

Child and Family Services Reviews

Louisiana Final Report 2018



This page is intentionally blank.

Final Report: Louisiana Child and Family Services Review

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the state of Louisiana. The CFSRs 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 CFSRs 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 Louisiana are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Louisiana Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and submitted to
 the Children's Bureau on February 1, 2018. 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 65 cases (40 foster care and 25 in-home) conducted via a State Conducted Case Review
 process in Orleans, Baton Rouge, Covington, Thibodaux, Lafayette, Lake Charles, Alexandria, Shreveport, and Monroe
 regions of Louisiana between April 1, 2018, and September 30, 2018.
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
 - Attorneys for the agency, children and youth, and parents
 - Child welfare agency caseworkers and supervisors
 - Child welfare agency contract staff
 - Child welfare agency executive leadership
 - Child welfare agency senior managers
 - Child welfare agency area directors
 - Child welfare agency program managers
 - Child welfare agency information systems staff
 - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) staff
 - Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA)

- Court system and Court Improvement Program staff
- Foster and adoptive parents
- Information system staff
- Kinship caregivers
- Parents
- Public/private training agency staff
- State licensed and approved child care facility staff
- 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 the 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 CFSR 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.

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 of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting Louisiana's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Louisiana's performance in Round 2.

I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

Louisiana 2018 CFSR 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 the 7 systemic factors were found to be in substantial conformity:

- Quality Assurance System
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

Children's Bureau Comments on Louisiana Performance

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

In 2016, a change of leadership occurred in Louisiana DCFS, including the appointment of a cabinet secretary and a new Child Welfare (CW) director, both of whom have substantial backgrounds in child welfare. Before this change, the child welfare system had experienced years of budgetary restrictions that negatively affected the workforce, service providers, and organizational capacity to achieve child and family outcomes. The new leadership prioritized action to improve outcomes for the child welfare system, including developing a competent, stable workforce invested in best practices and improving technology to support efficient and effective staff practice. In addition, DCFS implemented new initiatives such as the Quality Improvement Center for Workforce Development grant, the Quality Parenting Initiative, and the improved Louisiana Child Welfare Training Academy.

Based on the CFSR findings, the Children's Bureau has identified cross-cutting practice concerns that affect the state's ability to meet safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes. In developing the state's Program Improvement Plan (PIP), the Children's Bureau encourages Louisiana to focus on the following key cross-cutting priorities: conducting timely and quality safety assessments; achieving timely permanency for children in foster care; engaging parents and families in quality casework; and strengthening the workforce throughout the state.

CFSR results identified key issues in the area of safety assessment. Practice concerns include the lack of accurate and comprehensive safety and risk assessments and limited parent and family engagement to assess and support families in obtaining services related to identified safety concerns. While the state did not consistently conduct comprehensive risk and safety assessments for both in-home and foster care cases, there was poorer performance for in-home cases. Some opportunities for the state to increase the effectiveness of safety practice would be to strengthen initial and ongoing risk and safety assessment activities; provide appropriate services to address identified safety concerns; develop appropriate safety plans; and ensure that the monitoring of these plans is sufficient to ensure safety.

Concerns regarding achieving permanency may be due, in part, to a lack of concerted efforts to provide appropriate services for parents, particularly incarcerated parents; courts failing to allow reunification based on compliance concerns rather than safety; a lack of concerted efforts to approve prospective adoptive homes timely; and ineffective use of concurrent planning. Opportunities for the state to improve permanency for children include establishing appropriate permanency goals and regular reviews of the progress toward meeting those goals; changing the goal to that which best meets the child's needs in a timely manner; provision of appropriate services to achieve the goal; filing for termination of parental rights (TPR) within required timeframes; and increasing the effectiveness of concurrent planning.

The CFSR case review results revealed the need for effectively engaging families during quality caseworker visits and case planning activities. The lack of parental engagement significantly affected performance in well-being items related to case planning, caseworker visits, and service needs assessment and provision. Insufficient contact with parents adversely affected the timely achievement of case plan goals and permanency for children in foster care. Further, the case review results illustrated a lack of engagement of incarcerated parents, which also negatively affected outcomes for children. The agency has an opportunity to demonstrate effective work with parents and more meaningful engagement that will result in thorough and accurate assessments of needs and services for children and parents on an ongoing basis.

