



Child and Family Services Reviews

Oklahoma 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: Oklahoma Child and Family Services Review

INTRODUCTION

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

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Oklahoma Department of Human Services (OKDHS), and submitted to the Children's Bureau on March 21, 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 65 cases (40 foster care and 25 in-home cases) conducted via a State Conducted Case Review process at 27 district sites and 1 Tribal site in Oklahoma between April 1, 2016, and September 30, 2016
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
 - Attorneys representing the agency
 - Attorneys representing children and youth
 - Attorneys representing parents
 - Court Appointed Special Advocates
 - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) staff
 - Child care facility staff
 - Child welfare agency director, deputy directors, senior managers, and program managers
 - Child welfare caseworkers and supervisors
 - Foster and adoptive licensing staff
 - Foster and adoptive parents
 - Judges

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Representatives from the courts and Court Improvement Project
- Training 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 Oklahoma's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Oklahoma's performance in Round 2.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

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

The following 3 of 7 systemic factors were found to be in substantial conformity:

- Statewide Information System
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community
- Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

Children's Bureau Comments on Oklahoma Performance

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

As part of the settlement agreement of the class action litigation, *D.G. v. Yarbrough*, Case No. 08-CV-074-GKF-FHM (N.D. Okla. Dec. 1, 2011), OKDHS developed the Pinnacle Plan, a 5-year improvement plan for child welfare services. During the first 2 years of the plan, the state implemented many initiatives, including the recruitment and support of resource families; organizational changes and restructuring the field and local staff; improvements in initial training and mentorship of the child welfare workforce; staff training on intentional interviewing skills; practice model development and implementation; continuation of permanency roundtable efforts; improving the assessment of safety throughout the life of the case; improving monthly worker child visitation; and increased engagement of community partnerships and external stakeholders. Additionally, OKDHS created a Performance Quality Assurance (PQA) division to provide ongoing quality assurance and practice improvement information.

Oklahoma's work under the Pinnacle Plan, and its capacity for data analysis and efforts to develop a continuous quality improvement (CQI) system, will serve as a foundation for monitoring and improving practices and outcomes identified as areas of concern in the CFSR. Oklahoma implemented its current CQI system in April 2015. While still in its early stages, the state has demonstrated a strong case record review process. However, key elements still under development are critical for moving forward, such as integration of CQI processes, outcome evaluation of program improvement initiatives, and use of case record review data and information to monitor and make adjustments to practice and implementation initiatives. The Children's Bureau encourages OKDHS to analyze and share aggregate data with internal and external stakeholders to support systemic improvement and address practice issues identified during the case review.

The CFSR identified key issues in the area of safety that need to be a priority for practice improvement. Practice concerns include the lack of accurate and comprehensive safety and risk assessments; case closure with safety concerns present; and limited parent

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

and family engagement to assess and support families in obtaining services. Case review results indicated that workers focus on the presenting problems as opposed to addressing the underlying issues in the family that create safety concerns. The state needs to ensure that staff have a clear understanding of family functioning and how protective capacities affect safety. In many cases, ongoing safety assessments completed during caseworker visits do not sufficiently address safety, and as a result, significant safety concerns are not adequately assessed or addressed. OKDHS will need to further identify what supports are needed to improve safety practice, including strengthening supervision and training.

Permanency outcomes also are a challenge for the state. While the agency often established an appropriate and timely initial goal of reunification, there were a number of cases where the goal of adoption was not established in a timely manner given the case circumstances. Case review results identified that in 80% of the cases, the agency and court did not make concerted efforts to achieve reunification or adoption in a timely manner. Case reviews results and information from stakeholders indicated several practice concerns regarding the court system. Notably, while OKDHS frequently recommends termination of parental rights (TPR) prior to or at the 15-month time frame of the original petition, some district attorneys are reluctant to file for TPR timely, often because in Oklahoma parents have a right to request jury trials in termination cases. In some cases, the delay in TPR court proceedings stalls efforts toward adoption because some agency staff believe that TPR should be achieved before moving forward. In Oklahoma, periodic reviews occur no less often than once every 6 months, and permanency hearings typically occur more frequently than the 12-month federal standard. The state may be able to build upon this strong practice to improve permanency outcomes for children.

