



Child and Family Services Reviews

California

Final Report

2016



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION FOR
CHILDREN & FAMILIES
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
Children's Bureau

This page is intentionally blank.

Final Report: California Child and Family Services Review

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CF SR) for the state of California. The CF SRs enable the Children's Bureau to: (1) ensure conformity with certain federal child welfare requirements; (2) determine what is actually happening to children and families as they are engaged in child welfare services; and (3) assist states in enhancing their capacity to help children and families achieve positive outcomes. Federal law and regulations authorize the Children's Bureau, within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families, to administer the review of child and family services programs under titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act. The CF SRs are structured to help states identify strengths and areas needing improvement in their child welfare practices and programs as well as institute systemic changes that will improve child and family outcomes.

The findings for California are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), and submitted to the Children's Bureau on March 25, 2016. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes, and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan
- The results of case reviews of 160 cases (128 foster care and 32 in-home cases) conducted via a State Conducted Case Review process at Butte, Calaveras, Contra Costa, Fresno, Imperial, Kern, Los Angeles, Marin, Nevada, Orange, San Diego, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, and San Mateo counties, California, between April 1, 2016, and September 30, 2016
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
 - Attorney representing the agency
 - Attorneys representing children and youth
 - Attorneys representing parents
 - CDSS senior managers and bureau chiefs
 - Child care facility staff
 - Child welfare agency caseworkers and supervisors
 - Child welfare agency county directors, deputy directors, and program managers
 - Continuous Quality Improvement staff
 - Court Appointed Special Advocates
 - Foster and adoptive licensing staff

California 2016 CFPSR Final Report

- Foster and adoptive parents and members of the Foster Parent Association
- Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) staff
- Information system staff
- Judges
- Parents
- Public/private agency training staff
- Relative caregivers
- Representatives from the Courts and Court Improvement Project
- Service providers
- Tribal representatives
- Youth served by the agency

In Round 3, the Children’s Bureau suspended the use of the state’s performance on national standards for the 7 statewide data indicators in conformity decisions. For contextual information, Appendix A of this report shows the state’s performance on the 7 data indicators. Moving forward, the Children’s Bureau will refer to the national standards as “national performance.” This national performance represents the performance of the nation on the statewide data indicators for an earlier point in time. For the time periods used to calculate the national performance for each indicator, see 80 Fed. Reg. 27263 (May 13, 2015).

Background Information

The Round 3 CFPSR assesses state performance with regard to substantial conformity with 7 child and family outcomes and 7 systemic factors. Each outcome incorporates 1 or more of the 18 items included in the case review, and each item is rated as a Strength or Area Needing Improvement based on an evaluation of certain child welfare practices and processes in the cases reviewed in the state. With two exceptions, an item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 90% or more of the applicable cases reviewed were rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies to those items. For a state to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95% or more of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome.

Eighteen items are considered in assessing the state’s substantial conformity with the 7 systemic factors. Each item reflects a key federal program requirement relevant to the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) for that systemic factor. An item is rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement based on how well the item-specific requirement is functioning. A determination of the rating is based on information provided by the state to demonstrate the functioning of the systemic factor in the statewide assessment and, as needed, from interviews with stakeholders and partners. For a state to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factors, no more than 1 of the items associated with the systemic factor can be rated as an Area Needing Improvement. For systemic factors that have only 1 item associated with them, that item must be rated as a Strength for a determination of substantial conformity.

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

The Children's Bureau made several changes to the CF SR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state's performance in the third round of the CF SRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting California's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about California's performance in Round 2.

I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

California 2016 CF SR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

None of the 7 outcomes was found to be in substantial conformity.

The following 2 of 7 systemic factors were found to be in substantial conformity:

- Statewide Information System
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

Children's Bureau Comments on California Performance

The following are the Children's Bureau's observations about cross-cutting issues and California's overall performance:

The systemic factors of Statewide Information System and Agency Responsiveness to the Community were found to be strong and functioning within federal requirements. The Children's Bureau notes that California has developed an effective state case review process. California has been successful in galvanizing support across the state-level agency, county child welfare and probation departments, and the legislature toward implementation statewide of a fully functioning quality assurance system. The state has provided leadership, guidance, and technical assistance to counties, modeling an approach to case review that is transparent with a focus on uncovering what is actually happening to children and families in the child welfare system. These systemic strengths were noted throughout the state-conducted CF SR process and will continue to be critical to the success of ongoing work.

The CF SR identified significant differences in performance among counties participating in the review. Stronger and more consistent practice and resource distribution across the state should lead to more positive outcomes for children and families. Cross-cutting concerns identified during the review include inconsistent safety practice, inconsistent quality and frequency of caseworker visits with children and parents, and lack of attention to timely achievement of permanency.

The review found that there is an opportunity to strengthen the effectiveness of safety practices in the state. California does not have a specific time frame for completing face-to-face contact with children who are the subject of a report of child maltreatment. A clear policy would confirm that the state expects investigations to include face-to-face contact with children within specific time frames, which is necessary to ensure child safety. In some cases, the agency placed children in foster care to manage situations that could

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

have been addressed while the children remained in the home. More comprehensive safety and risk assessments that incorporate case history, and case management that appropriately targets services, increases access to services, and links clients to services, could reduce the number of children entering foster care. For those children unable to remain at home, greater attention to placement matching and support to foster caregivers could improve safety in out-of-home care and placement stability.

Case review results identified strong practice in assessing and meeting the educational needs of children. The review indicated strong relationships and coordination among the agencies and local school systems. The review found inconsistent quality and frequency of caseworker visits with children and parents that affected performance on safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes. Case reviews revealed that the agency does not conduct thorough assessment of individual children and all family members, missing opportunities to identify underlying challenges in families and to provide appropriate services and support to parents. In several of the cases reviewed, challenging behaviors of children and the lack of strategies to address their behavioral needs affected performance on safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes. Many children in the review sample were on psychotropic medications to address mental/behavioral health needs. Although California has a protocol in place, appropriate oversight of prescription medication is evident on only approximately half of applicable cases.

Among the items included within the permanency outcomes, the state demonstrated the lowest performance on Item 6, which measures whether permanency was achieved timely. Case review results indicated a lack of attention to permanency, especially for children who do not return home. For example, several cases had been open for over 10 years. Engaging parents and caregivers—and continuing to work with them—is critical to maintaining safety, achieving permanency, keeping family connections for children, and promoting children’s well-being.

The review also noted challenges in achieving guardianship and adoption for children. The review included cases in which guardianship had been established, but dependency had not been dismissed. These guardianship/dependency cases represent instability for children and cannot be considered permanent. Finally, the agency does not have a clear path to petition the courts to terminate parental rights. Although not codified in law, when no adoptive resource has been identified, California courts are reluctant to terminate parental rights or to change the permanency goal to adoption. These barriers to permanency hinder concurrent planning and lengthen the time children spend in foster care.

II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

For each outcome, we provide performance summaries from the case review findings. The CF SR relies upon a case review of an approved sample of foster care cases and in-home services cases. Where relevant, we provide performance summaries that are differentiated between foster care and in-home services cases.

This report provides an overview. Results have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Details on each case rating are available to the California Department of Social Services. The state is encouraged to conduct additional item-specific analysis of the case review findings to better understand areas of practice that are associated with positive outcomes and those that need improvement.

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Item 1.

State Outcome Performance

California is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 80% of the 59 applicable cases reviewed.

Safety Outcome 1 Item Performance

Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether responses to all accepted child maltreatment reports received during the period under review were initiated, and face-to-face contact with the child(ren) made, within the time frames established by agency policies or state statutes.

State policy requires caseworkers to respond to a referral received by the hotline by completing an emergency response assessment to determine whether an in-person investigation is appropriate. If an in-person investigation is appropriate, either an immediate (within 24 hours) in-person investigation will be initiated when a child is alleged to be at immediate risk or, in case of less-severe allegations, an in-person investigation will be initiated within 10 calendar days from the date the referral is received. Although California has no stated requirement to conduct face-to-face contact with a child when an investigation is initiated, reviewers in this CF SR were instructed to consider completed face-to-face contact with a child as the initiation of the investigation.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 80% of the 59 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the safety statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 2 and 3.