The results from the CFSR indicate the need for improvements in training and support for the workforce. Staff training is very basic and does not sufficiently prepare the CW staff to do their job; however, an on-the-job training mentoring pilot shows promising results and may be an opportunity to build upon. Stronger supervision can also assure that messaging from leadership and good practice are supported.

The systemic factors of Agency Responsiveness to the Community and Quality Assurance were found to be strong and functioning within federal requirements. Louisiana collaborates, engages, and responds to internal and external stakeholders such as Tribal representatives, children and families, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, court improvement, and other family-serving agencies in the development of major federal reports. The Children's Bureau notes that Louisiana has developed an effective state case review process. The state has provided leadership, guidance, and technical assistance to counties, modeling an approach to case review that is focused on imparting what is actually happening to children and families in the child welfare system. These systemic factors provide a foundation upon which Louisiana can plan for ongoing change to improve outcomes for children and families served by the child welfare system.

II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

For each outcome, we provide performance summaries from the case review findings. The CFSR 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 DCFS. 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.

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

Louisiana is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 69% of the 29 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 the initiation of response to reports of child maltreatment according to 4 priorities: Priority 1: The first face-to-face contact with all alleged child victims shall be made as soon as possible but must be within 24 hours of the receipt of the report by the agency. The first face-to-face contact with at least one of the parents/caretakers shall also be within 24 hours. Priority 2 requires initiation with the same conditions of face-to-face contact with all alleged child victims as soon as possible, and also with at least one of the parent/caretakers, but within 48 hours of receipt of the report. Priority 3 requires the same conditions to be met within 3 calendar days of receipt of the report, and Priority 4 requires the same conditions to be met within 5 calendar days of receipt of the report.
- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 69% of the 29 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

Louisiana is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 14% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 20% of the 40 foster care cases and 4% of the 25 in-home services cases.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 8% of the 37 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 20% of the 15 applicable foster care cases and 0% of the 22 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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 14% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 20% of the 40 foster care cases and 4% of the 25 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

Louisiana is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 20% of the 40 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).

• Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 88% of the 40 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.

• Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 64% of the 39 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.

• Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 25% of the 40 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

Louisiana is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 23% of the 40 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.

• Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 53% of the 30 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 34% of the 38 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 50% of the 22 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.

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.

- In 43% of the 30 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 33% of the 21 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.

• Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 59% of the 39 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.

• Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 60% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 30% of the 33 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 50% of the 30 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 32% of the 22 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.

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.

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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 14% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 20% of the 40 foster care cases and 4% of the 25 in-home services cases.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 14% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 20% of the 40 foster care cases and 4% of the 25 in-home services cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

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

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 51% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 55% of the 40 foster care cases and 44% of the 25 in-home services cases.

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.

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

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 10% of the 60 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 14% of the 35 applicable foster care cases and 4% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 16% of the 57 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 13% of the 53 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

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

• Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 72% of the 39 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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 16% of the 61 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 25% of the 36 applicable foster care cases and 4% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 55% of the 33 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 27% of the 52 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 18% of the 45 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve fathers in case planning.

_

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.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 46% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 55% of the 40 foster care cases and 32% of the 25 in-home services cases.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 16% of the 56 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 26% of the 31 applicable foster care cases and 4% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 25% of the 52 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 15% of the 46 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with fathers were sufficient.

_

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.

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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 77% of the 30 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 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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 77% of the 30 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 75% of the 28 applicable foster care cases and 100% of the 2 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 32% of the 60 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 25% of the 40 foster care cases and 45% of the 20 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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 36% of the 59 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 30% of the 40 foster care cases and 47% of the 19 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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 36% of the 22 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 29% of the 17 applicable foster care cases and 60% of the 5 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 CFSR 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

Louisiana is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Louisiana has multiple information systems in place that operate statewide. Stakeholders reported, however, that the systems do not work seamlessly, and each requires separate data entry. In addition, delays in data entry result in an inability to consistently identify a child's current placement location.

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.

State Systemic Factor Performance

Louisiana is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. One of the 5 items in this systemic factor was 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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment. Louisiana agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- In the statewide assessment, Louisiana reported that statewide data are not available to confirm that case plans are developed jointly with parents and noted that staff struggle to locate and engage parents, especially fathers.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data from the statewide assessment showed that in most cases a periodic review is held timely either by the courts or through the agency's administrative review process. Stakeholders confirmed that periodic reviews are occurring at least every 6 months, if not more often.

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.

• Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

Stakeholders interviewed reported that permanency hearings typically occur between 9- and 12-month points in care. Data
from the statewide assessment, however, show that timely permanency hearings do not consistently occur throughout the
state.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data in the statewide assessment showed that TPR petitions are not filed timely in accordance with the requirements. Information in the statewide assessment and reported in stakeholder interviews identified barriers to filing, including court continuances to allow parents more time to achieve their case plan goals; administrative process issues with the agency attorneys; staff turnover; and a lack of sufficient information to support termination.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information provided in the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews showed that there are no data to demonstrate a consistent statewide process to notify caregivers of hearings regarding children in their care, and that a caregiver's opportunity to be heard in court is dependent upon the jurisdiction and the judge.

Quality Assurance System

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

State Systemic Factor Performance

Louisiana is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews showed that the state's CQI system functions statewide, as part of the DCFS structure, to promote the use of data to improve practice and guide collaborative efforts. Data overviews are an important focus of the state-level committee, and CQI management staff review data to identify statewide trends. Trend information and data from case reviews are provided to the state office management team to identify strengths, needs, barriers, and possible solutions to improve practice.

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

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

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data and information from the statewide assessment, which was confirmed by stakeholder interviews, do not show that staff
 are completing initial training within the allotted time. While the state uses a training management system to track staff
 training, it is the responsibility of the supervisor to enroll new workers, and there is no method to verify that all staff comply

with the state's 6-month timeframe for initial training. In addition, no data or information was provided to demonstrate that the training provides the knowledge and skills necessary to meet specific job requirements.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data and information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews showed that the agency does have ongoing staff training requirements, and that there is coordination of multi-disciplinary training through the Pelican Center. The agency does not, however, track whether all staff who must take the training complete it as required statewide.

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 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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment identifies pre-service training as a certification requirement, as well as ongoing training requirements. Data indicate, and stakeholders confirmed, that most active foster and adoptive parents complete their ongoing training requirements timely or a plan is established to ensure completion. Training requirements for staff of state licensed or approved facilities caring for children in foster care are outlined in the Licensing Regulations, and data indicate that those requirements are met in the vast majority of the facilities.

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.

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

Louisiana 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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information provided in the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews indicated that there are services available from Family Resources across the state for which there are generally no delays to receive. Stakeholders identified other service gaps, especially in the rural areas of the state, and reported waiting lists for services, transportation service issues, a lack of substance abuse treatment services, and a lack of psychological evaluation providers.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information provided in the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews identified provisions for individualizing services, such as flexible funding and the children's systems-of-care approach with wraparound services. Stakeholders interviewed, however, noted multiple barriers to individualizing services, including services not being available locally, limited services in rural communities, and waiting lists for services to medically fragile children and to children and parents with intellectual disabilities. In addition, while interpreters are provided to support service delivery, stakeholders noted a need for more services delivered directly in a family's primary language.

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

Louisiana is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Both of the 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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information provided in the statewide assessment shows that DCFS engages in ongoing consultation to develop and implement provisions of the CFSP and annual progress reports with the state's four federally recognized American Indian Tribes, the CIP, children and families, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private agencies serving children and families. The major concerns identified by these representatives are incorporated into the goals, objectives, and activities of the CFSP and annual reports of progress. As initiatives are identified, DCFS includes stakeholders in both development and implementation efforts. Stakeholders confirmed collaborations with youth, foster parent associations, the faith-based community, public universities, the juvenile justice agency, the Children's Cabinet Advisory Board, the Secretary's external advisory board, and CIP including regular meetings with the judiciary.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information provided in the statewide assessment identified examples of coordination with other federal systems through
 memoranda of understanding and information exchange with partners including the Department of Education, Juvenile
 Justice, Behavioral Health, Office of Developmental Disabilities, Medicaid, Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program, and
 Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

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

Louisiana is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. Two of the four items in this systemic factor were 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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information from the statewide assessment confirmed that DCFS policy is consistently applied to ensure that foster and
 adoptive applicants meet prescribed minimum standards for the safety, health, and well-being of children in foster care. In a
 small portion of cases where families, including relatives and non-relatives, do not meet a licensing or agency requirement,
 the home may be certified only with a licensing waiver or policy exception.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data from the statewide assessment showed that criminal background checks on household members 18 years and older
 prior to certifying a foster or adoptive family, or mandatory updates of those checks, were not completed as required. In
 addition, while most criminal record checks are completed timely for licensed agency homes, stakeholder interviews identified
 a gap in monitoring whether criminal background checks are completed timely by licensed child care contractors.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed by stakeholders showed that DCFS staff develop and implement
 annual regional recruitment and retention plans that incorporate the use of race and ethnicity data on both foster and adoptive
 parents and children in need of care. Each specific recruitment method identified in the regional plans is linked to data
 regarding children in foster care and certified foster parents. The plans are reviewed quarterly along with updated data to
 determine continued accuracy.

