



Child and Family Services Reviews

Oregon

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: Oregon Child and Family Services Review

INTRODUCTION

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

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS), and submitted to the Children's Bureau on March 25, 2016. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes, and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan
- The results of case reviews of 96 cases (64 foster care and 32 in-home cases) conducted via a State Conducted Case Review process at 9 of Oregon's 16 districts between April 1, 2016, and September 30, 2016
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
 - Administrative Review Board members
 - Attorneys representing parents
 - Citizens Review Board members
 - Child welfare agency program managers, district managers, central office supervisors, and staff
 - Child welfare agency supervisors and caseworkers
 - Court Appointed Special Advocates
 - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) staff
 - Foster and adoptive licensing staff
 - Foster and adoptive parents
 - Indian Child Welfare Advisory Committee
 - Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) staff
 - Judges
 - Representatives from the court and Court Improvement Project

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Parents
- Service providers
- Youth served by the agency

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

Background Information

The Round 3 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 Oregon’s overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Oregon’s performance in Round 2.

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

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

- Statewide Information System
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

Children's Bureau Comments on Oregon Performance

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

In the statewide assessment, the DHS identified inconsistent application across the state of the investigatory process, and a lack of follow-up on allegations of abuse of children in foster care. In addition to the state's assessment for the CFSR, an external review of the safety of children in foster care in Oregon occurred in the first half of 2016. The review identified confusing DHS investigatory rules, policies, and processes and highlighted a lack of coordination among the multiple entities responsible for responding to allegations of abuse and neglect. Both the statewide assessment and the external review reported inefficient information-sharing regarding identified safety concerns and noted associated challenges, including a decreasing number of non-relative foster care resources. The shrinking pool of foster homes has led to the inability to consistently match placement options with the needs of children entering foster care. Evidence of this significant shortage was seen in the number of times children stayed with caseworkers in their offices or at a hotel over the past year.

The CFSR case review results revealed challenges similar to those identified in the statewide assessment and external review. The results showed practice concerns with making face-to-face contact with alleged victims of child abuse and neglect during investigations, and with conducting comprehensive assessments of risk and safety, both initially and at critical case junctures, such as when case circumstances change and prior to case closure. These practice concerns affect the state's ability to engage in appropriate safety planning, especially for children remaining in their family homes. As a result, Oregon recently introduced significant changes in statute and policy with regard to screening, investigatory response, and supervisory policies, as well as communication protocols among the multiple offices within DHS.

In the last several years, DHS made a commitment to increasing the number of relative placements. The CFSR found that the early identification of, and placement of children with, relatives positively affected placement stability. In more than half of the applicable cases in which placement instability was identified, children were placed with non-relative foster parents who may not have had the necessary skills to care for, or been appropriately matched to, the children in their homes. Both DHS and stakeholders interviewed attribute this, in part, to the lack of a foster-parent pool that reflects the needs and characteristics of the children requiring placement. Due to this shortage of foster homes, placement decisions appear to be driven, at times, by foster home availability rather than the

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

needs of the child. The CFSR findings emphasize the need for more foster homes that reflect the needs and characteristics of children requiring placement in Oregon. The case review results also identified the need to provide enhanced training and support to foster parents that prepares them to care for the children placed in their homes.

Maintaining connections for children is a critical component of achieving permanency and stability. DHS clearly values preserving connections for children. Cases reviewed showed that more often than not, the agency makes concerted efforts to keep children placed in their communities, engaged in their culture, connected to important adults, and bonded to their parents and siblings through frequent, often at least biweekly, visitation with each other.

The case review identified caseworker visits with children and parents as a challenge with sweeping consequences. Cases reviewed revealed that caseworkers visit children and parents at least monthly in their living environments or other places conducive to open conversation. In a number of cases, however, the frequency of visitation was not increased or decreased to reflect changing case circumstances. In addition, the lack of quality caseworker visitation is the primary factor driving areas needing improvement across various practice areas. The CFSR case review found several areas needing improvement that are affected by the quality of caseworker visits. These include lack of comprehensive risk and safety assessments, placement stability, engagement in case planning, assessing and meeting the service needs of children and parents, and achievement of permanency. The Children's Bureau encourages DHS to consider how CQI can inform and monitor strategies and key activities that address quality caseworker visitation and, in turn, positively affect many other practice areas and outcomes for children and families.

The CFSR case review results showed that DHS needs to focus attention on improving involvement of mothers and fathers in achieving safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes for their children. It is important to note that in those cases rated as a Strength, mothers and fathers were equally engaged in case planning. This involvement positively affects many practice areas, including identification of relatives, supporting relationships between children and parents, needs assessment, and service provision. However, a substantial number of the cases reviewed reflect a lack of concerted efforts to engage parents in case planning, which contributes to inadequate assessments of needs and a lack of timely and/or appropriate service provision.

Oregon has seen positive outcomes resulting from the DHS's deliberate application of resources to reduce Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (OPPLA) as a goal and to implement the new PL-113-182 requirements. In a majority of cases reviewed in which youth had the goal of OPPLA, the goal was deemed achieved because the youth was placed in a living arrangement that was considered permanent.

The CFSR also found that DHS's investment in collaborative relationships with stakeholders results in meaningful outcomes. For example, children's educational needs are routinely assessed and met, reflecting the agency's continued work with the Department of Education on: (a) data-sharing to ensure assessment and service provision for qualified students; (b) transportation agreements ensuring children experience as few school changes as possible; and (c) training school personnel on experiences of children in foster care. Through the Indian Child Welfare Advisory Committee (ICWAC), DHS has developed government-to-government relationships with federally recognized Tribes. The agency also leverages its relationships with local federal or federally assisted community organizations to ensure coordination of services and benefits for their shared populations. The same is true of DHS's work with Oregon state courts.

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

Through data-sharing and collaborative work between DHS and Oregon's Juvenile Court Improvement Program (JCIP), periodic reviews and initial and subsequent permanency hearings occur timely in most cases. However, these hearings do not facilitate timely achievement of permanency for children in foster care. In the vast majority of cases where a lack of agency and/or court concerted efforts to achieve permanency was noted, the contributing factors are either a lack of adequate needs assessment and service provision or the failure to complete administrative paperwork, such as adoption home studies, adoption or guardianship assistance forms, and adoption finalization documents.

DHS's established partnerships can be leveraged, in conjunction with a routinely functioning quality assurance system, to support the improvements needed for children and families in Oregon to achieve permanency, safety, and enhanced well-being in a more timely manner. Although DHS has made significant gains in its approach to CQI via the use of scorecards, case record reviews, and data and feedback from the field, the agency has not fully integrated the multiple data and information sources to inform the agency's direction. The Children's Bureau encourages DHS to continue its efforts to build and implement an agencywide CQI vision and operating principles. A robust and integrated CQI system would effectively support DHS's ability to implement and monitor improvement strategies focused on foster parent training, support, recruitment, and retention; staff training; the service array; and licensing activities for both foster homes and child care institutions. Prioritizing improvements in these systemic areas, in addition to casework practice around safety, assessment, and engagement, should result in a positive impact on outcomes for children and families.

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. Oregon provides an alternative/differential response to, in addition to a traditional investigation of, incoming reports of child maltreatment or children in need of services. Where relevant, we provide performance summaries that are differentiated between foster care, in-home, and in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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

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

Oregon is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

The outcome was substantially achieved in 58% of the 40 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 accepted reports are assigned for either a 24-hour or 5-calendar-day response. The Child Protective Services worker must make an initial contact within the assigned response time frame and have face-to-face contact with the alleged child victim's custodial parent or caregiver and with the alleged child victim.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 58% of the 40 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

Oregon is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 60% of the 96 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 67% of the 64 foster care cases, 47% of the 30 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 82% of the 22 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 79% of the 14 applicable foster care cases and 88% of the 8 applicable in-home services cases. None of the in-home services alternative/differential response cases was applicable for assessment for this item.

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 60% of the 96 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 67% of the 64 applicable foster care cases, 47% of the 30 applicable in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response 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

Oregon is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 20% of the 64 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).

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 78% of the 64 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 48% of the 64 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 41% of the 64 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

Oregon is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 86% of the 64 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 89% of the 36 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Oregon 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 82% of the 39 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 85% of the 20 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 84% of the 25 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 87% of the 15 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 88% of the 64 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 77% of the 61 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.

Oregon 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 79% of the 29 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 88% of the 26 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 81% of the 16 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 42% of the 96 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 39% of the 64 foster care cases, 47% of the 30 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response 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.

Oregon 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 44% of the 94 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 42% of the 64 foster care cases, 46% of the 28 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

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

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 71% of the 94 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 73% of the 64 foster care cases, 68% of the 28 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 49% of the 81 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 52% of the 52 applicable foster care cases, 44% of the 27 applicable in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 60% of the 77 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.

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.

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

- In 56% of the 66 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

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 63% of the 63 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 61% of the 87 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 67% of the 57 applicable foster care cases, 46% of the 28 applicable in-home services cases, and 100% of the 2 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 84% of the 63 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 70% of the 74 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 70% of the 60 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 68% of the 96 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 72% of the 64 foster care cases, 60% of the 30 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response 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.

Oregon 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement† for Item 15 because 59% of the 81 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 62% of the 50 applicable foster care cases, 55% of the 29 applicable in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 64% of the 75 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 66% of the 62 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 91% of the 65 applicable cases reviewed.

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.

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 91% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 91% of the 57 applicable foster care cases and 88% of the 8 applicable in-home services cases. None of the in-home alternative/differential response cases was applicable for assessment on this item.

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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 50% of the 82 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 50% of the 64 applicable foster care cases, 50% of the applicable 16 in-home services cases, and 50% of the applicable 2 in-home services alternative/differential response 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 68% of the 71 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 69% of the 64 foster care cases and 57% of the 7 applicable in-home services cases. None of the alternative/differential response cases was applicable for assessment for this item.

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 49% of the 59 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 48% of the 46 applicable foster care cases, 55% of the 11 applicable in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response 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

Oregon 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Strength for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

- In the statewide assessment, the state provided information from a targeted review to show that the statewide information system, OR-kids, has the capacity to readily identify all the required elements for children in foster care. Stakeholders asserted a high level of confidence in locating all children in their care across all regions. The state measures data quality and accuracy.

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

Oregon 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment. Oregon agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- In the statewide assessment, Oregon reported that the case plans and reports to the court include the required provisions. However, in a recent targeted review, only a few case plans showed evidence of parental involvement in development. Oregon also reported a lack of consistent and statewide documentation of completed case plans and record management of the written plans.

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment. In the statewide assessment, Oregon provided information demonstrating that almost all children and youth in care receive a periodic review once every 6 months either by a court or the Citizen Review Board (administrative review). The Citizen Review Board tracks compliance with required time frames for review, the occurrence of hearings, and the reasons for delays.

Oregon 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Oregon reported that JCIP tracks timeliness of initial and subsequent permanency hearings and shares this information with DHS. The data showed a high frequency of timeliness in several counties. Stakeholder interviews affirmed the timeliness of hearings statewide.

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment. Oregon agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- In the statewide assessment, Oregon was not able to provide information representing statewide performance for this systemic factor. The data reports that the state was able to provide were limited and showed that Termination of Parental Rights petitions are not filed timely or in accordance with federal requirements.

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment. Oregon agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- In the statewide assessment, Oregon was not able to demonstrate statewide functioning of caregiver notice and right to be heard in reviews and hearings. Although the state reported having protocols in 11 of the 16 districts, a recent survey indicated that only a simple majority of foster parents believed that they received notice. Oregon did not have additional statewide data to track and ensure that notices are being sent to children's caregivers.

Oregon 2016 CFSR 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

Oregon 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 is (1) 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.

- Oregon 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, Oregon asserted that the state has several Quality Assurance (QA) components in place, and is working toward a more comprehensive and integrated CQI system. The state maintains a statewide case review process, administers other targeted reviews, employs Results Oriented Management (ROM), and had recently implemented performance-based contracts. Oregon maintains a quarterly process that monitors a collection of data measures assigned an evaluative target range of performance. However, Oregon's QA system does not yet effectively integrate, reconcile, or routinely manage change using the data and information collected to inform the direction of agency tasks. While the state expects that the regional offices will use case review results to develop and implement improvement strategies, this work is still in its infancy, and there is not a clear mechanism for monitoring implementation and making adjustments as needed.

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

Oregon is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. None of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

Oregon 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment. Oregon agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment indicated that an initial training program is in place, but the training is not effectively preparing staff for their duties. Most respondents to a recent survey noted that they were not well-prepared for their job duties after initial training. Further analysis of the survey results found discrepancies between urban and rural districts in post-training support and observation.

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment. Oregon agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- In the statewide assessment, Oregon stated that it does not have statutory or policy requirements for continuing education for the ongoing training of staff. Oregon presented data from many trainings showing that participants generally find the information applicable, but no mechanisms are in place to assess how effective the trainings are at achieving certain levels of job performance. Further, the state asserted the need to develop additional tools for a more comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of staff training overall.

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.

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment. Oregon agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Oregon is not fully able to assess whether foster and adoptive parent training is routinely functioning statewide. Oregon noted a decline over the last 18 months in positive responses to a survey question asking whether the required initial training's statewide curriculum adequately prepared them for the foster children placed in their homes. The state's evaluation of placement stability also found concern among foster parents about a lack of preparation for placements in their homes.

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

Oregon is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array and Resource Development. Both of the items in this systemic factor were rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Oregon presented data demonstrating that although most services are available throughout the state, they are not available to the extent, or at times the quality, required to meet the identified needs of children and

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

families. Stakeholders said that common service gaps existed in almost all districts across the state, including in housing, transportation, foster care and treatment foster care, psychiatric care, and culturally appropriate service providers. Parent engagement services and In Home Safety Service Providers services were also identified as inconsistently available across the state.

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.

- Oregon 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, Oregon asserted that within resources available either through DHS or within the community, Oregon individualizes services to meet child and family needs. Child and family outcome data, however, suggest inconsistency in tailoring services across the state. During interviews, many stakeholders said that services statewide are not culturally appropriate and are limited in the languages in which they are offered. Stakeholders also said that individualizing services in rural areas is most difficult.

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

Oregon 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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that Oregon routinely involves Tribal representatives and a sufficient range or child- and family-serving stakeholders, agencies, and advisory groups in consultation for input and feedback during the

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

CFSP/APSR process. In addition, Oregon created a public version of its ROM data site to be able to communicate performance with a wider group of stakeholders on CFSR and CFSP outcome measures.

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the state effectively coordinates CFSP services with other federally funded or assisted programs that serve the same population. In interviews, stakeholders confirmed that clients gained more access to self-sufficiency services through collaboration among agencies. Moreover, the state has invested in partnerships with several federally recognized Tribes and juvenile justice agencies in implementing IV-E agreements to support coordination of foster care for those populations.

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

Oregon is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. None of the four items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

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

Item 33. Standards Applied Equally

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

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment. Oregon agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

- Information in the statewide assessment indicated the state's licensing standards are not routinely applied statewide. The state cited several internal and external audits and reviews that highlighted the need for improved fidelity to the state's home study guidelines and licensing process by the licensed private child-caring agencies. The information illustrated a lack of system-wide coordination to ensure that standards are applied equally. Numerous procedural, communication, and organizational gaps in the application of standards were cited.

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment. Oregon agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the state's criminal background clearance process is in place for foster and adoptive families; however, systemic issues were found, including lack of communication or integration between the clearance process and the license/certification process. Further, a reliable source is not in place for casework staff to determine the current status of a foster family home's licensing certificate, and the lack of a clear case planning process hinders the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

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.

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment. Oregon agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that despite successes in child-specific recruitment efforts, recruitment and retention activities have not resulted in successful recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state. In the last 3 years, the number of regularly certified foster homes has declined significantly. Moreover, the state did not provide data concerning the effectiveness of recruitment strategies to meet the geographic and/or cultural needs of children entering out-of-home care.

Oregon 2016 CFSR Final Report

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

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

- Oregon received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed in stakeholder interviews showed that Oregon uses both in-state and out-of-state cross-jurisdictional resources; however, the state could not demonstrate that these efforts were routinely functioning. The state acknowledged that the agency is unable to complete all ICPC home studies in accordance with federal requirements of timeliness. Stakeholders also indicated concerns with the data's accuracy consistent with federal requirements.

Appendix A: Summary of Oregon 2016 CFSR Performance

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

I. Ratings for Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being Outcomes, 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	60% Substantially Achieved
Item 2 Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	82% Strength
Item 3 Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	60% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Oregon 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	20% Substantially Achieved
Item 4 Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	78% Strength
Item 5 Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	48% Strength
Item 6 Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	41% 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	86% Substantially Achieved
Item 7 Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	89% Strength
Item 8 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	82% Strength
Item 9 Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	88% Strength
Item 10 Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	77% Strength
Item 11 Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	79% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Oregon 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	42% Substantially Achieved
Item 12 Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	44% Strength
Sub-Item 12A Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	71% Strength
Sub-Item 12B Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	49% Strength
Sub-Item 12C Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	63% Strength
Item 13 Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	61% Strength
Item 14 Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength
Item 15 Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement†	59% 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	91% Substantially Achieved
Item 16 Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	91% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Oregon 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	50% Substantially Achieved
Item 17 Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength
Item 18 Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	49% Strength

II. Ratings for Systemic Factors

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

STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

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

Appendix A: Summary of Oregon 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	Area Needing Improvement
Item 21 Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment	Strength
Item 22 Permanency Hearings	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 23 Termination of Parental Rights	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement
Item 24 Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement

QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

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

STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

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

Appendix A: Summary of Oregon 2016 CFSR Performance

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

SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

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

AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

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

Appendix A: Summary of Oregon 2016 CFSR Performance

FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

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

Appendix A: Summary of Oregon 2016 CFSR Performance

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	10.9%	10.2%–11.6%	FY13–14
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	8.50	Lower	14.34	12.76–16.12	14A–14B, FY14
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	40.5%	Higher	36.5%	35%–38%	12B–15A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	43.6%	Higher	40.1%	38%–42.2%	14B–15A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	30.3%	Higher	28.1%	26.7%–29.5%	14B–15A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.3%	Lower	6.8%	5.5%–8.3%	12B–15A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.12	Lower	4.28	4.11–4.45	14B–15A

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 Oregon 2016 CFSR Performance

* **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: Oregon 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Appendix B Summary of CFSR Round 2 Oregon 2007 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in Oregon 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: 10
Date of Onsite Review: September 10–14, 2007
Period Under Review: April 1, 2006, through September 10, 2007
Date Final Report Issued: March 7, 2008
Date Program Improvement Plan Due: April 7, 2008
Date Program Improvement Plan Approved: January 1, 2009

Highlights of Findings

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

Appendix B: Oregon 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	90.2	Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.35	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	118.5	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	96.4	Does Not Meet Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	107.8	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	96.7	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: Oregon 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	Did Not Achieve 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	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

Appendix B: Oregon 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	Strength
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: Oregon 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	Area Needing Improvement
Item 23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

Systemic Factors

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 24. Statewide Information System	Area Needing Improvement
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	Strength
Item 30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
Item 31. Quality Assurance System	Strength
Item 32. Initial Staff Training	Strength
Item 33. Ongoing Staff Training	Area Needing Improvement
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	Strength

Appendix B: Oregon 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 39. Agency Annual Reports Pursuant to CFSP	Area Needing Improvement
Item 40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Strength
Item 41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Area Needing Improvement
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