The CFSR case review found that in most cases, both the quality and frequency of visitation between the worker and the child, and the worker and the parents, is not sufficient. The lack of concerted efforts to ensure that visitation between the child and his or her parents are sufficient to maintain or promote the continuity of the relationship also affects positive outcomes.

Case review results showed that the agency struggles with conducting initial and ongoing comprehensive assessments that accurately assess the needs of children, parents, and foster parents, as well as providing services to meet those needs. Concerns relate to involving parents and children in case planning. Specifically, there is a lack of concerted efforts to pursue parents who are difficult to locate, incarcerated, or resistant to engaging with the agency. Case review findings highlighted concerns with inadequate involvement of the families in evaluating their service needs and developing case plans as well as engaging families in services. In the cases reviewed, caseworkers often provided resource and referral information to families, but provided limited or no support to engage parents in services or to follow up on whether services were provided. While family team meetings (FTMs) provide an opportunity for the parent to be involved in the case plan, the FTMs are not currently effectively involving parents in on-going case planning. Inadequate comprehensive initial and ongoing assessments, lack of frequent quality visitation with children and parents, and failure to engage parents and children in case planning, appear to also contribute to the state's struggle with appropriately assessing and meeting children's educational, physical, and behavioral/mental health needs. OKDHS has started to address these concerns through its Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Project. The project plan allows children to remain safely in their homes by providing additional assessment and delivery of preventative in-home services while linking families with community services based on their needs. These services started in July 2015 and are expected to roll out statewide by 2018. The Children's Bureau

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

encourages OKDHS to continue to address family engagement in case planning as the state evaluates and implements new and ongoing initiatives, develops its Program Improvement Plan, and implements new training academies for workers and supervisors.

Case review results and stakeholders noted that substance abuse and domestic violence services, and individualized parenting skills services, were limited. Also, there were significant differences between the services offered in metro areas and those available within the rural areas of the state. While there are some localized initiatives, an adequate array of services is not available statewide to meet the needs of children and families. Gaps or waitlists for services exist in the following areas: substance abuse treatment (especially in-patient), treatment providers for sexual abuse perpetrators, mental health treatment, speech therapy, domestic violence treatment, placement resources within the county of removal, and concrete resources to meet family needs in rural areas. Transportation and the availability of services for working parents and parents without Medicaid or insurance affected the reunification efforts. Case reviewers found that caseworkers struggle in working with families who do not speak English and that staff are not always aware of translation services. Stakeholders said there is a lack of placement resources for children with higher service needs, especially in rural areas of the state in addition to foster homes for sibling placements. The Children's Bureau encourages OKDHS to address the service array issues. This will help to ensure that assessments are occurring statewide to determine the strengths and needs of children and families so services can be provided to create safe home environments, enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and help children achieve permanency.

The CFSR identified a number of key practice strengths that the state may build upon in its program improvement efforts. Stakeholders and case review results highlighted Oklahoma's efforts to identify the Tribal membership of children. The state also showed strong practice in the recruitment, training, licensing, and retention of foster and adoptive parents. The state has the capacity for responding to, and engaging with, stakeholders and the community at the local level and is enhancing opportunities at the state level. The CFSR also identified that the state has services in some areas available to its clients that have been coordinated with other federally funded programs, such as Comprehensive Home-Based Services, substance abuse services, domestic violence treatment services, early intervention services, and a child's "health passport" Web application that allows resource providers' access to Medicaid and education information for all children who enter foster care.

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 OKDHS. 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.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR 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

Oklahoma is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 58% of the 45 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 that OKDHS respond to an accepted report of child abuse or neglect by initiating an assessment of the family or an investigation. The state prioritizes reports based on the severity and immediacy of the alleged harm to the child. Priority I reports indicate the child is in present danger and at risk of serious harm or injury and are responded to immediately, the same day the report is received. Priority II reports are initiated within 2 to 10 calendar days from acceptance of the report based on the vulnerability and risk of harm to the child. Initiation is defined as diligent face-to-face efforts to contact with the alleged child victim.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 58% of the 45 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

Oklahoma is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 9% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 13% of the 40 foster care cases and 4% of the 25 in-home services cases.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 33% of the 39 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 47% of the 15 applicable foster care cases and 25% of the 24 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 9% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 13% of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 4% of the 25 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

Oklahoma is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 8% 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).