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.

- Louisiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Louisiana reported in the statewide assessment, and stakeholders confirmed, that a low percentage of home studies from
 other states are completed within the required 60 days. The state identified barriers to meeting ICPC home-study timeframes
 such as turnover, high worker caseloads, and competing priorities.

Appendix A Summary of Louisiana 2018 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	69% Substantially Achieved
Item 1 Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	69% Strength

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Safety Outcome 2	Not in Substantial Conformity	14% Substantially
Children are safely maintained in their homes		Achieved
whenever possible and appropriate		
Item 2	Area Needing Improvement	8% Strength
Services to protect child(ren) in home and		
prevent removal or re-entry into foster care		
Item 3	Area Needing Improvement	14% Strength
Risk and safety assessment and management		

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	20% Substantially Achieved
Item 4 Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	88% Strength
Item 5 Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	64% Strength
Item 6 Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	25% 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	23% Substantially Achieved
Item 7 Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	53% Strength
Item 8 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	34% Strength
Item 9 Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	59% Strength
Item 10 Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	60% Strength
Item 11 Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	30% Strength

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	14% Substantially Achieved
Item 12 Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	14% Strength
Sub-Item 12A Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	51% Strength
Sub-Item 12B Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	10% Strength
Sub-Item 12C Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	72% Strength
Item 13 Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	16% Strength
Item 14 Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	46% Strength
Item 15 Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	16% Strength

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 2	Not in Substantial Conformity	77% Substantially
Children receive appropriate services to meet	·	Achieved
their educational needs		
Item 16	Area Needing Improvement	77% Strength
Educational needs of the child		

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	32% Substantially Achieved
Item 17 Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	36% Strength
Item 18 Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	36% 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	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 19 Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

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	Area Needing Improvement
Item 21 Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 22 Permanency Hearings	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
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	Substantial Conformity
Item 25 Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment	Strength

STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Staff and Provider Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 26 Initial Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 27 Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Item 28	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Foster and Adoptive Parent Training		

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	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

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	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	Strength
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.

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.5%	Lower	11.9%	11.3%–12.6%	FY15–16

A-7

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. Performance shown in this table reflects performance based on May 2017 revised syntax that is pending final verification.

Appendix A: Summary of Louisiana 2018 CFSR Performance

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	9.67	Lower	8.38	6.91–10.16	15A-15B, FY15-16
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	42.7%	Higher	49.5%	47.8%–51.2%	14B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12- 23 months	45.9%	Higher	51.1%	48.5%–53.6%	16B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	31.8%	Higher	35.3%	32.8%–37.9%	16B–17A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.1%	Lower	5.4%	4.3%-6.8%	14B–17A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.44	Lower	5.88	5.66–6.11	16B–17A

^{*} 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 Summary of CFSR Round 2 Louisiana 2010 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in Louisiana in 2010. 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

_				•			on
<i>1 - </i>	 ~r-	`	ın	*^	T I	~+	\sim

Children's Bureau Region: 6

Date of Onsite Review: March 8-12, 2010

Period Under Review: October 1, 2008, through March 12, 2010

Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued: July 1, 2010

Date Program Improvement Plan Due: September 29, 2010

Date Program Improvement Plan Approved: September 1, 2011

Highlights of Findings

Performance Measurements

- A. The state met the national standards for **two** of the **six** standards.
- B. The state achieved substantial conformity with **none** of the **seven** outcomes.
- C. The state achieved substantial conformity with **five** of the **seven** systemic factors.

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	93.5	Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.53	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	123.6	Meets Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	108.2	Meets Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	97.1	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	86.4	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

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	Achieved 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	Achieved Substantial Conformity

Key Findings by Item

Outcomes

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

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
21. Educational Needs of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
22. Physical Health of the Child	Strength
23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

Systemic Factors

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

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength
42. Standards Applied Equally	Strength
43. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Strength
44. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Strength
45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength