



# Child and Family Services Reviews

## Washington Final Report

2018



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: Washington Child and Family Services Review

## INTRODUCTION

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

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) Children's Administration (CA) of the state of Washington and submitted to the Children's Bureau on February 1, 2018. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan
- The results of case reviews of 130 cases (95 foster care and 35 in-home) conducted via a State Conducted Case Review process across sites in each of Washington's 3 regions between April 1, 2018, and September 30, 2018
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Attorneys for the agency and parents
  - Child-placing agencies
  - Child welfare agency caseworkers and supervisors
  - Child welfare agency director, senior managers, and program managers
  - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) staff
  - Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA)
  - Court system and Court Improvement Program (CIP) staff
  - Foster and adoptive parent recruitment and retention staff
  - Foster and adoptive parents and relative caregivers
  - Judges and commissioners
  - Licensing staff

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Members of the Intergovernment Agency
- Parents
- Service providers
- Training staff and partners
- 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).<sup>1</sup>

### 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

---

<sup>1</sup> May 2017 revised syntax (pending final verification) uses 2 years of NCANDS data to calculate performance for the Maltreatment in Foster Care indicator. National performance is based on FY 2013–2014 and 2013AB files. All other indicators use the same time periods identified in the May 2015 Federal Register notice.

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting Washington's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Washington's performance in Round 2.

### I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

#### Washington 2018 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

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

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

- Quality Assurance System
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community
- Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

#### Children's Bureau Comments on Washington Performance

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

The Washington CFSR demonstrates that the state's child welfare system has a number of strengths and challenges that affect positive outcomes for children and families. The CFSR identified several areas of strength in Washington's child welfare system, including functioning quality assurance (QA) and foster care licensing systems, strong community engagement, coordination of services with federal agencies, and training that meets the needs of licensed foster parents. The Children's Bureau also observed strong casework practice that ensures children's educational needs are met and the state's concerted efforts to place siblings together in foster care when possible.

The CFSR findings indicate that agency caseworkers routinely make face-to-face contact with children subject to child maltreatment reports in a timely manner during the investigation stage of service delivery. High-quality caseworker contacts with children in foster care ensure that important permanency connections and educational needs are routinely met. However, the CFSR findings show that high-quality caseworker contacts with children and parents do not routinely occur during all stages of child welfare service delivery across the state and may be a key driving factor that affects the achievement of safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes. The frequency and quality of caseworker contacts do not routinely meet the needs of parents in foster care and in-home cases and the children receiving in-home services. The quality of caseworker contacts with children and parents drives the casework practice concerns associated with the accuracy and comprehensiveness of risk, safety, and well-being assessments; family engagement; case plan development; and achievement of timely permanency for children in foster care.

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

The CFSR found that the quality of assessments of risk, safety, and well-being is uneven across the state. In many of the cases reviewed, the underlying risk and safety concerns were not routinely identified or addressed through the provision of appropriate safety services or in safety planning. In the foster care and in-home stages of service delivery, ongoing assessments of well-being did not routinely address the key reasons associated with the agency's involvement with the family. However, the CFSR found that the use of Family Team Decision Making meetings in some of the foster care cases reviewed appeared to promote comprehensive assessments and ongoing monitoring of service provision.

Both case review findings and stakeholders indicated that the provision of individualized services to meet the needs of parents and children does not routinely occur. Barriers to timely service provision are associated with waitlists for the limited number of providers that can offer critical services such as mental health, substance abuse treatment, transportation, support for parent-child visits, independent living, and dental care for children. Overall, accessing services to address the physical health, including dental needs, of children is a challenge—particularly for in-home cases. In addition, services are not routinely provided to support relatives providing foster care to children.

The achievement of timely permanency for children in the state's foster care system is a particular concern. The review found that the agency and court did not consistently make concerted efforts to achieve permanency. In many cases, permanency goals of reunification were maintained too long. In some cases, delays in filing timely petitions to terminate parental rights (TPR) were found to be barriers to timely permanency for children. In addition, timely permanency hearings do not routinely occur in all parts of the state. The Children's Bureau suggests the state conduct further analysis with stakeholders, such as judicial partners, birth parents, and foster and adoptive parents, to determine areas of focus related to improving permanency outcomes to address in the state's Program Improvement Plan.

While the CFSR findings indicate that the training foster and adoptive parents receive is meeting their needs, stakeholders said that new caseworkers and supervisors require additional training to perform their job duties. Stakeholders identified clinical supervision training as a critical training need for supervisors and said that improvements are underway to strengthen the training requirements for new caseworkers. While staff training alone will not change casework practice, skill-based training for caseworkers and supervisors can support critical workforce development initiatives aimed at achieving positive outcomes for children and families.

The Children's Bureau encourages the state to leverage its strengths in establishing partnerships with an array of agencies and stakeholders—particularly parents, youth, state judiciary and court personnel, mental health and substance abuse service providers, and field staff as Washington moves forward in its efforts to develop and implement strategies to promote positive outcomes for children and families. The state's QA system is functioning well and can help the state monitor its progress toward achieving measurable program improvement goals.

## 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. Washington provides an alternative/differential response to, in

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

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 DSHS CA. 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**

Washington is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 86% of the 72 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 reports assigned for emergent response are initiated within 24 hours. Reports assigned for non-emergent response are initiated within 72 hours. Initiation is defined as face-to-face contact with the alleged child victim or identified child. Extensions may be granted if child safety may be compromised if the extension is not granted or if a law enforcement officer requests the delay per established protocols. Extensions must be approved by CA supervisors/managers. If the child, despite reasonable efforts, cannot be located within the 24-hour or 72-hour timeframe, the CA supervisor reviews the caseworker's efforts and approves a new extension every 3 business days for emergent intakes and every 5 business days for non-emergent intakes until the initial face-to-face contact occurs.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 86% of the 72 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

### **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**

Washington is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 64% of the 130 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 67% of the 95 foster care cases, 57% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 12 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 68% of the 44 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 69% of the 36 applicable foster care cases, 80% of the 5 applicable in-home services cases, and 33% of the 3 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 65% of the 130 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 68% of the 95 foster care cases, 57% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 12 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.



## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

### State Outcome Performance

Washington is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 17% of the 95 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).

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 68% of the 95 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 60% of the 95 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 23% of the 95 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

Washington is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 68% of the 95 applicable cases reviewed.

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

### *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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 85% of the 67 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

#### **Item 8. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father,<sup>2</sup> and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 64% of the 75 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 56% of the 36 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 74% of the 62 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 74% of the 34 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 82% of the 93 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

### 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 81% of the 94 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 11. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father<sup>3</sup> or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 67% of the 67 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 68% of the 62 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 71% of the 34 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 47% of the 130 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 46% of the 95 foster care cases, 48% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

## Washington 2018 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,<sup>4</sup> 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 50% of the 129 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 49% of the 95 foster care cases, 52% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 55% of the 11 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

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

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 79% of the 129 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 81% of the 95 foster care cases, 78% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 64% of the 11 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 58% of the 118 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 58% of the 84 applicable foster care cases, 61% of the 23 applicable in-home services cases, and 55% of the 11 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 63% of the 110 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

- In 55% of the 83 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

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 70% of the 92 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 parents<sup>5</sup> and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 62% of the 125 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 61% of the 90 applicable foster care cases, 70% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 58% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 82% of the 68 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 67% of the 109 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 66% of the 74 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 80% of the 130 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 86% of the 95 foster care cases, 70% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.

## Washington 2018 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 fathers<sup>6</sup> of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 53% of the 116 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 51% of the 81 applicable foster care cases, 61% of the 23 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 12 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 55% of the 109 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 54% of the 74 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 94% of the 83 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

---

<sup>6</sup> 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.

## Washington 2018 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 94% of the 83 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 95% of the 74 applicable foster care cases, 75% of the 4 applicable in-home services cases, and 100% of the 5 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 54% of the 123 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 53% of the 95 foster care cases, 53% of the 19 applicable in-home services cases, and 67% of the 9 applicable 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 59% of the 111 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 62% of the 95 foster care cases, 36% of the 11 applicable in-home services cases, and 60% of the 5 in-home services alternative/differential response 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 60% of the 72 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 55% of the 51 applicable foster care cases, 71% of the 14 applicable in-home services cases, and 71% of the 7 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

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

##### *Statewide Information System Item Performance*

##### Item 19. Statewide Information System

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The statewide information system is functioning statewide to ensure that, at a minimum, the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is (or, within the immediately preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment. Washington 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 Washington's statewide information system, FamLink, is not functioning statewide to ensure that, at a minimum, the state can readily identify the location of every child because of delays in entering placement information for children in foster care. Washington has begun improvement efforts in this area through the use of a Placement Entry Tool.



## Washington 2018 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

Washington is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. None of the 5 items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

#### Case Review System Item Performance

##### Item 20. Written Case Plan

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

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment. Washington 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 Washington does not ensure that every child in foster care has a case plan that includes the required provisions. The state is unable to determine how many case plans are completed timely and with the family's involvement. Although the agency has policies that require case plans to be developed with families at specific junctures, information in the statewide assessment, including case review data, showed that parents are not included in the development of the case plan and are often unaware of plans that have been developed.

##### 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Although the state asserted in the statewide assessment that this item was functioning, information collected from stakeholders and additional supplemental data found barriers to timely review hearings and inconsistent statewide performance, particularly with lack of timeliness of the first review hearing. Stakeholders provided data showing that in the states' largest urban county, continuances result in failing to meet timeframes for periodic reviews. Agency worker turnover was often cited as a reason for the continuances. Interactive court data has been made recently available to agency and court personnel and can help identify timeliness issues and administrative errors. In addition, stakeholders described several

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

counties' new approaches for scheduling hearings to ensure hearings are held timely and that additional training and support has been provided to judicial officers.

### 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that in parts of the state, there are barriers to timely permanency hearings. Stakeholders provided supplemental data showing that in the states' largest urban county, continuances related to agency worker turnover and the agency not providing court reports in advance of the hearing result in a failure to meet timeframes. Stakeholders noted that parents' attorneys requesting more time for clients also result in continuances. Stakeholders said that the interactive court data for state and judicial officers has helped to identify timeliness issues and administrative errors in the system.

### 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment. Washington agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Data and information in the statewide assessment indicated that the filing of termination of parental rights (TPR) proceedings and documentation of a compelling reason not to file is not occurring as required statewide.

### 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment. Washington agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- In the statewide assessment, Washington reported that it does not have a reliable method of tracking compliance with the caregiver notification requirement. The data that have been collected show that foster parents are not routinely provided

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

adequate notice of hearings. Although the court is in the process of tracking caregiver notification, not all counties are able to regularly collect this information.

### 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

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

#### Quality Assurance System Item Performance

##### Item 25. Quality Assurance System

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

- Washington received an overall rating of Strength for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders provided evidence showing that the state has a fully functioning QA system operating in all jurisdictions, which includes the five required elements.

### 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

Washington 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.

## Washington 2018 CFSP 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders, along with supplemental information, showed that although Washington has a system in place to track the timely completion of initial training, additional revisions in the training curriculum and changes to the mode of delivery are needed to ensure that workers have adequate knowledge and skills for their positions.

#### **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 staff<sup>7</sup> that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders, along with supplemental information, showed that although competency-based trainings are available, the state lacks a sufficient tracking system for monitoring compliance. After 2 years of employment, there are no ongoing training requirements beyond basic annual personnel trainings. Stakeholders indicated that high workloads were a barrier to attending ongoing training. Supervisor Core Training is available for new and experienced supervisors, but the state was unable to provide information on the percentage of supervisors who have attended. Overall, stakeholder interviews indicated that supervisors do not routinely receive ongoing training relevant to the supervision of casework practice, and attendance at and effectiveness of supervisors' training varies.

#### **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

---

<sup>7</sup> "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.

## Washington 2018 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Strength for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Data and information in the statewide assessment showed the state ensures that all foster parents complete required training. Training is tracked by the foster home licensor. Data from a survey of foster parents shows that the vast majority of foster parents feel that the initial and ongoing training they receive adequately meets their needs. The state also has requirements for staff working within licensed group homes. Training hours are monitored by Division of Licensed Resources (DLR) staff through ongoing CQI activities, and the data shows that most staff are completing training as required.

### 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

Washington 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information from the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the current array of services is not adequately addressing the needs of children and families. Stakeholders said that there are waiting lists and a limited number of providers offering mental health services, psychological evaluations, individual and family therapy, evidence-based programs, services for co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders, inpatient substance abuse treatment, and independent living services, including housing for youth. Stakeholders are concerned about inadequate visitation services and transportation to visitation services throughout the state. The availability of transportation services/supports to access services varied in rural areas. Stakeholders said there is a lack of foster homes in parts of the

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

state and that there is a need for services to stabilize placements and provide additional supports for foster parents, relative caregivers, and adoptive parents.

### 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders described concerns with the state's ability to individualize services because staff are not aware of available services and are not ensuring that family assessments identify specific needs that inform tailored services. While service providers are able to access translator services, the lack of bilingual and culturally appropriate providers is a concern throughout the state, particularly for Spanish-speaking families. Stakeholders are also concerned about ensuring that tailored services are provided to families who experience physical or cognitive disabilities. Family Team Decision Making meetings and "Wrap" meetings are not consistently used statewide to ensure that services are individualized. Stakeholders said that the agency is not utilizing available in-home services to safely prevent foster care placement, support timelier reunification, or provide post-reunification support. Housing was identified as a significant barrier for many families in achieving reunification.

### 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

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

#### *Agency Responsiveness to the Community Item Performance*

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

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that, in implementing the provisions of the CFSP and developing related APSRs, the state engages in ongoing consultation with Tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals, objectives, and annual updates of the CFSP.

- Washington received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that stakeholders are engaged in the development of the CFSP and involved in CQI and CFSR processes in the state. External stakeholders provided examples of the agency's efforts to ensure meaningful involvement in identifying strengths and needs of the system. Stakeholders were familiar with the activities that were part of the state's strategic planning process, and most reported that the agency shares data at meetings to inform planning. The state ensures that the following key stakeholders are involved in ongoing collaboration: youth, birth parents, court personnel, Tribal representatives, foster parents, service providers, and staff.

### 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders demonstrated that the state engages in ongoing coordination of services with other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population. Stakeholders provided examples describing coordinated efforts with programs such as the Office of the Superintendent for Public Instruction, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Social Security, Child Support Enforcement, and the Health Care Authority. Stakeholders said that service coordination is supported through shared data in the FamLink case management system.

## 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

Washington 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.

### *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.

## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Washington received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data and information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state has standards that are applied equally to all foster family homes and child care institutions. The state has monitoring processes in place to ensure standards are met. Renewal health and safety visits are conducted by DLR/CPS staff. CQI reviews ensure standards are applied equally. Data indicates that the majority of homes and institutions are in compliance with standards.

### 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Strength for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Washington described policy, procedures, and QA review activities for requiring, following up, and monitoring compliance with criminal background check requirements. Data presented in the statewide assessment showed that the state is ensuring compliance with all required checks.

### 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.

- Washington received an overall rating of Strength for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Washington described diligent recruitment plans and provided data showing that inquiries from prospective foster parents were increasing for identified populations. Stakeholders described examples of recruitment activities targeted at recruiting families that reflect the race and ethnicity of the children in care.

### 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.



## Washington 2018 CFSR Final Report

- Washington received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment. Washington agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Data and information in the statewide assessment showed that although Washington has had some success in utilizing cross-jurisdictional resources to support permanent placements for children, the state does not ensure that home study requests made by other states are completed timely.

## Appendix A

### Summary of Washington 2018 Child and Family Services Review Performance

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

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

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

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Safety Outcome 1</b> Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	Not in Substantial Conformity	86% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 1</b> Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	86% Strength

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Safety Outcome 2</b> Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	64% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 2</b> Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength
<b>Item 3</b> Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	65% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Washington 2018 CFSR Performance

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 1</b> Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	Not in Substantial Conformity	17% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 4</b> Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength
<b>Item 5</b> Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	60% Strength
<b>Item 6</b> Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	23% Strength

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Permanency Outcome 2</b> The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	Not in Substantial Conformity	68% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 7</b> Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	85% Strength
<b>Item 8</b> Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	64% Strength
<b>Item 9</b> Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	82% Strength
<b>Item 10</b> Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	81% Strength
<b>Item 11</b> Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	67% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Washington 2018 CFSR Performance

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 1</b> Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	47% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 12</b> Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	50% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12A</b> Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	79% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12B</b> Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	58% Strength
<b>Sub-Item 12C</b> Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	70% Strength
<b>Item 13</b> Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	62% Strength
<b>Item 14</b> Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	80% Strength
<b>Item 15</b> Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	53% Strength

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 2</b> Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	94% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 16</b> Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	94% Strength

## Appendix A: Summary of Washington 2018 CFSR Performance

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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
<b>Well-Being Outcome 3</b> Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	54% Substantially Achieved
<b>Item 17</b> Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	59% Strength
<b>Item 18</b> Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	60% 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
<b>Statewide Information System</b>	Statewide Assessment	Not in Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 19</b> Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement

## Appendix A: Summary of Washington 2018 CFSR Performance

### CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

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

### QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Quality Assurance System</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 25</b> Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

### STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

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

## Appendix A: Summary of Washington 2018 CFSR Performance

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

### SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

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

### AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

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

## Appendix A: Summary of Washington 2018 CFSR Performance

### FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
<b>Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention</b>	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
<b>Item 33</b> Standards Applied Equally	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 34</b> Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment	Strength
<b>Item 35</b> Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
<b>Item 36</b> State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement

### III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators<sup>8</sup>

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

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.5%	Lower	9.1%	8.2%–10.0%	FY15–16
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	9.67	Lower	10.00	8.89–11.25	15A–15B, FY15–16

<sup>8</sup> In October 2016, the Children's Bureau issued Technical Bulletin #9 (<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9>), which alerted states to the fact that there were technical errors in the syntax used to calculate the national and state performance for the statewide data indicators. Performance shown in this table reflects performance based on May 2017 revised syntax that is pending final verification.



## Appendix A: Summary of Washington 2018 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	42.7%	Higher	34.7%	33.4%–36.0%	14B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	45.9%	Higher	36.8%	35.2%–38.4%	16B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	31.8%	Higher	31.9%	30.7%–33.2%	16B–17A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.1%	Lower	5.8%	4.7%–7.1%	14B–17A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.44	Lower	6.38	6.19–6.57	16B–17A

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

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

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

## Appendix B

### Summary of CFSR Round 2 Washington 2010 Key Findings

The Children’s Bureau conducted a CFSR in Washington state in 2010. Key findings from that review are presented below. Because the Children’s Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round and in response to feedback from the child welfare field, a state’s performance in the third round of the CFSR is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round.

#### Identifying Information and Review Dates

<b>General Information</b>
<b>Children’s Bureau Region:</b> 10
<b>Date of Onsite Review:</b> September 13–17, 2010
<b>Period Under Review:</b> April 1, 2009, through September 17, 2010
<b>Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued:</b> April 6, 2011
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Due:</b> July 5, 2011
<b>Date Program Improvement Plan Approved:</b> October 1, 2011

#### Highlights of Findings

<b>Performance Measurements</b>
A. The state met the national standards for <b>none</b> of the <b>six</b> standards.
B. The state achieved substantial conformity with <b>none</b> of the <b>seven</b> outcomes.
C. The state achieved substantial conformity with <b>five</b> of the <b>seven</b> systemic factors.

## Appendix B: Washington 2010 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	93.9	Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.62	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	108.5	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	96.0	Does Not Meet Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	120.0	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	95.8	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: Washington 2010 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: Washington 2010 CFSR Key Findings

### Key Findings by Item

#### Outcomes

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

## Appendix B: Washington 2010 CFSR Key Findings

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

### **Systemic Factors**

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

## Appendix B: Washington 2010 CFSR Key Findings

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