 18 Child/family involvement in case planning.
 - f. Well-being Outcome 1, Item 19 Caseworker visits with child.
 - g. Well-being Outcome 1, Item 20 Caseworker visits with parents.
2. Improve Achievement of Permanency. Items from the CFSR included in this strategy are:
 - a. Permanency Outcome 1, Item 7 Permanency goal for child.
 - b. Permanency Outcome 1, Item 8 Reunification, guardianship, and placement with relatives.
 - c. Permanency Outcome 1, Item 9 Adoption.
 - d. Permanency Outcome 1, Item 10 Other planned permanent living arrangement.
 - e. Systemic Factors and Items Case Review System, Item 25 Case plan developed jointly with parents.
 - f. Systemic Factors and Items Case Review System, Item 29 Notification of hearings to caregivers and provision of opportunity for caregivers be heard.
3. Strengthen and Preserve Family Connections. Items from the CFSR included in this strategy are:
 - a. Permanency Outcome 2, Item 12 Placement with siblings.
 - b. Permanency Outcome 2, Item 13 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care.
 - c. Permanency Outcome 2, Item 14 Preserving connections.
 - d. Permanency Outcome 2, Item 15 Relative placement.
 - e. Relationship Outcome 2, Item 16 Relationship of child in care with parents.
4. Assess Services Available and Gaps in Services for Children and Families. Items from the CFSR included in this strategy are:
 - a. Well-Being Outcome 2 Item 21 Educational needs of the child.
 - b. Well-Being Outcome 3, Item 22 Physical health of the child.
 - c. Well-Being Outcome 3, Item 23 Mental/behavioral health of the child.
 - d. Systemic Factors and Items, Service Array and Resource Development, Item 36 Service Accessibility.
 - e. Systemic Factors and Items, Service Array and Resource Development, Item 37 Individualizing Services.

OVER-ARCHING THEMES AND STRATEGIES

Strategy 1: Improve Consistency of Child Welfare Practice Across the State

Utah has had the basis for excellent Child Welfare practice since the implementation of the Practice Model in 2000. As a result of the first round of the CFSR, Utah acknowledged that while the basis for excellent practice was in place, the consistent application of the values, principles, and skills defined in the Practice Model was not. This need was included in the first PIP. While we believe that we did achieve some results from the first PIP process we obviously are not at the level of consistency desired. As a result “improving the consistency of practice across the state” is again included in the PIP for round two.

Increasing the consistency of Child Welfare practice across the state will require us to better develop our CQI process in Utah. We have a number of components in place having added them over the last decade. We are able to pull data reports on many, many compliance measures and we have several qualitative reviews as well that measure outcomes for children and families. We want to add formal processes for accountability both at the region level and the

supervisor and worker level. In other words, there is responsibility on both the macro and the micro level for change. Utah already has a rich data reporting process; what we need to improve is the feedback loop that provides information to administration from supervisors and frontline workers, and also region accountability for improvement. While we have these on an informal basis we will increase the focus on these, which will, in turn, affect every item on the CFSR and improve the outcomes for children and families. We will tackle this from two different angles. First, a supervisor steering committee will be commissioned that will meet with the director and discuss data and the issues that are hindering practice that adheres to the Practice Model. Administration will then be responsible for finding ways to overcome these barriers so that workers can practice as required. Second, an additional component will be a defined process for regions to use the data available to determine barriers both systemic and with individual workers and teams. The data, by region, will be discussed in the Statewide Leadership Team (SLT) meetings and may then, in turn, be discussed in the supervisor committee. This improved CQI process will assist Utah in all of the other strategies in the PIP.

1.1 Define a Set of Supervisory Skills

In assessing the needs connected to the improvement of consistency, we have found that while the expectations of the Practice Model are clearly identified and the training on those expectations is adequate, the expectations, training, and follow-through for supervisors related to coaching, mentoring, and monitoring are lacking. For a number of years Utah has worked on a mentoring and coaching program for supervisors to use with their workers. We have held supervisor conferences and developed curriculum for supervisors, but the art of good supervision has not been clearly imparted to supervisors. Utah needs to define a skills set and clear expectations for supervisory practice that include a set of tasks for supervisors to accomplish that are monitored by administration for completion, Administrative and Practice Guidelines for supervisors defining the expectations, and training on the skills set needed for supervisors to do well.

The supervisor steering committee mentioned above, will play an integral part in defining the role of a supervisor, especially as it relates to the improvement of consistency in practice across the state. The committee members will be chosen through an application process from across the state and across program areas. This group will take a major role in defining the supervisory expectations, activities, and skills that will be required of every supervisor. They will develop a strategic plan, including evaluation methodology and sustainability. The plan will also include the identification of supports needed by supervisors in order to resolve barriers to supervisor success, expectations for accountability, assessment of existing tools, and identifying and prioritizing what items to measure. Administrative and Practice Guidelines will be developed in conjunction with the group to support the expectations for supervisors. The committee will meet on a regular basis with the division director. The supervisor committee will be an ongoing committee that will strengthen supervisors' involvement in the ongoing continuous quality improvement efforts of Child and Family Services.

The annual supervisor conference, funded by Casey Family Programs, will continue to be provided. This year the focus will be on supervision to promote consistency of practice leading to safety and permanency for the children we serve, which will fit well with the goals of the PIP. As a part of the presentations, supervisors will be introduced to the Structured Decision Making (SDM) model and the plans for implementation. A community of practice will also be explored for the "Supervision for Success" training that was completed just prior to the conference.

In the time between the CFSR on-sight review and today, we have begun training supervisors on the Supervision for Success training, which is presented by Jeff Bormaster of the Child Welfare League of America. We are planning to continue those trainings for both supervisors and administrators with the last series to be completed by mid-2012. We are also in the process of developing the ability to provide the training within Child and Family Services through a group of supervisors or our own trainers so that the training can be a part of the regular training curriculum offerings.

1.2 Establish Sustainable Regional CQI Process to Strengthen Statewide Consistency of Practice and Address Systemic Issues

It is important for administrators to enhance the role of the supervisors by providing leadership and support to supervisors and caseworkers. This includes setting standards of practice, monitoring practice, and holding workers and supervisors accountable for performance. With the administrative team managing outcomes, providing ongoing monitoring, and assuring continuous accountability, consistency will increase. We will be establishing processes for administrators and supervisors to increase consistency of practice by using the monthly and quarterly data reports, supervisor and administrator reports available in SAFE, QCR and CPR results, and other supervisory reviews.

