

Wisconsin Program Enhancement Plan

Progress Report for Quarter 6

February 2006 – April 2006

Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services

Division of Children and Family Services

Submitted June 1, 2006

To:

Federal Administration for Children and Families

Wisconsin PEP Progress Report for Quarter 6

Contents

	Page
List of Attachments	2
Introduction	3
PEP Implementation Team Activities	4
General PEP Updates	6
Continuous Quality Improvement Program	8
Accomplishments and Planned Activities	11
PEP Data Update	19
Performance Chart for National Standards (Table 1)	22
Performance Chart for CFSR Items (Table 2)	24
Performance Chart for CPS Investigation Timeliness (Table 3)	27
Changes to PEP Matrix	29

Attachments to PEP Quarter 6 Report:

1. 2/23/2006 PEP Implementation Team Meeting Agenda
2. List of PEP renegotiation items
3. DCFS Memo 2006-09 on Safety Intervention Standard
4. Safety Intervention Standards (final)
5. Draft of trial reunification policy
6. Draft ICWA legislation
7. Permanency plan review booklet
8. Draft memo on information sharing with relatives
9. Draft memo on foster parent support needs
10. Summary of foster parent support and service needs
11. Draft memo on documentation of foster parent support services
12. March 2006 report of Foster Parent Training Committee
13. Draft memo on providing information to the court
14. Draft form for providing information to the court
15. Draft Administrative Rule HFS 43
16. DCFS Memo 2006-04 on Service Array Survey
17. Draft revised Information for Foster Parents Form

Introduction

This progress report describes Program Enhancement Plan (PEP) implementation activities completed during February 1, 2006 through April 30, 2006, which is the 6th quarter of the two-year PEP period. The report also describes planned activities that will occur during the 7th quarter of May 1, 2006 through July 31, 2006. Since PEP action steps have benchmark tasks occurring in successive quarters, the narrative for most items covers both the accomplishments in the most recent quarter and planned activities in the next quarter.

The PEP is administered by the Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the state child welfare agency within the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS). The PEP is being implemented with the cooperation and participation of county and tribal child welfare agencies and other stakeholders on the PEP Implementation Team.

The progress report refers to Action Steps in the PEP, as approved by the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF), to respond to the findings of the 2003 federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) of Wisconsin. The Action Steps are described in the Matrix portion of the PEP. An updated PEP Matrix reflecting changes through Quarter 6 is attached to this progress report.

The complete PEP Narrative and Matrix and information about the PEP process are available at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/PEP.htm>

PEP Contact Person:

John Tuohy, Planning Director
Division of Children and Family Services
1 W. Wilson Street, Room 550
Madison, WI 53708-8916
Phone 608-267-3832
Fax 608-266-6836
Email [mailto: tuohyjo@dhfs.state.wi.us](mailto:tuohyjo@dhfs.state.wi.us)

PEP Implementation Team Activities

The PEP Implementation Team was formed in August 2004 and the first meeting was held on November 29, 2004. The Implementation Team was created as a collaborative, cross-systems approach to guide planning and implementation of child welfare practice and policy in order to achieve the federal performance outcomes and enhance services to Wisconsin's children and families. The Implementation Team is comprised of over 80 individuals representing a wide array of diverse fields, including domestic abuse, schools, law enforcement, juvenile justice, state courts, health care, mental health, substance abuse, and child protective services. In addition, the Implementation Team has representation from foster and adoptive parents, tribes, advocacy groups and state legislators.

The Implementation Team meetings are held quarterly and broadcast on the Internet to allow remote participation. Information about the Implementation Team is available at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/PEP-Team/pepTeam.htm>

The PEP Implementation Team held its 6th meeting on February 23, 2006 (see attached agenda). The February meeting included an in-depth presentation on the SAFE model for foster and adoptive family assessments, revision of PEP action steps for submission to the federal ACF, initial findings from the county Quality Service Review (QSR) process, and child welfare program updates. The next Implementation Team meeting was scheduled for June 9, 2006, but has been cancelled.

The DCFS has begun discussion with the Implementation Team members about future directions for the group once the PEP is completed in October 2006. The general consensus is that full Implementation Team is too large and should be revised, while there is strong support for continuing the PEP committees with possible new memberships. The DCFS will continue to seek input from stakeholders to develop a proposal for revising the PEP Implementation Team.

PEP Committees

The PEP Implementation Team utilizes five PEP committees to help shape the policies, procedures, and practices needed to complete the twenty (20) Action Steps identified in the Wisconsin PEP. The Executive Committee held its first meeting in February 2005 and meets quarterly to set agendas for full Implementation Team meetings. The other PEP committees held their first meetings in January or February 2005 and met at least monthly during calendar year (CY) 2005. The PEP committees and their respective responsibilities are as follows:

- **PEP Executive Committee**

The Executive Committee of the full PEP Implementation Team meets between the PEP Implementation Team meetings to assist DCFS in creating long-term goals and strategies for the PEP Implementation Team, including the development of the agendas for the quarterly meetings.

- **Child Welfare Case Process**

The Child Welfare Case Process Committee clarifies and develops policies and guidelines for standards of practice related to Access/Intake, Initial Assessment, and Ongoing Services. In

addition, this Committee addresses issues related to domestic violence and other child welfare associated programs and service systems.

- **Out-of-Home Care**

The Out-of-Home Care Committee enhances policies, practices, and procedures related to Out-of-Home Placement, Title IV-E, Permanency Planning, Independent Living, Kinship Care, and the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC).

- **Adoption Services**

The Adoption Services Committee develops and updates policies, practices, and procedures related to Concurrent Permanency Planning, Termination of Parental Rights (TPR), Adoption, Adoption Search, and Adoption Assistance payments.

- **Continuous Quality Improvement**

The Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Committee designs and implements a county review process including an on-site review process and identifies the management and program information needs of counties and tribes for child welfare data reports.

In addition, for PEP Action Steps and other policy issues that involve tribal child welfare or child welfare staff and provider training, the existing Indian Child Welfare Coordination Group and State Training Council are consulted by the PEP Implementation Team for expertise and guidance. Training updates are provided at PEP Implementation Team meetings.

To facilitate public input on policies and procedures related to PEP action steps, DCFS created the PEP Bulletin Board for materials developed by PEP committees to be available for public comment. The availability of the Bulletin Board has been publicized to counties, tribes and other key stakeholders. The Bulletin Board can be accessed at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/bulletinBrd.htm>

General PEP Updates

Updates to PEP Matrix Action Steps

During Quarter 5, Wisconsin reached agreement with the federal ACF to revise several PEP action steps, generally to defer completion of certain tasks within the action steps until after the October 31, 2006 end date of the two-year PEP period. The items were discussed with ACF staff initially in January 2006 and a draft list of “renegotiation items” were submitted for ACF staff review in March 2006 following approval of the list by the PEP Implementation Team. A conference call was held with ACF staff and the final list of renegotiation items (see attached) was submitted for federal approval in early April 2006. Federal approval of the revised action steps was received in late April. The updated PEP Matrix attached to the Quarter 6 report reflects the approved changes.

The tasks removed from the PEP Matrix generally pertain to permanency and well being objectives that are not critical to achievement of national standards and improvement targets for which Wisconsin can be penalized by the federal ACF. To ensure these tasks will be completed, they will be included in the Wisconsin Child and Family Services Plan. The affected tasks will be included in the state plan for FFY 2007, which is due to ACF by June 30, 2006. Reporting for these tasks will be done as part of the Annual Services and Progress Report component of the state plan.

Affected tasks with action step references:

- Update policy for Child Protective Service (CPS) case findings (Action Step A.2)
- Issue policy on trial reunification/home visits (Action Step C.1)
- Local agency use of combined foster/adoptive family assessment (Action Step D.5)
- Increase child placement limit for siblings in HFS 56 (Action Step E.3)
- Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) policy requirements (Action Step G.1)
- Issue resource guide for identification and engagement of family members (Action Step H.1)
- Safety assessments for placements with relatives (Action Step H.3)
- Locate and involve non-custodial parents (Action Step I.1)
- Revision of *CPS Ongoing Service Standards and Practice Guidelines* (Action Steps J.1 and N.2)
- Foster parent training requirements (Action Step K.4)
- Implement local and private agency use of foster parent handbook (Action Step K.5)
- Analyze results of Milwaukee managed care project (L.1)
- Pilot mental health screening tool and develop policy on screening (Action Step M.1)
- Issue administrative rule on reasonable efforts permanency planning (Action Step N.1)
- Automate the QSR case review tool (Action Step Q.3.10)
- Committee on social work curriculum (Action Step R.2)

For the Quarter 6 report, the PEP Matrix is updated to reflect routine changes to particular benchmark tasks, as has been done in previous quarterly reports. The changes to the Matrix are noted in this report.

Wisconsin requests approval to defer one additional item from the PEP. Action Step K.2.a specifies that DCFS will issue the revised information for foster parents form (attached) in Quarter 6. While the form has been revised, it has been determined that because the form is an attachment to administrative rule HFS 37, the revised form must go through the administrative rule process before it can be issued. DCFS is hopeful that the administrative rule change can be made quickly since the change is technical in nature; however, the earliest that the revised form can be issued going through the rule process is by January 1, 2007. Therefore, Wisconsin requests that Action Step K.2.a.2 be deleted from the PEP Matrix. The task will be included in the state plan along with the previously approved renegotiation items.

State Performance

Wisconsin is required to meet improvement targets for one of the national safety standards and three of the national permanency standards. The data is shown in the PEP Data Update section of this report. For the safety standard and two of the permanency standards, Wisconsin continues to meet the improvement target. For the permanency standard on re-entry to out-of-home care, however, the most recent 2005 data shows Wisconsin exceeding the improvement target. The DCFS will monitor the re-entry data closely and do additional analysis of re-entry for the Quarter 7 report.

Wisconsin is required to meet improvement targets for 19 of the 23 CFSR outcome items. Five of the items are based on the national performance standards, one is based on state eWiSACWIS data, and 17 items are based on the results of county QSR reviews. This report includes data from QSR case reviews through April 2006 as well as data from the 2005 comprehensive case review conducted by the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare (BMCW). QSR data is presented for information purposes for the four outcomes items that Wisconsin met in the 2003 federal CFSR. More information about the BMCW case review data is included in the PEP Data Update section to the report.

The case review data shows that Wisconsin is generally meeting or exceeding the improvement targets. The one item that is significantly below the improvement target so far is Item 7 on permanency goal for children. Based on the experience of other states using the QSR approach, permanency scores tend to lag behind the scores in other areas and DCFS believes that there is a “case selection” effect thus far in that counties are choosing complex placement cases for their county QSR reviews. The DCFS will continue to analyze the case review results for permanency goal.

Continuous Quality Improvement Program

This section of the report addresses activities of the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) program within DCFS, including implementation of the Quality Service Review (QSR) case review protocol with counties and other activities to ensure compliance with federal program requirements. References to PEP Action Steps in parentheses are to the specific Action Steps in the PEP Matrix.

Quality Service Reviews

The QSR review system of child welfare programs continued as planned for Quarter 6 with three county reviews completed. St. Croix County was reviewed during the week of February 13 -17, 2006, followed by Dane County (3/13/06 – 3/24/06) and Sheboygan County (4/17/06 – 4/21/06).

- The St. Croix review was done by a team of 14 persons. A total of 80 persons were interviewed within the 10 cases selected for review. A total of 36 persons participated in the 8 focus groups.
- The Dane review was conducted over a two-week period by a team of 28 persons. Dane County has the second largest county population in Wisconsin. A total of 196 persons were interviewed within the 24 cases selected for review. A total of 145 persons participated in the 16 focus groups.
- The Sheboygan review was done by a team of 16 persons. A total of 130 persons were interviewed within the 12 cases selected for review. A total of 72 persons participated in 11 focus groups.

Upcoming reviews in Quarter 7 include Burnett and Washburn counties (5/22/06 – 5/26/06); Adams County (6/12/06 – 6/16/06); Waupaca County (6/26/06 – 6/30/06) and Green County (7/24/06 – 7/28/06).

Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) (Q.3.8)

The preparation for the Dane County review included the CQI Team meeting with personnel from the DCFS Office of Program Evaluation and Planning (OPEP) to review the county's eWiSACWIS reports for statistical information to be addressed during some of the focus groups. This practice will become a regular feature of future reviews.

In each of the Quart 6 reviews, the Children's Court Initiative (CCI) conducted a simultaneous review of the judicial systems in the counties. The CQI site leaders and CCI site leader conducted many joint focus groups to gather stakeholder opinions about the strengths of and identifying opportunities for improving outcomes in the counties' child welfare systems. The site leaders of he respective reviews now meet within two weeks following the review to share their respective overlapping findings and highlight significant strengths and opportunities for improvement.

Improving the QSR Process (Q.3.9)

Although the Quality Service Review has been favorably received in all nine of the first 32 counties who volunteered for a review, efforts are planned to improve the review process, consistency in case scoring, and clarity of the QSR protocol.

On July 12, 2006, all certified Quality Service Reviewer (QSR) case reviewers will meet in Wisconsin Dells to begin the process of refining select QSR indicators. Ray Foster and Paul Vincent of the Child welfare Program and Policy Group will lead the next stage of the refinement process at a meeting of the redesign team on August 7 & 8, 2006. The result will be the second edition of the Wisconsin QSR protocol that will be used starting in Fall 2006.

The CQI Team will explore the feasibility of broadening the scope and depth of a CQI review with the intent of providing counties with even more beneficial information to improve outcomes for children and families. The plan is to use the statewide CQI Committee to explore and recommend inclusion of select quantitative and statistical measures to complement the qualitative QSR review. This will be followed with specific skill based training and technical assistance to the staff of each county reviewed, based on aspects of the QSR case practice model the review findings suggest will improve outcomes.

BMCW Use of QSR Process (Q.4.2)

Paul Vincent of the Child Welfare Program and Practice Group has been directly involved with DCFS in working with BMCW in planning for implementation of the QSR in Milwaukee. Mr. Vincent has attended meetings of the BMCW QSR Steering Committee to directly provide consultation and information and to respond to questions from the committee members.

The BMCW, in conjunction with community members of the Steering Committee, has made the decision to use the QSR process beginning in 2006 for case reviews of the Ongoing Case Management (placement cases) program. The case review sample size will be 24-30 cases, drawn equally from the three BMCW Regions. The Milwaukee QSR review will be held October 16-27, 2006.

The BMCW has requested that Mr. Vincent develop a plan to modify the QSR for use with other programs. The feasibility of incorporating a modified version of the QSR for the Initial Assessment, Adoption, Safety Services, and Out-of-Home Care programs are being assessed. If the QSR tool cannot be modified for any/all of these programs, the Program Evaluation Managers will review the program using the BMCW Comprehensive Review process as they have done in the past.

Given time constraints for 2006, it will not be possible for Program Evaluation Managers to be certified in time for the 2006 case review; therefore, a plan for recruiting QSR certified reviewers is being developed. The BMCW will need 18 QSR certified reviewers for the 2006 QSR.

Ongoing Development of State Reviewers 9 (Q.5.3)

During the week of March 20, 2006, Ray Foster, Director of Human Systems and Outcomes (HSO) conducted the 3rd and 4th set of two-day trainings for QSR case reviewer, bringing the total number of persons trained statewide to 56. As of Quarter 6, 12 of the 56 persons trained have successfully demonstrated competency in the 7 required areas and are now certified as lead case reviewers. The DCFS anticipates another 8 persons will be certified during the seventh quarter of the PEP.

Accomplishments and Planned Activities

The following is a summary of the activities completed during the PEP Quarter 6 period of February 1, 2006 to April 30, 2006 and activities planned for the PEP Quarter 7 period of May 1, 2006 through July 31, 2006. References to PEP Action Steps in parentheses are to the specific Action Steps in the PEP Matrix.

Access Standard (A.1.)

The Access Standard took effect on March 31, 2006 and was implemented along with a modification to eWiSACWIS. The Access Standard provides more clarity and direction to CPS staff around gathering and documenting information collected when a report of alleged child maltreatment is received and in making the screening and response time decisions. The eWiSACWIS modification uses one document to gather information at the first point of contact with supervisor ability to subsequently assign the type of report (e.g. CPS assessment or request for voluntary services).

The Wisconsin Child Welfare Training System began offering training on the Access Standard statewide in January of 2006. Over 500 people have currently been trained with further trainings being offered statewide through Quarter 7. The Access Standard training content will be incorporated into the pre-service and foundation training.

Safety Intervention Standards (B.1)

The Safety Intervention Standards were issued on May 1, 2006 via DCFS Memo 2006-09 (attached). The Standards along with the associated modifications to eWiSACWIS will become effective on July 17, 2006.

Design sessions for eWiSACWIS were held during January, February and March of 2006. These sessions included statewide input to modify the Safety Assessment in the system to support the implementation of the Standards. In addition, six statewide regional roundtables on the Standards were held in April and information was presented to county agency directors in May at the Division's annual Public Child Welfare conference. DCFS staff, in conjunction with regional and Training Partnership staff, will continue to provide technical assistance to county agency staff.

The Safety Intervention Standards training content will be incorporated into the pre-service training available to county staff later in 2006. The Division is also collaborating with the Wisconsin Child Welfare Training Partnership to revise the current CORE/ Foundation training for workers and supervisors to include the practice requirements of the Standards.

Trial Reunification Policy (C.1.b) (AKA: *Trial Home Visit*)

During Quarter 6, DCFS staff continued to revise the policy. The biggest change during this quarter was to call this policy Trial Reunification rather than Trial Home Visits. In addition, the policy was posted to the PEP Bulletin Board for a second time. Comments from the Bulletin Board will direct further revisions to the policy. The policy will be finalized by the Out-of-Home care Committee in Quarter 7.

DCFS staff have also continued to meet with eWiSACWIS project team members to identify how to document a trial reunification in the automated system. System changes are expected to be available with the December 2006 eWiSACWIS release.

With regards to foster parents and staff, the policy has been incorporated into the Foster Parent Handbook and in Quarter 6 was included into foster parent training curriculum, which is currently being revised by BPP and Training Partnership staff.

Item D. 3 Permanency Planning Procedures

The booklet entitled, “A Guide for Permanency Plan Administrative Review Panel Members.” (attached) was published in February 2006. The booklet provides information to permanency plan review panel members regarding their role and the purpose of permanency plan reviews. The booklet can be downloaded at: <http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/children/foster/pdfs/PFS4101.pdf>

Foster and Adoptive Family Assessments (D.5)

The Adoption Services committee met February 22 and April 5, 2006 to reach a consensus on the new combined foster/adoptive home study process to be used in Wisconsin. The unanimous decision of the Committee, county staff, and tribal staff is to implement the Structure Analysis Family Evaluation (SAFE) developed by the Consortium for Children in California. The SAFE tool will be implemented by the Special Needs Adoption Program (SNAP) and BMCW. The tool will be made available to counties for optional use.

A survey of counties is currently being completed to determine which counties want to be a part of the SAFE study process and how many staff need to be trained in addition to SNAP and BMCW staff. The Consortium for Children staff will come to Wisconsin in June 2006 to discuss how to complete the agreement for Wisconsin to join the consortium, make adjustments to the SAFE document to reflect Wisconsin practice, and plan the training schedule. The new SAFE home study document is scheduled to be completed in eWiSACWIS by September 2006 and SNAP, BMCW and county agency staff will be trained during Quarter 8.

Sibling Placement (E.1.b)

DCFS staff provided information and training about Info Memo 2006-01 “*Placement of Siblings in Out-of-Home Care and Adoption*” at the Western Regional CPS Supervisors meeting on April 7th, and the Northern Regional CPS Supervisors meeting by phone on April 13th, and at the Public Child Welfare Conference to an audience of statewide CPS supervisors on May 1st. Since many of the supervisors from the Northeastern Region were at the Public Child Welfare Conference, it was decided that it was not necessary to do an additional overview with that region unless it is requested at another date. BPP staff will continue to do outreach to the Southern and Southeastern Regional CPS supervisors to attend their meetings and discuss the memo. The memo also included information about additional training resources for agencies and foster parents regarding the placement of siblings together in out-of-home care.

ICWA Policy Legislation (G.1)

A draft of the legislative changes necessary to codify the Indian Child Welfare Act into Ch. 48 (the Children's Code) and Ch. 938 (the Juvenile Justice Code) of Wisconsin Statutes (attached) was completed by the Legislative Reference Bureau in March of 2006 based on suggested changes submitted by DCFS in December of 2005. Unfortunately, the draft language was received too late for consideration in the 2006 legislative session.

The DCFS is planning to introduce the legislation in the 2007 legislative session (which begins in January of 2007). To finalize the draft legislation, DCFS has developed a two-step plan for assuring that the content of the proposed legislation is accurate and appropriately drafted. Beginning in May of 2006, a workgroup comprised of state and tribal child welfare staff and attorneys will review the proposed legislation. When the tribes have achieved consensus approval of the changes, DCFS will establish a broader workgroup that will include county child welfare staff, supervisors, and managers and county legal staff (i.e., corporation counsels and district attorneys). DCFS will work with the Legislative Reference Bureau to make necessary changes to the legislation.

The DCFS anticipates that the legislation review process will be completed no later than November of 2006. As a result, we will begin seeking legislative sponsors in preparation for introduction of the bill as early as possible in the 2007 legislative session.

Identifying and Engaging Relatives and Non-Custodial Parents (H.1 and I.1)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee is continuing to work on the guide to identifying, locating, and involving relatives and non-custodial parents. The Committee is scheduled to discuss the newest draft on May 25, 2006, and after revisions the guide will be posted to the PEP Bulletin Board to gather comments from a wider audience. The guide will be issued via a DCFS Memo.

The DCFS is working with the Bureau of Child Support in the Department of Workforce Development to finalize an agreement regarding access to child support information by child welfare staff. The increased access will allow child welfare staff to more effectively identify relatives based on child support information. The agreement also addresses access to child welfare information by child support staff. The agreement will be issued via a joint memo by the two state agencies in Quarter 7.

Benchmark task I.1.2 is deleted in the PEP matrix to be consistent with the approved deletion of task H.1.4 because the tasks are the same.

Sharing Information with Relatives (H.2)

2005 Wisconsin Act 232 was signed into law on March 29, 2006. Act 232 expanded the type of information that a caseworker can provide to a family member who is or may be an out-of-home placement for a child. A DCFS Information Memo on information sharing (attached) has been revised to include the Act 232 provisions and is currently going through the DCFS approval process. It is anticipated the memo will be issued in Quarter 7.

Relative Placement Survey (H.4)

Results of the survey continue to be considered by members of the Out-of-Home Care Committee during development of the proposed guide for identifying, locating and involving relatives.

Family Assessment and Case Plan (J.1.b)

The DCFS worked with the Child Welfare Case Process Committee to modify the family assessment, case plan, and case progress evaluation documents in eWiSACWIS. State, county, and BMCW staff were involved in design sessions to make necessary changes to support practice requirements of the Safety Intervention Standards as well as an integrated approach to CPS intervention related to the assessment and planning process. The changes in eWiSACWIS are scheduled for implementation in July 2006.

The DCFS continues to work with county, regional, and other state staff to examine ways to consolidate various case plan documents in the automated system. A Single Case Plan Committee has been formed to work on long term, comprehensive changes that will improve and streamline workflow as well as explore ways to combine and integrate timeframes for the various case plans (e.g. permanency plan, case plan).

Service Matching (J.2)

Newly developed pre-service training modules for child welfare caseworkers include information and assistance on identification and matching of appropriate services for children and families. The pre-service modules will be posted on the Wisconsin Child Welfare Training System website for use in Quarter 7 and will be required when the administrative rule on training (HFS 43) goes into effect in Quarter 8.

Barriers to Engagement (J.3.b and J.3.c)

During Quarter 6, DCFS staff and the Child Welfare Training Partnership continued to meet to revise training courses to enhance the engagement skills of caseworkers. The training system is also planning to pilot a stand-alone skills training on engaging families and motivational interviewing. The training will be open to both initial assessment and ongoing workers. It will be piloted in the Northeast Region of the state on 9/13 - 9/14/06. In addition, a train the trainers session will follow on 9/15. Trainers will then facilitate the training in their respective regions.

In addition, as county agencies go through the QSR process, DCFS staff will provide additional training and technical assistance to child welfare supervisors on removing barriers to family engagement at the request of the agency.

Foster Parent Support Plans (K.1)

The DCFS is currently finalizing two memos (both attached) about foster parent support services. An Informational Memo will be issued with an attached report about the service and support needs of foster parent as reported by foster parents, foster care coordinators, and other people who work with foster parents. A Numbered Memo will be issued outlining requirements for documentation of services provided to foster parents. Both memos is in the final approval process.

Workers currently receive training about meeting the general support needs of foster parents as a part of the CORE child welfare trainings. In addition to the content in the CORE trainings, DCFS is also working with AdoptUsKids to have Lorrie Lutz present at the Statewide Foster Care Coordinators conference in September and to access additional training days for Ms. Lutz to present to child welfare supervisors about meeting the support needs of foster parents, working on relationships between agencies and foster parents, and assessing a child's and foster parents' needs. This topic also relates to Item K.2.

Instrument to Assess Foster Child Needs (K.2)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee has completed its recommendations of revisions to the Information to Foster Parents, Part B, and DCFS staff are in the process of incorporating the final revisions from the Out-of-Home Care Committee. The Information to Foster Parents, Part B, form (CFS-872B) is an attachment to Administrative Rule HFS 37, "Information to be Provided to Foster Parents." In Quarter 6, DCFS was informed by the Legislative Council that changes to an appendix of an administrative rule require the same procedures as changes to the content of an administrative rule. The DCFS is drafting the required paperwork to begin the administrative rule change process.

Foster Parent Training Committee (K.4)

The Foster Parent Training Committee presented recommendations regarding foster parent training at the March Training Council meeting. The Training Council endorsed the guiding principles and six goals and the ideas to develop pre service, foundation and ongoing foster parent training as they relate to foster parents, Treatment Foster Parents and adoptive parents.

Guiding Principle: All children who are placed in foster care or for adoption deserve well-trained and supported resource families. In order to develop the knowledge and skills of the resource families, pre-service, foundation, and ongoing training will be made available to resource families who are entrusted with the care of our most vulnerable children.

The six goals for foster parent training at all levels – pre-service, foundation, and ongoing - are:

- Goal 1: Improve the quality of care provided to children who live in foster or adoptive homes.
- Goal 2: Prepare foster and adoptive families for caring for and providing stability for children while in their homes.
- Goal 3: Promote communication, respect, and understanding among all working for the best interest of the child.
- Goal 4: Provide opportunities to mutually explore one's values, strengths, limitations, and needs as they relate to the compatibility to foster and adopt children.

- Goal 5: Develop an understanding of the child welfare system and the importance of permanency for children.
- Goal 6: Encourage foster and adoptive parent networking and the use of resources.

Foster Parent Handbook (K.5)

The Foster Care and Adoption Resource Center staff completed the first official draft of the handbook in Quarter 6 and, at the end of April, sent the draft to John McMahon, a writer and editor for the School of Social Work in North Carolina, for editing. The Resource Center has worked with Mr. McMahon before in the development of their foster care newsletter and thought it would be beneficial to have a professional outside of Wisconsin read the handbook for content and tone. The workgroup created to develop the handbook is going to meet again in the end of May to review Mr. McMahon's comments, and the Resource Center is working to post chapters of the handbook on the PEP Bulletin Board by the end of June 2006.

Milwaukee Managed Care Program (L.1)

In February 2006, it was announced that implementation of the Allied Health Services program will be delayed due to revisions to the Medicaid waiver authorizing the managed care program. Because of changes to the original waiver, the Department of Health and Family Services submitted an amended waiver to the federal authorities at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Before the Department has the authority to implement the managed care program, CMS must approve the amended waiver and approval has not yet been received to date. In the meantime, BMCW staff, Abri (the managed care vendor) and partner agency staff continue to meet regularly to develop and finalize plans for implementation of the program.

Mental Health Screening (M.1)

The Department of Health and Family Service (DHFS) internal workgroup to address mental health screening in child welfare has continued to review and revise stakeholder edits to California's version of a mental health screening tool for use with children and adults in the Child Protective Services (CPS) system.

The final version of the tool is going through the DCFSW approval process. Once endorsed, an informational memo with criteria for the selection of pilot counties interested in implementing the screening tool will be distributed statewide. Upon pilot counties selection in Quarter 7, the University of Wisconsin Training Partnership will provide training in the use of the screening tools. State-provided funding will be used to assist counties/tribes staff to:

- attend training events,
- participate in work groups (primarily in Madison), and
- build the multidisciplinary, collaborative infrastructure necessary for follow through with screening, evaluating, developing a referral system, and preparing treatment providers for an anticipated increased demand for assessment and treatment.

In selecting counties for the pilot, preference will be given to counties/tribes with existing Integrated Services Projects (ISPs), Coordinated Services Teams (CSTs), and/or Comprehensive Community Services (CCS) programs.

Reasonable Efforts and Permanency Planning Rule HFS 44 (N.1)

The HFS 44 Workgroup finished review of the draft of the draft administrative rule, meeting a total of four times. The draft will be submitted to the Department's Office of Legal Counsel by the end of May 2006. All Rules must be submitted to the Wisconsin Legislature's Legislative Council for review by August 31, 2006, or held for submission until January 2, 2007. As noted in the Quarter 5 report, the effective date of the rule will be contingent on final legislative approval of the rule.

Court Process for Hearing Participation (P.1)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee approved the final draft of an Informational Memo that explains the right of foster parents and other physical custodians to receive notice of any hearing or permanency plan review specific to the child in their care, clarifies the opportunity for foster parents to provide information to the court, and provides a tool to help foster parents consider what information they may want to provide to the court specific to the hearing or permanency plan review. DCFS is currently finalizing the form that will be attached the memo and was developed by the Committee to assist foster parents in organizing their thoughts about information they would like to provide to the court about the child in their care. The memo will be submitted for DCFS approval when the form is completed.

Pre-Service Training for Child Welfare Caseworkers and Supervisors (R.1)

The DCFS has submitted a draft of Administrative Rule HFS 43 (attached), Training for Child Protective Services Caseworkers and Supervisors, to the Office of Legal Counsel for review. The Fiscal Estimate for the rule is currently being developed. The DCFS anticipates that the proposed order for rulemaking will be submitted to the Wisconsin Legislative Council for comment by June 15, 2006, and public hearings will occur in July 2006. The rule will be submitted to the Wisconsin Legislature for final approval by August 31, 2006.

eWiSACWIS Training Committee (R.3)

The committee is currently examining new pre-service modules for child protective services workers and what existing new worker training modules in eWiSACWIS may be incorporated into the pre-service content, as well as what is included in the stand alone new worker eWiSACWIS training modules.

Service Array Survey (T.1)

The Service Array Workgroup continued to meet throughout Quarter 6. DCFS submitted to counties a Numbered Memo (attach) providing direction to counties on how to complete the Service Array Survey. Staff from DCFS attended CPS Coordinators Meetings and Human Services Director meetings in each region of the state to explain the nature of and the work required to complete the survey. Data was entered by workers via a web based survey and responses were received from 69 of

72 counties. DCFS will be analyzing the data in Quarter 7 and will share preliminary results with the Service Array Workgroup. A summary of the data will be presented to the PEP Implementation team and DCFS will send counties a summary of the data.

Workload Survey (T.2)

The Workload Management Workgroup participated in a teleconference with representatives from the National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement in April 2006. This discussion assisted the group in developing several options for a workload survey. Continued discussions and meetings in Quarter 7 will focus on which of the three options the workgroup will recommend and development of the survey will follow. Member of the workgroup have committed to piloting the survey prior to general dissemination.

PEP Data Update

The PEP data includes information on state performance relative to national performance standards relating to safety and permanency as well as information on the CFSR case review outcome items for which Wisconsin established improvement targets. The data comes from several sources, including eWiSACWIS reports specifically designed for PEP performance measurement, eWiSACWIS data submitted for federal AFCARS and NCANDS purposes, results from the state QSR case reviews and from the BMCW Comprehensive Review, and other data collection methods.

1. Status of NCANDS and AFCARS Reporting

The DCFS submitted its first NCANDS Child and Agency Files for the FFY 2005 reporting period on April 7, 2006. The federal NCANDS contractor (Walter R. McDonald and Associates) identified several data elements requiring additional consideration and validation. DCFS has begun to examine these elements and will make the necessary corrections to the NCANDS Child and Agency file logic to ensure that these elements are consistent with the file requirements and will continue to address questions related to any resubmission of the NCANDS files. DCFS continues to provide technical assistance to counties through the regional offices to use the eWiSACWIS Initial Assessment data quality report put into production in February 2006. This report is used to monitor and address data quality issues for NCANDS purposes and CPS practice issues regarding completion of Initial Assessments.

Wisconsin continues to improve the quality of the AFCARS Foster Care data. The DCFS has continued to identify and address data quality issues associated with recent file submissions, particularly those affecting the Time to Adoption outcome measure calculation. To ensure the most accurate data for the permanency standards, DCFS will resubmit AFCARS files as part of the PEP close out process. The DCFS has been working with representatives from each of the counties, the BMCW and the state Special Needs Adoption Program to review and correct AFCARS errors identified with the latest AFCARS submission. These efforts have been supported by the statewide roll-out of the Placement History Correction functionality in April 2006.

2. State Performance on National Standards

The state baselines for the PEP are based on the FFY 2003 AFCARS annual file for the permanency national standards and state CY 2003 data for the safety national standards. The minimum improvement targets were agreed to as part of federal approval of the PEP and must be achieved by the end of the two-year PEP period.

Table 1 includes data showing state performance on the national standards for safety and permanency. DCFS used updated CY 2005 state data for the safety items and FFY 2005 AFCARS data for the permanency items.

DCFS continues to use state eWiSACWIS reports designed based on the national standards to monitor progress on all outcomes. These reports have been incorporated into the eWiSACWIS Reports Dashboard in a graphical format. Recent enhancements to the Reports Dashboard include added functionality to conduct select county comparisons and to present up to 12 quarters of

historical results. These enhancements were put into production in March 2006 and were designed to better meet the increasing demand for trend data by state and county staff.

3. Analysis of State Performance on National Standards

Safety Outcomes

Recurrence of Maltreatment - The DCFS uses an eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Report to monitor performance for this standard. The report indicates a maltreatment recurrence rate of 5.25% for CY 2004 and 4.97% for CY 2005.

Maltreatment in Out-of-Home Care – The DCFS uses an eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Report to monitor performance for this item. The report indicates a rate of maltreatment in OHC of 0.57% for CY 2004 and 0.62% for CY 2005. Performance for this standard reflects the year-to-year fluctuations that occur with this sensitive measure. DCFS has identified several cases for CY 2004 and CY 2005 where the relationship of the maltreater (foster parent or facility staff) was reported incorrectly. This data will be corrected and the reports will be re-run for these periods to capture results that reflect actual performance on this measure. In addition, the rates reflect the initial substantiation case findings, some of which are subsequently overturned upon appeal by the provider.

Permanency Outcomes

The performance for the four permanency national standards is based on the recent permanency profile for Wisconsin generated by ACF from AFCARS data using the FFY 2005 annual file. DCFS is continuing to work with ACF to replicate the permanency profile at the state level and compare the federal performance calculations with the results of the eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Reports for the four permanency national standards.

The DCFS understands that data submitted to AFCARS for some children continues to result in data being excluded from the performance calculations, either due to missing removal or discharge information. To better understand the impact of excluding cases in the federal calculations and the discrepancies between the AFCARS-based permanency data profile and comparable state eWiSACWIS reports, DCFS is reviewing the files from ACF to examine excluded records. The results of this review will assist DCFS in better assessing performance and advancing more successful strategies to improve data quality.

Timely Adoption - The DCFS has identified and corrected inaccurate removal data for many cases in both FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 periods. In September 2005, the DCFS made the necessary corrections to these removal dates by Adoption Program staff using the eWiSACWIS placement history correction functionality. DCFS is still reviewing the completeness of adoption reporting in the AFCARS files for FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 prior to resubmission of the files.

Timely Reunification, Re-entry and Placement Stability – The DCFS will make any necessary revisions to state performance based on the new data profile resulting from the above-mentioned AFCARS Foster Care file re-submissions.

Table 1 - Wisconsin Achievement of National Performance Standards

Performance Standards	National Standard (Percent)	WI Data 2002 (Percent)	WI Data 2003 (Percent)	WI Data 2004 (Percent)	WI Data 2005 (Percent)	Minimum Improvement Target (Percent)
Safety Outcome 1 – Recurrence of Maltreatment Of all children who were victims of substantiated maltreatment reports, what percent were victims of another substantiated report within a 6-month period?	6.1 or less	6.04	7.13	5.25	4.97	6.23
Safety Outcome 2 – Maltreatment While in Care Of all children in out-of-home care, what percent experienced maltreatment by foster parents or facility staff members?	0.57 or less	0.26	0.30	0.57	0.62	Standard Met (2003 data)
Permanency Outcome 1 – Re-entry to Care Of all children who entered out-of-home care, what percent re-entered care within 12 months of a prior out-of-home care episode?	8.6 or less	22.2	21.5	18.9	22.4	20.15
Permanency Outcome 2 – Timely Reunification Of all children reunified from out-of-home care, what percent were reunified within 12 months of entry into out-of-home care?	76.2 or more	66.5	65.2	70.1	77.8	67.62
Permanency Outcome 3 – Timely Adoption Of all children adopted from out-of-home care, what percent were adopted within 24 months of their entry into care?	32.0 or more	17.5	17.8	21.7	30.1*	20.7
Permanency Outcome 4 – Placement Stability Of all children in out-of-home care for less than 12 months, what percent experienced no more than 2 placement settings?	86.7 or more	92.3	92.6	90.5	89.8	Standard Met (2003 data)

Data Sources:

-- Safety Outcomes- 2002 - 2003 data is based on estimates derived from alternate methodology approved by the federal Children’s Bureau; the 2004 & 2005 figures are derived solely from the eWiSACWIS Maltreatment Recurrence and Maltreatment in Out of Home Care Outcome reports.

-- Permanency Outcomes- 2002 - 2005 data are based on data profile figures generated by the federal Children’s Bureau using the state’s FFY AFCARS submissions

* Time to Adoption Data from the federal State Data Profile includes adoptions with incorrect removal dates; efforts to correct removal dates will be completed by Fall 2006

Adjustments to State Baselines for National Standards

At this point, the DCFS does not propose adjustments to the state baseline performance levels used to compute performance improvement targets for the national standards. Adjustments may be warranted for the timeliness to adoption and maltreatment in out-of-home care measures, but additional data clean-up activity, data analysis, and submittal to the Children's Bureau for review is needed before determining if any of the performance standard baselines should be adjusted.

4. State Performance on CFSR Items

Table 2 shows the state performance on 14 of the 19 CFSR performance items that Wisconsin is required to address in the PEP. For five of the 19 items, performance is measured using the statewide data for the national standard applicable to the item rather than case review data. These items are shown in Table 1. Case review data is used for 13 of the 19 items based on the results of county case reviews through the CQI process and from the 2005 BMCW Comprehensive Review. For the item on CPS Investigation Timeliness, statewide data from eWiSACWIS is used to measure performance, as described in the next section on PEP performance reports.

Case review data is also shown for the four CFSR items that Wisconsin was found in conformance on during the August 2003 CFSR. This data is presented for information purposes only as these items are not addressed in the PEP.

The data presented in this report consists of information from 88 cases reviewed in seven counties and 75 cases in the BMCW during the period of September 2005 through April 2006. The 88 cases reviewed in the balance of the state included 49 out-of-home placement cases and 39 in-home service cases. The 75 cases in the BMCW included 50 out-of-home placement cases and 25 in-home service cases. The balance of state counties include Washington, Rock, Waukesha, Iowa, St. Croix, Dane and Sheboygan.

The data from the seven counties is computed using scores from the QSR case reviews and the QSR/CFSR conversion methodology approved by the federal ACF in January 2006. The data from the BMCW is derived from comparable items reviewed as part of the BMCW Comprehensive Review. This review considers comparable areas of performance regarding safety, permanency and well-being as is assessed by the CFSR and the QSR. The review includes a random selection of both in-home and placement cases. The review process is also comparable and includes a review team which examines the case record and conducts interviews with the family and key stakeholders to the case such as placement and service providers and legal staff. The review uses a three-point scoring methodology where the highest score is considered to be a strength and the two lowest scores are considered to be areas needing improvement.

For some of the CFSR performance items, particularly Item 10, the number of cases reviewed thus far is very small and thus the performance data is very tentative at this point. As additional cases are reviewed in subsequent county reviews, the reliability of

the performance data will improve. If necessary, case samples for county reviews will be stratified to provide a sufficient number of cases for these items.

For Items 11 and 14, the DCFS has determined that the QSR review criteria do not lend to a reasonable conversion of QSR information into the CFSR equivalent scores. The DCFS will be initiating a revision to the QSR tool to track results that can be reliably converted to CFSR scores on applicable cases. The revision process will begin in July 2006 with a focus group of trained and experienced QSR reviewers and will conclude in August 2006 with final decisions regarding revisions to the review tool. As a result, the DCFS will not be able to provide scores on these items during the PEP period.

As specified in the federal ACF approval of the PEP, Wisconsin must demonstrate a 2% improvement for the 14 items that case review or eWiSACWIS data is used. The improvement targets for the five CFSR items tied to National Standards are shown in Table 1. For Safety Items 1 and 3 and Well Being Items 17, 18 and 20, Wisconsin must achieve the 2% improvement to avoid federal financial penalties on those items. The improvement targets for the national standards must also be achieved to avoid financial penalties.

The results for the 13 items based on the QSR case reviews shows that thus far Wisconsin is generally meeting the improvement targets. For Item 7, the results show Wisconsin is below the improvement target. BMCW scores for this item were higher than the remaining counties. This difference is likely due to the differences in the review tool criteria and the sample population. For Items 17 and 18, the results show Wisconsin is well above the improvement target. The DCFS is analyzing the factors that are contributing to this dynamic, which is contrary to the correlation found between these items on the national level. In addition, the QSR scores for Items 4, 12, 15, 22 and 23 are significantly higher than the improvement targets. For some of these items, the items are rated for all cases reviewed in the QSR whereas in the CFSR the cases are rated only if the item is relevant to the case; so the QSR scores may be higher as a result of including more children. Based on further analysis of the QSR case review tool, the DCFS will revise the tool during the July and August 2006 revisions sessions to better align the criteria by which these items are rated and the results are converted to CFSR scores.

Table 2 – State Performance on CFSR Outcome Items

Item #	Description	Initial Baseline	Adjusted Baseline	Quarter 5 Performance	Quarter 5 & 6 Performance	Improvement Target
Safety Outcome 1 & 2 Performance Items						
1 *	Timeliness of CPS investigations	N/A	44.80%	49.90%	55.70%	46.80%
2 *	Recurrence of maltreatment	7.13%	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	6.23%
3 *	Services to prevent removal	84%	79%	88.6%	89.8%	81%
4	Risk of harm to child	86%	N/A	95.5%	98.9%	N/A
Permanency Outcome 1 Performance Items						
5 *	Re-entry to out-of-home care	21.50%	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	20.15%
6 *	Stability of out-of-home care placements	86.70%	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	Maintain 86.7%
7	Permanency goal for child	60%	64%	36.0%	44.9%	66%
8 *	Reunification, guardianship, and placement with relatives	65.20%	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	67.60%
9 *	Adoption	17.80%	National Standard	National Standard	National Standard	20.70%
10	Other planned living arrangement	83%	70%	40% (n = 5)	50.0% (n = 10)	72%
Permanency Outcome 2 Performance Items						
11	Placement proximity	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
12	Placement with siblings	50%	59%	100.0%	85.7%	61%
13	Visiting with parents and siblings in out-of-home care	54%	61%	65.2%	64.3%	63%
14	Preserving connections	63%	68%	N/A	NA	70%
15	Relative placement	65%	53%	84.0%	73.9%	55%
16	Relationship of child in care with parents	63%	67%	70.8%	70.2%	69%
Well-Being Outcome 1 Performance Items						
17 *	Needs/services of child, parents, and foster parents	58%	56%	75.0%	85.2%	58%
18 *	Child/family involvement in case planning	62%	56%	65.9%	67.1%	58%
19	Worker visits with child	88%	N/A	92.3%	89.7%	N/A
20 *	Worker visits with parents	77%	72%	72.7%	77.0%	74%
Well Being Outcomes 2 and 3 Performance Items						
21	Educational needs of child	91%	N/A	82.7%	81.8%	N/A
22	Physical health of child	83%	87%	100.0%	100.0%	89%
23	Mental health of child	69%	71%	82.2%	90.9%	73%

Performance Target met thus far
 Performance Target not met thus far
 Item measured using National Standard or not applicable for PEP
 * Item subject to federal penalties if fail to meet Performance Target

5. eWiSACWIS PEP Performance Reports

The performance reports used for the PEP include a set of Federal Outcome Reports that replicate the national performance standards for safety and permanency using data directly from eWiSACWIS. The DCFS also uses PEP Performance Reports to measure the impact of PEP Action Steps for several safety, permanency and well being outcome items.

eWiSACWIS Reports – The DCFS continues to work with the BMCW and county agencies to fine tune the reports used to provide information for the PEP. The DCFS has implemented a plan to provide ongoing communication and technical assistance to local agency staff and to include agency staff in the report enhancement design and testing process. In Quarter 6, DCFS continued to train Area Administration staff to use the PEP reports with counties in their region and participate in regional meetings to discuss how to effectively use eWiSACWIS reports.

The PEP Reports address the following performance measures as either a primary or secondary data source as follows:

PEP Performance Measure	PEP Report Name	Primary Performance Data Source	Secondary Performance Data Source
Safety			
Timeliness of CPS Initial Assessments	CPS Initial Assessment Timeliness	PEP Report	N/A
Safety Assessments, Plans and Services	CPS Safety	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Permanency			
Timeliness of ASFA Documentation	ASFA Documentation	PEP Report	Case Review Results
Completeness of ICWA Notification	ICWA Notification	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Sibling Placement	Siblings in Placement	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Permanency Planning	Permanency Planning Detail	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Independent Living Assessment and Planning	Independent Living	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Well Being			
Timeliness of Family Assessments & Case Planning	Family Assessments and Case Plans	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Monthly Contacts for Ongoing Cases	Contacts with Children and Parents	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Use of Education Screen for Ongoing Cases	Education Screen	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Use of Medical/MH Screen for Ongoing Cases	Medical Screen	Case Review Results	PEP Report

6. Data Entry for PEP Reports

The DCFS has continued to work with the regional office, county agencies, the BMCW and the state Special Needs Adoption Program to identify and address training and technical assistance to support the accuracy and timeliness of critical documentation in eWiSACWIS related to data used in the above-mentioned PEP reports. These critical documentation items were identified in the DCFS Information Memo 2006-06 issued on January 23, 2006.

Additional efforts have been made to improve the quality and accuracy of documentation in eWiSACWIS related to the PEP and Outcome reports during Quarter 6. These efforts include the following enhancements to eWiSACWIS reports and report functionality:

- Added new functionality to the eWReports Dashboard for federal outcome reports to support selected county and regional comparisons and to allow multiple quarter data comparisons; and
- Implemented a new Access report monitoring CPS Report activity including intakes and screening activity.

7. CPS Timeliness Report

This report is used as the primary data source for CFSR Safety Item 1 relating to timeliness of CPS investigations. The report uses eWiSACWIS data on completed CPS Initial Assessments, including the date the CPS report was received, the assigned response time, and when the initial face-to-face contact with the children involved in the CPS report was attempted or occurred. Timeliness is measured based on the percentage of valid CPS reports where the face-to-face contact occurred within the assigned response time. Response times can vary from 0-2 hours for high priority CPS reports to 2-5 days for low priority CPS reports.

Table 3 shows data from Quarters 2 of CY 2005 through Quarter 1 of CY 2006 and the baseline period of Quarter 4 of CY 2004 and Quarter 1 of CY 2005. The baseline performance level of 44.8% was approved by the federal ACF in January 2006. Based on the results for CY 2005 and for CY 2006 to date, the state is making improvement in performance for this item and steady improvement in data quality. The DCFS anticipates that the state will meet the performance improvement target for this performance item and continues to provide training and technical assistance to counties and the BMCW to improve data quality.

Table 3 - CPS Initial Assessment Timeliness

BASELINE RESULTS

CY 2004, Quarter 4

Statewide Results	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Totals
Total Records	265	1,169	1,092	4,293	125	6,944
Total Records Valid *	127	504	749	2,666	NA	4,046
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>47.9%</i>	<i>43.1%</i>	<i>68.6%</i>	<i>62.1%</i>	NA	<i>58.3%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	50	213	203	1,273	NA	1,739
Sub-Total outside Response Time	77	291	546	1,393	NA	2,307
<i>Percentage within Response Time</i>	<i>39.4%</i>	<i>42.3%</i>	<i>27.1%</i>	<i>47.7%</i>	NA	<i>43.0%</i>

CY 2005, Quarter 1

Statewide Results	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Totals
Total Records	269	1,254	1,265	4,688	152	7,628
Total Records Valid *	138	589	847	3,048	NA	4,622
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>51.3%</i>	<i>47.0%</i>	<i>67.0%</i>	<i>65.0%</i>	NA	<i>60.6%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	96	267	290	1,494	NA	2,147
Sub-Total outside Response Time	42	322	557	1,554	NA	2,475
<i>Percentage within Response Time</i>	<i>69.6%</i>	<i>45.3%</i>	<i>34.2%</i>	<i>49.0%</i>	NA	<i>46.5%</i>

PERFORMANCE MONITORING RESULTS

CY 2005, Quarter 2

Statewide Results	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Totals
Total Records	291	1,914	1,347	4,896	67	8,515
Total Records Valid *	151	638	911	3,148	NA	4,848
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>51.9%</i>	<i>33.3%</i>	<i>67.6%</i>	<i>64.3%</i>	NA	<i>56.9%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	106	325	335	1,538	NA	2,304
Sub-Total outside Response Time	45	313	576	1,610	NA	2,544
<i>Percentage within Response Time</i>	<i>70.2%</i>	<i>50.9%</i>	<i>36.8%</i>	<i>48.9%</i>	NA	<i>47.5%</i>

CY 2005, Quarter 3

Statewide Results	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Totals
Total Records	245	1,183	1,212	4,415	115	7,170
Total Records Valid *	129	569	819	2,882	NA	4,399
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>52.7%</i>	<i>48.1%</i>	<i>67.6%</i>	<i>65.3%</i>	NA	<i>61.4%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	96	239	277	1,469	NA	2,081
Sub-Total outside Response Time	33	330	542	1,413	NA	2,318
<i>Percentage within Response Time</i>	<i>74.4%</i>	<i>42.0%</i>	<i>33.8%</i>	<i>51.0%</i>	NA	<i>47.3%</i>

CY 2005, Quarter 4

Statewide Results	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Totals
Total Records	235	1,082	1,106	4,087	63	6,573
Total Records Valid *	119	481	735	2,657	NA	3,992
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>50.6%</i>	<i>44.5%</i>	<i>66.5%</i>	<i>65.0%</i>	NA	<i>60.7%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	89	228	283	1,326	NA	1,926
Sub-Total outside Response Time	30	253	452	1,331	NA	2,066
Percentage within Response Time	74.8%	47.4%	38.5%	49.9%	NA	48.2%

CY 2006, Quarter 1

Statewide Results	Same Day	24 Hrs	48 Hours	W/in 5 Days	N/A	Grand Totals
Total Records	285	1,233	1,200	4,727	63	7,508
Total Records Valid *	136	540	823	3,220	NA	4,719
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>47.7%</i>	<i>43.8%</i>	<i>68.6%</i>	<i>68.1%</i>	NA	<i>62.9%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	100	332	576	1,620	NA	2,628
Sub-Total outside Response Time	36	208	247	1,600	NA	2,091
Percentage within Response Time	73.5%	61.5%	70.0%	50.3%	NA	55.7%

* Valid records include those records where contact information is documented as required, is not a negative ('-') number, and is not greater than 99 days.

Changes to PEP Matrix

The following changes were made to the PEP Matrix reflecting activity through the end of Quarter 6. See the updated Matrix attached to this report for more information on modifications to tasks in the Matrix. The changes made in this report reflect clarification of tasks and incremental changes to completion dates.

D.5.a and b.– Tasks renumbered under D.5.a. Achievement date changed per renegotiation.

G.1.b.2 – Benchmark achievement date changed per renegotiation.

H.2 – Achievement date changed for H.2.3 and additional benchmark task H.2.6 added to Matrix.

I.1.1 – Benchmark achievement date changed to Quarter 7.

I.2.2 – Task deleted to be consistent with deletion of H.1.4.

K.2.a.2 – Task deleted per request on Page 7 of Quarter 6 report.

K.5.a.2 - Benchmark achievement date changed to Quarter 7.

N.1.3 – Benchmark achievement date modified to Quarter 7

N.1.4 - Benchmark achievement date modified to Quarter 8

R.1.c.2 – Benchmark achievement date modified to Quarter 7

The updated Matrix reflects all of the renegotiation changes approved by ACF.