

I. PIP General Information

CB Region: I	II	II	I	V	VI	VII	I	X
State: Oregon								
Lead Children's Bureau Regional Office	Telephone Number: 206.615.2602							
Contact Person: Carol Overbeck	E-mail Address: carol.overbeck@acf.hhs.gov							
State Agency Name: Oregon Department of Human Services, Children, Adults and Families	Address: 500 Summer Street NE, E-69 Salem, Oregon 97301							
	Telephone Number: 503.945.6798							
Lead State Agency Contact Person for the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR): Kathy Ledesma	Telephone Number: 503.947.5095							
	E-mail Address: kathy.ledesma@state.or.us							
Lead State Agency Data Contact Person: Maria Duryea	Telephone Number: 503.945.6510							
	E-mail Address: maria.duryea@state.or.us							
State PIP Team Members* (name, title, organization)								
1. Kulongoski, Theodore R., Governor of the State of Oregon								
2. Goldberg M.D., Bruce, Director, Department of Human Services								
3. Johnston, Bryan M., Interim Assistant Director, Department of Human Services Children, Adults and Families Division								

4.	Aguirre, Kevin, District Manager, DHS/CAF District 16
5.	Ainam, Dana, ICWA Child Welfare Supervisor, Representative Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
6.	Albertson, Betty, District Manager, DHS/CAF District 7
7.	Arenz, Janet, Oregon Alliance of Children
8.	Baldomaro-Lucus, Cheryl M., Branch Manager DHS/SDA 2
9.	Ballard, Noreen, Supervisor, DHS Community Human Services SDA 3
10.	Balter, Mike, Boys and Girls Aid Society of Oregon
11.	Bell, Iris, Commission on Children's and Families
12.	Bennett, Ann J., Adoptions Manager, CAF Adoptions
13.	Benson, Ken, Foster/Adoptive Parent
14.	Black, Chris M., CW Program Manager, DHS/SDA13
15.	Blackburn, Randy, Administrator-Federal Financial Policy, DHS—HSB 4 DO OFFP
16.	Bouska, Bill, Children's Treatment Systems Manager, DHS/Health Services
17.	Bradach, Michelle, Representative, Burns Paiute Tribe
18.	Brennan, Daniel, OPA3/Requirements Coordinator, DHS/CAF Program Systems
19.	Brown, Linda R., SSS Supervisor, DHS/SDA 5
20.	Brownhill, Paula J., Honorable, Clatsop County Judicial Officer
21.	Burns, Jerry, District Manager, DHS/CAF District 2
22.	Buzzard, Jerry, Training Director, Portland State University
23.	Byfield, Bridget D., SSSI, DHS/SDA 5
24.	Cahn, Katharine, Child Welfare Partnership Director, Portland State University
25.	Carey, Patrick, District Manager, DHS/CAF District 10
26.	Carignan, Alicia, SSS Supervisor, DHS/Community Human Services SDA 1
27.	Chanti, Breeze, SSS 1, DHS/SDA 5 Child Welfare, W. Eugene Branch
28.	Chase, Sandra, District 4 Manager, DHS/SDA 4 Child Welfare
29.	Christian, Robin, Children First for Oregon
30.	Coleman, Lee, Interim SDA Manager, DHS/Community Human Services SDA 1
31.	Collins, Cecelia, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs

32.	Cox, Anna, Research Analyst 4, DHS—HSB 2 CAF OPPr
33.	Cronin, Esther, SOC Coordinator, DHS—HSB 2 CAF System of Care
34.	Curriu, Leslie, CWAC, School Health Services Spec./ Student Learning & Partnership, Oregon Department of Education
35.	Cummings, David, Foster Care Coordinator/PA3, DHS Foster Care Unit
36.	Daeschner, Stacey, Program Tech 2, DHS/CAF OSPC E68
37.	Darland, Don, Foster Parent, CWAC
38.	Darling, Deanne, Honorable, Judicial Clackamas County
39.	Darling, Steve, Program Manager, DHS/SDA 6 Community Human Services
40.	Davis, Veronica, Youth, Foster Child
41.	Day, Lois, Child Welfare Program Manager, DHS/SDA 5 Child Welfare Eugene
42.	Dobbins, Nicole, Youth, Foster Child
43.	Duboise, Rene L., SDA 3 Manager, DHS/SDA 3
44.	Duryea, Maria, Research & Reporting Manager, DHS/CAF/OPPr
45.	Elisoff, Theresa, Representative, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
46.	Friese, Megan, CASA Springfield
47.	Gallinger, Joni, Program Manager, DHS/SDA 10 Child Welfare Division
48.	Garcia, Marvin, The Klamath Tribes
49.	Garcia, Dottie, ICWA Contact, Representative Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua & Siuslaw
50.	Garcia, Rolanda, Child Welfare Program Manager, DHS/SDA 5 Community Human Services
51.	George, Kevin, Foster Care Program Manager, DHS/CAF OSPC E77
52.	Goins, AJ, Assistant Manager, Foster Care Unit, DHS/CAF
53.	Gonzales, Katrina M., Prepaid Health Plan Coordinator, DHS/SDA3 DMAP DSU
54.	Graf, Carolyn, Assistant District 2 Manager, DHS/CAF SDA 2 Administration Office
55.	Griggs, Joshua, Youth, Foster Child

56.	Hammack-Ryan, Tamara, Medical Assistance Resource Coordinator/Program Analyst, DHS/CAF/OPPR Federal Compliance
57.	Haney, Donna P., Foster Care Coordinator, DHS/CAF OPPR Foster Care Unit
58.	Harrington, Phyllis, Representative, Burns Paiute Tribe
59.	Hazelton, Benjamin C., Citizen Review Board, CWAC
60.	Hege, Jan, Human Services Manager, DHS/ Community Human Services, SDA 2
61.	Helstrom, Judy, Training Specialist, DHS/CAF Training Services
62.	Hill, Wendy, District Manager, DHS/CAF District 14
63.	Hoang, Helen H., Honorable, Judicial/Juvenile Court Improvement Project
64.	Horsefield, John D., Research Analyst 4, DHS/CAF/OPPR—CW Research & Reporting Unit
65.	Hudson, Shelbee, Foster Parent, Oregon Foster Parent Association,
66.	Iavenditti, Rosemary, ILP Coordinator, DHS/CAF
67.	Jackson-Spino, Bernadine, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs
68.	James, Aline, Representative, Confederated Tribes of the Siletz, FAM
69.	Jernstedt, Stephanie, Family Support & Connections Program Analyst, DHS/CAF
70.	Johnson, Maurita, Admins & Program Manager, DHS Community Human Services SDA 2
71.	Jones, Marilyn, Community Development Coordinator, DHS Community Human Services SDA 13
72.	Kallstrom, Cyndi, Supervisor, Services Children Families
73.	Kay, Lisa, Juvenile Rights Project
74.	Kaufmann, Cathy, Children's First of Oregon- CWAC
75.	Keddy, Donna, Program Manager, DHS/CAF OSPC E83
76.	Keeling, Nancy, Administrator Office of Safety and Permanency for Children, DHS/CAF
77.	Kelly-Siel, Erinn L., Administrative Services
78.	Keys, Ted, FBS Program Coordinator, DHS/CAF
79.	Kurtz, Shelly, Eugene Reporter

80.	Landis-Steward, Jenny L., OPS & Policy Analyst, DHS/CAF/OPPR
81.	Lasater, Jean, Commission for Children and Families—Oregon Homeless/Runaway Youth
82.	Ledesma, Kathy, Assistant Administrator Office of Program Performance and Reporting, DHS/CAF
83.	Lemman, Phil, OYA, CWAC
84.	Leonard, Hon. Kip W., Judicial Lane County
85.	Long, Angela, Administrator Office of Program Performance and Reporting, DHS/CAF
86.	Lowrey, Marthe, Training Specialist, DHS Community Human Services SDA 3
87.	Lupinacci, Melinda, DHS/Services Children Families
88.	Main, Becky, Representative, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs
89.	Malone, Rhonda, Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe
90.	Mares, Doug, District Manager, DHS/CAF District 8
91.	Martinez-Parker, Gayle, SSSI, DHS Community Human Services SDA 2
92.	Mason, Shary K., Citizen's Review Board
93.	May, Gayla J., Child Welfare Program Manager, DHS/CAF SDA 15 Child Welfare Clackamas
94.	McKechnie, Mark, Juvenile Rights Project
95.	McNeivins, Mary, ICWA Manager, DHS/CAF-Training E65
96.	Meade, John, Program Manager, DHS Community Human Services SDA 4
97.	Minten, Irvin, Assistant Administrator, DHS/CAF OSPC
98.	Mohr-Peterson, Judy, Unit Manager, DHS/FPA/OFRA
99.	Moore, Jerry, Chief of Police, Salem Police Department/CWAC
100.	Murphy, Kory L, District 2 Recruitment Relations Manager, DHS/CAF District 2 Administration Office
101.	Neely, James, Deputy Assistant Director, DHS/Children, Adults and Families
102.	Newland, Aaron, Business Analyst, DHS/CAF Program Systems Support
103.	Newton, Ginger, SOC Coordinator, DHS/CAF
104.	Nichelson, Candice, Supervisor, DHS Community Human Services SDA 8

105.	Obie-Barrett, Christy, Heart Gallery, A Family for every child
106.	Olsen, Rainey, Jackson County Child Welfare Program Manager, DHS Services Children Families SDA 8
107.	Olsen, Madeline M., Assistant Administrator, Health Services
108.	Parker, Greg W., CAF Communication Office, DHS/HSB4 AS Communications
109.	Patton, Pam, Coalition of Advocates of Equal Access for Girls/Morrison Center
110.	Pearl, Matthew, Child/Adolescent MH Specialist, Health Services
111.	Peterson, Bonnie, Representative, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
112.	Peterson, Toni, Deputy Assistant Director, DHS/CAF Administration
113.	Petite, Kristi, Representative, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
114.	Phillips, Christine, Program Manager, DHS Community Human Services SDA 14
115.	Pickens, Joe, Program Manager, DHS/CAF SDA 4 Child Welfare
116.	Pike, David, Pem E, DHS SDA 2 Child Welfare
117.	Poppen, Doug, Oregon Juvenile Dept. Directors Assn.
118.	Porter, Sue, Economist 4—Lead Forecast Analyst, DHS HSB4 AS FPA
119.	Price, Thomas, FBS Consultant, DHS/CAF
120.	Reinhart, Marge, CAF FS Senior Operations Manager, DHS/CAF Field Service Administration
121.	Ricks, Jennifer, PEM-C Child Welfare Supervisor, DHS SDA 16 Child Welfare
122.	Radich, John, District Manager, DHS/CAF District 5
123.	Rhode, Denise, District Manager, DHS/CAF District 11
124.	Satrum, Judy K., Research Analyst 3, DHS/CAF-OPPR/CW Research & Reporting Unit
125.	Schelle, Gail A., Assistant Program Manager, DHS/CAF Adoptions Unit
126.	Schimmels, Karyn, Training Manager, DHS/CAF Training E65
127.	Schultheis, Susan, Heart Gallery, A family for every child
128.	Serice, Mickey, Deputy Assistant Director, DHS/CAF Admin
129.	Sheirbon, Bill, Child Welfare Program Manager, DHS/CAF District 9
130.	Sherbo, Angela, Juvenile Rights Project
131.	Simpson, Dave C., PEMD, DHS/CAF/OPPR Parkway Building

132.	Slick, Janvier, Program Manager, DHS/CAF OSPC E68
133.	Smith, Becky, Oregon Commission for Children & Families
134.	Sornson, Pam, CASA Director, SDA Community Human Services
135.	Stafford, Stephanie S., Grants Coordinator, DHS/CAF Child Welfare Policy Group
136.	Stauff, Brian, District Manager, DHS/CAF District 9
137.	Stetzer, Christine, Principal, Grant Watts School, CWAC
138.	Stewart, NancyLee, Program Manager Coos/Curry, DHS Community Human Services SDA 7
139.	Stiegler, Judy, CWAC Chair
140.	Stolebarger, Christine, Parents Anonymous of Oregon
141.	Straughan, Shelley, Social Services Specialist, DHS/CAF OSPC E68 SDA 13
142.	Swanson, Una M., Trainer, PSU Child Welfare Partnership
143.	Taylor, Ruth, Parents Anonymous c/o Morrison Center
144.	Thomas, Greg W., SSS2 CET, DHS/CAF SDA 15 Child Welfare
145.	Torrey, Dana, FBS Consultant, Administrative Office SDA 2
146.	Travis, Timothy M., Juvenile Court Improvement Project
147.	Turner, Joyce, Community Human Services Child Welfare SDA 12
148.	Vette, Gwen, DAS/ Administrative Services
149.	Vlahos, Tom P., PEME, DHS Child Welfare SDA 16
150.	Vogt, Ryan, CAF Business Transition Manager, CAF Field Services HSB2
151.	Waller, Nan, Honorable, Multnomah County Judicial Officer
152.	Walling, Jason, Program Manager, Community Human Services Child Welfare SDA 3
153.	Waybrant, Jerry, District Manager, DHS/CAF District 6
154.	Wheeler, Bridgett, Representative, Coquille Indian Tribe
155.	Wheeler, Karen, Program & Policy Development Specialist, OMHAS
156.	Williams, Janet, Foster Care Coordinator, DHS/CAF
157.	Williams, Janette C., DD Children's Program Director, SPD Seniors & People with Disabilities
158.	Wurscher, Jay M., A&D Services Coordinator, DHS/CAF

II. PIP Agreement Form

The PIP should be signed and dated by the Chief Executive Officer of the State child welfare agency and by the Regional Administrator for the Children's Bureau Regional Office responsible for the State. The approved PIP with original signature must be retained in the Children's Bureau Regional Office. A hard copy of the approved PIP must be submitted to the following parties immediately upon approval:

State child welfare agency
Children's Bureau (Child and Family Services Review staff)
Child Welfare Review Project, c/o JBS International, Inc.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Agreements

The following Federal and State officials agree to the content and terms of the attached Program Improvement Plan:

_____ Date

_____ Date

Children's Bureau

Oregon Department of Human Services, Children, Adults and Families Division Child and Family Services Review Program Improvement Plan Narrative April 7, 2008

Introduction

The Children, Adults and Families Division (CAF) of the Oregon Department of Human Services (OR-DHS) has developed this Program Improvement Plan (PIP) in response to the findings from the federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) conducted by the Children's Bureau (CB), Administration for Children and Families (ACF) during the week of September 10, 2007. On January 7, 2008, Oregon received a preliminary courtesy copy of ACF's Final Report of findings, to which the State responded on January 21, 2008, with suggested technical and factual edits. On March 13, 2008, Oregon received ACF's Final Report of findings with a cover letter, dated March 7, 2008, from Christine M. Calpin, Associate Commissioner of the Children's Bureau.

Between the conclusion of its on-site CFSR and the receipt of the preliminary written report of findings from it, CAF worked in close collaboration with staff from the ACF Region X Office to identify and define six major child welfare themes that emerged from five key areas of the CFSR that are discussed in Oregon's findings. The five key areas are:

- Findings from Oregon's first (2001) CFSR;
- Policy, practice and organizational changes that were made during the subsequent (2002 – 2004) PIP, along with measures of improvements;
- Oregon's Statewide Assessment (July 2007);
- Oregon's performance in relation to the National Data and Composite Measures;
- Findings from the on-site CFSR (September 2007), which included a review of 65 foster care and in-home cases, as well as interviews with state and local stakeholders.

The six practice-area themes (identified as "domains" in this PIP) that form the organizational schema of Oregon's PIP are:

I. In-Home Safety

- II. Caseworker Face-to-Face with Children and Parents
- III. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning
- IV. Concurrent Planning
- V. Service Array and Accessibility
- VI. Recruitment and Retention of Foster and Adoptive Families

In addition, Oregon identified three universal themes that it needs to address in the PIP: over-representation of children of color across Oregon's child welfare system/cultural competency of staff and contracted providers, expectations for and support of supervisors, and advanced training for staff. Grouping of these three themes together has resulted in the creation of a seventh PIP domain:

VII. Workforce Development and Support

Approximately eighty DHS staff (including an official representative from each of CAF's sixteen geographic districts) and community stakeholders participated in Oregon's PIP Kickoff on October 22, 2007. ACF Region X staff and representatives from the National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement (NRCOI) and the National Resource Center for Child Welfare Data and Technology, as part of the CB's Training and Technical Assistance Network, assisted with the development of and actively participated in the kickoff agenda. Each participant self-selected to work with a CAF-facilitated small group to brainstorm possible strategies to address one of the six practice themes cited above. On the following day, ACF and NRC staff met with CAF leadership to debrief and plan next steps, including monthly conference calls with the State, with participation by Oregon Juvenile Court Improvement Project (JCIP) staff.

Upon receipt of its preliminary Final Report on January 7, 2008, in collaboration with ACF staff and in response to the report's key concerns, CAF solidified its work-in-process to identify goals (total of 18) for the State's six PIP domains. In preparation for a large PIP Workgroup meeting on February 4, 2008, CAF staff also identified strategic co-leads for each of the six practice domains. Staff also began identification of PIP domain-related activities across Oregon's child welfare system that had so recently been initiated that measurable improvements in child and family outcomes would not have been captured in any of the 2007 CFSR processes cited above. Additionally, between January 8 and February 4, CAF worked closely with the Oregon Governor's office to analyze the State's CFSR findings and to build a plan to proactively share with the public the findings, analysis and broad plan of action to address the report's key concerns.

On January 28 and 29, 2008, ACF Region X staff made a site visit to Oregon. The first day was spent meeting with DHS Director, Dr. Bruce Goldberg, the Interim Assistant Director for CAF, Bryan Johnston, and with representatives from the Oregon Safety Model (implementation started March 2007) and three of the DHS Director's child welfare improvement initiatives: the Child Safety Committee, the Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT) Review Committee, and the CAF Assistant Director's Advisory Committee. All three of these committees began their work in December 2008. The stated purpose by ACF for these dialogues was to encourage full integration of the PIP with these four key initiatives. On the second day of the site visit, ACF staff met with the CAF strategic co-leads for the six domains and JCIP staff to test-run a methodology (co-developed by ACF and CAF) for PIP development in the small groups beginning with the scheduled February 4 PIP Workgroup reconvening.

On February 4, 2008, Oregon Governor Ted Kulongoski, DHS Director Dr. Bruce Goldberg, and DHS Assistant Director for CAF Bryan Johnston shared the findings from the CFSSR (preliminary) Final Report. Together, they issued a call to action to better respond to the needs of Oregon's children and families who come into contact with the State's child welfare system. In addition to approximately one hundred PIP Workgroup members who were in attendance, two key state legislators and the press participated. Workgroup members again self-selected which of the six domain subgroups they would participate in that day and over the next eight weeks. This work would culminate in the submission to ACF of this first official draft of Oregon's child welfare Program Improvement Plan.

On February 28, 2008, the CAF PIP strategic co-leads for the six practice domains met to report their progress to identify for their respective domains:

- values, beliefs and practice principles
- dynamic tensions
- needed skills
- strategies already in process and new implementation strategies
- community engagement
- evaluation
- resource and training and technical assistance needs
- DHS and community champions

To address the low community stakeholder participation in the ongoing work of some of the PIP domain subgroups, the co-leads formulated a consensus plan to actively engage the 21-member DHS Child Welfare Advisory Committee (CWAC). CWAC is a legislatively-created representative group of community stakeholders. They were asked to assist in the selection, from among all of the strategies suggested by the domain subgroups, of a small number with high potential for broad, positive impact across multiple PIP domains. The PIP strategic co-leads refined and submitted their final draft plans by March 11, and those plans were presented to CWAC at their regular quarterly meeting on March 12. On March 14, at CWAC request, specially-created PIP evaluation tools were provided to CWAC members to assist them in their PIP evaluation preceding and during their special meeting that they planned for March 25. The March 25 meeting resulted in a small number of recommendations for the structure and content of the PIP.

Four other important PIP-related activities took place during February and March:

1. Incorporation into the PIP of local Model Court projects, which focus on improvement strategies related to items on the CF SR instrument. Most, but not all of Oregon's 36 counties have Model Court projects. Most of them either had so recently begun at the time of the September 2007 onsite CF SR or did not get well underway until after the review for any local outcome improvement to be noted in the review.
2. Inclusion in the PIP, in addition to statewide improvement strategies, of local (in this case, "local" means CAF's 16 districts) PIPs that each focus on 1-2 CF SR items for which DHS data demonstrates weak local performance.
3. Renewed, more culturally responsive, efforts to include Oregon's Tribes in PIP planning.
4. Formation of a committee consisting of CAF's CF SR, PIP and Research staff, four CAF district managers, and JCIP staff to identify proposed appropriate measures of improvement (i. e. case review, National Data Measures and Composites, Oregon systems data) for the PIP and to negotiate the levels of improvement with ACF.

The Oregon Child and Family Services Review Program Improvement Plan that follows aspires to strengthen agency capacity, strengthen professional development, improve social work interventions, expand community resources, and build stronger partnerships both within DHS and in the community. The PIP incorporates all of the following:

1. Analysis of Oregon's 2001 CFSR findings and subsequent (2002 – 2004) PIP, including areas in which progress toward improved outcomes was either not sustained or not reflected in the State's 2007 CFSR.
2. Data and information gathered by Oregon and included in the Statewide Assessment (July 2007).
3. Findings from the September 2007 onsite CFSR, including both case review and stakeholder interviews, as contained in the March 7, 2008, Final Report.
4. Strategies created by the Oregon Child Welfare Program Improvement Plan (PIP) Workgroup, consisting of approximately 140 invited DHS staff and community partner participants. The workgroup organized their work within six domains, and the DHS Child Welfare Advisory Committee (CWAC) provided feedback and recommendations to it.
5. The work of the Oregon Judicial Department's statewide and local (county) Model Court projects.
6. Local DHS/CAF District program improvement plans.
7. Collaboration with the ACF Region X staff, the Children's Bureau's National Review Team staff, and the National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement and the National Resource Center for Child Welfare Data and Technology.

The mission and values of the Oregon Department of Human Services and its Children, Adults and Families Division provide the overarching framework for the values and practice principles upon which this Program Improvement Plan is built. They are as follows:

Mission

- *The mission of the Department of Human Services is assisting people to become independent, healthy and safe.*
- *The mission of Children, Adults, and Families is to improve family capacity to be self-sustaining while creating a safe and permanent living environment for children.*

Values

- *Every child in Oregon has the right to grow up in a safe, permanent and nurturing family home. Oregon's child welfare practice focuses on each child's individualized needs for safety, permanency and well-being.*
- *The following central values are the foundation for policies, procedures and practices:*
 - *Child safety is the fundamental right of every child in our state and the paramount concern of the child welfare system.*
 - *Identifying and understanding children's individual needs are the first steps toward meeting those needs.*
 - *Identifying and reinforcing parental strengths and capacities to keep their children safe are the first steps in mobilizing them to meet children's needs.*
 - *Active participation of families in service planning for and decision-making about their children is a powerful catalyst for mobilization of strengths to respond to children's identified needs.*
 - *Whenever safety concerns dictate that children must live apart from their families, reunification is most often the goal of initial service planning.*
 - *Children's needs for safety and permanency are urgent, requiring that the child welfare system activate and complete with corresponding urgency child-specific plans to meet those needs.*
 - *When Child Welfare and families work collaboratively to develop activities and services to preserve and enhance their children's healthy connections with them yield improved outcomes for both children and families.*
 - *Employing diverse services and staff that are responsive to the unique cultural composition and needs of each child and family is a fundamental responsibility of the child welfare system.*

- *By preserving healthy connections with their families and communities promotes children's current and future well-being.*
- *Children's needs are individualized but fall into three primary categories: safety, permanency and well-being.*

Each of the seven themes, or domains, that comprise Oregon's Program Improvement Plan encompasses a portion of items from the CFSR onsite instrument that ACF determined during the September 2007 onsite review are areas needing improvement (ANI). This plan proposes strategies to be administered over the eight calendar quarters that comprise the PIP period. A brief description of the seven domains follows here, beginning with a discussion of the values, beliefs and practice principles that undergird each of them, followed by a chart in which the CFSR items addressed in the domain and ACF's key concerns about them are presented.

Domain I: Safety

The Oregon Safety Intervention Model represents an overarching process that requires safety assessment and safety management at all stages of case management from screening through case closure.

The safety intervention model includes all actions and decisions required throughout the life of a case to:

- Assure that an unsafe child is protected;
- Support and facilitate the parent taking responsibility for the child's protection whenever possible;
- Reconfirm the child's safety at home or in out-of-home care throughout the life of the case; and
- Achieve the establishment of a safe, permanent home for the unsafe child.

Values and Practice Principles

Safety is the fundamental right of every child in Oregon and the paramount concern of the child welfare system [OSM] which strives to help families be healthy, independent and safe.

Children should be safe from abuse in their parental home or a home that most connects them to their family and culture.

Safety, permanency, and well-being should drive practice.

Children's needs are individualized but fall into three primary categories: safety, permanency, and well-being. [OSM]

Identifying and understanding children's individual needs are the first steps toward meeting those needs. [OSM]

Identifying and reinforcing parental strengths and capacities to keep their children safe are the first steps in mobilizing them to meet children's needs. [OSM]

Active participation of families in service planning for and decision-making about their children is a powerful catalyst for mobilization of strengths to respond to children's needs.

Parents and community partners have important information and input into safety decision-making.

Reunification should be pursued as soon [as it has been determined that the] child can go home safely.

Communication and collaboration built on mutual trust and understanding between CAF and community partners are essential elements of child safety.

Relatives can play an important role in child safety, including as placement resources and as active contributors to child safety plans.

Domain Number: I Domain Name: Safety

Domain I encompasses child safety from the screen-in of reports of maltreatment and responses to them through safety in out of home care, assurance of safety at reunification or alternate permanent placement, to post-permanency safety supports.

CFSR Items and Key Concerns in this Domain and 2007 Performance

#	ITEM/STANDARD	KEY CONCERN	2007 PERFORMANCE
1	Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment	Lack of timely investigations, mostly (77%) involving reports that were given a 5-day timeframe for initiation of response.	ANI @ 67.5%
2	Repeat maltreatment	Oregon did not meet the national standard for the safety-related indicator on recurrence of maltreatment within a 6-month period.	93.5% on National Data Measure for Annual Period ending 09.30.06 94.1% required
*3	Services to family to protect child(ren) and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Inconsistent implementation of OSM. Services provided are not sufficient to adequately address safety issues in the home, leaving children at risk in their homes; lack of reunification support services.	ANI @ 74%
4	Risk assessment and safety management	Lack of adequate safety and risk assessments in the child's home and in the foster home. Maltreatment concerns in foster homes not adequately addressed by the agency.	0.61% on National Data Measure for absence of maltreatment in foster care for Annual Period ending 09.30.06 0.51% required; ANI @ 63%
24	Statewide Information System	FACIS is unable to quickly and accurately identify location and address of children in SPD or contracted provider foster homes.	This is the sole item in the Systemic Factor: Statewide Information, which was not in substantial conformity. Item 24 is an ANI.

* Items with an asterisk were rated as Strengths in Oregon's 2001 CFSSR.

Domain II: Timeliness and Quality of Caseworker Visits with Children and Parents¹

In the first round of CFRs, ACF found a positive association between caseworker face-to-face contact with parents and children and risk of harm to children; needs and services for children, parents and foster parents; and child and parent involvement in case planning (Item 18). The frequency and quality of caseworker visits with children and parents also was associated with services to protect children at home, timely permanency goals, timely reunification, child's visits with parents and siblings, relative placements, meeting educational needs, meeting physical and mental health needs. Domain 2 encompasses strategies to increase the timeliness and quality of caseworker face-to-face contacts with both parents that focus on the ongoing assessment of the child's needs and support of parents' understanding of and capacity to meet those needs within a framework of child safety, permanency and well-being.

Values and Practice Principles:

Frequent face to face contact is critical to establishing the relationship with children and families, and that relationship is what is critical to improving outcomes and developing the concurrent plan and the success of the concurrent plan.

Face to face contact with children and parents is where the work gets done:

- Family Engagement
 - Relationship building
 - Family involvement in case planning (parents & children)
 - Identification of needs and services
 - Preparing the child for permanency plan
 - Concurrent planning: every parent should have a back-up plan
 - Identify and respond to cultural needs of family and child
- Safety assessment (beyond a "safety check")
- Placement matching

¹ Please note that in response to Region X's suggestion that the State "undo the overlap between Domain II and Domain III concerning work with parents, Oregon's PIP Workgroup has decided that Domain 2 remain exclusively about face-to-face contact with children and with parents (which is and key activity needing improvement in Oregon, only one way to involve children and parents in case planning, and does not include any goals or strategies about relatives). Domain 3 more broadly addresses **engagement** of the child, all of the child's parents, and the relatives of the child in case planning, beginning with the identification of and diligent search for relatives and absent/non-resident parents.

Quality of face to face contact with children and parents includes more than a safety assessment; the quality of relationship between the caseworker and the family determines the quality of the assessments, service provision, concurrent planning, family involvement, and monitoring of child safety and family progress toward achieving the case plan.

Effective face to face contact should always include an understanding of the family's culture and should be responsive to that culture.

Domain Number: II Domain Name: Timeliness and Quality of Caseworker Visits with Children and Parents

In addition to the quality and timeliness of caseworker visits with children and with parents, the scope of Domain 2 includes identifying, locating and engaging all parents of the child, including non-resident parents, incarcerated parents, and parents who have a biological but no personal relationship with the child.

CFSR Items and Key Concerns in this Domain and 2007 Performance

#*	ITEM/STANDARD	KEY CONCERN	2007 PERFORMANCE
19	Caseworker visits with child	The frequency and quality of caseworker visits with children were not consistent across cases	ANI @ 55%
20	Caseworker visits with parents	There was a lack of sufficient caseworker visits with mothers and fathers, but particularly with fathers.	ANI @ 39%
19 and 20	Caseworker visits with child and Caseworker visits with parents	Lack of frequent and meaningful contact between caseworkers with children and parents makes it difficult to ensure children's safety while in their own homes or in foster homes, and also makes it difficult to engage parents of children in foster care in services to meet the requirements of their case plan so that children can return home.	See above for association of this activity with other CFSR items.

* Items with an asterisk were rated as Strengths in Oregon's 2001 CFSR.

Domain III: Involvement of Child and Parents in Case Planning²

Values and Practice Principles:

A child's greatest resource is his or her family.

Genetic and family histories are important to children.

Children deserve to have meaningful relationships with their siblings, parents and relatives.

Families have the right to be treated with respect.

Children deserve to have their mothers, fathers, relatives and other significant people in their lives identified, assessed and [included in case planning as personal and potential placement resources for them].

Case plans and goals will be developed collaboratively, involving parents, other family members and, where realistic, children.

Family members will be identified and engaged early in and throughout the life of the case.

Relatives will be [included] not only as potential placement resources, but also as ongoing support to the parents and child.

Individualize services given to families and children.

Parent-child visits will begin immediately and sustained on a regular basis.

² Please note that in response to Region X's suggestion that the State "undo the overlap between Domain II and Domain III concerning work with parents, Oregon's PIP Workgroup has decided that Domain 2 remain exclusively about face-to-face contact with children and with parents (which is and key activity needing improvement in Oregon, only one way to involve children and parents in case planning, and does not include any goals or strategies about relatives). Domain 3 more broadly addresses **engagement** of the child, all of the child's parents, and the relatives of the child in case planning, beginning with the identification of and diligent search for relatives and absent/non-resident parents.

Domain Number: III**Domain Name: Involvement of Child and Family in Case Planning**

Domain 3 primarily focuses on children and their parents and children and their siblings who are also in care. While the preservation of the child's connections with extended family members is part of Domain 3, most of the improvement activities regarding the child's relatives are addressed in Domain 4.

CFSR Items and Key Concerns in this Domain and 2007 Performance

#*	ITEM/STANDARD	KEY CONCERN	2007 PERFORMANCE
*13	Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	The frequency of visitation between the child and parents and between siblings is sometimes inadequate to meet the needs of the child.	ANI @ 79%
*14	Preserving connections	For the most part, the agency made concerted efforts to preserve the child's connections with extended family members.	ANI @ 88%
*16	Relationship of child in care with parents	The agency was not consistent with regard to making concerted efforts to support the relationship child's connections between children and fathers.	ANI @ 66%
17	Needs (services are addressed in D-5) of child, parents (needs of foster parents are addressed in D-6)	Inconsistency with regard to assessing and meeting the service needs of mothers, fathers, children and foster parents. Fathers were less likely that the others to have needs assessed and met.	ANI @ 43%
*18	Child and family involvement in case planning	The agency was not consistent with regard to involving mothers, fathers, and age-appropriate children in developing the case plan, with fathers being less likely to be involved than mothers or children.	ANI @ 44%
25	Written Case Plan	Parents are not consistently involved in the development of their case plan.	ANI (part of Case Review System)

* Items with an asterisk were Strengths in Oregon's 2001 CFSR.

Domain 4: Concurrent Planning

Two indications that Oregon's early national lead on the use of concurrent planning now needs attention and improvement are the growing use of Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (OPPLA) as a permanency goal as well as the increasing numbers of challenges by foster parents and relatives of children who both seek to adopt them.

Values and Practice Principles:

Every child deserves and needs a permanent, safe home.

It is imperative to achieve timely permanency for every child; delays once reunification is no longer the plan should be eliminated.

Parents should be actively engaged in permanency planning for their children, and workers should be capacitated to do concurrent planning with families with full recognition of the inherent duality.

Early and continuous engagement of the child's family and support network is essential to well-grounded concurrent planning.

Financial barriers to achieving child permanency should be identified and removed.

Timely concurrent permanency planning and achievement of permanency should be child focused and accomplished within the child's sense of timeliness.

A child's permanency options are expanded and important connections preserved when family, kin, kith (non-legally related "family") and significant others as identified by the child's culture are considered.

The use of simple language, straightforward communication, and a focus on developing trust all help to build the system-parent relationship that supports timely achievement of child permanency.

Active engagement of foster parents as models and mentors for parents supports the timely achievement of reunification.

Effective concurrent planning includes the active engagement of the child's community to identify and access service and placement resources for children.

Domain Number: IV **Domain Name: Concurrent Planning**

Domain 4 includes items from both Permanency Outcome 1 (Items 7, 8, 9, 10) and Permanency Outcomes 2 (Item 15), as well as one item (28, Termination of Parental Rights) from the systemic factor, Case Review System, all of which are aspects of practice that the State considers integral parts of concurrent planning.

CFSR Items and Key Concerns in this Domain and 2007 Performance

#*	ITEM/STANDARD	KEY CONCERN	2007 PERFORMANCE
7	Permanency goal for child	Inconsistency of establishment of permanency goals in a timely way.	ANI @ 78%
8	Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives	Oregon did not meet the national standards for the permanency- related data composite for the timeliness and permanency of reunification; inconsistency in achieving reunification in a timely manner.	ANI @ 85%
9	Adoption	Oregon did not meet the national standard for permanency-related data composite for timeliness of adoptions; extensive delays in achieving adoption in a timely way.	ANI @ 36%
10	Other planned permanent living arrangement	Children were assigned the goal of OPPLA at very young ages; a lack of adequate consideration for other permanency options before establishing this goal.	ANI % 60%
*15	Relative placement	Inconsistency with regard to seeking both maternal and paternal relatives as potential placement resources for the child.	ANI % 74%
28	Termination of Parental Rights	TPR petitions not filed timely; inconsistent documentation of compelling reasons in case file.	ANI (one of two Case Review System ANIs)

* Items with asterisks were Strengths in Oregon's 2001 CFSR.

Domain V: Service Array and Accessibility that Address the Needs of Children and Their Families

Values and Practice Principles:

The needs of families, not by the needs or limitations of the system, should drive service array and accessibility to services that strengthen families' capacity to care for their children.

Mental health and drug and alcohol assessments of parents and children should be standardized, research- and evidence-based and normed to the culture of the individual and family. They should take into account the family or individual's readiness for services and the trauma that is a common element of child maltreatment.

Assessors of parents and children should be held to high standards of cultural and professional competency.

Orientation toward recovery, increased parental protective capacity, prevention of future problems, and individual and family health, safety and independence are the ultimate goals of service array and accessibility to services.

Effective service planning and delivery begin with family involvement, and services grow and develop in order to meet the evolving and changing needs of families. Service planning should be inclusive, coordinated community efforts that are respectful (not punitive) of families, take into account families' natural supports, value timeliness and good customer service, and provide services in the least restrictive environment in proximity to the family.

Domain Number: V

Domain Name: Service Array and Accessibility that Address the Needs of Children and Their Families

As is evidenced throughout the findings from Oregon's 2007 CFSR and acknowledged by the State's governor, the decline in resources for services for families who come to the attention of Oregon's child welfare system have had a negative impact on the agency's ability to help families keep their children safely at home or safely and permanently return them home. Moreover, the well-being of children has been negatively impacted by this reduction in resources. The CFSR provides an opportunity to quantify these impacts and to strategize ways to improve this situation.

CFSR Items and Key Concerns in this Domain and 2007 Performance

#*	ITEM/STANDARD	KEY CONCERN	2007 PERFORMANCE
17	(Needs of child and parents are addressed in D-3) and services of child and parents. (Needs and services to foster parents is included in D-6 as a retention issue.)	The agency was not consistent with regard to assessing and meeting the service needs of mothers, fathers, children and foster parents. Fathers were less likely than the other to have their needs assessed and met.	ANI @ 43%
21	Educational needs of the child	Although many children did have their educational need met, there were concerns in many other cases that educational needs were identified but no services were provided to address those needs.	ANI @ 77%
*22	Physical health of the child	The agency was generally effective in meeting children's physical health needs, although there were concerns regarding access to dental services.	ANI @ 88%
23	Mental/behavioral health of the child	The agency was less effective in meeting children's mental health needs. In many cases, children's mental health needs were not assessed, and in many other cases, needs were assessed but services were not provided.	ANI @ 71%

* Items with asterisks were Strengths in Oregon's 2001 CFSR.

#*	ITEM/STANDARD	KEY CONCERN	2007 PERFORMANCE
*35	Array of services	<p>Throughout the State, there are insufficient inpatient substance abuse treatment services, an inadequate continuum of mental health resources.</p> <p>Services are not available in adequate supply in some areas of the State.</p>	<p>ANI (Item is from Systemic Factor: Service Array, which was not in substantial conformity.)</p>
*36	Service accessibility	<p>Transportation to services is limited or unavailable in some parts of the State.</p>	<p>ANI (Item is from Systemic Factor: Service Array, which was not in substantial conformity.)</p>
*37	Individualizing services	<p>Although the State has some flexible funding and can access community resources to provide wraparound services, both the Statewide Assessment and stakeholder interview information indicate that the scarcity of services and the lack of adequate resources make it difficult to ensure individualization of services to meet unique needs.</p>	<p>ANI (Item is from Systemic Factor: Service Array, which was not in substantial conformity.)</p>

* Items with asterisks were Strengths in Oregon's 2001 CFSR.

Domain VI: Recruitment and Retention of Foster and Adoptive Families

Values and Practice Principles:

[NOTE: The values and practice principles for Domain 6 are in draft form only for the April 7, 2008, PIP submission.]

Every child's first out of home placement should be his or her last out of home placement.

Retention of foster families is a fundamental key to successful recruitment of new foster families.

Retention = Respect + Response + Reciprocation

Improved identification, assessment, and approval of relatives who are able to meet the placement needs of their relative children is beneficial to children and families and can help relieve the need to place children with unrelated foster families in excess of their numerical or skill capacity to meet their needs.

Every child who requires placement in foster care deserves:

- to be placed in the least restrictive setting in proximity to his or her family;
- to be placed with his or her siblings who also require out of home care
- to be matched with a family who receives, understands and can respond to information about the child's behaviors and needs and the reasons for them, and is provided a variety of supports to meet those needs.

Every foster parent deserves:

- to be matched with children for whom he or she has the capacity to safely and effectively take care of;
- to receive information and supports to enhance their capacity;
- assistance for their own family to adjust to and accommodate the special needs of the children who are placed with them;
- to be honored and receive recognition.

Domain Number: VI Domain Name: Recruitment and Retention of Foster and Adoptive Families
 Domain VI includes

CFSR Items and Key Concerns in this Domain and 2007 Performance

#*	ITEM/STANDARD	KEY CONCERN	2007 PERFORMANCE
*6	Stability of foster care placement	Although many children experience placement stability, a substantial number of cases occurred in which the child was not in a stable placement at the time of the onsite CFSR and in which the child had experienced placement changes that were not in the child's best interest nor intended to further attainment of the child's permanency goal.	ANI @) 66%
17	Needs and services of foster parents	The agency was not consistent with regard to assessing and meeting the service needs of foster parents.	This PIP treats Item 17 as it pertains to foster parents as a key retention issue. ANI @ 43%
*35	Array of Services	Throughout the State, there is a serious shortage of foster homes and therapeutic foster homes.	ANI (Item is from Systemic Factor: Service Array, which was not in substantial conformity.)
*41	Standards for foster homes and institutions	Although the State's standards for foster family homes and child care institutions are reasonably in accord with recommended national standards, these standards are not consistently adhered to in practice. (Note: this concern refers specifically to granting exceptions in some cases for placing children into foster homes in numbers in excess of those for which the foster homes are licensed.)	ANI (Item is from Systemic Factor: Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention, which was not in substantial conformity.)

* Items with asterisks were Strengths in Oregon's 2001 CFSR.

#*	ITEM/STANDARD	KEY CONCERN	2007 PERFORMANCE
*44	Diligent recruitment of foster and adoptive homes	The State does not have a statewide process in place to ensure the diligent recruitment of foster homes, despite significant shortages of all types of foster parents.	ANI (Item is from Systemic Factor: Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention, which was not in substantial conformity.)

* Items with asterisks were Strengths in Oregon's 2001 CFSR.

Domain VII: Workforce

During the drafting of the PIP several over-arching themes that do not fit neatly into any of the six preceding PIP domains but rather have significant connections to and impact on them were identified. These themes – supervisory expectations and supports; cultural competence and over-representation of children of color; ongoing professional development for staff; and continuous efforts to communicate and collaborate with community partners – all fall under the rubric of workforce.

Values and Practice Principles:

A well-trained workforce is fundamental to the provision of high quality services to families and children who come to the attention of Oregon’s child welfare system.

All agency staff and contracted providers should be held to high standards of cultural and professional competency.

Professional competency for child welfare staff requires rigorous, continuous acquisition of knowledge regarding evidence practice.

Clearly articulated expectations for casework supervisors, ongoing professional formation to provide them with the knowledge and skills to meet these expectations, and strong agency support are prerequisite to supervisors’ capacity to provide high quality supervision to the staff within their scope of responsibility.

All families and children who come to the attention of Oregon’s child welfare system deserve to receive services that are responsive to their cultures.

Effective face to face contact should always include an understanding of the family’s culture and should be responsive to that culture.

There is a fundamental relationship between the cultural competence of the agency as an organization, its individual staff and its contracted providers, and the quality and equality of services provided to children and families of all races and ethnicities.

The quality and timeliness of the services that CAF provides to families and children who come to its attention is strengthened by consultation, collaboration and coordination with other child-and-family serving entities in Oregon.

CFSR Items and Key Concerns in this Domain and 2007 Performance

#*	ITEM/STANDARD	KEY CONCERN	2007 PERFORMANCE
33	Ongoing Staff Training	State does not require a minimum number of hours of ongoing staff training.	ANI (Item is from Systemic Factor: Training.)
NA	Expectations of and supports for supervisors		The agency concurs with ACF that this issue, which does not have a specific related CFSR item, impacts all of the ANIs in Domains 1-6.
39	The agency develops, in consultation with Tribal representatives, consumers, services providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child-and-family serving agencies, annual reports of progress and services delivered pursuant to the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP)	The agency does not consistently engage stakeholders in the process of developing annual reports of progress and services delivered	ANI (Item is from Systemic Factor: Agency Responsiveness to the Community.)
NA	Cultural competence of agency staff and contracted providers		Oregon has identified this as a fundamental issue related to the the over-representation of children of color (specifically Native American and African American) throughout the State's child welfare system.

* Items with asterisks were Strengths in Oregon's 2001 CFSR.

#*	ITEM/STANDARD	KEY CONCERN	2007 PERFORMANCE
*44	Diligent recruitment of foster and adoptive homes	The State does not have a statewide process in place to ensure the diligent recruitment of foster homes, despite significant shortages of all types of foster parents.	<p>ANI (Item is from Systemic Factor: Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention, which was not in substantial conformity.)</p> <p>Diligent recruitment is one of several issues related to the over-representation of children of color (specifically Native American and African American), which in turn relates to cultural competence</p>

* Items with asterisks were Strengths in Oregon's 2001 CFSR.

Program Improvement Goals, Current Strategies, and Planned Strategies

The PIP sub-workgroups for Domains 1 through 6 met for the first time at Oregon's PIP Kickoff on October 22, 2007, prior to the State's receipt of a Final Report of findings from the September 2007 onsite CFSR. These groups did not have at their disposal ACF's final calculation of outcomes which were not in substantial conformity and associated items that ACF identified as areas needing improvement. Nonetheless, based largely on agency notes from the September 14 exit conference regarding ACF's preliminary findings, as well as the preliminary collaborative work done by CAF and ACF to formulate goals for each domain, the workgroups compiled preliminary lists of potential strategies to improve those areas thought to be deficient. Leaders for these groups were all CAF staff. They were selected, not necessarily because of their expertise in the specific sub-group theme, but rather for their recognized group facilitation skills.

When the PIP Workgroup reconvened on February 4, 2008, after DHS had received the preliminary courtesy copy of Oregon's Final Report, Workgroup members self-selected, as they had done in October, their participation in the domain(s) in which they had the most interest and/or expertise. Three strategic co-leaders for each domain – one each from CAF Field, CAF Office of Program Performance and Reporting (OPPR), and the CAF Office of Safety and Permanency for Children (OSPC) unit that would have lead policy-change responsibilities during PIP implementation – had been identified by CAF prior to the February meeting. Thus, neither the composition nor the leadership of the six subgroups was precisely the same as it had been in October, although each sub-group was provided with the work done by its corresponding precursor (October) sub-group. These sub-groups conferred through face-to-face meetings, conference calls and e-mail exchanges from February 4 through April 4, 2008. Their work will continue throughout both PIP planning and PIP implementation.

The items included in each of the domains (including Domain VII: Workforce, which is the locus of the PIP's overarching themes and concerns), ACF's key concerns relevant to them, and the values and practice principles identified by the domain sub-group are memorialized in the preceding section. This section contains for each domain:

1. Proposed goals for this domain for Oregon's 2008-2010 child welfare Program Improvement Plan
2. The CFSR item(s) to which each goal relates
3. Strategies that were used in Oregon's first PIP (2002-2004) to improve these items³
4. Strategies that are already in progress to address each of the 2008 PIP goals for this domain^{4 5}
5. New, proposed strategies for the two years of the PIP implementation^{6 7}
6. Proposed action steps ("How") and collaborators ("Who") for each proposed strategy⁸

³ Not all items in Oregon's 2001 CFSR required improvement plans, but by the conclusion of the PIP in 2004, measurable performance improvement goals for all items requiring improvement had been met.

⁴ This section for each domain may include two different categories of strategies-in-progress: those that the State has set in motion as a direct result of the preliminary or final findings from its September 2007 CFSR; and strategies and initiatives which are related to the goal or items, but were not specifically initiated in response to those findings. Commencement of some of the strategies in the latter category began prior to the September 2007 CFSR.

⁵ Most of Oregon's 36 counties have Model Court projects based on the CFSR items. In most cases, these projects began before Oregon's September 2007 CFSR. They are included in the Strategies-in-Process section for the goal/items to which each project most closely corresponds.

⁶ While every effort was made to respect the integrity of the work of each of the six domain-specific PIP Workgroup sub-groups, in some cases a strategy proposed by a group has been deemed more appropriately associated with an item or goal in a different domain and has been moved there. In other cases, a strategy may have been deemed appropriate for another domain in addition to the one for which it was proposed. In those cases, the strategy appears in both domains.

⁷ District Managers for CAF's 16 geographic service delivery areas were encouraged to develop local PIPs for those CFSR items for which their documented performance presents high opportunity for improvement. Fifteen of the 16 districts submitted local PIPs in time for inclusion in this draft. They are included here.

⁸ Some, but not all, of the domain sub-groups have proposed action steps ("How") and collaborators ("Who") for their proposed strategies. The workgroups for those domains lacking this detail will continue their work and provide it for the next PIP submission to ACF, which is expected to be required around the end of May 2008.

Domain I: SAFETY

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
I-A	Promptly respond to reports of children who are identified as potentially unsafe in their own home or substitute care.	Item 1: Promptly respond to reports of children who are identified as potentially unsafe in their own home or substitute care.
PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS		2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS
Developed specialized data reports regarding timeliness of investigations and disseminated them to the field to be used to monitor performance in these areas.		Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies: None identified
Revised agency policy to ensure consistent practice with regard to screening maltreatment reports and determining dispositions; Provided training for current staff on the new policies and also incorporated this training into the training for new caseworkers.		Model Court Strategies⁹: None identified by OJD
Supported implementation of new policies and practices through developing online applications of the new tools and procedures and incorporating them into the agency's information technology system.		<p>Other Item-Associated Initiatives: Implementation of the Oregon Safety Model</p> <p>DHS Director's Child Safety Work Group</p> <p>DHS Director's Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT) Review Group</p> <p>JRP Paper "Foster Care and Beyond"</p> <p>Clinical Supervision Training</p> <p>Hiring of 12 OSM trainers (staff rotations) in March 2008 to provide comprehensive statewide child welfare staff training on OSM.</p>

⁹ In support of the JCIP Model Court program and for other judicial support, CAF OPPR provides judicial officers and other OJD staff access to a secure website that contains, but jurisdiction, statistical reports relating to reabuse, subcare/foster care, stability, adoption, re-entry, and reunification.

PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS
<p>I-A-1: Improve timeliness of response to allegations of abuse and/or neglect where children are determined to be unsafe.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CAF Field - CAF Program - CW Program Managers - CPS Supervisors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide local level staff earnings for Protective Service Field workers - Identify best practice worker rotation models for big, medium, and small size branches. - Identify local barriers to timely assessment (eg when law enforcement is involved)
<p>Proposed Local (District) Improvement Plans:</p> <p>District 1 plans to reduce by 20% the March 2008 level (43.9%) of overdue assessments through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use of Speakwrite - increased clinical supervision focusing on keeping assessments current - review of assessment stats @ monthly manager meetings - use of protected caseworker time <p>District 6 plans to reduce to a monthly average of 12% the number of overdue assessments in the 12-month period starting April 2008 through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use of Speakwrite 	<p>(Not yet developed)</p>	<p>(Not yet developed)</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improved clinical supervision at intake focusing on timeliness <p>District 8 plans to decrease by 20% their current overdue assessment rate (35.8%) through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - clear direction given to mgt and staff that overdues must be cleared - identifying and piloting technology that has potential for assisting staff to be more timely with assessments - use of protected time - determination if staff is appropriate distributed/assigned within offices in District - promoting use of Speakwrite 		
--	--	--

Domain I: SAFETY

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
I-B-1	Safely maintain children at home <i>as an alternative to placement into care</i> as the result of effective practices and services that are individualized to each child and the circumstances and capacity of each family, with added attention to African American and Native American children, who are over-represented in Oregon's child welfare population.	<p>Item 2: Repeat maltreatment</p> <p>Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care.</p>
<p>PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Developed specialized data reports regarding repeat maltreatment and disseminated them to the field to be used to monitor performance in these areas.</p> <p>Revised agency policy to ensure consistent practice with regard to screening maltreatment reports and determining dispositions; Provided training for current staff on the new policies and also incorporated this training into the training for new caseworkers.</p> <p>Supported implementation of new policies and practices through developing online applications of the new tools and procedures and incorporating them into the agency's information technology system.</p>	<p>2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:</p> <p>Model Court Strategies:</p> <p>Clatsop, Lincoln and Malheur: Plans for return to parents will include a detailed transition plan.</p> <p>Other Item-Associated Initiatives:</p> <p>Implementation of the Oregon Safety Model; hiring of 12 OSM trainers (staff rotations) in March 2008 to provide comprehensive statewide child welfare staff training</p> <p>DHS Director's Child Safety Work Group</p> <p>DHS Director's Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT) Review Group</p> <p>JRP Paper "Foster Care and Beyond"</p> <p>Clinical Supervision Training</p>	

PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS ¹⁰
<p>I-B-1: Significantly reinvest in, and improve access to, services that are designed to enhance families' protective capacity to care for their own children and are culturally appropriate, including Family Based Services (FBS) and individualized services funded with system of Care (SOC) flex funds and Supportive Remedial Day Care.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FBS Program - CPS Program Staff - JRP - Community Advocates - Mental Health & Addictions - DHS Diversity Committee - Contracts and Procurement - CRB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of statewide IV-E Waiver plans to develop Safety Services - Include Cultural Proficiency in FBS RFP's, - *Require cultural proficiency for all service contracts, and Inter-Governmental Agreements - Include In-Home Safety Services (eg. Home Builders) within current and future Family Based Service (FBS) Contracts - Include Protective Capacity focused services in current FBS redesign project - *Develop more in home based services (ex. Home Builders) - Require contractors to make services available in a clients' first language - Eliminate policy barriers around SRDC to allow for this service to be utilized to prevent placement or support reunification. - Early access to mental health and developmental screenings to assist in determining level of vulnerability
<p>I-B-2: Expand day care services to prevent foster care placements, sustain current placements, and support reunification plans. (<i>Strategy tentatively inserted also in Domains 5 (service array) and 6 (fp retention), pending their</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Office of Safety & Permanency - Office of Program Performance & Reporting (Title IV-E Waiver staff) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilization of statewide IV-E Waiver initiative to enhance funding to support expanded utilization - Modify policy to allow for expanded access to funding

¹⁰ Action steps with asterisks in Domain I are five-year strategies.

concurrency.)

PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS
<p>1-B-3: Institutionalize and allocate resources to support the use of early and collaborative problem solving approaches, which balance safety risks with the strengths and protective capacities of parents, extended family and community supports, whenever an out of home placement or placement change is contemplated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CPS Program - FBS Program - Community Partners - Courts - Juvenile Attorneys - Training Unit - PSU Partnership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of early (1 week from placement or sooner) family resource meeting to identify potential resources that will allow a child to remain safely at home or the least restrictive placement - Require focused facilitated meetings for the purpose of early identification and collaboration with potential Safety Service Providers (i.e. family, friends, support people and community partners) with a purpose of exploring potential In-Home Protective Actions and Ongoing Safety Plans through the sharing of the identified Safety Threats in relationship to the “enhanced” (strengths) and “diminished” (needs) Protective Capacities of the parent(s) whenever an out of home placement or placement change has occurred or is contemplated. - Focused training on full implementation of the OSM, most specific to this strategy would be the Safety Analysis. - Define the scope of, and train to, the purpose of various meetings and when they are to be used.

Domain I: SAFETY

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
I-D	Improve initial screening and assessment of potential foster parents, the use of development plans with foster care providers, placement practices, and the technology that support placements identification to consistently assure safety of children through regular and frequent face to face contact and activities.	<p>Item 4: Risk assessment and safety management</p> <p>Item 24: Statewide Information System</p>
<p>PIP I (2002-2004)</p> <p>STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Developed standards for treatment service providers requiring them to document parent behavior changes for parents in both the in-home services cases and the foster care cases, including a specific requirement that behavior changes were to be assessed for parents prior to reunification.</p> <p>Developed a Guided</p>	<p>2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:¹¹</p> <p>DHS collaboration involving CAF, OIS, SPD for identification of location of SPD-supervised DD foster care children begun in 2007 with targeted completion of all systems and processes by 06.30.08. Implementation phase-in has already begun.</p> <p>Capacity in FACIS to identify placement and moves of children in contracted BRS provider homes is on track for phased-in implementation between July 1 and Dec 30, 2008. (OIS-CAF-BRS provider collaboration)</p> <p>Oregon’s SACWIS system, OR-Kids, is on track for statewide roll-out in February 2010. Included:</p> <p>"The system will record the accurate placement provider, indicating the actual physical location of a child even if the placement is made through a parent organization." (Key # 19353)</p> <p>"The system will utilize role-based access control." (Key # 17506) This would allow us</p>	

¹¹ Please note that these strategies are also referenced in Domain VI.

<p>Assessment Process (GAP) and needs-planning process that includes standards, tools, and procedures for assessing safety and risk on an ongoing basis and at critical case junctures.</p> <p>Revised agency policy to support comprehensive ongoing assessments and safety planning.</p>	<p>to create a role for SPD to be able to enter physical location information directly into OR-Kids.</p> <p>New Policy 01-01-08: <u>I-B.2.2.3 Department Responsibilities during Screening and Assessment of a Child Abuse or Neglect Report Involving the Home of a Department Certified Foster Parent or Relative Caregiver.</u> Within this policy the department has strengthened several areas including communication with family members and legal parties to a case and an increased collaborative process among CPS staff and the Certification staff and supervisors, sharing of information through required staffing model. The Central Program office now requires receipt of the assessments and will provide a level of Quality Assurance and review for trends, training needs of staff and foster parents.</p> <p>CAF Research has created reports that show the number of foster children per foster home. Groundwork was laid spring 2008 to capture <u>all</u> children in foster homes, including fps' bio and other children. Plan is to expand current report with this additional information, make available to District Managers, CW Program Managers monthly or quarterly.</p> <p>Model Court Strategies: None identified by OJD for these items.</p> <p>Other Item-Associated Initiatives: Implementation of the Oregon Safety Model; hiring of 12 OSM trainers (staff rotations) in March 2008 to provide comprehensive statewide child welfare staff training</p> <p>DHS Director's Child Safety Work Group</p> <p>DHS Director's Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT) Review Group</p> <p>JRP Paper "Foster Care and Beyond"</p> <p>Clinical Supervision Training</p>
--	---

PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS
<p>I-D-1: Improve initial screening and assessment of potential foster parents, the use of development plans with foster care providers, placement practices, and the technology that support placement identification to consistently assure safety of children through regular and frequent face to face contact and activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Foster Care Program Area - OSM Trainers - OR-Kids Business Team - Foster Parent Association - Licensing and Residential Services Program Area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilize OSM Trainers train the field on Policy I-B.1 Monitoring Child Safety - Foster care and adoptions program workgroup to evaluate models utilized in other states during assessment for certification for foster care and for adoptive homes that standardizes the assessment methodology, reduces worker bias, strengthens the ability to match the needs of the child with the skills of the family, utilizes assessment to build on family strengths over time. Must be adaptable for both relatives and non-related caregivers.

Domain II: Timeliness and Quality of Caseworker Visits with Children and Parents

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
II-A	<p>Increase the <i>frequency and quality</i> of caseworker face-to-face contacts with <i>children</i> that focus on assessment of child needs and support of parents' understanding of and capacity to meet those needs within a framework of child safety, permanency and well-being, as documented in the written case plan. Include practices that are culturally responsive to and will improve outcomes for African American and Native American children, who are over-represented in the Oregon child welfare population.</p>	<p>Item 19: Caseworker visits with children</p>
<p>PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Revised policy to clarify agency standards with regard to the frequency, location, and purpose (i.e., what the caseworker should be assessing during the visit) of caseworker visits with children (and parents).</p> <p>Incorporated prompts in the State's information system to ensure that caseworkers were entering data in the system regarding their visits with children (and parents).</p>	<p>2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:</p> <p>Model Court Strategies: OJD has identified no Model Court projects for Item 19.</p> <p>Other Item-Associated Initiatives: The monthly CAF Dashboard contains a District-specific report on 30-day face-to-face visits with children.</p> <p>Oregon Safety Model Training to begin spring 2008 with 12 job-rotation trainers</p> <p>Oregon Child Welfare Procedure Manual contains guidelines for what should occur during caseworker face-to-face visits with children</p> <p>McKinsey Workload Study</p> <p>Title IV-B Caseworker Visits with Families</p>	

CRB efforts to streamline case review processes

CWAC Committee Face-to-Face project

Juvenile Rights Project proposal “Foster Care and Beyond”

Child Safety Workgroup

Child Welfare Supervisor Training Committee

SACWIS

CRB has been monitoring face-to-face since 2006 and has collaborated with the agency on its findings.

In order to reduce caseworker workload and free up time for more frequent, higher quality face-to-face, CRB:

- has been working with local courts to “synch” court and CRB reviews, is developing pilots in Clackamas, Linn and Jackson counties
- Pilot begun in Washington County in which court is setting date of first CRB
- CAF/CRB MOU currently in renegotiation; CRB has proposed paperwork reduction (no CRB-specific case plan) be included

PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS
II-A-1: Take something off the plate and make face to face visits with children a priority.	DHS and CAF Administration	<p>Respond to McKinsey Report findings that Oregon workers carry a high administrative load – the agency needs to increase the amount of time available to caseworkers for contact with families.</p> <p>Consistent with McKinsey, explore workload shifts such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One support person for every two caseworkers • Increasing paralegal support for branches <p>Review policies to look for efficiencies and streamline practice</p>
II-A-2: Improve face to face engagement skills with children	CAF Child Welfare Training Unit PSU Partnership/Training	<p>Clinical supervision/90 day staffings</p> <p>Training staff of why and how</p> <p>Make better use of Oregon Child Welfare Procedure Manual guidelines for visits</p>
II-A-3: Look for efficiencies in the Face to Face process itself	OSM Implementation Team	Update Oregon Child Welfare Procedure Manual to make expectations for face-to-face

<p>frequency and content clear and adding tips for caseworker time-savers (eg scheduling visits geographically)</p>		
<p>Pilot efficiency recommendations of McKinsey child welfare workload report</p>	<p>CAF Administration District Managers</p>	
<p>Propose to court the establishment of dockets to reduce wait-times for workers and families</p>	<p>Child Welfare Program Managers</p>	
<p>Look at early reviews (continuity) for CRB</p>		
<p>Consolidate reviews of all types (most notably increase coordination between court and CRB)</p>		
<p>Pilot new technology, possibly using some or all of IV-B face-to-face funding:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRM-customer relationship management technology • Blackberries • Notebook Computers • SanTrax type technology?? 		
		<p>Local District Program Improvement Plans: District 1: To increase the current percentage (69.1% on March 2008 Dashboard) who have face-to-face contact with children, District will use</p>

clinical supervision addressing and reviewing the importance of face-to-face.

District 4: To achieve increase of face-to-face contacts with children from March 2008 level (60.6%), will use weekly supervisors meetings.

District 7: To achieve goal of increasing worker visits with children, to 75% by July 2008 and to 80% by January 2009, District will continue twice-monthly face-to-face committee to review reports and determine children who have not been visited, and if there are discrepancies between reports and performance.

District 8: To achieve goal of increasing monthly face-to-face visits with children to 80%, District will provide special help to workers with less than 50% F2F contact and examine caseloads to determine equitability. To monitor and improve quality of visits with children, District will utilize case notes to record visit length and what was discussed with the child.

District 13: To achieve goal of increasing 30-day face-to-face with children, from 74.4% (March 2008 Dashboard) supervisors will use weekly supervisor conferences with workers and monthly review of Dashboard to monitor and improve performance.

Domain: Timeliness and Quality of Caseworker Visits with Children and Parents

GOAL #	GOAL		PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
II-B	<p>Increase the <i>frequency</i> and <i>quality</i> of caseworker face-to-face contacts with <i>parents</i> that focus on assessment of child needs and support of parents' understanding of and capacity to meet those needs within a framework of child safety, permanency and well-being, as documented in the written case plan. Include practices that are culturally responsive to and will improve outcomes for African American and Native American parents, whose children are over-represented in the Oregon child welfare population.</p>		<p>Item 20: Caseworker visits with parents</p>
<p>PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p>			
<p>Revised policy to clarify agency standards with regard to the frequency, location, and purpose (i.e., what the caseworker should be assessing during the visit) of caseworker visits with children and parents.</p>	<p>2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies: None</p> <p>Model Court Strategies: OJD did not identify any Model Court projects specific to Item 20.</p>		
<p>Incorporated prompts in the State's information system to ensure that caseworkers were entering data in the system regarding their visits with children and parents.</p>	<p>Other Item-Associated Initiatives: Oregon Safety Model Training to begin Spring 2008 (12 trainers were hired early April 2008)</p> <p>Oregon Child Welfare Procedure Manual</p> <p>McKinsey Workload Study</p> <p>CRB efforts to streamline case review processes</p> <p>CWAC Committee Face-to-Face project</p>		
<p>Juvenile Rights Project proposal "Foster Care and</p>			

<p>Beyond”</p> <p>Child Safety Workgroup</p> <p>Child Welfare Supervisor Training Committee</p> <p>SACWIS</p>	<p>PROPOSED STRATEGIES</p> <p>II-B-1: Take something off the plate and make face to face visits with parents a priority.</p>	<p>PROPOSED COLLABORATORS</p> <p>DHS and CAF Administration</p>	<p>PROPOSED ACTION STEPS</p> <p>Respond to McKinsey Report findings that Oregon workers carry a high administrative load – the agency needs to increase the amount of time available to caseworkers for contact with families.</p> <p>Consistent with McKinsey, explore workload shifts such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One support person for every two caseworkers • Increasing paralegal support for branches <p>Review policies to look for efficiencies and streamline practice</p> <p>Utilize CFSR performance on face-to-face with fathers as one criterion for evaluation</p>
<p>II-B-1: Evaluate branch staffing and consider adding or moving more positions to the front end of the case to immediately begin the search for fathers.</p>	<p>CAF Administration CAF Field Administration District Managers Child Welfare Program Managers (Field)</p>	<p>Review policies to look for efficiencies and streamline practice</p> <p>Utilize CFSR performance on face-to-face with fathers as one criterion for evaluation</p>	

<p>II-B-2: Develop written guidelines about who should be put on a case plan.</p>	<p>OSPC Foster Care Unit</p>	
<p>II-B-3: Improve face to face engagement skills with parents</p>	<p>CAF Child Welfare Training Unit Casework supervisors, caseworkers</p>	<p>Clinical supervision/90 day staffings Training staff of why and how Use of Oregon Child Welfare Procedure Manual</p>

Domain III: Involvement of Child and Family in Case Planning

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
III-A	<p>Improve the frequency and quality of <i>children's</i> involvement in case planning and provide documentation of it in the written case plan.</p> <p>Include strategies that address the specific needs of African American and Native American children, who are over-represented in Oregon's child welfare system.</p>	<p>Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care</p> <p>Item 14: Preserving connections</p> <p>Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents</p> <p>Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents and foster parents¹²</p> <p>Item 18: Child (and family) involvement in case planning</p> <p>Item 25: Written case plan</p>
<p>PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Developed a tool called a Needs Planning Guide, which was designed to assist caseworkers in working with parents and foster parents by providing guidance in how to assess for needs and how to plan for service delivery to address needs.</p> <p>Developed policies and procedures related to using the Needs Planning Guide and provided training to staff on using the guide.</p>		<p>2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:</p> <p>Model Court Strategies:</p> <p>OJD identified the following counties as having Model Court projects that include items associated with this goal as they pertain to the involvement of children in case planning: Clatsop (18), Columbia (13, 14, 16, 17), Coos (13, 14, 16, 17), Douglas (25), Josephine (14, 18), Klamath (17, 18, 25), Lincoln (13, 14, 16, 17, 18), Linn (13, 14, 16, 17, 18), Malheur (18), Marion (18), Multnomah (13, 14, 16, 17, 18), Umatilla (18), and Yamhill (13, 14, 16, 17, 18).</p>

¹² Rationale for inclusion of Item 17 in three domains is as follows: Domain 3 (primarily because involvement of the child and parent in case planning provides opportunities to identify their service needs); Domain 5 (encompasses all components of Item 17, i.e. needs and services of child, parents, foster parents); Domain 6 (primarily because identifying foster parents' needs and providing them with needed services is a retention strategy).

Other Item-Associated Initiatives:		PROPOSED STRATEGIES ¹³	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS
<p>The Oregon Safety Intervention Model was implemented in March 2007.</p> <p>Child Welfare policy ‘Developing and Managing a Case plan was updated.</p> <p>The Procedure Manual was completed and distributed, and mandatory training on the Oregon Safety Model was provided.</p> <p>The case plan began being recorded in a new form series.</p> <p>Both the policy and procedure contained detailed direction for caseworkers when developing the case plan, guiding caseworkers in providing all required provisions including inclusion of children in case planning.</p>				
<p>Local District Plans: Twelve of CAF’s sixteen geographic districts are developing local PIPs that include strategies to increase the involvement of children</p>				

Comment [KL1]: This goal will have to include some strategies in the next draft.

Comment [DHS2]: These local plans will be described in more detail in the next draft of the PIP

¹³ The first three strategies were identified as the key strategies that could be achieved during the two-year PIP period.
C:\DOCUME~1\GWPARKER\LOCALS~1\Temp\GWViewer\04-07-08 Oregon draft PIP as submitted to ACF.doc Last printed 5/13/2008 3:10:00 PM Page 55 of 104

and parents in case planning, including one or more of the six CFSR items included in this goal.		
--	--	--

Domain III: Involvement of Child and Family in Case Planning

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
III-B	Increase the documented: 1. early identification; and 2. engagement of all parents, including but not limited to, <i>non-resident fathers (and mothers)</i> , and include them in case planning. Include strategies that address the specific needs of African American and Native American children, who are over-represented in Oregon's child welfare system.	Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents and foster parents ¹⁴
PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS		2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS
		<p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies: Collaboration between CAF Self-Sufficiency and CAF Child Welfare began in March 2008 to identify fathers; could result in recommendations for strategy for wise spending of IV-B face-to-face funds</p> <p>CAF Child Welfare Training Unit is developing an 8-hour, research-based training curriculum on identifying, locating and engaging fathers. This training will become part of the child welfare Advanced Professional Training curriculum from July 1, 2008 to July 1, 2009.</p>

¹⁴ Rationale for inclusion of Item 17 in three domains is as follows: Domain 3 (primarily because involvement of the child and parent in case planning provides opportunities to identify their service needs); Domain 5 (encompasses all components of Item 17, i.e. needs and services of child, parents, foster parents); Domain 6 (primarily because identifying foster parents' needs and providing them with needed services is a retention strategy).

Model Court Strategies:

OJD has identified five counties that are addressing identifying, locating and engaging all parents in their current Model Court projects, with the following strategies:

Columbia: Trial court administrator will track the number of petitions filed with unknown or missing parents. DHS will supply additional information about fathers available from their investigations for each file with missing parents.

Coos: Included a goal to “Identify absent parents and interested relatives, increase involvement,” but has no associated strategies specific to parents.

Linn: JCP will research practices occurring in other counties.

Linn: To increase the number of jurisdictional findings involving both parents completed by 4 months of filing, JCP and DHS will distribute existing information about diligent searches.

Multnomah: To create an absent parent search protocol, the DA’s Office and DHS will investigate other counties’ absent parent search protocols and report back to the group.

Other Item-Associated Initiatives:

Child Welfare policy “Developing and Managing a Case plan was updated.

The Procedure Manual was completed and distributed, and mandatory training on the Oregon Safety Model was provided.

Both the policy and procedure contained detailed direction for caseworkers when developing the case plan, guiding

<p>caseworkers in providing all required provisions including inclusion of parents.</p> <p>The Protective Capacity Assessment helps parents identify their strengths and weaknesses in keeping their children safe. The Oregon Safety Intervention Model was implemented in March 2007.</p> <p>The case plan began being recorded a new form series.</p> <p>Both the policy and procedure contained detailed direction for caseworkers when developing the case plan, guiding caseworkers in providing all required provisions including inclusion of parents in case planning.</p> <p>The Protective Capacity Assessment helps parents identify their strengths and weaknesses in keeping their children safe.</p>		
PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS
<p>III-B-1: Evaluate branch staffing and consider adding or moving more positions to the front end of the case to immediately begin the search for fathers. (Strategy also included in Domain II, strategy B-1 because of inclusion of data on face-to-face with fathers as one criterion for this strategy.)</p> <p>III-B-2: Develop guidelines for engagement with non-residential</p>	<p>CAF Administration CAF Field Administration District Managers Child Welfare Program Managers (Field)</p>	<p>Utilize CFSR performance on face-to-face with fathers as one criterion for evaluation</p>
	OSPC	Clinical supervision/training staff of why and how

<p>mothers and fathers</p>		<p>Update Oregon Child Welfare Procedure Manual</p> <p>Require that all appropriate caseworkers and supervisors participate in newly developed training on identifying and engaging fathers</p>
<p>III-B-3: Document the various Family Finding initiatives across the state.</p>	<p>CAF Field Administration</p> <p>CAF Office of Program Performance and Reporting</p>	<p>Identify key outcomes that can be measured.</p> <p>Track these initiatives for 6-12 months to determine effectiveness.</p> <p>Propose to District Managers what model or models to use, based on documented effectiveness, cost and availability of funds.</p>
<p>III-B-4: Develop a new set of tools to support the engagement, placement and development of meaningful relationships with dads in unbiased ways</p>		
<p>Local District Plans: District 3: Will engage incarcerated mothers to complete absent father questionnaires; judge will inquire as to status of absent or non-legal fathers at dependency</p>		

<p>hearings; Catholic Community Services & Collaborative Partnership to expand (relative and) parent search support utilizing grant funds in support of the Family Find/Reconnecting Families Project (expanding services); AAG 4-month staffing will include caseworker plans and services with both biological parents.</p> <p>District 4: Implementation of relative search pilot in Linn and Benton counties may include search for non-resident parents(?).</p>		
---	--	--

Domain III: Involvement of Child and Family in Case Planning

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
III-C	Increase the documented: 1. early identification, and 2. engagement of relatives/kin of children who are involved with the child welfare system, and include them in case planning. Include strategies that address the specific needs of African American and Native American children, who are over-represented in Oregon's child welfare system.	<p>Item 14: Preserving connections</p> <p>Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning</p>
	<p>PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>(None. Item 14 and Item 18 were both Strengths, so no PIPs for them were required.)</p>	<p>2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:</p> <p>Model Court Strategies: According to OJD, the following counties have Model Court projects that include identification of, diligent search for, and involvement of relatives, including Item 14, Item 18 or both: Columbia (14, 18), Coos (14, 18), Douglas (18), (Jackson 14, 18), Josephine (18), Klamath (18), Lincoln (14, 18), Linn (14, 18), Malheur (18), Marion (18), Multnomah (14, 18), Umatilla (18), and Yamhill (14, 18).</p>
	<p>PROPOSED STRATEGIES</p>	<p>Other Item-Associated Initiatives: Relative rules and procedure workgroup</p>
III-C-1:	Identify structural, policy, practice, and training to	<p>PROPOSED COLLABORATORS</p> <p>PROPOSED ACTION STEPS</p>

<p>eliminate bias against relatives/relative placement. Change the “suitability letter” to include all contacts vs just placement. Broaden those letters going out.</p>		
<p>III-C-2: Develop a new set of tools to support the engagement, placement and development of meaningful relationships of families in unbiased ways.</p>		
<p>Local District Plans: District 2 has developed a relative placement plan that includes 9 strategies for identify, assessing and engaging relatives in case planning. District 3 is developing a plan to engage Catholic Community Services & Collaborative Partnership to expand relative (and parent search support utilizing grant funds in support of the Family Find/Reconnecting Families Project. District 4 will implement a Relative Search Pilot in Lincoln and Bend counties. District 5 has identified a local plan to increase the number and quality of familial contacts and relationships for a child as they enter care, dedicating 1 FTE SSS1 to Family Finding. District 7 has a Title IV-E Waiver project (Relative Support Plan) in process (ends Mach 2009) that grants relatives who have started the certification process access to a counselor to help them with boundary issues. District 9 has cited its involvement in the local Model Court project, which includes use of a relative locator form. In addition, it plans to pilot for the State the services of Next Door, Inc., which is experienced in conducting internet-based relative searches in the State of Washington. District 12 has a plan that began in March 2008 with the goal that the “Child and family will be involved in case planning as collaborative partners who feel respected and heard. Their</p>		

specific strategies include using an OS2 to conduct initial relative and absent father searches utilizing web-based data programs. Their plan also includes dedication of more casework staff in emergency certification (of relatives). **District 14** plans to collaborate with the local Commission on Children and Families to utilize IV-E Waiver funds to locate and engage fathers and paternal relatives in planning for the child's future and for ongoing relationships. **District 15** is partnering with CASA, who conducts their relative and absent parent searches, to seek funding from the local Commission to cover the cost to access existing internet relative search engines. The District is hiring 4 additional temp support staff to assist with the relative searches and associated data entry.

Domain IV: Concurrent Planning

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS¹⁵
IV-A	<p>Goal 4 A: Establish early in the life of every case clearly documented primary and alternate permanency plans, and begin to work concurrently to achieve the safest and secure primary and alternate permanency outcomes for every child. Focused attention on practices that are culturally responsive to and improve outcomes for African American and Native American children, who are over-represented in Oregon’s child welfare population, is an integral part of this goal.</p>	<p>Item 7: Permanency goal for child</p> <p>Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives</p> <p>Item 9: Adoption</p> <p>Item 10: Other planned permanent living arrangement</p> <p>Item 15: Relative placement</p>
<p>PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES¹⁶ RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Developed policy and training on concurrent planning and decision-making regarding TPR.</p> <p>Conducted a pilot study of specific groups of children to determine whether factors such as age, length of stay in foster care, and other characteristics contributed to delays in achieving permanency.</p>	<p>2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:</p> <p>Model Court Strategies: According to OJD, the focus of the current Model Court projects is child permanency. Therefore, all 17 participating courts have projects that include one or more of the CFSR items contained in this goal.</p> <p>Other Item-Associated Initiatives¹⁷:</p>	

¹⁵ Items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 15 are focus items for both Goal IV-A and IV-B. Additionally, Goal IV-B includes Item 28 (Termination of Parental Rights).
¹⁶ Except for the inclusion of Item 28 in Goal IV-B, the items for IV-A and IV-B are the same. Therefore, so are the strategies cited here. In the interest of space, these PIP I strategies will not appear in Goal IV-B, nor will a PIP I strategy for Item 28, which did not require a PIP as a result of findings from the 2001 CFSR.

<p>Established protocols for expediting adoptions and provided legal assistance to caseworkers in the adoption process.</p> <p>Identified statewide system barriers to adoption.</p> <p>Created a standardized checklist with timelines to monitor each child's progress through the adoption process, and developed and disseminated management reports providing tracking information.</p> <p>Improved the legal process for freeing children for adoption.</p> <p>Developed specific criteria for determining when adoption is not an appropriate permanency goal.</p>	<p>2007 Oregon Legislature increased the number of caseworkers and supervisors</p> <p>Senate Bill 283 (2007) authorizes foster care payments to relatives for children who do not qualify for federal assistance</p> <p>Implementation of the National Resource Center's 2007 recommendations on adoptive family selection</p> <p>OJD, DOJ and DHS are working jointly on a Termination of Parental Rights Mediation Program for appellate cases</p> <p>Working with Relatives Initiative –analyzing philosophy, norms, culture policies and practice with relatives (November 2007)</p> <p>DHS Mental Health Enhancement Workgroup targeted at identifying gaps in services related to assessments</p> <p>OSM Protective Capacity Assessment- identifies services for families; OSM Procedural Manual- engagement of parents</p> <p>McKinsey Workload Study February 2008</p> <p>Enhancement of legal representation to caseworkers began in the fall of 2007 to assist with five and 11-month legal</p>
---	---

¹⁷ All of the strategies listed here are equally applicable to Goal IV-B. In the interest of preserving space, the strategies are not reiterated there.
C:\DOCUME~1\GWPARKER\LOCALS~1\Temp\GWViewer\04-07-08 Oregon draft PIP as submitted to ACF.doc Last printed 5/13/2008 3:10:00 PM Page 66 of 104

case staffings		
PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS
IV-A-1: Consistent review of Concurrent Planning efforts by the court and CRB	Court, CRB, Child's attorney, AAG, DHS	<p>Refine 333's (case plan narrative) to support the documentation and articulation of the concurrent plan for the court and CRB.</p> <p>Have a clear and consistent understanding of what concurrent plans are and how they are reviewed and implemented.</p>
IV-A-2: Increase the number of children who achieve the highest level of permanency; reduce the number of children in APPLA.	Court, CRB, CASA, Attorney's, Families	<p>Increase the recruitment of families for older children statewide</p> <p>Relative search throughout the life of the case</p> <p>Early and ongoing engagement of relatives in planning</p> <p>Clarify in policy and train staff on a more explicit definition and appropriate</p>

		<p>use of APPLA</p> <p>Address racial disparity of children in APPLA plans by using Minority Adoption Leadership Development Institute (MALDI) outcomes</p> <p>Ensure that workers have an understanding of how culture impacts permanency outcomes for children</p>
<p>IV-A-3: Enhance understanding across the State's child welfare system of the concepts of concurrent planning to drive a practice reflective of these concepts to shorten a child's stay in care.</p>	<p>Court, CRB, CASA, attorneys, families, substitute care providers, community providers</p>	<p>Clinical Supervision;</p> <p>Court Check lists and bench guidelines;</p> <p>AAG incorporating Concurrent Planning in their staffings;</p> <p>Incorporate Concurrent Planning into OSM training;</p> <p>Operationalize the Guidelines to Achieve Permanency grid; e</p>

<p>Enhance practice directions in the Procedure Manuel around Concurrent Planning.</p> <p>September-December 2008: JCIP “Roadshow,” with focus on concurrent planning. Audience is DHS, CASA, judges, defense attorneys and District Attorneys.</p>		
<p>Adjust worker caseloads consistent with findings from the 2008 McKinsey Child Welfare Workload Study</p> <p>Strengthen the clinical supervision relationship between workers and supervisors</p> <p>Examine DHS procedure and practice at local and state level, identifying and implementing streamlining/efficiency opportunities.</p>	<p>DHS, Legislature</p>	
<p>On June 1, 2008, CRB</p>	<p>CAF Field</p>	<p>IV-A-5: (Item 7: Permanency goal for child) Collaborate</p>

<p>with CRB to identify and resolve issues that negatively impact the timely establishment and activation of the child's concurrent plan</p>	<p>CAF OPPR CAF OSPC</p>	<p>will add a new finding regarding the redevelopment of the concurrent goal.</p> <p>Track and report performance at the worker, unit, office, district and state levels at least quarterly during the PIP implementation period.</p> <p>Analyze data and utilize to develop and administer improvement strategies.</p>
<p>Local District Plans</p> <p>District 2 has included concurrent planning as a strategy in two local PIPs. One will use staff training to establish a concurrent plan early, collaborating with relatives (maternal and paternal), community, tribe, representatives of child's country of origin. This plan relies heavily on also improve the cultural competence of staff. The other plan focuses on the early identification of relatives and engagement of them in case planning and in the life of the child, preparing them to be the child's alternate permanency resource should reunification be unsuccessful.</p> <p>District 3 is developing a plan that includes concurrent planning as a strategy that will grow from early identification of fathers and paternal relatives, and their inclusion in case planning and as potential temporary or</p>		

<p>permanent placement resources.</p> <p>District 6 is working on a plan that includes this strategy: Every court hearing will include the court inquiring into and the agency presenting a concurrent plan for the child.</p> <p>District 9 will address OPPLA, aiming to improve permanency outcomes for Hood River County children in care longer than 24 months. A committee will study the case history and consider alternate, more permanent outcomes for these children in order to reduce the youth who age out of the system.</p> <p>District 11's plan calls up staff to identify and engage fathers and paternal relatives early in the life of the case in order to broaden permanency options for children.</p>		
--	--	--

Domain IV: Concurrent Planning

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS¹⁸
IV-B	Create and assure a culture of continued efforts, with attention paid to removal of institutional barriers, later in the life of every case, to actively and concurrently work toward achievement of dual permanency plans, including cases in which the primary permanency plan has changed. Pay special attention to practices that are culturally responsive to and improve outcomes for African American and Native American children, who are over-represented in Oregon’s child welfare population.	<p>Item 7: Permanency goal for child</p> <p>Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives</p> <p>Item 9: Adoption</p> <p>Item 10: Other planned permanent living arrangement</p> <p>Item 15: Relative placement</p>
PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS¹⁹		<p>Item 28: Termination of Parental Rights</p> <p>2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS²⁰</p>
		<p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:</p> <p>RE Item 28: Oregon’s narrative case plan, the 147, was replaced by the 333 in March 2007. The 147 did not allow for a citation of compelling reason for not filing TPR; both the 333 that went into effect in March 2007 and the revised 333, which will likely be effective before the beginning of the State’s PIP, allow for that citation. It is relevant to note</p>

¹⁸ Items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 15 are focus items for both Goal IV-A and IV-B. Additionally, Goal IV-B includes Item 28 (Termination of Parental Rights).

¹⁹ Except for the inclusion of Item 28 in Goal IV-B, the items for IV-A and IV-B are the same. Therefore, so are the strategies cited in Goal IV-A. In the interest of space, these PIP I strategies do not appear in Goal IV-B, nor does a PIP I strategy for Item 28, which did not require a PIP as a result of findings from the 2001 CFSR.

²⁰ See Goal IV-A, above for a list of the strategies-in-process for Items 7, 8, 9, 10 and 15. Two in-process strategies for Item 28 are described in this section.

that most of the cases review in the September 2007 CFSR likely contained the old 147 rather than the 333.

RE Item 28: Four and ten month legal reviews were piloted in Clackamas County beginning in January 2008. It is likely these reviews will be implemented statewide before the beginning of the State's PIP. This initiative calls for AAG legal staffings at the 4-month point after the child has entered care and again when the child has been in care for 10 months. DOJ will be tracking the staffed cases very closely, and it is likely that these early staffings will prevent unnecessary delays in the pursuit of filing for timely TPR.

Model Court Strategies:

According to OJD, the focus of the current Model Court projects is child permanency. Therefore, all 17 participating courts have projects that include one or more of the CFSR items 7, 8, 9, 10 and 15 contained in this goal. In addition, the following counties have Model Court projects for Item 28 (TPR): Baker, Columbia, Coos, Clackamas, Douglas, Josephine, Klamath, Marion, Multnomah, Polk, Umatilla, Wasco/Hood River, Wheeler/Gilliam/Sherman/Morrow, and Yamhill.

Other Item-Associated Initiatives:²¹

²¹ See "Other Item-Associated Initiatives in Goal IV-A

PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS
<p>IV-B-1: Region X comment: “Strategies here have to impact time to reunification. While concurrent planning is an important piece, we’re not sure it is the only piece and will result in the improvement you need. A good analysis of the two [federal permanency] composites and some thinking about barriers that need to be addressed needs to be more explicit here.”</p> <p>To improve performance on Reunification (Item 8 and Permanency Composite 1) Oregon will</p>		

Comment [DHS3]: The Domain 4 workgroup will include a strategy or strategies in the next draft of this PIP.

<p>IV-B-2: Region X comment: “Strategies here have to impact time to adoption and youth permanency. While concurrent planning is an important piece, we’re not sure it is the only piece and will result in the improvement you need. A good analysis of the two [federal permanency] composites and some thinking about barriers that need to be addressed needs to be more explicit here.”</p> <p>To improve performance on Reunification (Item 8 and Permanency Composite 2) Oregon will</p>		
<p>IV-B-3: Consistent review of Concurrent Planning efforts by the court and CRB</p>	<p>Court, CRB, Child’s attorney, AAG, DHS</p>	<p>Refine 333’s to support the documentation and articulation of the concurrent plan for the court and CRB.</p> <p>Have a clear and consistent understanding of what concurrent plans are and how they are reviewed and implemented.</p>
<p>IV-B-3: OPPLA/APPLA kids....suggest this be addressed through a strategy that we reviewers</p>		

Comment [DHS4]: The Domain 4 workgroup will include a strategy or strategies in the next draft of this PIP.

go through a diligent review of these cases-ruling out the more permanent plans before settling for OPPLA. (B Hazelton)

To address the selection of OPPLA as a permanency outcome before carefully examining and ruling out more permanent outcomes for children, especially very young children, CAF will . . .

Comment [DHSS]: Domain 4 will include a strategy for this in the next draft of the PIP

Domain V: Service Array and Accessibility that Address the Needs of Children and Their Families

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
V-A	<p>Remove institutional barriers, aim available resources and seek new resources, as necessary, to provide children, youth and parents who are involved in the child welfare system with comprehensive mental health assessments which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are conducted early in the life of the case to identify specific service needs; • include input from professionals who are providing services to the children, youth and parents; • are reviewed and updated throughout the life of the case; • focus on the child or youth’s safety, permanency and well-being needs and on services and supports needed by the parent to meet those needs; and • consider the family’s culture, especially for African American and Native American families, who children are over-represented in Oregon’s child welfare population. 	<p>Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents and foster parents²²</p> <p>Item 23: Mental/behavioral health of the child</p> <p>Item 35: Array of services</p> <p>Item 36: Service Accessibility</p> <p>Item 37: Individualizing services</p>

²² Rationale for inclusion of Item 17 in three domains is as follows: Domain 3 (primarily because involvement of the child and parent in case planning provides opportunities to identify their service needs); Domain 5 (encompasses all components of Item 17, i.e. needs and services of child, parents, foster parents); Domain 6 (primarily because identifying foster parents’ needs and providing them with needed services is a retention strategy).

<p align="center">PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p>	<p align="center">2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p>
<p>Developed a tool called a Needs Planning Guide, which was designed to assist caseworkers in working with parents and foster parents by providing guidance in how to assess for needs and how to plan for service delivery to address needs.</p> <p>Developed policies and procedures related to using the Needs Planning Guide and provided training to staff on using the guide.</p> <p>Increased enrollment into managed care plans.</p> <p>Provided agency staff and foster parents with training on how to access mental health services and advocate for services in an effective manner</p>	<p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:</p> <p>Model Court Strategies: According to OJD, 12 counties (Baker, Clatsop, Columbia, Coos, Josephine, Klamath, Lincoln, Linn, Malheur, Umatilla, Wasco/Hood River, Yamhill) have included strategies in their Model Court plans which relate to Item 17. Most of the plans focus on increasing the participation of foster parents in hearings as a strategy to assess their service needs. Klamath has as a Model Court goal improving the quality of service plans, and has included Items 17, 35, 36, and 37.</p> <p>Other Item-Associated Initiatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statewide wraparound project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation team and project manager Statewide SOC Grant for a statewide infrastructure. 2. DHS CAF Residential Treatment BRS Redesign. 3. MHO Enrollment change for children going into BRS residential treatment. 4. FIT Model – Multnomah Co. 5. Oregon Safety Model 8. SACWIS ORKIDS

PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS ²³
<p>V-A-1: CAF will collaborate with DHS/AMH (Addictions and Mental Health Division) to build a Mental Health Assessment that is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Child/parent focused B. Standardized C. Systemically and consistently applied D. Consistent criteria and delivery model, and E. Is easily transferable to a more comprehensive assessment model to be planned in a five year pip <p>Objectives To Achieve Components of Strategy 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Child and Family Focused Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Every child when appropriate will have a mental health assessment within 60 days and every parent when appropriate. b. Mental health assessment will occur with child and parent together, when possible. c. Children coming into foster care will have a mental health assessment completed in a timely manner within the policy requirements. c. Individualized service needs will be determined based on the mental health assessment and referral for services will be made. d. Client MH service needs will be assessed with attention to culturally specific needs and strengths. e. Repetition of like assessments will be 	<p>CAF AMH DHS Administration County Mental Health Providers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. On going measurement of types of services and the diversity of services to CAF children. B. Monitor the percent of individual assessments that lead to referral to appropriate resources. C. FBS service contracts will require services that are designed to target problem areas that the child and family typically experience when child welfare issues are present and will be tailored to meet the individual child's safety, permanency and well being needs. D. FBS service contracts will require culturally appropriate services that are evidence based practices. E. FBS services will be designed to promote a collaborative process that will align with a

²³ These action steps apply to both Goal V-A-1 and Goal V-B.

<p>minimized.</p> <p>f. Specialized assessments will be more accessible as needed.</p> <p>g. Child and parent assessed needs; over time, will have the potential to be incorporated into future resource development.</p> <p>B. Standardized Objectives</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Research current mental health assessments. b. Electronically accessible to reduce families repetition of assessment. (OR-Kids) c. Lends itself to more individualized assessments. d. Links with the work on assessment in other domains, e.g. A&D, physical health and dental health. e. Lends itself to be absorbed into the comprehensive assessment in the 5 year plan. <p>C. Systemically and consistently applied Objectives</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Define assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Initial Screening ● Comprehensive Assessment ● Bio-psycho-social ● Specialized by primary condition ● Re-assessment over time and change in condition b. Assessments are culturally sensitive. c. Every child receives MH assessment that 	<p>future statewide wraparound model.</p> <p>F. AMH will contract with a project manager to oversee an implementation team for statewide wraparound.</p> <p>G. AMH will contract for a market assessment which will provide data on prevalence, utilization and unmet needs for children 0-18 who have emotional and behavioral or substance abuse needs and have touched at least two systems.</p> <p>H. AMH will contract for Information System and assessment that is able to coordinate information across systems at both the state and local levels relative to children including CAF.</p> <p>I. Increase the amount of resource available statewide for Treatment Foster Care (ICC).</p> <p>J. Increase the</p>
---	--

<p>includes family functioning.</p> <p>d. Referral for mental health assessment is automatic, not initiated by the caseworker.</p> <p>e. Statewide uniform system to accessing an assessment and tracking assessments completed.</p> <p>f. Research existing local implementations of MH Assessments and look for statewide applicability.</p> <p>g. Statewide criteria provides a foundation for further development locally.</p> <p>h. Child/Family assessed need translates to systemic improvement for future service and resource development.</p> <p>D. Consistent Criteria and delivery model Objectives</p> <p>a. Locally driven planning for implementation of procedure to access mental health assessment.</p> <p>b. The “who, what, where, when and how” within a locally established criteria.</p> <p>c. Local plan has to build upon the criteria of the statewide systemic criteria.</p> <p>d. Culturally sensitive mental health assessment reflects the demographic of the local population.</p> <p>e. Data collected on referral and mental health assessment completion will be used as a quality improvement tool.</p> <p>E. Is easily transferable to a more comprehensive case assessment model to be designed in a five year PIP.</p>	<p>availability of Treatment Foster Care in rural regions of Oregon.</p> <p>K. Increase the amount of resource available statewide for BRS Therapeutic Foster Care.</p> <p>L. Increase the availability of BRS Therapeutic Foster Care in rural regions of Oregon.</p> <p>M. Monitor BRS bed utilization, available bed capacity and referral information.</p> <p>N. Access to Mental Health and A&D services will be impacted through the implementation and training of staff on the Guidelines for Transportation.</p>
--	---

Domain V: Service Array and Accessibility that Address the Needs of Children and Their Families

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSSR FOCUS ITEMS
V-B	Remove institutional barriers, aim available resources and seek new resources, as necessary, to provide for parents of children and youth who are involved in the child welfare system timely, community-based substance abuse assessment and treatment services that are affordable and are designed and locally available to meet their specific needs, especially with regard to improving their child protective capacity, and with special attention to the needs of African American and Native American parents whose children are over-represented in Oregon’s child welfare population. . .	<p>Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents and foster parents²⁴</p> <p>Item 23: Mental/behavioral health of the child</p> <p>Item 35: Array of services</p> <p>Item 36: Service Accessibility</p> <p>Item 37: Individualizing services</p>
PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS	2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS	
	<p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:</p> <p>Model Court Strategies:</p> <p>Other Item-Associated Initiatives:</p> <p>Intensive treatment and recovery services initiative - Legislature invested 10.4 mil</p> <p>Four Oregon sites (Jackson, Multnomah, and Baker counties, and the Klamath Tribe) have received Children’s Bureau meth grants</p>	

²⁴ Rationale for inclusion of Item 17 in three domains is as follows: Domain 3 (primarily because involvement of the child and parent in case planning provides opportunities to identify their service needs); Domain 5 (encompasses all components of Item 17, i.e. needs and services of child, parents, foster parents); Domain 6 (primarily because identifying foster parents’ needs and providing them with needed services is a retention strategy).

PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS ²⁵
<p>CAF will collaborate with AMH to create a monitored, consistent and expedient response to the Alcohol and Drug needs of child welfare parents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Child/parent focused B. Standardized C. Systematically and consistently applied D. Monitored via electronic data collection to track trends and needs in the statewide system of A&D services <p>Objectives To Achieve Components of Strategy 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Child and Parent Focused Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Every parent with alcohol or drug issues identified in the allegations of abuse or neglect will have an initial alcohol and drug screen b. Screen will take into consideration the aspect of the parent child relationship and the current placement of children in terms of parent's ability to achieve or maintain sobriety B. Standardized <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Every parent with alcohol or drug allegations will receive an alcohol and drug screen that is consistent and offered within the first 20 days of a case opening. <p>Objectives: Child Welfare in conjunction with the</p>	<p>AMH CAF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. On going measurement of types of services and the diversity of services to CAF children. B. Monitor the percent of individual assessments that lead to referral to appropriate resources. C. FBS service contracts will require services that are designed to target problem areas that the child and family typically experience when child welfare issues are present and will be tailored to meet the individual child's safety, permanency and well being needs. D. FBS service contracts will require culturally appropriate services that are evidence based practices. E. FBS services will be designed to promote a collaborative process that will align with a future statewide wraparound model. F. AMH will contract with a project manager to oversee

²⁵ These action steps apply to both Goal V-A-1 and Goal V-B.

Addictions and Mental Health Division, will ensure the use of medical assistance budgets, treatment dollars for OHP eligible clients and treatment dollars covering non-OHP clients (ITRS money – Intensive Treatment and Recovery Services) is facilitated in a way that allows every child welfare parent with A&D allegations to obtain an A&D screen in a quick time frame and access individualized treatment that is recommended in an equally short time frame.

C. Systematically and consistently applied Objectives:

Child Welfare and the Addictions and Mental Health Division will combine resources and data base information as outlined in a DHS inter-division agreement. The agreement will detail the scope and use of information to track consistency of service delivery, areas of improvement and trends in client outcomes.

Child welfare will employ the use of IIS tracking codes to systematically enter into a data base every client referred for A&D services. This system will create a comparison set of data to be integrated with that from the Addictions and Mental Health Division, to consistently track all clients referred to A&D services, all clients entering treatment services, the results of treatment services and the results of child welfare involvement.

Using Addiction Recovery Team

an implementation team for statewide wraparound.
 G. AMH will contract for a market assessment which will provide data on prevalence, utilization and unmet needs for children 0-18 who have emotional and behavioral or substance abuse needs and have touched at least two systems.

H. AMH will contract for Information System and assessment that is able to coordinate information across systems at both the state and local levels relative to children including CAF.

I. Increase the amount of resource available statewide for Treatment Foster Care (ICC).

J. Increase the availability of Treatment Foster Care in rural regions of Oregon.

K. Increase the amount of resource available statewide for BRS Therapeutic Foster Care.

L. Increase the availability of BRS Therapeutic Foster Care in rural regions of Oregon.

M. Monitor BRS bed

services, through contracted service agreements, child welfare will put in place treatment and recovery support services that help clients sustain recovery. These services will be coordinated at the local level with other treatment and recovery support services paid for by AMH through the use of ITRS funds.

utilization, available bed capacity and referral information.
N. Access to Mental Health and A&D services will be impacted through the implementation and training of staff on the Guidelines for Transportation.

Domain V: Service Array and Accessibility that Address the Needs of Children and Their Families

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
V-C	Remove institutional barriers, aim available resources and seek new resources, as necessary, to provide for families and children who are involved in the child welfare system additional individualized, timely, community-based services that are affordable and are designed and locally available to meet their specific needs, with special attention to the needs of African American and Native American children, who are over-represented in Oregon's child welfare population. ²⁶	<p>Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents and foster parents²⁷</p> <p>Item 21: Educational needs of the child</p> <p>Item 22: Physical health needs of the child</p> <p>Item 35: Array of services</p> <p>Item 36: Service Accessibility</p> <p>Item 37: Individualizing services</p>
<p>PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p>		<p>2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p>
<p>Developed a tool called a Needs Planning Guide, which was designed to assist caseworkers in working with parents and foster parents by providing guidance in how to assess for needs and how to plan for service delivery to address needs.</p> <p>Developed policies and procedures related to using the Needs Planning Guide and provided training to</p>	<p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies: A transportation matrix and flexible guidelines for provision of transportation services that are safe and age-appropriate (for children), including those for which the agency can contract, was presented by OSPC to CAF District Managers on April 1, 2008. District Managers are to provide suggested edits no later than April 11, after which OSPC will officially issue these guidelines and</p>	

²⁶ Although having an adequate supply of foster homes from which to select a family that can most closely meet each child's individual needs is related to service array, it has been included in Domain VI.

²⁷ Rationale for inclusion of Item 17 in three domains is as follows: Domain 3 (primarily because involvement of the child and parent in case planning provides opportunities to identify their service needs); Domain 5 (encompasses all components of Item 17, i.e. needs and services of child, parents, foster parents); Domain 6 (primarily because identifying foster parents' needs and providing them with needed services is a retention strategy).

<p>staff on using the guide.</p>	<p>continue to get transportation contracts in place across the state.</p> <p>Model Court Strategies: According to OJD, 12 counties (Baker, Clatsop, Columbia, Coos, Josephine, Klamath, Lincoln, Linn, Malheur, Umatilla, Wasco/Hood River, Yamhill) have included strategies in their Model Court plans which relate to Item 17. Most of the plans focus on increasing the participation of foster parents in hearings as a strategy to assess their service needs. Klamath has as a Model Court goal improving the quality of service plans, and has included Items 17, 35, 36, and 37.</p> <p>Other Item-Associated Initiatives:</p>	
<p>PROPOSED STRATEGIES</p>	<p>PROPOSED COLLABORATORS</p>	<p>PROPOSED ACTION STEPS</p>
<p>V-C-1: If not completed prior to commencement of PIP, roll out transportation guidelines and put in place contracts where needed.</p>	<p>OSPC (Administration, Foster Care, FBS, Contracts); DHS Contract</p>	
<p>V-C-2: (Item 21: Education)</p>		
<p>V-C-3: (Item 22: Physical Health)</p>		
<p>V-C-4: (Item 37: Individualizing Services)</p>		
<p>Local District Plans:</p>		
<p>Districts 2, 8, and 11 are proposing local PIPs that include service array and accessibility. Those plans will be further fleshed out and included in the next PIP draft.</p>		

Comment [KL6]: will need a strategy to address key concern for Item 21: "educational needs were identified but no services were provided to address those needs"

Comment [KL7]: will need a strategy to address key concern for Item 22: "concerns regarding address to dental services"

Comment [KL8]: Need to add in Local District Plans, if any

Domain VI: Recruitment and Retention of Foster and Adoptive Parents

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
VI-A	Support foster parents' capacity to safely care for child by decreasing the number of general foster families with placements of children in excess of the standard policy for parent to child ratio through increased targeted recruitment efforts.	<p>Item 6: Stability of foster care placement</p> <p>Item 17: Needs and Services of child, parents, foster parents</p> <p>Item 41: Standards for foster homes and institutions</p>
N/A	<p>PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p>	<p>2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies: (Safety in foster homes) Policy change on 1/1/08 <i>Department Responsibilities during Screening and Assessment of a Child Abuse or Neglect Report Involving the Home of a Department Certified Foster Parent or Relative Caregiver, <u>I-B.2.2.3</u></i>. Within this policy the department has strengthened several areas including communication with family members and legal parties to a case and an increased collaborative process among CPS staff and the Certification staff and supervisors, sharing of information through required staffing model. The Central Program office now requires receipt of the assessments and will provide a level of Quality Assurance and review for trends, training needs of staff and foster parents,</p> <p>Model Court Strategies: According to OJD, no county has included Item 6 (Placement Stability) or Item 41 (Standards for foster homes and institutions) in a Model Court project. The following counties have included Item 17 as it relates to the needs and services of foster parents: Baker, Clatsop, Coos, Josephine, Linn, Malheur, Umatilla, Wasco/Hood River, Yamhill.</p>

Other Item-Associated Initiatives:²⁸

DHS collaboration involving CAF, OIS, SPD for identification of location of SPD-supervised DD foster care children begun in 2007 with targeted completion of all systems and processes by 06.30.08. Implementation phase-in has already begun.

Capacity in FACIS to identify placement and moves of children in contracted BRS provider homes is on track for phased-in implementation between July 1 and Dec 30, 2008. (OIS-CAF-BRS provider collaboration)

Oregon's SACWIS system, OR-Kids, is on track for statewide roll-out in February 2010. Included:

"The system will record the accurate placement provider, indicating the actual physical location of a child even if the placement is made through a parent organization." (Key # 19353)

"The system will utilize role-based access control." (Key # 17506) This would allow us to create a role for SPD to be able to enter physical location information directly into OR-Kids.

New Policy 01-01-08: [I-B.2.2.3](#) *Department Responsibilities during Screening and Assessment of a Child Abuse or Neglect Report Involving the Home of a Department Certified Foster Parent or Relative Caregiver*. Within this policy the department has strengthened several areas including communication with family members and legal parties to a case and an increased collaborative process among CPS staff and the Certification staff and supervisors, sharing of information through required staffing

²⁸ Please note that these strategies were also mentioned in Domain I, Safety.

<p>model. The Central Program office now requires receipt of the assessments and will provide a level of Quality Assurance and review for trends, training needs of staff and foster parents.</p> <p>CAF Research has created reports that show the number of foster children per foster home. Groundwork was laid in spring 2008 to capture information about <u>all</u> children in foster homes, including fps' bio and other children (see Domain D). Plan is to expand current report with this additional information, make available to District Managers, CW Program Managers monthly or quarterly.</p>	<p>PROPOSED STRATEGIES</p> <p>Local District Plans: District 2 is the only district that has proposed a local PIP that includes the Recruitment and Retention of Foster and Adoptive Parents. The plan focuses on the use of relatives as placement resources for children in their families, but also includes this strategy: Recruit relative foster parents to remain as general foster parents to non-relative children.</p>	<p>PROPOSED COLLABORATORS</p>	<p>PROPOSED ACTION STEPS</p>
---	--	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Comment [K19]: Need to add local district plans

Domain VI: Recruitment and Retention of Foster and Adoptive Parents

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
V-B	Improve placement stability for children by improving retention of foster families, as evidenced by the percentage of non-relative families who leave the foster/adoptive provider system for documented reasons other than a change in family circumstances or failure to meet State safety standards.	Item 6: Stability of foster care placement
PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS		2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS
Placement Stability was a Strength in 2001 and did not require a PIP.		Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:
		Model Court Strategies:
		Other Item-Associated Initiatives:
PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS
VI-B-1: Expand day care services to support foster placements by supporting foster parents. ²⁹		Increased funding for Employment-Related Day Care (ERDC) for foster parents is a Policy Option Package (POP) that CAF has proposed for consideration by the 2009 Oregon Legislature (would require prioritization by DHS to move forward). Consider utilization of statewide IV-E Waiver initiative to enhance funding to support expanded

²⁹ This strategy has also been included in Domain I-D.

		utilization. Modify policy to allow for expanded access to funding.
VI-B-2: Local District Plans (None)		

Domain VI: Recruitment and Retention of Foster and Adoptive Parents

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
VI-C	Improve the agency's capacity to place children in foster families who are well-suited to meet their individual needs.	Item 44: Diligent Recruitment
<p>Oregon was in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Recruitment and Retention in 2001, so no PIP was required.</p>	<p>PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Oregon was in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Recruitment and Retention in 2001, so no PIP was required.</p>	<p>2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:</p> <p>A workgroup meeting for brain storming/problem solving with Tribal representatives is scheduled for May 7th, to discuss Recruitment and Retention of Foster Families for Native American children. This is a result of the ICWA State Advisory Committee and a request to have a sub-committee with a specific focus.</p> <p>A planning meeting on April 9th, to design and develop the Grant Application for the Federal Adoption Opportunities Grant for Recruitment of Foster/Adoptive families for children. In our initial discussion we believed tying this grant proposal with our CFSR needs specific to addressing disproportionality and related it to some of the work being done through the AdoptUSkids federal initiative would make us competitive and serve our needs. Specifically, we discussed honing in on disproportionality with Native American and African American children, which are our biggest areas of need.</p>

<p>Casey State-to-State TA (TX/OR) re: disproportionality</p> <p>May 22, 2008 Disproportionality Conference in Portland</p> <p>Possible OCCF/CAF grant on prevention of placement and over-representation/disproportionality</p>	<p>Model Court Strategies: According to OJD, Coos, Josephine, Malheur, Umatilla, Wasco/Hood River, and Yamhill counties all have Model Court projects that include Item 44 (Diligent Recruitment).</p> <p>Other Item-Associated Initiatives: District 2 has a variety of unique programs that are underway. D2 management believe these programs, which include the following, are providing a positive impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o a mentor program for foster parents and relatives o Foster parents excellence awards <p>surveying foster parents each six months and doing exit interviews with all foster parents who leave</p>
<p>PROPOSED STRATEGIES</p> <p><u>WHAT</u></p>	<p>PROPOSED COLLABORATORS</p> <p><u>WHO</u></p>
<p>VI-C-1: Using evidence-based practice regarding recruitment strategies that are most likely to</p>	<p>The Foster Care Program has taken the lead in the Recruitment RFP process for the General and Target</p>
	<p>PROPOSED ACTION STEPS</p> <p><u>HOW</u></p> <p>Restructuring the Recruitment Contract and development of the RFP. (completed 2/08)</p>

<p>result in increasing placement resources for children, focus efforts on targeted recruitment and child specific recruitment (as opposed to blanket recruitment).</p>	<p>Recruitment Contract, while the Adoption Program has the lead in the Child Specific Contract.</p> <p>Office of Program Performance and Reporting will participate in the RAC to provide qualitative and quantitative data for recruitment plans.</p>	<p>Contractor selected and implementation of contract in place 4/08.</p>
<p>VI-C-2: Create and utilize a Recruitment Advisory Committee to convene at least quarterly to plan, evaluate and oversee joint contracted recruitment efforts with a contracted recruitment entity.</p>	<p>Foster Care and Adoption program are the co-leads in the development of the Statewide Recruitment Advisory Committee (RAC) which will include members from CAF Central Foster Care and Adoptions, CAF Research, two representatives from the Oregon Foster Parent Association, and one representative from each District. District reps will work with local community partners, both public and private.</p> <p>CAF/OSPC</p>	<p>Recruitment Advisory Committee (RAC); charter developed and membership drive initiated by 4/08 with first committee meeting by 5/08. Initial plan is to convene committee at least quarterly to plan, evaluate and oversee contracted efforts.</p>
<p>VI-C-3: Engage Oregon's Native American Tribes in planning foster and adoptive home recruitment and retention strategies</p>		<p>Participation in ICWA Quarterlies (beginning May 7, 2008)</p>
<p>VI-C-4: Seek additional funding sources for increasing recruitment activities specifically related to increasing the pool of African American and Native American</p>		<p>Apply for Children's Bureau Adoption Opportunities recruitment grant. (Note that, although grant applications are due in June 2008, any grants awarded would likely not</p>

<p>Children who are over-represented in Oregon's child welfare system.</p>		<p>begin until Oregon's PIP is underway.</p>
<p>Local District Plans: District 2 is the only district that has proposed a local PIP to address diligent recruitment.</p>		

Domain 7: Workforce

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
7-A	Enhance the professional development of child welfare staff through increasing the requirements for ongoing training.	Item 33: Ongoing Training
PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS		2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS
Implemented a 3-week long training for supervisors called Supervising for Excellence.		Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:
		Model Court Strategies: According to OJD, two counties (Multnomah and Umatilla) have Model Court plans that include this CFSR item.
		Other Item-Associated Initiatives: Although the Oregon Legislature has
PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS
Pursue proposed Policy Option Package (POP) for consideration by the 2009 Oregon Legislature to increase funding for expanded advanced training of child welfare staff and support of staff for completion of professional social work degree programs at Portland State University.	CAF Administration DHS Administration Oregon Governor's Office Legislative and Budget Office (LAB) Oregon Legislature Portland State University	Continue to work through the CAF-DHS budget development process, advocating for advancement of this POP

Domain 7: Workforce

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
VII-B	Clearly articulate expectations and provide professional supports for casework supervisors.	N/A
	<p>PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p> <p>Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies: Clinical supervision training for supervisors through PSU launched in early spring 2008. It consists of 80 hours of professional development presented in six modules on Effective Leadership (Making the Transition from Social Worker to Supervisor), Achieving Excellence in Staff Performance, Building a Cohesive Work Group, Promoting the Growth and Development of Staff, Case Consultation and Supervision, and Managing Effectively Within the Organization.</p> <p>Model Court Strategies:</p> <p>Other Item-Associated Initiatives:</p>	<p>2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS</p>
PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS

Comment [DHS10]: Oregon would like to talk with ACF regarding the inclusion of a PIP for this area, as none is required.c

Domain 7: Workforce

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
VII-C	Increase efforts to include key stakeholders in the State's federal Annual Progress and Service Report (ASPR) and provide improved documentation to of stakeholder participation.	Item 39: The agency develops, in consultation with Tribal representatives, consumers, services providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child-and-family serving agencies, annual reports of progress and services delivered pursuant to the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP).
PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS		2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS
Oregon was in substantial conformity with this systemic factor in 2001, and no PIP for it was required.		Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies: Model Court Strategies: Other Item-Associated Initiatives:
PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS
As outlined in the ACF program instructions, the CAF Federal Compliance Unit staff will notify stakeholders and central office program staff that information is needed to meet the ASPR reporting requirements, providing the type of information that is required and the date by which it is needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juvenile Court Improvement Project (JCIP) Steering Committee; • Oregon Commission on Children and Families (OCCF); • Citizens Review Board; • Tribes; • Foster Parent Advisory Committee; • Children's Justice Act Task Force (CJA); • Domestic Violence Advisory 	<p>Use a variety of means of contacting stakeholders (email, phone)</p> <p>Convene a quarterly work group of the key central office program staff, stakeholders and community partners to review the progress and services delivered, with a focus on documenting outcomes for the ASPR and five-year CFSP.</p> <p>Provide clear documentation in the ASPR of which stakeholders</p>

	<p>Committee;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child Welfare Advisory Committee (CWAC); <p>District managers, branch managers, and program managers meet regularly with community partners and stakeholders to address issues specific to their community, families and children.</p>	<p>participated in its development.</p> <p>Provide a copy of the completed, approved ASPR to stakeholders who were invited to participate.</p>
--	--	--

Domain 7: Workforce

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
VII-D	Increase cultural competence of agency staff and contracted providers	N/A
	PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS	2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS
		Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:
		Model Court Strategies:
		Other Item-Associated Initiatives:
	PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS
	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS	
	[CAF would like to consult with ACF regarding development of strategies, as it is not required.]	

Domain VII: Diligent Recruitment³⁰

GOAL #	GOAL	PRIMARY CFSR FOCUS ITEMS
VII-E	Improve the agency's capacity to place children in foster families who are well-suited to meet their individual needs.	Item 44: Diligent recruitment
	PIP I (2002-2004) STRATEGIES RELATED TO THESE ITEMS	2008 STRATEGIES-IN-PROCESS RELATED TO THESE ITEMS
		Intentional Specific PIP-Related Strategies:
		Model Court Strategies:
		Other Item-Associated Initiatives:
PROPOSED STRATEGIES	PROPOSED COLLABORATORS	PROPOSED ACTION STEPS

³⁰ Please refer to Domain VI, Goal VI-C, Diligent Recruitment.
 C:\DOCUME~1\GWPARKER\LOCALS~1\Temp\GWViewer\04-07-08 Oregon draft PIP as submitted to ACF.doc Last printed 5/13/2008
 3:10:00 PM Page 102 of 104

Next Steps

This Program Improvement Plan is now an official submission to ACF within the 90-day timeframe required by federal regulation. Nonetheless, Oregon continues to consider this PIP as a work-in-progress. Many strategies do not yet have identified action steps, and in some cases, the strategies lack precision. As discussed by conference call with the Region X ACF staff on April 1, 2008, and on previous occasions, the agency places a high value on the active involvement of a wide representation of stakeholders in both the development and implementation of this improvement plan. Moreover, Oregon has appreciated the collaboration with ACF in the PIP development process.

Next steps include:

1. Oregon's understands that Region X's target for getting comments back to us is Friday, April 18.
2. On April 9, there is a planning meeting to design and develop a federal Adoption Opportunities Grant for Recruitment of Foster and adoptive families. Our focus will be on reducing disproportionality of Native American and African American children in Oregon's child welfare system.
3. A PIP Strategic Co-Leads meeting scheduled for April 24. Before that date, we will have done some preliminary analysis of Region X's feedback to the April 7 draft and have distributed it by email to the Co-Leads, who will, in turn, share it with their small groups. In addition, we will, together, come up with an estimated amount of time that it will take us to craft the next PIP draft. Subsequent Co-Lead meetings through at least the month of June will be on the second and fourth Thursdays.
4. Domain small workgroups will meet and do further edits between April 24 and April 30, and for at least through the middle of May.
5. We will continue our involvement of the DHS Director's Office and the Oregon Governor's Office in PIP development and information dissemination about it.
6. On April 30 (3:30 to 4:30), we have a conference call scheduled with Region X in which we are including the PIP Co-Leads. The purpose of the call is to clarify the contents of the feedback and next steps. As required by

federal regulations, on or after April 30, Region X will send us an official letter that states that the draft PIP that we submitted on April 7 was not yet complete, and giving us the date by which the next PIP submission is due, which will be 30 days from our receipt of that letter. We think that the due date for the next PIP draft will be around the end of May.

7. On May 6, we will meet with CAF Field District Managers to discuss further development of the statewide PIP and the Local District improvement plans as part of the statewide PIP. Subsequent to that meeting, OPPR will provide technical assistance to the Districts to flesh out their local plans.
8. Although not yet scheduled, we will be meeting with the District Managers who are part of the team to help us identify the measurements for PIP improvement we would like to negotiate with ACF. We will also continue to work on the PIP quarterly action steps and continue our work with JCIP to coordinate our improvement plans with theirs.
9. On May 7, we will discuss the PIP with Oregon's Tribal social services representatives at the quarterly ICWA State Advisory Committee.
10. On May 8, we will meet with Child Welfare Program Managers to discuss the PIP.
11. On May 14, we will again meet with CWAC to discuss the continued PIP development. (We have also encumbered time on their regular agendas on July 9, September 10 and November 12.)
12. We have already agreed with Region X that it will take us a minimum of 30-45 days from receipt of their comments until submission of the next draft, and it may take more, depending on the extent of their comments. The activities that we hope to accomplish before submitting the next draft PIP.
13. In May, we believe we may possibly learn more about McKenzie findings as well as Director's Child Safety Committee and incorporate them into PIP as appropriate.