Currently, regions are required to develop a “marked decline plan” whenever one of the core systemic indicators falls below the standard. This has focused attention on items such as engaging, teaming, assessing, long-term view, planning, plan implementation, and tracking and adapting. While these are fundamentally important to good outcomes for families, they do not tell the complete story. This year we are renaming and modifying the “marked decline plan” process. Now, regions will develop a “practice improvement plan” any time any indicator falls below the standard. This new process will be a part of the region CQI process.

1.3 Ensure Fidelity to the Practice Model

Utah assesses the fidelity to our Practice Model through the two reviews provided by the Performance Milestone Plan from the David C. lawsuit known as the QCR and CPR. We will continue to assess the fidelity to the Model through this process as well as through other supervisory tools. We have recently modified our review tools to reflect the measures in the CFSR. We have also broadened the requirements for practice improvement plans based on the outcomes of the reviews as described above. Practice improvement plans will be posted on the Child and Family Services website and will be linked to the posted QCR report on the Office of Services Review website. Both the report and the practice improvement plan will be shared with the State and Regional QI Committees. QI Committee members also participate in the QCR’s as shadow reviewers. Region directors will report on their activities and progress in SLT meetings.

As a part of the QCR, stakeholders are interviewed by the Office of Services Review staff. These stakeholders include community partners, Child and Family Services caseworkers and supervisors, foster and biological parents, and youth. The information gathered in these stakeholder interviews has, in the past been incorporated into the report issued by the Office of Services Review. This process will continue but with more emphasis on how the information gathered can be used to improve practice. These reports will be discussed in administrative meetings and follow up formalized. Regions will organize focus groups to determine barriers to consistent practice and will develop region CQI plans as outlined in 1.2 to address these barriers.

1.4 Implement SDM Model to Assess Safety, Risk, and Needed Ongoing Service Intervention

Utah has long had requirements for assessing safety in Child Protection cases. We have struggled with providing a tool for workers to use to formally assess ongoing safety and risk, especially in ongoing services cases. A couple of years ago, it was decided that we would look for an evidence-based tool that would fit with the Safety Model framework that was adopted several years ago. Last year, after communicating with a number of other states using the model, the SDM model was chosen. Since that time, we have worked with the Children’s Research Center to tailor the tool to Utah’s definitions of abuse and neglect and get it ready to be trained and implemented. The tool is being purchased in partnership with the CIP. Our court partners, including the Guardian ad Litem office and the Office of the Attorney General, have been a part of the selection and modification process. This partnership is key in gaining support from our legal partners and building trust in the tool and the system.

In addition to providing a new tool, staff must understand the value of assessing for safety throughout the life of the case. Training is an important aspect but cannot be relied on to provide all that is needed. The SDM assessments include an intake, initial and ongoing safety assessments for use during a CPS case, ongoing services safety assessment, and reunification readiness assessment. What remains to be done during the two year PIP timeframe is to finish the

modifications, program the tools into SAFE, train the tools, and implement them into daily practice, including monitoring performance.

Utah has a well-defined plan for implementation of the SDM tools purchased thus far. The Training of Trainers will occur the last week in September 2011. This training will include each of the region trainers and the State Professional Development Team as well as the Program and Practice Improvement Team (PPIT). Other state office administrators will also be in attendance. SDM will be further introduced to the Child and Family Services supervisors at their conference to be held in December 2011. In spring of 2012 we expect to have the SDM tools in the SAFE system and we will roll out training and Practice Guidelines to all Child and Family Services workers. Training for legal partners, including judges is also planned for the first part of 2012. There will be SDM mentors identified in each area of the state who will be available to answer questions that workers may have.

Strategy 2 – Improve the Achievement of Permanency

Permanency planning begins when the phone call is answered at Intake. Achieving a positive permanency outcome for a child continues with consideration of alternatives other than removal. Preserving permanency is always better than interrupting it and then putting it back together. An emphasis on engagement of parents and involvement of extended relatives and other support systems is vital to exploring alternatives to removal, as is the strengthening of frontline services. If a child must be placed in foster care, the pathway to permanency must be identified and kept at the forefront of case management and planning. Reunification is the first goal, but if that is not possible another family must be found. Child and Family Services employees believe that every child deserves a loving family. However, there are multiple barriers that result in children remaining in foster care far beyond permanency time frames and also aging out. Currently nearly 25% of our children have a goal of Individualized Permanency; over half of all children age 15 and older have this goal. These children are essentially in long-term foster care. Sometimes stability is confused for permanency. Many of these children have told their caseworker at one time that they did not want to be adopted, thus Individualized Permanency became their new goal. Many of these youth age out of foster care after they turn 18 years old. Last year 11% of children exited foster care to emancipation. Child and Family Services needs to identify and address systemic barriers and help caseworkers better understand the long-term needs of youth for family connections in order for them to be successful in their adult years. A paradigm shift may be needed to strengthen the value that each child leaves foster care to a permanent family.

2.1 Define Permanency Planning Practices

During the PIP period, Child and Family Services will work with the CIP to gather information on the proper selection of permanency goals, the use of concurrent goals and planning, and preservation of family connections. It is important that permanency planning be understood and implemented as a comprehensive process rather than a sequence of events so that finding appropriate permanency is, along with safety, always the highest priority. Utah will use technical assistance from the National Resource Center (NRC) for Permanency and Family Connections to assist in development of a more comprehensive approach to permanency planning and permanency decision-making, including improvement in the selection of the proper permanency goal, concurrent permanency goals, and the process of achieving permanency for every child. Child and Family Services will work with the courts and other community partners to charter a permanency planning workgroup that will develop protocol for permanency planning. This workgroup will also develop a monitoring process. In support of these changes, Practice Guidelines and a training curriculum for permanency planning will be developed and the region CQI process will include measurements and improvement strategies for improving permanency for all children in foster care and in particular youth, those children who have been in care for more than 24 months.

2.2 Pilot Casey Roundtables in Western and Eastern Regions

Between the CFSR On-Site Review and today, Utah piloted the Casey Family Programs Permanency Roundtables in Salt Lake Valley Region (the largest metropolitan area). Ten cases with children who had been in foster care for more than three years were identified. The pilot occurred at a time when the leadership in Utah at the department, division, and region level was changing. Because of this, key administrators were not completely aware of the goals of the pilot. In spite of this, the pilot did have some success with at least one of the youth being very close to achieving permanency

with a family. Several valuable lessons were learned as a result of the pilot. First, it is vitally important for administration to be involved and supportive. Second, that there are some systemic barriers that are hindering success. And, third, while our state has many innovative Child Welfare practices and is family-centered and strengths-based, we still benefit from a direct discussion on the importance of permanency for every child and expectations for staff that support that philosophy. During the CIP Summit last fall the Fourth District Juvenile Court and Child and Family Services staff met to discuss a project for the upcoming year. Fourth District chose to explore the possibilities of implementing the Permanency Roundtables in their area. The Western Region, which includes the Fourth District Court has committed to a Permanency Roundtable for eight children. In addition, the Eastern Region has also committed to a Permanency Roundtable project that will work to find permanency for eight children. One of the most important exercises in this process is the identification and elimination of systemic barriers to achieving permanency for all children in state custody.

2.3 Set up Mechanism for Foster Parents and Older Youth in Custody to have Information Regarding Upcoming Court Hearings and to Understand that They Have a Right to be Heard in Those Hearings

In the past, Child and Family Services has had an informal process for notifying foster parents of the date and time for court hearings. Because of changes to the court calendar, which cause cancellations and rescheduling of hearings, foster parents may not know when court hearings will be held. We also understand that some caseworkers tell foster parents that they really do not need to attend. This further distances foster parents from the court. It is also important for older youth to know when court hearings are scheduled. Utah will be working to educate these youth on accessing their court information through "My Case" on the Court's Management Information System (MIS). This will be done in several ways through distribution of an instructional document and training at Youth Council and/or Youth Summit meetings. The "My Case" functionality allows individuals to access information on court hearing dates and fines owed. A committee including data people from the courts and from Child and Family Services will work together to determine what parts of "My Case" can legally be accessible to foster parents. While this access may make it possible for foster parents to find information about hearing schedules that is accurate and current, it is not really a notification to foster parents. We propose to use a current survey to ask foster parents if the current system of notification is working for them, if the new ability to look up hearing information through "MyCase" is adequate, or if they would prefer an additional notification by email or some other method. This information will then be incorporated into the action steps for this item. The survey will also include questions about their experiences in the courtroom and whether or not they were given the opportunity to be heard. In addition, we will also distribute a practice alert reminding caseworkers and supervisors that foster parents are to be notified of court hearings and encouraged to attend and take the opportunity to speak.

Strategy 3 – Strengthening and Preserving Family Connections

Child and Family Services' mission statement is "Safe Children, Strengthened Families." Families are critical to the success of individuals. Family relationships are important even when families are not functioning well. We are committed to increasingly using relatives for placements when children cannot safely remain at home. Even when relatives are not able to be a placement for a child they may be a support by spending time or advocating for the child, being a member of the Child and Family Team, or supporting the parents in the changes they must make to provide for their children.

Utah values families and family relationships. The first round of the CFSR pointed out that our kinship placements often felt unsupported; this lead to frequent placement disruptions and so Utah instituted strategies to reverse this. Every region now has kinship experts whose role is to support relatives in becoming licensed foster parents, which gives both the relatives and the child not only financial support but other services as well. Until relatives complete the foster parent licensing process, they are encouraged to apply for a Specified Relative grant through the Department of Workforce Services (DWS) and are required to apply for child Medicaid through that same process. The kinship experts not only understand the process for applying with DWS, they also know the process that relatives must go through to become a licensed placement for a child. In Utah, there are separate agencies that administer foster parent training, licensing, and Medicaid/Specified Relative Grant. It is not an easy system for caseworkers to navigate and is even more confusing for relatives. A kinship expert is a great support through this.

Utah also has a kinship program administrator. This person works on the systemic barriers that relatives face as they work with these separate agencies to get the supports they and the children need to be successful. In the next two years Utah will be adding an Internet search engine that will help to locate relatives of children coming into custody. The kinship program administrator and the kinship experts will work directly with the staff who will be using the Kinship Locator search engine to interface with relatives and caseworkers in order to find viable contact information for relatives who might possibly be placement options or supports for children in foster care. They will also be working with caseworkers to help with contacting relatives and documenting in SAFE their contact information and willingness to be involved. In addition, they will be noting any systemic barriers and passing this information along to the kinship program administrator so that these can be addressed. The kinship experts and kinship program administrator meet together monthly to discuss the needs of the program.

3.1 Kin Locator

Utah is working to increase connections for children to the relatives that can be their support whether as a placement or in other ways. Since the CFSR On-Site Review we have been working on the purchase and implementation of an Internet search engine to assist us in looking for relatives. We are working in partnership with Casey Family Programs to select a provider and implement a process and are close to making a selection and developing the structure. The process will also involve identifying who will be tasked with the searches and whether that is a statewide or region position; developing Practice Guidelines around the search itself, the connection with kin and the documentation; and then gathering feedback from the regions to determine what changes need to be made to make this new system more useful and effective for caseworkers and kinship experts and ultimately children and families.

3.2 SAFE Documentation on Kin Connections

A functionality in SAFE has been developed that will provide caseworkers with a place to record the contact information and contacts made with the relatives of each child. The information is not connected to a particular case but to the child's information and therefore is easily accessible after a case closes. We have completed a pilot and will be making some adjustments before we implement statewide. The functionality in SAFE allows any staff to enter notes on conversations with kin such as "Not available for placement at this time – baby due in three months. May be available after that but would like to be kept informed. Is interested in adopting should that become the primary permanency goal." This new functionality will interface with the kin search engine described in 3.1 as it will provide a place for the information to be documented. As a part of this action step, requirements will be set and Practice Guidelines written to define the expectations for caseworkers.

The two processes outlined above (3.1 and 3.2) will be monitored and evaluated through data reports. If there are improvements to be made they will be included in the region CQI plans.

3.3 Father Engagement

Utah needs to better understand the reasons for the scores in father involvement, both in caseworker contact with fathers and in assessing needs and providing services to fathers. We would like to start the action steps for this item with a survey to determine what the root causes are for not involving fathers in case planning and other aspects of the child welfare case. Our next steps would include getting technical assistance from the NRC for In-Home Services to determine an approach to involving fathers in both foster care cases and In-Home cases when they do not reside in the home with the child. We will also request help on developing Practice Guidelines for contact with fathers that allows for flexibility to match the needs of each case.

Utah has purchased a curriculum on the importance of including fathers in child welfare cases. We will be exploring how we will use the curriculum including any modifications needed to make it compatible with the Utah Practice Model.

3.4 Parent/Child Visitation

Prior to the second round of the CFSR in Utah, a CIP summit was held where projects were selected by each of the Juvenile Court Districts. Several of those projects involved improving visitation between children and their parents during foster care episodes. The development and implementation period for these projects has concluded but information has not been formally gathered and assessed. The next step is to determine what was learned from the projects and what can be incorporated into our everyday practice that will improve visitation and maintain and build relationships between children and parents who are involved in the foster care system. This includes maintaining the vitally important relationships between siblings. We will work with the courts to incorporate the promising practices identified through the pilots into statewide practice to the extent possible. We have added an additional indicator to the QCR titled Family Connections. This indicator will review how well family connections as well as school and community connections are being maintained for children in foster care. The indicator also looks at the frequency of visits between the child and all appropriate family members. This indicator will be used in monitoring the effectiveness of the action steps for this item and, if indicated, steps for improvement will be included in the region CQI plans.

Strategy 4 – Assess and Address Gaps in Service Array

The focus for Utah in assessing and addressing gaps in services array will be on services contracted by Child and Family Services. Utah is currently working to improve the contracting process for services to support Child Welfare practice. In the past, contracts have been made at both the state and region level. This has created a problem in keeping track of what is actually available through contracted services. Region personnel have been unaware of all of the contracted services available for use with their clients. There have also been contracts for services in specific areas of the state that are needed throughout the state. The system has been unorganized and unstructured, making it very difficult for workers to understand. We are currently reviewing each contract now in place to determine if it fits with the priorities for Child and Family Services. Over the next two years we will be analyzing each contract to determine the value of it and looking for redundancy of services as well as service gaps. In addition we will be improving the auditing process to insure that the services available meet the needs. Another area for improvement will be collaboration with DWS to provide a smoother process for unlicensed kin providers to apply for Specified Relative Grants and Medicaid for children in care.

4.1 Conduct a Review of Existing Division Contracts

One of the projects started since the CFSR On-Site Review is an overhaul of the contracts process including both the procurement and auditing processes. Positions have been created and are being filled and every contract, both region and statewide, is being assessed to determine whether or not it is being used and if it is producing the outcomes that we are expecting. During the PIP period we will review the contracts that the state or any of the regions currently has and those that are expiring. We will determine if the contracted service has filled a need and if it is the best use of the funds available. If the contractor serves just one area of the state (as in a region contract) we will determine if it should be expanded to a statewide contract. As a part of this process we will also identify service needs in each region. Our focus will be on expanding services to fit with our In-Home Services. We have a goal to reduce the number of children in foster care and hope to achieve this, in part, through a richer, more effective In-Home Services program.

4.2 Develop Contracts Catalog for Workers

If workers are not aware of the services available for clients through contracts with Child and Family Services they cannot make use of those services. While the contracts are being assessed and as new contracts are made we will catalog the services provided and make that information available to caseworkers. Eventually we will include this information in the SAFE system but this will not be possible during the PIP timeframe. We will also develop a process for feedback from workers on the efficacy of the services provided through contracts so that contracts can be adjusted and services provided that better meet the needs of our clients. This will be a part of the audit process.

4.3 Collaborate with DWS to Improve and Expedite the Process for Unlicensed Kinship Providers to Apply for Specified Relative Grants and Medicaid for Children in Care

Utah is unusual in that the agency that administers TANF funds is not the same as the Child Welfare agency. This means that kinship providers must work through a number of processes administered by a number of agencies in order to get the supports they need. The process of getting a Specified Relative Grant is a complicated process, and kinship providers often give up before they complete it. It has been important to simplify the process so that kinship providers do not become frustrated. Recently we have been able to work with DWS, who manages the Specified Relative Grant, to form a specialized team to handle Specified Relative Grant applications. This will bring expertise and understanding to the process with the ultimate result of getting the services that the families need. As this new process evolves we will continue to partner with DWS to evaluate and improve the process.

C. MEASUREMENT PLAN

Utah has eight items that will need to be measured in the PIP as a result of the second round CFSR. We will be using Quality Assurance (QA) methods for measuring these items. Because the issues found in the CFSR were qualitative in nature, data from our management information system (SAFE) would not be the best method for monitoring improvement. Utah does two formal QAs each year that cover all areas of the state. The Case Process Review (CPR) is a file review that determines if workers complied with policy and documented their actions. The Qualitative Case Review (QCR) assesses outcomes to children and families. For the PIP measurements we will be utilizing our QCR process. Information regarding this review and the methodology for sampling is attached. Questions that measure the eight items will be added to the current review instruments where questions do not currently exist.

The state will utilize current QCR reviewers to conduct these reviews. These people are already involved in the state QCR process and are familiar with completing reviews. With utilizing our current process we will be able to sustain this throughout the PIP review period.

The QCRs are conducted over a nine-month time frame with each review being in one of the five different regions of the state. The initial nine-month timeframe would establish the baseline for all items whose source is QCR QA. The next three months there would be no measurement. Starting in year 2 we would begin to report quarterly by dropping off year one quarter one data and adding in year two quarter one data. For one quarter each year we would not report as no new data will have been collected. An example of this reporting method for the first two years is below. We would continue reporting in this manner through the non-overlapping year following the PIP closeout. The Metro area will always be part of the sample, since we will be using a full year's data. On the second round, we will replace the last year's data of one quarter with the new year's data for the same quarter. But it will still contain the Metro data, regardless (see attachment).

2011				2012								2013								2014							
S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A				
Baseline timeframe				No data																							
				First quarterly report – December 2012																							
				Second quarterly report – March 2012																							
				Third quarterly report – June 2013																							
				No quarterly report as no new data																							

For several of the items there may be multiple measurement questions in order to capture all areas covered by the CFSR questions or areas that were shown to be needing improvement in Utah based on the CFSR final report. Once baseline data is collected for all applicable items (Quarter 3), UT will negotiate calculation of baselines and goals by end of Quarter 4.

The 'Number of Cases' reported in the table below is the number of cases sampled in the most recent reviews. Based on analysis of prior reviews we feel confident that the number of applicable cases will meet the minimum required (the number of applicable cases from the onsite review). We will monitor this throughout the timeframe. If the applicable cases do not meet the minimum requirements then additional cases will be sampled until the acceptable number of applicable cases is attained.

PROPOSED MEASUREMENTS:

Item	Baseline	Types of Cases	Number of Cases	Source
3 - Services to Protect Children in the Home and Prevent Removal	Prospective developed during Quarters 1-3	In-home and foster care	150 Cases (CFSR: 40 applicable cases)	QCR QA
4- Risk Assessment Initial and Ongoing	Prospective developed during Quarters 1-3	In-home and foster care	150 Cases (CFSR: 65 applicable cases)	QCR QA
7- Appropriate and timely selection of the Permanency Goal	Prospective developed during Quarters 1-3	Foster care	71 Cases (CFSR: 25 applicable)	QCR QA
10- OPPLA(Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Prospective developed during Quarters 1-3	foster care	23 cases (CFSR: 16 applicable)	QCR QA
17- Assessment and provision of services for children, mother, father and caregivers	Prospective developed during Quarters 1-3 *Note that for this item, Utah performed at 100% for foster children item and 88% for children being served in IH cases. UT, in agreement with CB, will develop baseline and goal for children being served in IH cases only. Item 17 for foster children will not be monitored for PIP purposes.	In-home and foster care	150 cases (CFSR: 65 applicable cases)	QCR QA Assessment Indicator and Intervention Adequacy Indicator
18- Involvement in planning process for child, mother and father	Prospective developed during Quarters 1-3	In-home and foster care	150 cases (CFSR: 62 applicable cases)	QCR QA
19- Caseworker contact with Child:	Prospective developed during Quarters 1-3	In-home and foster care	150 Cases (CFSR: 65 applicable)	QCR QA
20- Caseworker contact with parents (mother and father)	Prospective developed during Quarters 1-3	In-home and foster care	150 Cases (CFSR: 55 applicable cases)	QCR QA

Rationales for Number of cases:

Item (3, 17, 19, 20)

QCR QA= 150 Total cases

Metro= 48 total cases (50 minus 2 adjusted to exclude Tooele Co cases)

QCR QA= 75% SCF (112) and 25% In-home (38)

Item 7 = Adjusted for SCF Cases with a permanency goal finalized in last 12 months or 64% of all SCF cases

Item 10 = Adjusted for SCF Cases with IP goal or 21% of all SCF Cases AND universe of all SCF cases with an IP goal- SACWIS

PIP Strategy Summary and TA Plan

State: Utah

Date Submitted: December 2010

PRIMARY STRATEGIES	KEY CONCERNS	TA RESOURCES NEEDED
Improve statewide consistency of practice.	Utah needs to define skills needed by supervisors to improve worker performance and consistency of practice in order to achieve the best possible outcomes for children and families.	Help from NRC for Organizational Improvement is needed. Utah will be using information from the NRCOI on building a supervisor advisory group.
	Administrative leadership is needed to support supervisors in their roles through regional CQI processes.	Pending – have not identified specific resources at this point in time but would like to reserve the right to identify in the future.
	Utah has a great system based on a Practice Model that has been in place for a number of years. Administration needs to identify and address barriers to adhering to the five Practice Model skills.	None identified at this time.
	Utah needs a formalized way of assessing initial and ongoing safety risk for children and families that will lead workers to more effective service provision.	None identified at this time.
Improve achievement of permanency.	A better understanding of the appropriate permanency planning including proper permanency goal selection is needed by both Child and Family Services and the courts. This includes concurrent permanency goal selection and planning.	May need help from NRC on permanency and family connections with information on selecting an appropriate permanency goal.
	Utah would like to focus more attention on those children and youth who have been in foster care the longest.	Casey Family Programs – Permanency Roundtables.
	Also needed is a process for notifying foster parents of court hearings and the opportunity to present information.	None identified at this time.
Improve family engagement.	Search for kin is slow and inadequate. There is not a repository for kinship contact information that is easily accessed by new caseworkers.	Casey Family Programs.
	Utah needs to determine the state's philosophy on involvement of fathers in both in home and foster care cases. Utah needs to improve the engagement of biological parents for children in foster care – especially fathers. This includes visits between caseworkers and parents as well as visitation between children and parents and siblings.	NRC for In Home Services or NRC for Permanency and Family Connections.

PRIMARY STRATEGIES	KEY CONCERNS	TA RESOURCES NEEDED
	The SACWIS system in Utah now includes a module that gives workers a place to record relatives of a child and contact information as well as contact made. This is not currently being used on a wide scale but has great potential.	None identified at this time.
Assess services available in each region by office area and gaps in services. Provide information for staff on services available.	Utah has not completed a statewide assessment of services by region and office area for many years. We need an assessment of services available and service gaps.	None identified at this time.
	Utah needs a thorough evaluation of the contracts currently in place, both region contracts and statewide contracts.	None identified at this time
	Utah has been working to improve the process for kinship placement to apply for financial support through the Department of Workforce Services, which administers TANF funds including Specified Relative Grants and Medicaid.	None identified at this time.

III. PIP Agreement Form

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

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

Agreements

The following Federal and State officials agree to the content and terms of the attached PIP:

Name of State Executive Officer for Child Welfare Services

Date

Children's Bureau

Date

IV. PIP Matrix

State: Utah
Type of Report: PIP: X Quarterly Report: ___ (Quarter:___)
Date Submitted: December 2010

Part A: Strategy Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report

Primary Strategy 1: Strengthen supervision through CQI and Quality Assurance (QA) processes.	Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: S1, S2, WB1
Goal: Improve consistency of practice across the state and across outcomes by strengthening supervision through CQI and QA processes.	Applicable CFSR Items:

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
1.1	Establish a sustainable supervisory workgroup framework to strengthen supervisors' involvement in ongoing CQI efforts, including practice consistency and improved supervision.	Jeff Harrop with supervisor group				
1.1.a	Define an administrative framework for the development of a supervisory improvement process	Jeff Harrop with supervisor group	Charter and workgroup application	Q1		
1.1.b	Charter a supervisory workgroup to act as an advisory group to the Director	SLT	Workgroup charter	Q1		
1.1.c	Convene supervisory workgroup.	Brent Platt with help from Jeff Harrop	Workgroup list	Q1		
1.1.d	Supervisory workgroup will identify barriers to consistent application of Practice Model and develop strategic plan to eliminate barriers to consistent application of Practice Model. Strategic plan will include evaluation methodology and sustainability plan, expectations for supervisor accountability, and assessment of existing resources.	Jeff Harrop with supervisor group	Strategic plan	Q3		
1.1.e	Supervisory workgroup will submit plan to SLT for approval.	SLT	Signed plan	Q4		

IV. PIP Matrix

State: Utah

Type of Report: PIP: X **Quarterly Report:** (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted: December 2010

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
1.1.f	Implement strategic plan (Administrative and Practice Guidelines).	SLT Jeff Harrop	Progress report from each region	Q5		
1.1.g	Assess outcomes and adjust strategic plan as necessary.	SLT	Evaluation report	Q7		
1.2	Establish sustainable region CQI process to strengthen statewide consistency of practice and address systemic issues.	SLT				
1.2.a	The SLT including region directors will establish a CQI process targeted toward improving consistent practice and addressing systemic issues.	Staci Ghneim	CQI process	Q3		
1.2.b	Implement process that addresses targeted statewide and regional barriers related to statewide consistency of practice and systemic issues.	Staci Ghneim	Progress reports from each region	Q5		
1.2.c	Monitor and review outcomes using data and process reports during SLT meetings.	Region directors	Monitoring report	Q7		
1.3	Ensure fidelity to the Practice Model by analyzing QCR and CPR outcomes	Linda Wininger				
1.3.a	Identify barriers to the consistent application of the five Practice Model skills engaging, assessing, teaming, planning, and intervening) using results of QCR & CPS and stakeholder interviews.	PPIT	Report from PPIT of identified barriers and any plans to mitigate	Ongoing to fit with QCR/CPR schedule but completed by Q4		
1.3.b	Convene focus groups for additional input into the identification of barriers to consistency of Practice Model based practice.	Region directors with assistance from PPIT	Report from focus groups	Same as 1.3.a		

IV. PIP Matrix

State: Utah

Type of Report: PIP: X **Quarterly Report:** (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted: December 2010

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
1.3.c	All Regions will use the current process of the practice improvement) plan (formerly known as the marked decline plan) to address barriers.	Region directors with assistance from PPIT	Written plan	Same as 1.3.a		
1.3.d	All regions will implement practice improvement plans	PPIT with SLT	Report on implementation	Q4		
1.3.e	Assess progress to fidelity to the Practice Model.	Linda Wininger	Report on fidelity to Practice Model	Q8		
1.4	Implement SDM model to assess safety, risk, and needed ongoing service intervention.	Kevin Jackson				
1.4.a	Training of trainers on SDM model	Katy Larsen CRC	Percentage of staff trained	Q1		
1.4.b	Update Practice Guidelines on utilization of the SDM tools.	Kevin Jackson Marnie Maxwell	Mandatory Information Communication (MIC) for Practice Guideline release	Q2		
1.4.c	Program CPS Risk and Safety Assessments into SAFE.	Navina Forsythe	Screen prints of tools in SAFE	Q3		
1.4.d	Train all regional staff on the use of Risk & Safety Assessments	Katy Larsen Region directors	Dates of trainings held. Percentage of staff trained	Q4		

IV. PIP Matrix

State: Utah

Type of Report: PIP: X **Quarterly Report:** (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted: December 2010

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
1.4.e	Identify a group of 'experts/mentors' on SDM that to support staff.	Kevin Jackson	List of experts and summary of how support will be provided.	Q5		
1.5	Create and implement a marketing plan for regional staff, legal partners, and community partners.	Kevin Jackson SDM group	Marketing plan	Q5		
	<i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i>					

IV. PIP Matrix

State: Utah

Type of Report: PIP: X **Quarterly Report:** (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted: December 2010

Primary Strategy 2: Partner with the legal community to improve permanency planning practices and notification of foster parents about court hearings.		Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: P1 and Case Review System				
Goal: Improve permanency for children.		Applicable CFSR Item:				

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
2.1	Improve permanency planning practices.	Marty Shannon				
2.1.a	Consult with the NRC for Permanency and Family Connections and obtain assistance in the development of a more comprehensive approach to permanency planning, permanency decision making and concurrent planning.	Jeff Harrop	Report summarizing consult with NRC and next steps	Q1		
2.1.b	Charter a workgroup, consisting of community and legal partners, to develop a permanency planning protocol and monitoring process.	Jeff Harrop	Protocol for permanency planning	Q4		
2.1.c	Review and revise Practice Guidelines and training curriculum that supports the new permanency planning protocol.	Jeff Harrop Reba Nissan	Revised Practice Guidelines and curriculum	Q4		
2.1.d	Develop marketing/training plan on the new permanency planning protocol.	Reba Nissan	Marketing and training plan	Q5		
2.1.e	Deliver statewide training for staff.	Professional Development Team Region Trainers	Report on percentage of staff trained	Q6		
2.1.f	Monitor outcomes from these action steps through data measures and by using the supervisor group described in 1.1.	Linda Winingar Navina Forsythe	Report	Q7		

IV. PIP Matrix

State:

Utah

Type of Report:

PIP: X

Quarterly Report: (Quarter:)

Date Submitted:

December 2010

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
2.1.g	Address barriers through the region CQI process outlined in 1.2.	SLT	Reports from Regions	Beginning Q3 and ongoing		
2.2	Establish Casey Permanency Roundtables pilot projects in Western and Eastern regions.	Jeff Harrop				
2.2.a	Coordinate with Casey Family Programs and Identify Roundtable team within each region.	Jeff Harrop	Plan for Roundtable roll out	Q1		
2.2.b	Identify (8) children in both the Western & Eastern Regions for intensive permanency planning through the Roundtable process.	Casey Christopherson Shawn Jack	List of 8 cases per region	Q1		
2.2.c	Conduct Roundtable training in the Western and Eastern regions.	Mike Scholl Jeff Harrop	Training completion date	Q2		
2.2.d	Convene Roundtables in the Western & Eastern regions.	Jeff Harrop Casey Christopherson Shawn Jack	Action lists from each Roundtable	Q2		
2.2.e	Monitor outcomes achieved for the 16 targeted cases and report to the SLT	Jeff Harrop Casey Christopherson Shawn Jack	Report on pilot	Q4		
2.3	Develop mechanism for foster parents and older youth in custody to have information regarding upcoming court hearings.	Navina Forsythe				
2.3.a	Write and distribute instructional document for foster youth on accessing 'My Case' through the Court's CARE system..	Doug Call Navina Forsythe	Instructional document completed	Q1		
2.3.b	Provide training for youth at Youth Council or Youth Summit meetings.	PPIT	Report of training provide and where	Q4		

IV. PIP Matrix

State: Utah

Type of Report: PIP: X **Quarterly Report:** (Quarter:)

Date Submitted: December 2010

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
2.3.c	Complete and distribute practice notification reminder for caseworkers and supervisors to notify foster parents of court hearings and allow for youth to attend if appropriate.	Navina Forsythe	MIC	Q1		
2.3.d	Determine what parts of 'My Case' can legally be accessible to foster parents.	Carol Verdoia Court legal person	Written results of decisions	Q1		
2.3.e	Survey foster parents: 1) on the effectiveness of the current notification process, including the potential use of email notifications. 2) to determine whether they are provided with the opportunity to be heard in court hearings.	Navina Forsythe	Survey results document	Q2		
2.3.f	Share survey data with SAFE/CARE interface team and determine if any follow-up action is needed.	Navina Forsythe	Minutes of meeting	Q3		
2.3.g	Complete system enhancements in the SAFE/CARE system interface based on legal determinations as per 2.3.c.	Penny Rainaldi Brody Arishita	Program-ming completed	Q4		
2.3.h	Complete system enhancement in SAFE/CARE interface to verify child specific foster care placement.	Brody Arishita SAFE team	Interface check working	Q4		
2.3.i	Test programming that was done in 2.3.f and 2.3.g.	Doug Call	Testing completed	Q5		
2.3.j	Create training materials for foster parents and staff on using 'My Case' to check for court hearing information.	Doug Call	Document completed	Q5		
2.3.k	Arrange for training on use of 'My Case' for foster parents by the Utah Foster Care Foundation.	Navina Forsythe Kelly Peterson	Instructions incorporated into training	Q6		
2.3.l	Advertise the new "My Case" process in Foster Roster.	Tanya Albornoz	Edition of Foster Roster	Q6		

IV. PIP Matrix

State: *Utah*

Type of Report: PIP: X **Quarterly Report:** (Quarter:__)

Date Submitted: *December 2010*

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
	<i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i>					

IV. PIP Matrix

State: Utah

Type of Report: PIP: X **Quarterly Report:** (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted: December 2010

Primary Strategy 3: Establish and preserve key connections for foster children by engaging fathers, locating and assessing relatives, and improving the quality of parent/child visitation.	Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: P2
Goal: Strengthen and preserve family connections.	Applicable CFSR Item:

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
3.1	Improve the ability to find relatives for possible involvement in child welfare cases such as placement options or support for children and families.	Judy Hull				
3.1.a	Research and purchase an internet based kinship search engine.	Contracts team and Judy Hull	Search engine obtained	Q1		
3.1.b	Identify position to assume lead role in managing kinship search.	SLT	Decision on how to set up the positions	Q1		
3.1.c	Write Administrative and Practice Guidelines on use of kinship locator search.	Judy Hull	Practice Guidelines	Q2		
3.1.d	Implement kinship locator search guidelines.	Linda Wininger	Launch date	Q3		
3.1.e	Review data on kinship outcomes, gather feedback from regions on use of and satisfaction with search engine and adjust processes as necessary.	Linda Wininger	Report on effectiveness of search engine	Q4		
3.1.f	Use region CQI processes to make improvements as needed.	SLT	Report on improvements made and next steps	Q6		
3.2	Finalize SAFE documentation on kin connections.	Charri Brummer				
3.2.a	Examine results of the SAFE kin connections pilot	Judy Hull	Report on	Q2		

IV. PIP Matrix

State:

Utah

Type of Report:

PIP: X

Quarterly Report: (Quarter:)

Date Submitted:

December 2010

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
	and revise as necessary.		pilot			
3.2.b	Develop statewide implementation plan for SAFE kin connections usage.	Linda Wininger	Plan	Q2		
3.2.c	Determine requirements for use of kin documentation in SAFE. Write Practice Guidelines to support the requirements.	Linda Wininger Judy Hull	Practice Guidelines	Q3		
3.2.d	Train staff on new kin documentation in SAFE	Linda Wininger Judy Hull Professional Development Team	Training plan	Q4		
3.3	Improve the engagement of fathers	Katy Larsen				
3.3.a	Consult with a NRC for In Home Services to develop an effective policy on engaging fathers.	Aude Bermond Hamlet	Report on consult with NRC	Q1		
3.3.b	Examine the agency's existing Father Engagement curriculum for compatibility with the Utah Practice Model.	Professional Development Team PPIT	Curriculum approval and list of needed revisions	Q5		
3.3.c	Provide training to staff on the policy on the engagement of fathers.	SLT	Percentage of staff trained	Q6		
3.3.d	Use QCR and CPR to determine if new policy on engaging fathers is being implemented. Use CQI process if needed to improve engagement of fathers.	PPIT	Results of QCR and CPR related to father involvement	Q7		

IV. PIP Matrix

State: Utah

Type of Report: PIP: X **Quarterly Report:** (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted: December 2010

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
3.4	Enhance parent/child visitation.	Aude Bermond-Hamlet				
3.4.a	Collect and analyze information from pilot programs on child visitation initiated through the CIP conference initiatives.	Linda Wininger	Report on pilot programs	Q4		
3.4.b	Develop a plan to standardize practice and implement throughout the state.	Linda Wininger	Plan	Q5		
3.4.c	Use QCR Family Connections and CPR measures to monitor changes in practice.	PPIT	QCR/CPR scores	Q6		
3.4.d	Revise practice guidelines as necessary.	PPIT	Practice Guidelines	Q7		
<i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i>						

IV. PIP Matrix

State: Utah

Type of Report: PIP: X **Quarterly Report:** (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted: December 2010

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
Primary Strategy 4: Assess service array across the state by designated geographical location.			Applicable CFSR Outcomes or Systemic Factors: S4, WB2, WB3			
Goal: Improve knowledge of services available in each region and improve collaboration across systems to improve the service array based on targeted needs.			Applicable CFSR Item:			

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
4.1	Assess and address gaps in service array.	Staci Ghneim region directors				
4.1a	Assess service array in each geographic area of the state.	Staci Ghneim region directors	Documentation of assessment	Q5		
4.1.b	Determine if identified gaps can be addressed through collaboration with community partner agencies.	Staci Ghneim region directors	Plan for next steps	Q5		
4.2	Conduct a review of existing division contracts in each region.	Wendy Thompson				
4.2.a	Compile a list of what contracted services are currently available in each region.	Wendy Thompson	List of current contracts	Q3		
4.2.b	Determine a method for publishing a list of current contracts with services available for clients that caseworkers can access.	Wendy Thompson	Published list with plan for updating	Q3		
4.3	Collaborate with DWS to improve and expedite process for unlicensed kin providers to apply for Specified Relative Grants and Medicaid for children in care.	Judy Hull				

IV. PIP Matrix

State: Utah

Type of Report: PIP: X **Quarterly Report:** (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted: December 2010

	Action Steps and Benchmarks	Person Responsible	Evidence of Completion	Quarter Due	Quarter Completed	Quarterly Update
4.3.a	Identify barriers and develop process to address barriers with DWS.	Judy Hull	Written process	Q1		
4.3.b	Work with DWS to implement process.	Judy Hull	Date of Implementation	Q2		
4.3.c	Evaluate process and make adjustments if needed.	Judy Hull	Report on continuing issues and how they will be addressed	Q4		
<i>Renegotiated Action Steps and Benchmarks</i>						

IV. PIP Matrix

State:

Utah

Type of Report:

PIP: X

Quarterly Report: (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted: *December 2010*

Part B: National Standards Measurement Plan and Quarterly Status Report

Safety Outcome 1: Absence of Recurrence of Maltreatment												
National Standard	94.6%											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	93.9% FFY 2008											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	92.9% FFY 2007											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	93.5% - State met negotiated goal as of FFY08 profile data, at 93.9%.											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	NA											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
Safety Outcome 2: Absence of Maltreatment of Children in Foster Care												
National Standard	99.68%											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	99.55% FFY 2008											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	99.01% FFY 2007											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	99.11% - State met negotiated goal as of FFY08 profile data, at 99.55%											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	NA											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
Permanency Outcome 1: Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification												
National Standard	122.6											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	118.1 FFY 2008											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	125.3 FFY2007											

IV. PIP Matrix

State:

Utah

Type of Report:

PIP: X

Quarterly Report: (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted:

December 2010

Negotiated Improvement Goal	NA; exceeded standard in FFY2007 and FFY2010											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	NA											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
Permanency Outcome 2: Timeliness of Adoptions												
National Standard	106.4											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	159.0 FFY 2008											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	NA; exceeded standard in all reported AFCARS periods, from FFY2007 through FFY 2010b2011a											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	NA											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	NA											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
Permanency Outcome 3: Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care for Long Periods of Time												
National Standard	121.7											
Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	120.1 FFY 2008											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	NA; exceeded standard per FFY2007b08a profile.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	NA											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	NA											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
Permanency Outcome 4: Placement Stability												
National Standard	101.5											

IV. PIP Matrix

State:

Utah

Type of Report:

PIP: X

Quarterly Report: (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted:

December 2010

Performance as Measured in Final Report/Source Data Period	71.9 FFY 2008											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	71.9 FFY 2008 – State met negotiated goal as of FFY08b09a profile data, at 74.1. FFY10b11a profile shows performance of 78.6.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	74.1											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal	NA											
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

IV. PIP Matrix

State: Utah

Type of Report: PIP: X Quarterly Report: (Quarter:)

Date Submitted: December 2010

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

Outcome/Systemic Factor: <u>S2</u>		Item: <u>3</u>											
Performance as Measured in Final Report	87.5%												
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	To be determined in Q4.												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	To be determined in Q4.												
Method of Measuring Improvement	QCR QA												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	
Outcome/Systemic Factor: <u>S2</u>		Item: <u>4</u>											
Performance as Measured in Final Report	83%												
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	To be determined in Q4.												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	To be determined in Q4.												
Method of Measuring Improvement	QCR QA												
Renegotiated Improvement Goal													
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	
Outcome/Systemic Factor: <u>P1</u>		Item: <u>7</u>											
Performance as Measured in Final Report	77.5%												
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	To be determined in Q4.												
Negotiated Improvement Goal	To be determined in Q4.												

IV. PIP Matrix

State:

Utah

Type of Report:

PIP: X

Quarterly Report: (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted:

December 2010

Method of Measuring Improvement	QCR QA											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
Outcome/Systemic Factor: <u>P1</u>	<u>Item:</u> <u>10</u>											
Performance as Measured in Final Report	75%											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	To be determined in Q4.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	To be determined in Q4.											
Method of Measuring Improvement	QCR QA											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
Outcome/Systemic Factor: <u>WB1</u>	<u>Item:</u> <u>17</u>											
Performance as Measured in Final Report	49%											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	To be determined in Q4.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	To be determined in Q4.											
Method of Measuring Improvement	QCR QA											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12

IV. PIP Matrix

State:

Utah

Type of Report:

PIP: X

Quarterly Report: (Quarter:)

Date Submitted:

December 2010

Outcome/Systemic Factor: <u>WB1</u>		Item: <u>18</u>										
Performance as Measured in Final Report	55%											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	To be determined in Q4.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	To be determined in Q4.											
Method of Measuring Improvement	QCR QA											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
Outcome/Systemic Factor: <u>WB1</u>		Item: <u>19</u>										
Performance as Measured in Final Report	88% (100% for foster cases; 88% for IH cases)											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	To be determined in Q4.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	To be determined in Q4.											
Method of Measuring Improvement	QCR QA											
Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12
Outcome/Systemic Factor: <u>WB1</u>		Item: <u>20</u>										
Performance as Measured in Final Report	49%											
Performance as Measured at Baseline/Source Data Period	To be determined in Q4.											
Negotiated Improvement Goal	To be determined in Q4.											
Method of Measuring Improvement	QCR QA											

IV. PIP Matrix

State: *Utah*

Type of Report: PIP: X **Quarterly Report:** (**Quarter:**)

Date Submitted: *December 2010*

Renegotiated Improvement Goal												
Status (Enter the current quarter measurement for the reported quarter.)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12