

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814



August 18, 1987

ALL-COUNTY INFORMATION NOTICE 1-71-87

TO: ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS
ALL COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENTS
ALL PUBLIC ADOPTION AGENCIES

SUBJECT: 1986 CHILD WELFARE SERVICES CASE REVIEW

The purpose of this All-County Information Notice (ACIN) is to provide an overview of the 1986 Child Welfare Services Case Review (CWSCR), present the final statewide review findings, and outline current and future activities relating to the Child Welfare Services (CWS) programs which are outgrowths of the review.

In early 1985, the State Department of Social Services (SDSS) began working with the SB 14 Task Force of the County Welfare Directors Association to develop a process for assessing counties' compliance with Federal and State CWS statutes and regulations. The reasons for developing such a process were twofold. First, current information was needed to identify those areas where corrective action was required in order to meet Federal Department of Health and Human Services, Title IV-B, Section 427 audit standards. Meeting these audit standards would maintain California's Title IV-B Federal funding. Second, a comprehensive assessment of counties' compliance with State CWS statutes and regulations was needed to identify areas in which State statutory and regulatory development and/or revision was needed, and to identify those areas where county corrective action was needed in order to meet the additional state-imposed CWS requirements.

After completing extensive research regarding compliance monitoring and statistical sampling, a process was adopted which focused both on CWS requirements that are covered by the Section 427 audit and on CWS requirements that were found by the State of Pennsylvania to have a positive correlation between meeting the requirement and achieving the desired outcome for a particular child. A maximum of 30 questions were applied to each

of the 1,853 cases read statewide. The actual number of questions applied varied from case to case depending on whether the child was in the Emergency Response, Family Maintenance, Family Reunification, or Permanent Placement Program, and on the specific case circumstances.

The universe for the review consisted of all CWS cases which were active during the month of March 1986. The actual cases reviewed were selected using a random number generator. The number of cases reviewed in each program for each county was proportional to the total number of cases in each program for each county. Each case reviewed was graded on a pass/fail standard. In order for a case to have met the pass standard all of the critical questions and 83 percent of the essential questions required affirmative answers. The critical questions dealt with timely assessments, service plans, court hearings, and permanent planning hearings. The essential questions covered a wide range of requirements including identifying child information, notice of court hearings, and timeliness of emergency response. See the attached review worksheet for a list of all the review questions. In order for a county to be determined to be in compliance with CWS requirements, 90 percent of all the county's CWS cases would have to be projected to be in compliance using statistical probability tables. The method of assessing a county's pass/fail rating is the same as that used in the Federal Section 427 audits.

While the 1986 CWSCR findings were statistically reliable for the four CWS programs as a whole for each county, the statewide findings are statistically reliable for each CWS Program. Individual county findings were previously provided to each county. The final statewide review findings are displayed on five separate tables covering each CWS program and the CWS Program in aggregate.

Statewide, 21 counties were found to have 90 percent or more of their CWS cases in compliance, and 37 counties fell below the 90 percent standard. (See attached Pass/Fail Counties List.)

In the ER Program, the following four requirements exceeded a ten percent error rate:

Question:

1. Timely Assessment - 12.83%
2. Timely Service Plan - 27.60%
27. Reasonable Efforts Statement on Court Report - 21.36%
30. Timeliness of Response - 10.46%

In the FM Program, the following five requirements exceeded a ten percent error rate:

Question:

1. Timely Assessment - 14.40%
2. Timely Service Plan - 12.45%
9. Timely Initial Service Plan - 12.76%
15. Parent's Signature on Service Plan - 15.11%
23. Court Projected Termination Date - 14.43%

In the FR Program, the following seven requirements exceeded a ten percent error rate:

Question:

7. Identifying Information on FCIS - 14.32%
10. Supervisor Signature on Initial Service Plan - 10.48%
15. Parent's Signature on Service Plan - 20.67%
17. Social Worker Contact with Foster Parent - 16.89%
27. Reasonable Efforts Statement on Court Report - 35.17%
28. Court Open to Parent/Child - 14.25%
31. Joint Adoption Review - 42.25%

In the PP Program, the following five requirements exceeded a ten percent error rate:

Question:

7. Identifying Information on FCIS - 11.54%
10. Supervisor Signature on Service Plan - 14.39%
17. Social Worker Contact with Foster Parent - 29.16%
18. Social Worker Contact with Child - 19.64%
28. Court Open to Parent/Child - 13.65%

On a statewide basis for all CWS programs, nine requirements exceeded a ten percent error rate:

Question:

- 2. Current Service Plan - 11.33%
- 7. Current FCIS Information - 12.94%
- 15. Service Plan Signed by Parent - 17.89%
- 17. Social Worker Contact with Foster Parent - 23.11%
- 18. Social Worker Visit with Child - 19.64%
- 27. "Reasonable Efforts" on Court Order - 31.55%
- 28. Court Open to Parent/Child - 14.02%
- 30. Timeliness of Response - 10.46%
- 31. Joint Adoption Review - 42.25%

The statewide findings have provided valuable information regarding compliance in the CWS programs which is already being used to explore statutory and regulatory revisions and appropriate corrective action. Proposed statutory and regulatory language will be developed, and a corrective action process will be implemented.

I would like to thank the counties for their cooperation on the reviews and for providing valuable insights into the causes of problems in the CWS programs. I intend to continue to work closely with the counties to ensure that statutory and regulatory requirements are made clearer and that SDSS implements improved procedures for providing clear and consistent interpretation of policy.

If you have any questions regarding the 1986 CWSCR, please contact your Adult and Family Services Operations Bureau Consultant at (916) 445-0623.



LOREN D. SUTER
Deputy Director
Adult and Family Services

Attachments

cc: CWDA

Pass/Fail Counties

Large

Pass

Fresno
Kern
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego

Fail

Alameda
Contra Costa
Los Angeles
Orange
Riverside
San Francisco
Santa Clara

Medium

Pass

Butte
Kings
Madera
Mendocino
Napa
Nevada
San Joaquin
Santa Barbara
Santa Cruz
Stanislaus
Sutter
Ventura
Yolo

Fail

El Dorado
Humboldt
Imperial
Marin
Merced
Monterey
Placer
San Luis Obispo
San Mateo
Shasta
Solano
Sonoma
Tehama
Tulare
Yuba

Small

Pass

Lassen
Trinity
Tuolumne

Fail

Alpine
Amador
Calaveras
Colusa
Del Norte
Glenn
Inyo
Lake
Mariposa
Modoc
Mono
Plumas
San Benito
Sierra
Siskiyou

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
1986 CHILD WELFARE SERVICES CASE REVIEW

CRITICAL / ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS SUMMARY
INDEXED BY COUNTY AND PROGRAM

STATEWIDE

EMERGENCY RESPONSE CASES READ: 413 PASSED: 279 FAILED: 134

QUEST.	CRITICAL ELEMENTS			ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS		
	YES	NO	N/A	YES	NO	N/A
1.	360	53	0			
2.	299	114	0			
3.	0	0	413			
4.	0	0	413			
5.	0	0	413			
6.				411	2	0
7.				0	0	413
8.				0	0	413
9.				0	0	413
10.				333	3	77
11.				0	0	413
12.				0	0	413
13.				333	3	77
14.				0	0	413
15.				0	0	413
16.				0	0	413
17.				0	0	413
18.				0	0	413
19.				112	1	300
20.				0	0	413
21.				0	0	413
22.				0	0	413
23.				0	0	413
24.				114	1	298
26.				105	3	305
27.				81	22	310
28.				0	0	413
29.				0	0	413
30.				368	43	2
31.				0	0	413
PROGRAM						
TOTALS:	659	167	1,239	1,857	78	8,390

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
1986 CHILD WELFARE SERVICES CASE REVIEW

CRITICAL / ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS SUMMARY
INDEXED BY COUNTY AND PROGRAM

STATEWIDE

FAMILY MAINTENANCE CASES READ: 495 PASSED: 389 FAILED: 106

QUEST.	CRITICAL ELEMENTS			ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS		
	YES	NO	N/A	YES	NO	N/A
1.	422	71	2			
2.	429	61	5			
3.	90	1	404			
4.	0	0	495			
5.	0	0	495			
6.				491	3	1
7.				0	0	495
8.				250	9	236
9.				376	55	64
10.				437	17	41
11.				0	0	495
12.				446	3	46
13.				452	2	41
14.				0	0	495
15.				382	68	45
16.				0	0	495
17.				0	0	495
18.				0	0	495
19.				97	0	398
20.				0	0	495
21.				94	1	400
22.				0	0	495
23.				83	14	398
24.				0	0	495
26.				0	0	495
27.				0	0	495
28.				0	0	495
29.				0	0	495
30.				0	0	495
31.				0	0	495
PROGRAM TOTALS:	941	133	1,401	3,108	172	9,095

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
1986 CHILD WELFARE SERVICES CASE REVIEW

CRITICAL / ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS SUMMARY
INDEXED BY COUNTY AND PROGRAM

STATEWIDE

FAMILY REUNIFICATION CASES READ: 477 PASSED: 416 FAILED: 61

QUEST.	CRITICAL ELEMENTS			ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS		
	YES	NO	N/A	YES	NO	N/A
1.	467	10	0			
2.	451	23	3			
3.	252	6	219			
4.	0	0	477			
5.	0	0	477			
6.				475	1	1
7.				407	68	2
8.				272	3	202
9.				422	27	28
10.				410	48	19
11.				427	31	19
12.				455	2	20
13.				456	3	18
14.				44	2	431
15.				357	93	27
16.				443	23	11
17.				374	76	27
18.				0	0	477
19.				0	0	477
20.				260	0	217
21.				258	0	219
22.				259	0	218
23.				243	17	217
24.				408	16	53
26.				448	11	18
27.				188	102	187
28.				367	61	49
29.				0	0	477
30.				0	0	477
31.				41	30	406
PROGRAM TOTALS:	1,170	39	1,176	7,014	614	4,297

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
1986 CHILD WELFARE SERVICES CASE REVIEW

CRITICAL / ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS SUMMARY
INDEXED BY COUNTY AND PROGRAM

STATEWIDE

PERMANENT PLACEMENT CASES READ: 468 PASSED: 393 FAILED: 75

QUEST.	CRITICAL ELEMENTS			ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS		
	YES	NO	N/A	YES	NO	N/A
1.	445	23	0			
2.	457	11	0			
3.	0	0	468			
4.	335	9	124			
5.	275	15	178			
6.				467	1	0
7.				414	54	0
8.				385	1	82
9.				396	8	64
10.				345	58	65
11.				0	0	468
12.				454	1	13
13.				455	2	11
14.				0	0	468
15.				0	0	468
16.				0	0	468
17.				328	135	5
18.				360	88	20
19.				0	0	468
20.				288	1	179
21.				287	2	179
22.				0	0	468
23.				276	12	180
24.				175	11	282
26.				212	4	252
27.				0	0	468
28.				234	37	197
29.				47	0	421
30.				0	0	468
31.				0	0	468
PROGRAM						
TOTALS:	1,512	58	770	5,123	415	6,162

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
 1986 CHILD WELFARE SERVICES CASE REVIEW

CRITICAL / ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS SUMMARY
 INDEXED BY COUNTY AND PROGRAM

STATEWIDE

CASES READ: 1,853 PASSED: 1,477 FAILED: 376

QUEST.	CRITICAL ELEMENTS			ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS		
	YES	NO	N/A	YES	NO	N/A
1.	1,694	157	2			
2.	1,636	209	8			
3.	342	7	1,504			
4.	335	9	1,509			
5.	275	15	1,563			
6.				1,844	7	2
7.				821	122	910
8.				907	13	933
9.				1,194	90	569
10.				1,525	126	202
11.				427	31	1,395
12.				1,355	6	492
13.				1,696	10	147
14.				44	2	1,807
15.				739	161	953
16.				443	23	1,387
17.				702	211	940
18.				360	88	1,405
19.				209	1	1,643
20.				548	1	1,304
21.				639	3	1,211
22.				259	0	1,594
23.				602	43	1,208
24.				697	28	1,128
26.				765	18	1,070
27.				269	124	1,460
28.				601	98	1,154
29.				47	0	1,806
30.				368	43	1,442
31.				41	30	1,782
COUNTY						
TOTALS:	4,282	397	4,586	17,102	1,279	27,944

PART 1 - CASE IDENTIFICATION AND REQUIRED DATA

COUNTY	AGENCY	PROGRAM	SAMPLE #	REVIEWER	DATE REVIEWED	VERIFIER	CHILD'S CASE NUMBER

CHILD'S LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	MI

SECTION A.	TYPE	MONTH	DAY	YEAR
1. REFERRAL RECEIVED				
2. RESPONSE DUE				
3. RESPONSE DONE				
4. CASE OPENED/TRANS. IN				
5. CASE TRANS. OUT/CLOSED				
6. INITIAL PLACEMENT				
7. LATEST PLACEMENT				
8. VOL. PLACEMENT SIGNED				
9. DETENTION HEARING				
10. DISPOSITIONAL HEARING				

SECTION C.	DATE DUE	DATE DONE
1. 6 MONTH		
2. 12 MONTH		
3. 18 MONTH		
4. PPH		
5. 1ST SUR		
6. 2ND SUR		
7. 3RD SUR		
8. 4TH SUR		
9. 5TH SUR		
10. 6TH SUR		
11. JOINT REVIEW		

SECTION B.	DATE DUE	DATE DONE
1. ASSESSMENT		
2. PREV. REA		
3. LATEST REA		
4. INITIAL SP		
5. PREV. MSP		
6. LATEST MSP		

VISIT	TYPE	DATE DUE	LAST DATE DONE	TYPE	NO.
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					

PART 2 - CRITICAL ELEMENTS (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION)	YES	NO	N/A
1. IS THERE A CURRENT ASSESSMENT/REASSESSMENT?	1	2	3
2. IS THERE A CURRENT SERVICE PLAN?	1	2	3
3. WAS THE LATEST COURT/ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW COMPLETED WITHIN THE REQUIRED TIME FRAME?	1	2	3
4. WAS A PERMANENCY PLANNING HEARING HELD WITHIN 18 MONTHS OF PLACEMENT?	1	2	3
5. AFTER THE PERMANENCY PLANNING HEARING, WAS EACH OF THE SUBSEQUENT HEARINGS COMPLETED EVERY 6 MONTHS?	1	2	3

RATING	TOTALS	YES	NO	TOTAL YES/NO	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> PASS	CRITICAL ELEMENTS				
<input type="checkbox"/> FAIL	ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS				
	PERCENTAGE			100.00	

PART 2 - ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION)	YES	NO	N/A
6. IS THERE CURRENT IDENTIFYING INFORMATION PERTAINING TO CHILD, PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S)/FOSTER PARENTS?	1	2	3
7. IS THERE CURRENT IDENTIFYING INFORMATION PERTAINING TO CHILD AND FOSTER PARENT(S)/FACILITY ON THE FOSTER CARE INFORMATION SYSTEM (FCIS) DOCUMENT?	1	2	3
8. DOES THE LATEST REASSESSMENT INCLUDE AN EVALUATION OF THE PREVIOUS SERVICE PLAN'S ADEQUACY AND CONTINUED APPROPRIATENESS?	1	2	3
9. WAS THE INITIAL SERVICE PLAN COMPLETED WITHIN THE REQUIRED TIME FRAME?	1	2	3
10. DOES THE INITIAL SERVICE PLAN INCLUDE WRITTEN APPROVAL BY THE SOCIAL WORKER SUPERVISOR?	1	2	3
11. DOES THE SERVICE PLAN INCLUDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE TYPE OF HOME/FACILITY IN WHICH THE CHILD IS TO BE PLACED AND THE APPROPRIATENESS OF IT?	1	2	3
12. DOES THE LATEST SERVICE PLAN INCLUDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OBJECTIVES BASED ON THE ASSESSMENT/REASSESSMENT?	1	2	3
13. ...ACTIONS PLANNED BY THE PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S)/FOSTER PARENT(S), CHILD AND AGENCY TO ACHIEVE THE SERVICE OBJECTIVES?	1	2	3
14. WAS THE LATEST CHANGE IN PLACEMENT REFLECTED IN A MODIFIED SERVICE PLAN?	1	2	3
15. DID THE PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S) SIGN THE LATEST SERVICE PLAN OR IS RECORD DOCUMENTED AS TO WHY NOT?	1	2	3
16. IS THERE A CURRENT ARRANGEMENT FOR VISITS BETWEEN PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S) AND CHILD OR DOCUMENTATION JUSTIFYING LESS FREQUENT CONTACTS?	1	2	3
17. DID THE SOCIAL WORKER HAVE CONTACT WITH THE FOSTER PARENT(S) WITHIN THE LATEST REQUIRED TIME FRAME?	1	2	3
18. DID SOCIAL WORKER HAVE A FACE-TO-FACE CONTACT WITH THE CHILD WITHIN THE LATEST REQUIRED TIME FRAME?	1	2	3
19. DID THE LATEST COURT REVIEW DETERMINE CONTINUED NECESSITY FOR AND APPROPRIATENESS OF COURT INTERVENTION AND/OR SERVICES?	1	2	3
20. DID THE LATEST COURT/ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW DETERMINE THE CONTINUED NECESSITY FOR AND APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PLACEMENT?	1	2	3
21. ...THE EXTENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE SERVICE PLAN?	1	2	3
22. ...THE EXTENT OF PROGRESS IN ALLEVIATING PROBLEMS WHICH RESULTED IN THE CHILD'S PLACEMENT?	1	2	3
23. .../IDENTIFY THE PROJECTED TERMINATION OF SERVICES, REUNIFICATION, OR PERMANENT PLACEMENT DATE?	1	2	3
24. WAS THE PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S) NOTIFIED OF THE INITIAL COURT HEARING?	1	2	3
25. WAS THE PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S) NOTIFIED OF THE LATEST COURT HEARING?	1	2	3
26. IF THE CHILD WAS REMOVED, IS THERE DOCUMENTATION OF COURT ORDERED REMOVAL OR A VOLUNTARY PLACEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S) AND THE COUNTY?	1	2	3
27. FOR THE DETENTION HEARING, DOES THE COURT ORDER FOR REMOVAL STATE THAT REASONABLE EFFORTS WERE MADE TO PREVENT PLACEMENT, OR IN AN EMERGENCY SITUATION, THAT THE LACK OF PREPLACEMENT PREVENTIVE EFFORTS WAS REASONABLE?	1	2	3
28. WAS THE LATEST COURT/ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OPEN TO PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S) AND CHILD'S PARTICIPATION?	1	2	3
29. WAS THE LATEST ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW CONDUCTED BY A PANEL OF APPROPRIATE PERSONS?	1	2	3
30. DID THE SOCIAL WORKER RESPOND TO THE ABUSE, NEGLECT, OR EXPLOITATION REFERRAL WITHIN THE REQUIRED TIME FRAME?	1	2	3
31. DID SOCIAL WORKER AND ADOPTION WORKER JOINTLY REVIEW THE CASE RECORD TO DETERMINE THE POTENTIAL FOR ADOPTION WITHIN ONE YEAR OF PLACEMENT?	1	2	3

PART 1 - CASE IDENTIFICATION AND REQUIRED DATA

COUNTY	AGENCY	PROGRAM	SAMPLE #	REVIEWER	DATE REVIEWED	VERIFIER	CHILD'S CASE NUMBER

CHILD'S LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	MI

SECTION A.	TYPE	MONTH	DAY	YEAR
1. REFERRAL RECEIVED				
2. RESPONSE DUE				
3. RESPONSE DONE				
4. CASE OPENED/TRANS. IN				
5. CASE TRANS. OUT/CLOSED				
6. INITIAL PLACEMENT				
7. LATEST PLACEMENT				
8. VOL PLACEMENT SIGNED				
9. DETENTION HEARING				
10. DISPOSITIONAL HEARING				

SECTION C.	DATE DUE	DATE DONE
1. 6 MONTH		
2. 12 MONTH		
3. 18 MONTH		
4. PPH		
5. 1ST SUR		
6. 2ND SUR		
7. 3RD SUR		
8. 4TH SUR		
9. 5TH SUR		
10. 6TH SUR		
11. JOINT REVIEW		

SECTION B.	DATE DUE	DATE DONE
1. ASSESSMENT		
2. PREV. REA		
3. LATEST REA		
4. INITIAL SP		
5. PREV. MSP		
6. LATEST MSP		

VISIT	TYPE	DATE DUE	LAST DATE DONE	TYPE	NO.
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					

PART 2 - CRITICAL ELEMENTS (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION)	YES	NO	N/A
1. IS THERE A CURRENT ASSESSMENT/REASSESSMENT?	1	2	3
2. IS THERE A CURRENT SERVICE PLAN?	1	2	3
3. WAS THE LATEST COURT/ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW COMPLETED WITHIN THE REQUIRED TIME FRAME?	1	2	3
4. WAS A PERMANENCY PLANNING HEARING HELD WITHIN 18 MONTHS OF PLACEMENT?	1	2	3
5. AFTER THE PERMANENCY PLANNING HEARING, WAS EACH OF THE SUBSEQUENT HEARINGS COMPLETED EVERY 6 MONTHS?	1	2	3

RATINGS	TOTALS	YES	NO	TOTAL YES/NO	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/> PASS	CRITICAL ELEMENTS				
<input type="checkbox"/> FAIL	ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS				
	PERCENTAGE			100.00	

PART 2 - ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION)	YES	NO	N/A
6. IS THERE CURRENT IDENTIFYING INFORMATION PERTAINING TO CHILD, PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S)/FOSTER PARENTS?	1	2	3
7. IS THERE CURRENT IDENTIFYING INFORMATION PERTAINING TO CHILD AND FOSTER PARENT(S)/FACILITY ON THE FOSTER CARE INFORMATION SYSTEM (FCIS) DOCUMENT?	1	2	3
8. DOES THE LATEST REASSESSMENT INCLUDE AN EVALUATION OF THE PREVIOUS SERVICE PLAN'S ADEQUACY AND CONTINUED APPROPRIATENESS?	1	2	3
9. WAS THE INITIAL SERVICE PLAN COMPLETED WITHIN THE REQUIRED TIME FRAME?	1	2	3
10. DOES THE INITIAL SERVICE PLAN INCLUDE WRITTEN APPROVAL BY THE SOCIAL WORKER SUPERVISOR?	1	2	3
11. DOES THE SERVICE PLAN INCLUDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE TYPE OF HOME/FACILITY IN WHICH THE CHILD IS TO BE PLACED AND THE APPROPRIATENESS OF IT?	1	2	3
12. DOES THE LATEST SERVICE PLAN INCLUDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE SERVICE OBJECTIVES BASED ON THE ASSESSMENT/REASSESSMENT?	1	2	3
13. ...ACTIONS PLANNED BY THE PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S)/FOSTER PARENT(S), CHILD AND AGENCY TO ACHIEVE THE SERVICE OBJECTIVES?	1	2	3
14. WAS THE LATEST CHANGE IN PLACEMENT REFLECTED IN A MODIFIED SERVICE PLAN?	1	2	3
15. DID THE PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S) SIGN THE LATEST SERVICE PLAN OR IS RECORD DOCUMENTED AS TO WHY NOT?	1	2	3
16. IS THERE A CURRENT ARRANGEMENT FOR VISITS BETWEEN PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S) AND CHILD OR DOCUMENTATION JUSTIFYING LESS FREQUENT CONTACTS?	1	2	3
17. DID THE SOCIAL WORKER HAVE CONTACT WITH THE FOSTER PARENT(S) WITHIN THE LATEST REQUIRED TIME FRAME?	1	2	3
18. DID SOCIAL WORKER HAVE A FACE-TO-FACE CONTACT WITH THE CHILD WITHIN THE LATEST REQUIRED TIME FRAME?	1	2	3
19. DID THE LATEST COURT REVIEW DETERMINE CONTINUED NECESSITY FOR AND APPROPRIATENESS OF COURT INTERVENTION AND/OR SERVICES?	1	2	3
20. DID THE LATEST COURT/ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW DETERMINE THE CONTINUED NECESSITY FOR AND APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PLACEMENT?	1	2	3
21. ...THE EXTENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE SERVICE PLAN?	1	2	3
22. ...THE EXTENT OF PROGRESS IN ALLEVIATING PROBLEMS WHICH RESULTED IN THE CHILD'S PLACEMENT?	1	2	3
23. .../IDENTIFY THE PROJECTED TERMINATION OF SERVICES, REUNIFICATION, OR PERMANENT PLACEMENT DATE?	1	2	3
24. WAS THE PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S) NOTIFIED OF THE INITIAL COURT HEARING?	1	2	3
25. WAS THE PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S) NOTIFIED OF THE LATEST COURT HEARING?	1	2	3
26. IF THE CHILD WAS REMOVED, IS THERE DOCUMENTATION OF COURT ORDERED REMOVAL OR A VOLUNTARY PLACEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S) AND THE COUNTY?	1	2	3
27. FOR THE DETENTION HEARING, DOES THE COURT ORDER FOR REMOVAL STATE THAT REASONABLE EFFORTS WERE MADE TO PREVENT PLACEMENT, OR IN AN EMERGENCY SITUATION, THAT THE LACK OF PREPLACEMENT PREVENTIVE EFFORTS WAS REASONABLE?	1	2	3
28. WAS THE LATEST COURT/ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OPEN TO PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN(S) AND CHILD'S PARTICIPATION?	1	2	3
29. WAS THE LATEST ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW CONDUCTED BY A PANEL OF APPROPRIATE PERSONS?	1	2	3
30. DID THE SOCIAL WORKER RESPOND TO THE ABUSE, NEGLECT, OR EXPLOITATION REFERRAL WITHIN THE REQUIRED TIME FRAME?	1	2	3
31. DID SOCIAL WORKER AND ADOPTION WORKER JOINTLY REVIEW THE CASE RECORD TO DETERMINE THE POTENTIAL FOR ADOPTION WITHIN ONE YEAR OF PLACEMENT?	1	2	3