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 58% 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 38% of the 40 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 20% 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

Oklahoma is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 15% 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 66% of the 29 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Oklahoma 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 23% of the 31 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 43% of the 14 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 44% of the 27 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 19% 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 10% of the 40 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 33% of the 40 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.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 33% of the 27 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 59% of the 27 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 33% of the 21 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 0% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 0% of the 40 foster care cases and 0% of the 25 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.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 3% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 3% 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

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 29% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 38% of the 40 foster care cases and 16% of the 25 in-home services cases.

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

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 4% of the 55 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 3% of the 30 applicable foster care cases and 4% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 13% of the 53 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 2% of the 46 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.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

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

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 31% 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 21% of the 63 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 24% of the 38 applicable foster care cases and 16% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 31% of the 48 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 32% of the 50 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 12% of the 41 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.

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

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 6% of the 53 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 7% of the 28 applicable foster care cases and 4% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 14% of the 50 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 5% of the 41 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 59% of the 46 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

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.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

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

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 59% of the 46 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 65% of the 37 applicable foster care cases and 33% of the 9 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 20% of the 65 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 15% of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 28% of the 25 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 37% of the 51 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 38% of the 40 foster care cases and 36% of the 11 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 16% of the 49 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSS Final Report

- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 14% of the 28 applicable foster care cases and 19% of the 21 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 CFSS 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

Oklahoma 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of strength for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Oklahoma provided data from the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) showing that depending on the data elements, the required data elements were present for children in care statewide in 97.79% to 100% of the cases. IT staff actively monitors and validates all data within Oklahoma's statewide information system. There are multiple processes in place to monitor the timeliness and accuracy of data and to contact field staff to educate and assist with corrections when errors are identified.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

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

Oklahoma 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.

- Oklahoma 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 during stakeholder interviews did not show that each child has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the child's parent(s). The state uses Family Team Meetings (FTMs) to provide an opportunity for parents to be involved in case planning. While stakeholders said that families were given the opportunity for input during FTMs and in completion of Family Functional Assessments (FFAs), there was no data or information to describe the quality of involvement. Case record reviews for the CFSR from April to September 2016 found the agency made concerted efforts to involve the mother in only 32% of applicable cases and the father in 12% of applicable cases.

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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Oklahoma provided data showing that in FY 2015, 93.7% of children due for periodic review hearings had one held within 6 months of the case opening. Stakeholders agreed that periodic reviews occur timely on a consistent basis and include the required provisions.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22 based on information from stakeholder interviews.
- Information collected during interviews with stakeholders indicated that permanency hearings in accordance with federal requirements are held at least annually for each child, and frequently more often. Additionally, stakeholders reported that reasonable efforts to finalize the permanency plan are reviewed at each hearing.

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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Oklahoma presented data from a December 2015 survey of judges showing that the TPR requirement was met 17.14% of the time. Stakeholders reported a wide variance regarding the requirement for filing a TPR petition for children in care 15 of 22 months. Stakeholders generally agreed that while the agency requests termination within required time frames, District attorneys varied greatly in filing the termination because parents in Oklahoma have a right to request jury trials in termination cases. Stakeholders said that the lack of available time slots for jury trials and the difficulty of obtaining a termination from juries are barriers.

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.

- Oklahoma 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, Oklahoma provided results of a foster parent survey indicating that not all foster parents are given the right to be heard at court hearings. Stakeholders reported that foster parents are given notices, but there is no consistent tracking of the date or type of notice provided. Stakeholders also reported that judicial practices across the state vary on whether foster parents are allowed in court hearings.

Oklahoma 2016 CF SR Final Report

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

Oklahoma 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Oklahoma described a strong case record review process with case reviewers who demonstrate a consistent understanding and application of the OSRI. The state has a dedicated Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) team; however, the state is missing key components such as integration of CQI processes, outcome evaluation of program improvement initiatives, and use of case record review data and information to monitor and make adjustments to practice and implementation initiatives. Both the statewide assessment and stakeholders noted that the feedback loop regarding the case review findings is being revamped and has yet to be tested in the field or the community.

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

Oklahoma 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.

Oklahoma 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Oklahoma provided a description of new worker training, which includes Pre-CORE activities and CORE training. Results of a satisfaction survey of child welfare specialists reported satisfaction rates from 56% to 76% on various aspects of the training, and supervisors reported satisfaction rates of 56% to 93% on different aspects of the program. During interviews, stakeholders said recent budget cuts resulted in the cancellation of the coaching training—coaching is a fundamental aspect of the program to support learning for the new workers.

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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Oklahoma described ongoing training requirements for staff and contracted staff and their model for evaluation of training. Stakeholders reported that supervisors and directors do not get the same information in training as new workers, thereby creating differing practice expectations. Stakeholders also noted that budget cuts required the canceling of any nonessential ongoing training in February 2016.

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.

Oklahoma 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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Strength for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Oklahoma described uniform initial and ongoing training requirements for public and private homes. Stakeholders described the mechanisms in place to monitor completion of initial training upon approval of the home and ongoing training requirements at annual reassessment. Residential workers conduct an unannounced annual visit to private foster care and adoption agencies and group homes to monitor compliance with initial and annual training requirements. Stakeholders expressed that generally foster parents believe the pre-service and ongoing training is useful and helps participants to understand the system better.

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

Oklahoma 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.

- Oklahoma 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 collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state does not have an adequate array of services accessible to children and families in all jurisdictions covered by the CFSP. In the statewide assessment, Oklahoma noted that services may have waitlists. Stakeholders said that there were significant differences between services offered in the metro areas and those available within the rural areas of the state. Parents may have to travel long distances to obtain services outside of their communities, especially if they live in rural areas. Gaps and/or waitlists for services were noted in substance abuse treatment (especially inpatient) and in treatment for sexual abuse

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

perpetrators, mental health evaluations and treatment, speech therapy, domestic violence shelters and treatment, specialized services for children on the autism spectrum, placement resources within the county of removal, and resources in rural areas to meet the families' concrete needs. Stakeholders said that there are many localized initiatives in only one or two of the five regions of the state and that there are not necessarily services available in the other regions to meet the same needs.

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.

- Oklahoma 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, Oklahoma described programs providing specialized assessments, but there was no information on the percentage of clients who receive these specialized assessments or whether services are regularly provided to meet assessed needs. Stakeholders were inconsistent in their opinions regarding services being individualized to meet the needs of children and families. Some stakeholders noted that specific courts order drug testing in cases where it is not indicated. Various stakeholder groups said that although individual needs were identified, services to address those needs were not available statewide or were difficult to obtain. Stakeholders shared that Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) are not timely and that after-hours services for parents and services for Spanish-speaking families are difficult to obtain. Stakeholders also felt that the state had difficulty recognizing and responding to the needs of parents who are developmentally delayed.

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

Oklahoma 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.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment demonstrated concerted efforts to collaborate with Tribes and specific local communities. The state described a variety of consultation efforts with service and placement providers to identify needs, standardize services, and coordinate services to clients. Community consultation efforts are focused at the local level to involve stakeholders in identification of region-specific challenges and to develop strategies to address those specific challenges. Stakeholders reported that the state is seeking feedback on how to replicate this involvement of stakeholders at the state level. The CFSP noted the involvement of youth, frontline staff, law enforcement agencies, foster parents, district attorneys, and other legal partners in the development of strategies that support the goals of the CFSP, but specific information was not provided regarding the process for involvement. Stakeholders noted the CIP's involvement in the development of the 2015-2019 CFSP, but stakeholders provided no information about how biological parents are involved in the collaboration and consultation process.

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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Oklahoma provided descriptions of services available to the agency's clients that have been coordinated with other federally funded programs. The state provided specific examples of cross-collaboration efforts, including Comprehensive Home-Based Services, substance abuse services, domestic violence treatment services, early intervention services, and the child's "health passport" Web application that allows resource provider access to Medicaid and education information for all children who enter foster care. The state described collaborative efforts with Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services, Oklahoma Systems of Care, Oklahoma State Department of Health, Community Based Child Abuse Prevention, Oklahoma State Department of Education, and Tribes receiving federal funding.

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

Oklahoma is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. Three of the four items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Oklahoma described its multi-level process for ensuring compliance with state standards. Stakeholders reported that standards are applied equally to all facilities of the same license type regardless of whether they are public, private, or religiously based. Stakeholders described the Department of Human Services Child Care Licensing (CCL) procedures for monitoring residential facilities and child-placing agencies to provide for consistent application of the standards. The state could enhance the monitoring process by reviewing audits conducted by CCL and creating a feedback loop to notify child welfare services of noncompliance.

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.

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Strength for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Oklahoma outlined the process the state follows to ensure compliance with the federal requirements for criminal background clearances, including the practice used to address reports of criminal activity following initial clearances. The agency has a yearly internal review to assure compliance with federal requirements for criminal records checks (CRC). Stakeholders said the consolidation of criminal and child abuse background checks within one unit supports consistency. The statewide assessment provided information from a 2015 state IV-E audit of 110 resources that did not show any compliance issues with CRCs. Stakeholders described the Department of Human Services CCL procedures for residential facilities and child-placing agencies, which include annual facility visits of personnel files including criminal record checks and time-limited plans of compliance if a standard is not met.

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.

Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Oklahoma received an overall rating of Strength for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Oklahoma reported that diligent recruitment plans are developed at the local level and include regular review and monitoring of data on the characteristics of children in foster care compared with the characteristics and availability of foster placements. The state described efforts to monitor the child population and pool of foster and adoptive families using monthly reports that detail the placement needs and placement types available by county, age, and race. The state provided examples of activities aimed at recruiting families to reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in care and described the process for monitoring the effectiveness of each regional office's recruitment plan. Stakeholders identified a lack of placement resources for children with higher service needs, especially in rural areas of the state, and a lack of foster homes for sibling placements.

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.

- Oklahoma 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, Oklahoma provided data showing that requests for home studies received from other states are approved within the federal 60-day requirement in 32.7% of cases. Stakeholders noted that delays are related to receiving the results of criminal record checks or the family not cooperating. Stakeholder groups agreed children in the custody of the state can be placed across jurisdictional lines to achieve permanency, and no major barriers were identified.

Appendix A: Summary of Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Performance

**Appendix A
Summary of Oklahoma 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	58% Substantially Achieved
Item 1 Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	58% 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	9% Substantially Achieved
Item 2 Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	33% Strength
Item 3 Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	9% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Oklahoma 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	8% Substantially Achieved
Item 4 Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	58% Strength
Item 5 Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	38% Strength
Item 6 Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	20% 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	15% Substantially Achieved
Item 7 Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	66% Strength
Item 8 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	23% Strength
Item 9 Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	10% Strength
Item 10 Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	33% Strength
Item 11 Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	33% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Oklahoma 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	0% Substantially Achieved
Item 12 Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	3% Strength
Sub-Item 12A Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	29% Strength
Sub-Item 12B Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	4% Strength
Sub-Item 12C Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	31% Strength
Item 13 Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	21% Strength
Item 14 Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	14% Strength
Item 15 Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	6% 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	59% Substantially Achieved
Item 16 Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	59% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Oklahoma 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	20% Substantially Achieved
Item 17 Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	37% Strength
Item 18 Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	16% 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	Substantial Conformity
Item 19 Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment	Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Oklahoma 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	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 and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 26 Initial Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

Appendix A: Summary of Oklahoma 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	Strength

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 Oklahoma 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	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	Strength
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	9.1%	Lower	13.0%	12.3%–13.7%	FY13–14
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	8.50	Lower	16.70	15.3–18.23	14A–14B, FY14

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 Oklahoma 2016 CFSR Performance

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	40.5%	Higher	27.4%	26.3%–28.5%	12B–15A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	43.6%	Higher	39.8%	38.3%–41.3%	14B–15A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	30.3%	Higher	29.9%	28.7%–31.2%	14B–15A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.3%	Lower	5.7%	4.7%–6.9%	12B–15A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.12	Lower	6.07	5.91–6.24	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 the national standard.

** **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: Oklahoma 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Appendix B Summary of CFSR Round 2 Oklahoma 2007 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in Oklahoma in 2007. 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: 6
Date of Onsite Review: August 20–24, 2007
Period Under Review: April 1, 2006, through August 20, 2007
Date Final Report Issued: April 16, 2008
Date Program Improvement Plan Due: May 22, 2008
Date Program Improvement Plan Approved: October 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 five of the seven systemic factors.

Appendix B: Oklahoma 2007 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	91.9	Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	98.8	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	119.8	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	103.8	Does Not Meet Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	116	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	74.1	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: Oklahoma 2007 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	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

Appendix B: Oklahoma 2007 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	Area Needing Improvement
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: Oklahoma 2007 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	Strength
Item 27. Permanency Hearings	Strength
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	Strength
Item 33. Ongoing Staff Training	Strength
Item 34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Strength
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	Area Needing Improvement

Appendix B: Oklahoma 2007 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	Strength
Item 41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength
Item 42. Standards Applied Equally	Strength
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