State Outcome Performance

California is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 58% of the 160 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 59% of the 128 foster care cases and 50% of the 32 in-home services cases.

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

Safety Outcome 2 Item Performance

Item 2. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-Entry Into Foster Care

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to provide services to the family to prevent children's entry into foster care or re-entry after a reunification.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 62% of the 63 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 64% of the 36 applicable foster care cases and 59% of the 27 applicable in-home services cases.

Item 3. Risk and Safety Assessment and Management

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns relating to the child(ren) in their own homes or while in foster care.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 59% of the 160 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 60% of the 128 applicable foster care cases and 53% of the 32 applicable in-home services cases.

Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 4, 5, and 6.

State Outcome Performance

California is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 19% of the 128 applicable cases reviewed.

Permanency Outcome 1 Item Performance

Item 4. Stability of Foster Care Placement

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether the child in foster care is in a stable placement at the time of the onsite review and that any changes in placement that occurred during the period under review were in the best interests of the child and consistent with achieving the child's permanency goal(s).

California 2016 CFSR Final Report

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 63% of the 128 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Item 5. Permanency Goal for Child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether appropriate permanency goals were established for the child in a timely manner.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 50% of the 127 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Item 6. Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether concerted efforts were made, or are being made, during the period under review to achieve reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 35% of the 128 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the permanency statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

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

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

State Outcome Performance

California is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 50% of the 128 applicable cases reviewed.

Permanency Outcome 2 Item Performance

Item 7. Placement With Siblings

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that siblings in foster care are placed together unless a separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 74% of the 84 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

California 2016 CFSR Final Report

Item 8. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father,¹ and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 45% of the 84 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 47% of the 45 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation with a sibling(s) in foster care who is/was in a different placement setting was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 52% of the 60 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her mother was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 58% of the 36 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her father was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

Item 9. Preserving Connections

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to maintain the child's connections to his or her neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, Tribe, school, and friends.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 44% of the 127 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Item 10. Relative Placement

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to place the child with relatives when appropriate.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 60% of the 127 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

¹ For Item 8, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification. The persons identified in these roles for the purposes of the review may include individuals who do not meet the legal definitions or conventional meanings of a mother and father.

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

Item 11. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father² or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 42% of the 64 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 48% of the 61 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her mother.
- In 46% of the 37 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her father.

Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 12, 13, 14, and 15.

State Outcome Performance

California is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 22% of the 160 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 19% of the 128 foster care cases and 34% of the 32 in-home services cases.

² For Item 11, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification.

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

Well-Being Outcome 1 Item Performance

Item 12. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency (1) made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents,³ and foster parents (both initially, if the child entered foster care or the case was opened during the period under review, and on an ongoing basis) to identify the services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address the issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family, and (2) provided the appropriate services.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 25% of the 160 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 22% of the 128 foster care cases and 38% of the 32 in-home services cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

Sub-Item 12A. Needs Assessment and Services to Children

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 59% of the 160 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 58% of the 128 foster care cases and 63% of the 32 in-home services cases.

Sub-Item 12B. Needs Assessment and Services to Parents

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 33% of the 132 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 30% of the 100 applicable foster care cases and 44% of the 32 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 45% of the 129 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 37% of the 99 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

³ For Sub-Item 12B, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable "mothers" and "fathers" for the period under review in the case.

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

Sub-Item 12C. Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 47% of the 116 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

Item 13. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents⁴ and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 35% of the 150 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 33% of the 118 applicable foster care cases and 41% of the 32 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 56% of the 117 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 43% of the 124 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 41% of the 91 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve fathers in case planning.

Item 14. Caseworker Visits With Child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the child(ren) in the case are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 61% of the 160 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 63% of the 128 foster care cases and 53% of the 32 in-home services cases.

⁴ For Item 13, in the in-home cases, “Mother” and “Father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, “mother” and “father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency’s work with multiple applicable “mothers” and “fathers” for the period under review in the case.

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

Item 15. Caseworker Visits With Parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the mothers and fathers⁵ of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 29% of the 125 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 24% of the 93 applicable foster care cases and 44% of the 32 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 42% of the 123 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 32% of the 90 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with fathers were sufficient.

Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Item 16.

State Outcome Performance

California is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 69% of the 125 applicable cases reviewed.

Well-Being Outcome 2 Item Performance

Item 16. Educational Needs of the Child

Purpose of Assessment: To assess whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs at the initial contact with the child (if the case was opened during the period under review) or on an

⁵ For Item 15, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" is typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable mother and fathers for the period under review in the case.

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

ongoing basis (if the case was opened before the period under review), and whether identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 69% of the 125 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 72% of the 112 applicable foster care cases and 38% of the 13 applicable in-home services cases.

Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 3 using the state's performance on Items 17 and 18.

State Outcome Performance

California is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 40% of the 155 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 41% of the 128 applicable foster care cases and 37% of the 27 applicable in-home services cases.

Well-Being Outcome 3 Item Performance

Item 17. Physical Health of the Child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the physical health needs of the children, including dental health needs.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 54% of the 142 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 55% of the 128 foster care cases and 43% of the 14 applicable in-home services cases.

Item 18. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the children.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 45% of the 121 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 46% of the 98 applicable foster care cases and 43% of the 23 applicable in-home services cases.

III. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

For each systemic factor below, we provide performance summaries and a determination of whether the state is in substantial conformity with that systemic factor. In addition, we provide ratings for each item and a description of how the rating was determined. The CF SR relies upon a review of information contained in the statewide assessment to assess each item. If an item rating cannot be determined from the information contained in the statewide assessment, the Children's Bureau conducts stakeholder interviews and considers information gathered through the interviews in determining ratings for each item.

Statewide Information System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 19.

State Systemic Factor Performance

California is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

Statewide Information System Item Performance

Item 19. Statewide Information System

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The statewide information system is functioning statewide to ensure that, at a minimum, the state 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.

- California received an overall rating of Strength for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment indicated that California's statewide information system can readily identify the placement status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for every child who is (or, within the immediately preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care. Stakeholders interviewed concurred that the system functions to track relevant information and that procedures are in place to reconcile data and correct errors.

Case Review System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24.

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

State Systemic Factor Performance

California is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. Two of the 5 items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

Case Review System Item Performance

Item 20. Written Case Plan

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the child's parent(s) and includes the required provisions.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected from stakeholder interviews showed that California had case plans in effect for almost all cases. However, stakeholders noted that case plans appear to be generic and are not developed jointly with parents in all counties. Stakeholders expressed that, while parents sign case plans and are sometimes involved in developing case plans, particularly when Family Team Meetings (FTM) are held, case plans are not consistently developed jointly with parents.

Item 21. Periodic Reviews

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that a periodic review for each child occurs no less frequently than once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review.

- California received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected from stakeholder interviews showed that California ensures that periodic review hearings are held in a timely manner in most cases. Stakeholders reported that most counties closely track the timeliness of periodic review hearings.

Item 22. Permanency Hearings

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a permanency hearing in a qualified court or administrative body that occurs no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

- California received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information provided in the statewide assessment and obtained during interviews with stakeholders showed that permanency hearings are occurring timely in almost all cases. Stakeholders explained that required permanency considerations are

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

generally addressed at least every 6 months during periodic review hearings despite reports of delays and continuances and congested court calendars.

Item 23. Termination of Parental Rights

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that the filing of termination of parental rights proceedings occurs in accordance with required provisions.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment did not demonstrate that California files petitions to terminate parental rights (TPR) in accordance with the provisions of the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA). The statewide assessment indicated that California does not have data to show when filings of TPR occur. Typically, after 12 months of reunification services to parents, a permanency hearing is requested to terminate reunification services that may include a petition to TPR. Stakeholders indicated that recommendations to TPR do not routinely meet ASFA timelines. Moreover, a practice is not in place to independently petition for TPR, other than an oral motion at the permanency hearing to cease reunification services. Stakeholders also confirmed that, although California does not require identification of an adoptive home before requesting TPR, practice across the state is to refrain from requesting TPR (even through oral motions) until an adoptive home is identified.

Item 24. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The case review system is functioning to ensure that foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care are notified of, and have a right to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, California did not provide data or information regarding notice to caregivers and the right to be heard in hearings. Stakeholders reported that notice is provided inconsistently to caregivers across the state and the methods for notification vary. Stakeholders explained that some courts welcome caregiver input and some counties provide caregivers a standardized form to reflect and submit their views to the court.

Quality Assurance System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 25.

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

State Systemic Factor Performance

California is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

Quality Assurance System Item Performance

Item 25. Quality Assurance System

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The quality assurance system is functioning statewide to ensure that it (1) is operating in the jurisdictions where the services included in the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) are provided, (2) has standards to evaluate the quality of services (including standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect their health and safety), (3) identifies strengths and needs of the service delivery system, (4) provides relevant reports, and (5) evaluates implemented program improvement measures.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and obtained during interviews with stakeholders showed that, although recent significant improvements have been made, California's Quality Assurance (QA) system is not fully implemented and functioning statewide. The QA system, though operational statewide, does not ensure consistent statewide standards for evaluating the quality of services across the state. Although California has made a significant commitment to continuous quality improvement (CQI) by implementing policies and providing guidance and funding to the counties for developing a uniform QA process, the state's new CQI process is not fully functioning in all counties. Stakeholders confirmed that the state's QA system in place during the period under review for this CF SR does not have a statewide process to consistently identify strengths and needs of the service delivery system and evaluate implemented program improvement measures.

Staff and Provider Training

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 26, 27, and 28.

State Systemic Factor Performance

California is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. One of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

California 2016 CFSR Final Report

Staff and Provider Training Item Performance

Item 26. Initial Staff Training

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that initial training is provided to all staff who deliver services pursuant to the CFSP that includes the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions.

- California received an overall rating of Strength for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the vast majority of caseworkers completed core training required in their first year, and juvenile probation reported that almost all placement officers completed the core training requirement. Both caseworkers and juvenile probation placement officers reported in the statewide assessment that training was either “useful” or “very useful.”

Item 27. Ongoing Staff Training

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that ongoing training is provided for staff⁶ that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information from the statewide assessment and collected in stakeholder interviews indicated that California requires continuing workers and supervisors to complete 40 hours of ongoing training within 24 months of completing initial core training and every 24-month period thereafter. Stakeholders reported that staff do not complete ongoing training consistently, and the state does not have a process to track the provisions or quality of training. Stakeholders also indicated that training options are variable across counties, and staff are not consistently provided time to complete training.

Item 28. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that training is occurring statewide for current or prospective foster parents, adoptive parents, and staff of state licensed or approved facilities (that

⁶ "Staff," for purposes of assessing this item, includes all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP. "Staff" also includes direct supervisors of all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP.

California 2016 CFSR Final Report

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.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, California reported that the state provides training for foster and adoptive parents through the Foster and Kinship Care Education program offered through the state's community college network. The state requires at least 8 hours pre-placement and 8 hours annually. California did not provide information in the statewide assessment on training of staff of licensed child care institutions or relative caregivers. Stakeholders reported that Foster Family Agencies provide training for foster families in their agencies. Stakeholders explained that training providers conduct evaluations or surveys of training quality and adjust offerings continually; however, because data on compliance with training requirements are collected by individual community colleges and licensing staff located at the agency, county, and state levels, relevant statewide data are not available.

Service Array and Resource Development

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 29 and 30.

State Systemic Factor Performance

California is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array and Resource Development. None of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

Service Array and Resource Development Item Performance

Item 29. Array of Services

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The service array and resource development system is functioning to ensure that the following array of services is accessible in all political jurisdictions covered by the CFSP: (1) services that assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, (2) services that address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe home environment, (3) services that enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and (4) services that help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and provided by stakeholders during interviews identified the tools used to assess the needs of families. In addition, stakeholders described the services in place across the state. Stakeholders confirmed that while some counties have rich, innovative, and effective service arrays, other counties severely lack access to quality services. Stakeholders also noted that the County Self-Assessment prepared annually reports gaps in the service array and a

California 2016 CFSR Final Report

plan to meet the service needs. Insufficient preventive treatment and permanency planning services to address mental health, substance abuse, domestic violence, homelessness, child care, independent living, and mental and behavioral health needs were gaps noted by stakeholders.

Item 30. Individualizing Services

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The service array and resource development system is functioning statewide to ensure that the services in Item 29 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the agency.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, California did not provide information on how well services are individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families. Stakeholders reported that services are not available statewide to meet some needs including language-specific, LGBTQ-specific services, and services to meet the cultural needs of Native American children. Stakeholders noted that some counties have developed community partnerships to provide tailored services, while other counties do not have the community resources available to do so.

Agency Responsiveness to the Community

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 31 and 32.

State Systemic Factor Performance

California is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Both items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

Agency Responsiveness to the Community Item Performance

Item 31. State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that, in implementing the provisions of the CFSP and developing related APSRs, 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, objectives, and annual updates of the CFSP.

- California received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, California reported that CDSS collaborates with Tribal governments and representatives; the state's 58 county child welfare agencies and juvenile probation departments; the Child Welfare Directors Association of

California 2016 CFSR Final Report

California; the Chief Probation Officers of California; federal, state, and local governments; California's legislative and judicial branches; Blue Ribbon Commissions; philanthropic organizations; and other stakeholders. Stakeholders interviewed confirmed that the state meets regularly with various collaborative groups and those involved in the development of the CFSP and Annual Progress and Services Report (APSR).

Item 32. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state's services under the CFSP are coordinated with services or benefits of other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population.

- California received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, California described the memberships and work of two specific collaborative bodies to demonstrate how state services under the CFSP are coordinated with services or benefits of other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population. The State Interagency Team (SIT) For Children, Youth and Families brings together representatives from the various departments within California's Health and Human Services Association with representatives from public health, education, mental health, employment, substance abuse, corrections, housing, the judiciary, emergency management, and others. The California Child Welfare Council consists of a 46-member advisory body from the legislative, judicial, and executive branches; youth; representatives from nonprofit agencies; and other stakeholders. These collaboratives work to promote shared responsibility for the welfare of children, youth, and families and ensure that planning, funding, and policy are aligned across state departments.

Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 33, 34, 35, and 36.

State Systemic Factor Performance

California is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. One of the four items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention Item Performance

Item 33. Standards Applied Equally

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that state standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds.

California 2016 CF SR Final Report

- California received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders indicated that state standards are applied equally to all foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds. The statewide assessment noted that, while there is a separate process for approving relative homes and licensing non-relative caregivers, all homes are held to the same core licensing standards. Stakeholders agreed that core licensing standards are enforced for all settings in which children are placed in foster care, including relative homes, non-relative foster homes, homes administered by foster family agencies, and child care institutions.

Item 34. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that 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.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that criminal background checks are not completed for all adults in the home for a significant portion of relative placement homes. Stakeholders interviewed reported that the state does not consistently track the completion of criminal background checks in relative homes, homes licensed directly by counties, or child care institutions.

Item 35. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed is occurring statewide.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that California has a variety of foster home recruitment activities; however, information about diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of the state's children in foster care was not provided. Stakeholders indicated that efforts to conduct diligent recruitment vary by county and that the state does not have a process in place to monitor recruitment plans.

California 2016 CFSR Final Report

Item 36. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptive or permanent placements for waiting children is occurring statewide.

- California received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, California reported the use of several cross-jurisdictional placement resources. Stakeholders reported that counties use the ICPC process to place children out-of-state or in other jurisdictions within the state. Stakeholders noted that only 55% of the requests for home studies from other states are completed within the 60-day requirement and ICPC requests for placement in other jurisdictions within the state experience similar delays in completion.

Appendix A: Summary of California 2016 CFSR Performance

**Appendix A
Summary of California 2016 Child and Family Services Review Performance**

I. Ratings for Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being Outcomes and Items

Outcome Achievement: Outcomes may be rated as in substantial conformity or not in substantial conformity. 95% of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the state to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

Item Achievement: Items may be rated as a Strength or as an Area Needing Improvement. For an overall rating of Strength, 90% of the cases reviewed for the item (with the exception of Item 1 and Item 16) must be rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies.

SAFETY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN ARE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, PROTECTED FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Safety Outcome 1 Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	Not in Substantial Conformity	80% Substantially Achieved
Item 1 Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	80% Strength

SAFETY OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Safety Outcome 2 Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	58% Substantially Achieved
Item 2 Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	62% Strength
Item 3 Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	59% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of California 2016 CFSR Performance

PERMANENCY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN HAVE PERMANENCY AND STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATIONS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Permanency Outcome 1 Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	Not in Substantial Conformity	19% Substantially Achieved
Item 4 Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	63% Strength
Item 5 Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	50% Strength
Item 6 Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	35% Strength

PERMANENCY OUTCOME 2: THE CONTINUITY OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS IS PRESERVED FOR CHILDREN.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Permanency Outcome 2 The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	Not in Substantial Conformity	50% Substantially Achieved
Item 7 Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	74% Strength
Item 8 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	45% Strength
Item 9 Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	44% Strength
Item 10 Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	60% Strength
Item 11 Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	42% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of California 2016 CFSR Performance

WELL-BEING OUTCOME 1: FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 1 Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	22% Substantially achieved
Item 12 Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	25% Strength
Sub-Item 12A Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	59% Strength
Sub-Item 12B Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	33% Strength
Sub-Item 12C Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	47% Strength
Item 13 Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	35% Strength
Item 14 Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	61% Strength
Item 15 Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	29% Strength

WELL-BEING OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 2 Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	69% Substantially Achieved
Item 16 Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	69% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of California 2016 CFSR Performance

WELL-BEING OUTCOME 3: CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 3 Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	40% Substantially Achieved
Item 17 Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	54% Strength
Item 18 Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	45% Strength

II. Ratings for Systemic Factors

The Children’s Bureau determines whether a state is in substantial conformity with federal requirements for the 7 systemic factors based on the level of functioning of each systemic factor across the state. The Children’s Bureau determines substantial conformity with the systemic factors based on ratings for the item or items within each factor. Performance on 5 of the 7 systemic factors is determined on the basis of ratings for multiple items or plan requirements. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with these systemic factors, the Children’s Bureau must find that no more than 1 of the required items for that systemic factor fails to function as required. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with the 2 systemic factors that are determined based on the rating of a single item, the Children’s Bureau must find that the item is functioning as required.

STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	In Substantial Conformity
Item 19 Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

Appendix A: Summary of California 2016 CFSR Performance

CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Case Review System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 20 Written Case Plan	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 21 Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 22 Permanency Hearings	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 23 Termination of Parental Rights	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 24 Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 25 Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Staff and Provider Training	Statewide Assessment	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 26 Initial Staff Training	Statewide Assessment	Strength

Appendix A: Summary of California 2016 CFSR Performance

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Item 27 Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 28 Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Service Array and Resource Development	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 29 Array of Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 30 Individualizing Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	In Substantial Conformity
Item 31 State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 32 Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Statewide Assessment	Strength

Appendix A: Summary of California 2016 CFSR Performance

FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 33 Standards Applied Equally	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 34 Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 35 Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 36 State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators⁷

The state's performance is considered against the national performance for each statewide data indicator and provides contextual information for considering the findings. This information is not used in conformity decisions. State performance may be statistically above, below, or no different than the national performance. If a state did not provide the required data or did not meet the applicable item data quality limits, the Children's Bureau did not calculate the state's performance for the statewide data indicator.

⁷ In October 2016, the Children's Bureau issued Technical Bulletin #9 (<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9>), which alerted states to the fact that there were technical errors in the syntax used to calculate the national and state performance for the statewide data indicators. The syntax revision is still underway, so performance shown in this table is based on the 2015 Federal Register syntax.

Appendix A: Summary of California 2016 CFSR Performance

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.1%	Lower	11.8%	11.5%–12%	FY13–14
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	8.50	Lower	10.71	10.18–11.28	14A–14B, FY14
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	40.5%	Higher	35.9%	35.3%–36.4%	12B–15A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	43.6%	Higher	41.4%	40.6%–42.2%	14B–15A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	30.3%	Higher	24.0%	23.4%–24.7%	14B–15A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.3%	Lower	10.0%	9.4%–10.7%	12B–15A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.12	Lower	3.98	3.92–4.03	14B–15A

* **Risk-Standardized Performance (RSP)** is derived from a multi-level statistical model and reflects the state's performance relative to states with similar children and takes into account the number of children the state served, the age distribution of these children, and, for some indicators, the state's entry rate. It uses risk-adjustment to minimize differences in outcomes due to factors over which the state has little control and provides a more fair comparison of state performance against national performance.

** **95% Confidence Interval** is the 95% confidence interval estimate for the state's RSP. The values shown are the lower RSP and upper RSP of the interval estimate. The interval accounts for the amount of uncertainty associated with the RSP. For example, the CB is 95% confident that the true value of the RSP is between the lower and upper limit of the interval.

*** **Data Period(s) Used for State Performance:** Refers to the initial 12-month period and the period(s) of data needed to follow the children to observe their outcomes. The FY or federal fiscal year refers to NCANDS data, which spans the 12-month period October 1 – September 30. All other periods refer to AFCARS data. "A" refers to the 6-month period October 1 – March 31. "B" refers to the 6-month period April 1 – September 30. The 2-digit year refers to the calendar year in which the period ends.

Appendix B: California 2008 CFSR Key Findings

Appendix B Summary of CFSR Round 2 California 2008 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in California in 2008. Key findings from that review are presented below. Because the Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round and in response to feedback from the child welfare field, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSR is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round.

Identifying Information and Review Dates

General Information
Children's Bureau Region: 9
Date of Onsite Review: February 4–8, 2008
Period Under Review: October 1, 2006, through February 4, 2008
Date Final Report Issued: July 17, 2008
Date Program Improvement Plan Due: September 8, 2008
Date Program Improvement Plan Approved: July 1, 2009

Highlights of Findings

Performance Measurements
A. The State met the national standards for none of the six standards.
B. The State achieved substantial conformity for none of the seven outcomes.
C. The State achieved substantial conformity for three of the seven systemic factors.

Appendix B: California 2008 CFSR Key Findings

State's Conformance With the National Standards

Data Indicator or Composite	National Standard	State's Score	Meets or Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of maltreatment recurrence (data indicator)	94.6 or higher	92.6	Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.49	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	120.1	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	94.6	Does Not Meet Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	106.2	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	92.2	Does Not Meet Standard

State's Conformance With the Outcomes

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

Appendix B: California 2008 CFSR Key Findings

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

State's Conformance With the Systemic Factors

Systemic Factor	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Statewide Information System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Case Review System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Quality Assurance System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

Appendix B: California 2008 CFSR Key Findings

Key Findings by Item

Outcomes

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment	Area Needing Improvement
Item 2. Repeat Maltreatment	Area Needing Improvement
Item 3. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-entry Into Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
Item 4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	Area Needing Improvement
Item 5. Foster Care Re-entries	Strength
Item 6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 7. Permanency Goal for Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives	Area Needing Improvement
Item 9. Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
Item 10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	Strength
Item 12. Placement With Siblings	Area Needing Improvement
Item 13. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
Item 14. Preserving Connections	Strength
Item 15. Relative Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 16. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
Item 17. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	Area Needing Improvement

Appendix B: California 2008 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	Area Needing Improvement
Item 19. Caseworker Visits With Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 20. Caseworker Visits With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
Item 21. Educational Needs of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 22. Physical Health of the Child	Strength
Item 23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

Systemic Factors

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 24. Statewide Information System	Strength
Item 25. Written Case Plan	Area Needing Improvement
Item 26. Periodic Reviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 27. Permanency Hearings	Area Needing Improvement
Item 28. Termination of Parental Rights	Area Needing Improvement
Item 29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Area Needing Improvement
Item 30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
Item 31. Quality Assurance System	Strength
Item 32. Initial Staff Training	Area Needing Improvement
Item 33. Ongoing Staff Training	Area Needing Improvement
Item 34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Area Needing Improvement
Item 35. Array of Services	Area Needing Improvement
Item 36. Service Accessibility	Area Needing Improvement
Item 37. Individualizing Services	Area Needing Improvement
Item 38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength

Appendix B: California 2008 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 39. Agency Annual Reports Pursuant to CFSP	Strength
Item 40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Area Needing Improvement
Item 41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength
Item 42. Standards Applied Equally	Area Needing Improvement
Item 43. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Strength
Item 44. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Area Needing Improvement
Item 45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength