IV. Measurement Plan

Florida is using the state Continuous Quality Improvement process to measure performance for CFSR Items 1-6 and CFSR Items 12-15. Community-based Care (CBC) lead agency continuous quality improvement (CQI) staff and state child welfare professionals will jointly assess cases selected for review as part of the program improvement plan. CBCs are established in state law, and the Department contracts with them to provide or oversee case management services at the local level. This approach ensures increased *local community ownership* of service delivery and design. All requirements in this plan are incorporated into CBC contracts with the Department.

Florida proposes to use 2016 state-conducted CFSR findings to establish baselines and goals for PIP measurement. Improvement on systemic factors will be measured through completion of strategies and key activities as outlined in Section III of this plan.

Case Review Item Measurement

Community-based Care CQI staff will review 678 cases semi-annually, or 339 cases each quarter, using the Children's Bureau's On-Site Review instrument (OSRI) and instructions. The OSRI requires reviewers to conduct case file reviews and case-related interviews with children, parents, foster parents, caseworkers, and other professionals involved in the case. The OSRI instrument is web-based and will be completed in the Children's Bureau Onsite Review System (ORS). A minimum of 80 cases will be reviewed for each measurement period, include case-specific stakeholder interviews and be designated as PIP-monitored cases. The cases will include a similar distribution of case types and metropolitan area ratios as were reviewed during the CFSR. Approximately 1,100 cases will be reviewed annually, of which a minimum of 160 will be designated as PIP-monitored. An over sample of cases will be reviewed, as needed, if the initial number of cases does not meet the number of applicable cases per item ("n") required for each PIP-measured item to ensure consistency with the "n" for CFSR case review items. Cases will be stratified across the Department's six regions and CBC agencies consistent with the stratification for the statewide CFSR. The first measurement period will be the first six months of reviews, using quarters 1 and 2 then the measurement period will be rolled and quarters 2 and 3 utilized and so forth. Once the Children's Bureau determines the PIP goal is achieved for an item, it will be considered met.

Each review will be comprised of a CBC CQI staff person and a Department of Children and Families (Department) regional or state level child welfare professional. The CBC CQI staff will lead the review.

Case selection criteria for the PIP-monitored cases will replicate the CFSR sample methodology split between out-of-home care and in-home services. Out-of-home care samples will be selected from the most recent Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) submission extract where all children were in out-of-home for 24 hours or more in the report period. In-home cases will be selected using the Florida Rapid Safety Feedback (RSF) listing report for in-home cases where one or more children received case management services for 45 consecutive days in the sample period and investigations open for 45 days or more in the sample period with a present danger or impending danger safety plan open at any time during the sample period where none of the alleged victims were in out-of-home care. The Office of Child Welfare will select PIP-monitored cases at the beginning of each quarter, utilizing the "random.org" website for case selection from a rolling quarterly sample frame from the AFCARS submission extract for out-of-home cases and RSF listing report for in-home cases. The period under review is at least 12 months preceding the review, starting with the first day of the sample period and ending on the date of the case review.

The sample periods and periods under review for the first year are identified below and will be replicated throughout the PIP measurement period by advancing the year identified in the table.

Review Months	Rolling Quarterly Sample Periods*	Periods Under Review
July 2017	07/1/2016 to 12/31/2016	07/1/2016 to Date of Review
August 2017	07/1/2016 to 12/31/2016	07/1/2016 to Date of Review
September 2017	07/1/2016 to 12/31/2016	07/1/2016 to Date of Review
October 2017	10/1/2016 to 3/31/2017	10/1/2016 to Date of Review
November 2017	10/1/2016 to 3/31/2017	10/1/2016 to Date of Review
December 2017	10/1/2016 to 3/31/2017	10/1/2016 to Date of Review
January 2018	01/1/2017 to 6/30/2017	01/1/2017 to Date of Review
February 2018	01/1/2017 to 6/30/2017	01/1/2017 to Date of Review
March 2018	01/1/2017 to 6/30/2017	01/1/2017 to Date of Review
April 2018	04/1/2017 to 9/30/2017	04/1/2017 to Date of Review
May 2018	04/1/2017 to 9/30/2017	04/1/2017 to Date of Review
June 2018	04/1/2017 to 9/30/2017	04/1/2017 to Date of Review

^{*}Add 45 days for in-home services sample periods.

The Department will ensure the minimum number of PIP-monitored case reviews completed semi-annually is consistent with the 2016 CFSR sample as follows:

Item 1: 47 cases	Item 6: 55 Cases
Item 2: 34 cases	Item 12: 80 cases
Item 3: 80 cases	Item 13: 77 cases
Item 4: 55 cases	Item 14: 80 cases
Item 5: 55 cases	Item 15: 69 cases

The CBC QA Manager or designee will provide first level QA of each case review to assure consistency across the review sites, accuracy of ratings and/or changed ratings, and resolution of disputed ratings. In addition, CBC QA managers are responsible for the following activities:

- (1) Cross-checking information and decisions within each instrument to ensure that the reviewer is responding correctly to the instrument instructions, including ensuring adherence to:
 - (a) Instructions that apply across the instrument
 - (b) Item-specific instructions
 - (c) Guidance applicable to common case dynamics (e.g., short-term foster care cases)
- (2) Fielding questions and conducting group debriefings with individuals conducting the quality assurance review throughout the review week.
- (3) Reinforcing the need for the reviewer to consult with assigned quality assurance team members regarding any questions or concerns.
- (4) Communication with the Office of Child Welfare as rating issues arise. This communication will result in a joint assessment for the reasons for any rating issues and how these will be addressed statewide.

The Office of Child Welfare CQI Unit will conduct second level reviews of all cases that include case-specific stakeholder interviews to assure consistency across the review sites and the accuracy of ratings and/or changed ratings. In addition, the Office of Child Welfare CQI Unit will be responsible for centrally tracking and resolving issues and sharing that information with the state's review team.

The table below provides the distribution of cases among the Department's regions and community based care lead agencies over four quarters. The schedule will replicate through the PIP implementation and non-overlapping period.

PIP Monitored Cases by CBC

	Review Period July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018													
	FY 2017/2018 Quarter 1			FY 2017/2018 Quarter 2				FY 2017/2018 Quarter 3			FY 2017/2018 Quarter 4			
Regional Community Based Care Lead Agency	Out of Home Care	In home Cases	Total Quarterly Reviews	Out of Home Care	In home Cases	Total Quarterly Reviews	Total Semi- annual Reviews	Out of Home Care	In home Cases	Total Quarterly Reviews	Out of Home Care	In home Cases	Total Quarterly Reviews	Total Semi- annual Reviews
Big Bend CBC	1	1	2	1	0	1	3	1	1	2	1	0	1	3
Families First Network	1	1	2	2	0	2	4	1	1	2	2	0	2	4
Northwest	2	2	4	3	0	3	7	2	2	4	3	0	3	7
Region	-	-		,			<u>'</u>	-	-		,			,
Community Partnership for Children	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	2
Family Integrity	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Family Support Services N. Florida	1	1	2	1	1	2	4	1	1	2	1	1	2	4
Kids First of Florida	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	2
Partnership for Strong Families	1	1	2	2	0	2	4	1	1	2	2	0	2	4
Northeast Region	4	3	7	4	2	6	13	4	3	7	4	2	6	13
Brevard Family Partnership	1	1	2	1	0	1	3	1	1	2	1	0	1	3
CBC Central Florida	2	0	2	1	2	3	5	2	0	2	1	2	3	5
Community Based Care Seminole	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Heartland for Children	1	1	2	2	0	2	4	1	1	2	2	0	2	4
Kids Central Inc.	1	1	2	2	1	3	5	1	1	2	2	1	3	5
Central Region	5	3	8	7	3	10	18	5	3	8	7	3	10	18
Children's Network of SW Florida	2	1	3	1	1	2	5	2	1	3	1	1	2	5
Eckerd Pinellas/Pasco	2	1	3	2	0	2	5	2	1	3	2	0	2	5
Eckerd Hillsborough	2	1	3	3	0	3	6	2	1	3	3	0	3	6
Sarasota YMCA	2	0	2	0	1	1	3	2	0	2	0	1	1	3
SunCoast Region	8	3	11	6	2	8	19	8	3	11	6	2	8	19
ChildNet Broward ChildNet Palm	2	2	4	3	1	4	8	2	2	4	3	1	4	8
Beach	1	1	2	2	0	2	4	1	1	2	2	0	2	4
Devereux	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	3
Southeast Region														15
Our Kids	3	1	4	3	1	4	8	3	1	4	3	1	4	8
Southern Region	3	1	4	3	1	4	8	3	1	4	3	1	4	8
TOTALS	25	15	40	30	10	40	80	25	15	40	30	10	40	80

Case Elimination Criteria

Decisions to discard a PIP-monitored case from the sample list must be approved by the Office of Child Welfare, who must also document the basis for the decision as it relates to the discard criteria. Children who meet any of

the following criteria should be dropped from the sample population and the next random order child considered for replacement in the final master list. (Case Elimination Worksheet Form 8) http://www.centerforchildwelfare.org/qa/CFSRTools/Form%208%20Case%20Elimination%20Worksheet.pdf

Criteria for Case Elimination

- (1) In-home services case open for fewer than 45 consecutive days during the period under review.
- (2) In-home services case in which any child in the family was in foster care for more than 24 hours during the period under review.
- (3) A foster care case in which the child is in foster care for fewer than 24 hours during the period under review.
- (4) An out-of-home case that was discharged or closed according to agency policy before the sample period.
- (5) A case open for subsidized adoption payment only and not open to other services.
- (6) A case open for non-relative caregiver payment only and not open to other services.
- (7) A case in which the target child reached the age of 18 before the period under review.
- (8) A case in which the selected child is or was in the care and responsibility of another state, and the state being reviewed is providing supervision through an Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) agreement.
- (9) A case appearing multiple times in the sample, such as a case that involves siblings in foster care in separate cases or an in-home services case that was opened more than one time during a sampling period.
- (10) An out-of-home case in which the child's adoption or guardianship was finalized before the period under review and the child is no longer under the care of the state child welfare agency.
- (11) A case in which the child was placed for the entire period under review in a locked juvenile facility or other placement that does not meet the federal definition of foster care.

<u>Case Elimination Criteria during Scheduling</u> - The CBC QA Manager must record the reasons for eliminating cases from the sample while scheduling cases for review.

- (1) Cases in which the key individuals are unavailable during the onsite review week or are unwilling to be interviewed, even by telephone. Note: The key individuals in a case are the child (if school age), the parent(s), the foster parent(s), the family caseworker, and other professionals knowledgeable about the case.
- (2) There may be cases that should not be eliminated even though key individuals are unavailable. Before eliminating these cases, the Office of Child Welfare should determine whether sufficient information and perspectives could be obtained from the available parties.
- (3) Cases involving out-of-county or out-of-state family members or services are considered on a case-by-case basis, depending on the availability of key individuals.
- (4) If an interview with a critical party to the case is cancelled at the last minute and results in insufficient information being available to review the case, the case should be eliminated from the sample after approval of the Office of Child Welfare.

<u>Cases not to be eliminated</u> - The following are specifically INCLUDED in the sample and do not constitute grounds for discard and replacement:

(1) Cases under out-of-county supervision will be INCLUDED in the sample population and assigned to the CBC of the primary worker.

- (2) Cases under in-home supervision (non-judicial and judicial) and in out-of-home placements are INCLUDED in the sample population.
- (3) Cases where Florida is the sending state on an Interstate Compact placement.
- (4) Children on runaway status should not be eliminated from the sample unless it has been determined that pertinent information needed to complete the Onsite Review Instrument cannot be obtained from other available parties, such as the guardian ad litem or other significant individuals.

Other

- (1) A case originally included in the out-of-home care sample frame that is determined during the onsite review to be an in-home services case during the entire period under review may be reviewed as an in-home services case only when no alternative foster care cases can be scheduled, provided no child in the family was in foster care during the period under review.
- (2) An in-home case found with a foster care episode during the period under review may not be reviewed as a foster care case.

Stakeholder Interview Requirements

Each PIP-monitored case will include a review of the child's file using the Florida Safe Families Network (FSFN), other records as needed and concerted efforts to conduct interviews with case participants that include the following:

In-Home Cases:

- (1) All children in the home (if age and developmentally appropriate). There is discretion to conduct a group interview if separate interviews would be problematic for the family or to ensure interviews can be completed.
- (2) The child's parent(s). While it is preferred that both parents are interviewed, only an interview with the primary caretaker is required if attempts to interview the other parent are unsuccessful.
- (3) The family's caseworker. When the caseworker has left the agency or is not available for an interview, the supervisor who was responsible for the caseworker assigned to the family should be interviewed.

Out-of-Home Care Cases

- (1) The child (if age and developmentally appropriate). Other children in the home may be interviewed if the reviewer believes there may be information helpful to completion of the review.
- (2) The child's parent(s). While it is preferred that both parents are interviewed, only an interview with the primary caretaker is required if attempts to interview the other parent are unsuccessful.
- (3) The child's foster parent(s), pre-adoptive parent(s), or other caregiver(s), such as a relative caregiver or group home houseparent.
- (4) The family's caseworker. When the caseworker has left the agency or is not available for an interview, the supervisor who was responsible for the caseworker assigned to the family should be interviewed.
- (5) Interviews will include the guardian ad litem (GAL) when assigned to a case.
- (6) If the child's <u>primary</u> placement was in a mental health or juvenile justice setting during the period of review, the assigned mental health or juvenile staff will be interviewed.

Acceptable exceptions to conducting interviews

- (1) Only school-age children are interviewed, unless other arrangements are made. Cases involving preschool age children may be reviewed but do not require an interview with the child. Instead, the reviewers might observe the child in the home while interviewing the birth or foster parent(s).
- (2) The parents and/or child cannot be located (example: youth is on runaway status) or are outside of the U.S.
- (3) There is a safety or risk concern in contacting any party for the interview. (example: A parent has previously made threats to the agency.)
- (4) Any party is unable to consent to an interview due to physical or mental health incapacity.
- (5) Any party refuses to participate in an interview and the agency can document attempts to engage them.
- (6) Any party is advised by an attorney not to participate due to a pending criminal or civil matter.

Unacceptable exceptions to conducting an interview

- (1) An age cut-off that does not take into account an individual child's development capacity (e.g., a policy of not interviewing children under age 12).
- (2) A party refused to participate in an interview and the agency did not attempt to engage them.
- (3) A party has a pending criminal, civil, or procedural matter before the agency (e.g., appealing a TPR).
- (4) The agency has not made attempts to locate a party for an interview.
- (5) Any party speaks a language other than English.
- (6) The party is available to be interviewed only by phone.

Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest is defined as a circumstance in which a quality assurance reviewer or quality assurance manager's personal interests or direct professional involvement with a case and case participants materially affect the objectivity or capacity of the individual to serve as a quality assurance reviewer in carrying out the duties of the Department's quality assurance system. Any individual having a conflict-of-interest shall report the conflict to their QA manager/Local Site Leader, and the Leader shall immediately re-assign the case. The QA manager/local site leader shall ensure that any individuals having a conflict-of-interest will not participate in any team or reviewer de-briefing of cases that affects ratings of cases.

All individuals participating on a Federal CFSR Review or PIP-monitored case shall sign a Conflict of Interest Statement (OCW-CFSR Form 6; Appendix 5) for each case reviewed, attesting that he/she has:

- (1) Never been directly or indirectly involved in casework activities related to this case or any of the participants in this case.
- (2) Not participated in decisions related to this case or any of the participants in this case.
- (3) No personal interest in this case or any of the participants in this case.
- (4) No direct professional involvement with the case or case participants under review.

The Office of Child Welfare state CQI manager will resolve any questions or concerns about when a conflict of interest arises.

Case Review PIP-Monitored Goals

PIP improvement goals for the following 10 CFSR items will be measured using the above process.

CFSR Items	Item Description	Z value for 80% Confidence Level ¹	Number of applicable cases ²	Number of cases rated a Strength	PIP Baseline ³	Baseline Sampling Error ⁴	PIP Goal⁵					
item 1 ⁶	Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment (Case Review)	1.28	47	43	91.5%	0.052098762	96.7%					
	Data Source and Approach to Measurement: Florida CQI PIP monitored cases; Federal OMS											
Item 2	Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-Entry Into Foster Care	1.28	34	26	76.5%	0.093115775	85.8%					
	Data Source and Approach to Measurement: Florida CQI PIP monitored cases; Federal OMS											
Item 3	Risk and Safety Assessment and Management	1.28	80	57	71.3%	0.064770364	77.7%					
	Data Source and Approach to Measurement: Florida CQI PIP monitored cases; Federal OMS											
Item 4	Stability of Foster Care Placement	1.28	55	45	81.8%	0.066569024	88.5%					
	Data Source and Approach to Measurement: Florida CQI PIP monitored cases; Federal OMS											
Item 5	Permanency Goal for Child	1.28	55	41	74.5%	0.075183386	82.1%					
	Data Source and Approach to Measurement: Florida CQI PIP monitored cases; Federal OMS											
Item 6	Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	1.28	55	37	67.3%	0.080984713	75.4%					
	Data Source and Approach to Measurement: Florida CQI PIP monitored cases; Federal OMS											
Item 12	Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	1.28	80	41	51.3%	0.071531811	58.4%					
	Data Source and Appro	ach to Measur	ement: Florida	CQI PIP monitor	ed cases; Fed	eral OMS						
Item 13	Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	1.28	77	49	63.6%	0.070169913	70.7%					
	Data Source and Appro	ach to Measur	ement: Florida	CQI PIP monitor	ed cases; Fed	eral OMS						
Item 14	Caseworker Visits With Child	1.28	80	58	72.5%	0.063899922	78.9%					
	Data Source and Approach to Measurement: Florida CQI PIP monitored cases; Federal OMS											
Item 15	Caseworker Visits With Parents	1.28	69	30	43.5%	0.076388726	51.1%					
	Data Source and Approach to Measurement: Florida CQI PIP monitored cases; Federal OMS											

Explanatory Data Notes:

¹Z-values represent the standard normal (Z) distribution of a data set and measures the number of standard errors to be added and subtracted in order to achieve our desired confidence level (the percentage of confidence we want in the results). In order to have 80% confidence in the results of the sample data, a Z-value of 1.28 is used to calculate the margin of error.

²Represents the number of applicable cases reviewed for the baseline Period Under Review (PUR). Typically, a larger sample size decreases the standard of error and leads to an increase in the precision of results. Measurement samples must be equal to or greater than the number of applicable cases for the item from the state's CFSR.

³Percentage of cases rated a strength divided by the total number of applicable cases reviewed for the specified CFSR item.

⁴Represents the margin of error that arises in a data collection process as a result of using a sample rather than the entire universe of cases.
⁵Calculated by adding the sampling error to the baseline percentage. The state uses percentages computed from 12 months of practice data/findings to determine whether the state satisfied its improvement goal. If the state has an improvement goal above 90% and is able to sustain performance above the baseline for three quarters, CB will consider the goal met even if the state does not meet its actual goal.
⁶Data for Item 1 applies when case review is the data source for the PIP measurement plan. When state case management data is used a 95% confidence level is applied (Z value = 1.960) as a lower confidence level would yield very minimal improvement goals.