STATE OF CALIFORNIA—HEALTH AND WELFARE AGENCY

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

September 22, 1987

ALL COUNTY INFORMATION NOTICE I-81-87

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

SUBJECT: FEDERAL TITLE IV-B, SECTION 427 COMPLIANCE REVIEWS

The purpose of this letter is to provide: (1) the findings of the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1982-83 Title IV-B, Section 427 compliance review that was recently completed by the Department of Health and Human Services for California; and (2) case retention instructions and general information relating to the upcoming FFY 1983-84 Title IV-B, Section 427 compliance review.

FFY 1982-83 Compliance Review Findings

We are pleased to inform you that California has passed its Title IV-B, Section 427 compliance review for FFY 1982-83. The State passed the review at the 66 percent accuracy level. A total of 111 cases were read out of a sample of 150 cases for 26 counties and a total of 90 acceptable cases were found.

In order for a case to have been considered acceptable for this review, all critical requirements must have been met and 13 of 18 (72.2 percent) of all essential requirements must have been met. In order for the State to have been considered in compliance; at least 65 percent of all of the cases in the review population must have been projected to be acceptable cases. California may now be certified as having been eligible for funds under Section 427 of the Social Security Act for FFY 1982-83.

The general findings that were provided to the State follow. County specific findings have not yet been provided to the State.

1. Eleven cases were counted in error because they had been destroyed or parts of the cases which were needed to substantiate documentation were missing.

2. Seven cases did not have Permanency Planning Hearings in the required time period and two missed periodic reviews (Question 1).

3. Eight cases did not include a plan for assuring that services were to be provided to the child and parents in order to improve the home and facilitate return of the child or provide permanent placement for the child (Question A7).

4. Sixteen cases did not contain documentation assuring the provision of services to the child and foster parents to address the child's needs while in foster care (Question A8).

5. Twelve cases did not address the appropriateness of the services that had been provided to the child; i.e., beneficial impact (Question A9).

6. At least seven cases were disqualified from the review because the child was under the care, custody, and control of a legal guardian.

The State was provided with recommendations for reducing errors which included: (1) advising counties to retain records which will be subject to Federal review; (2) re-emphasizing the Permanency Planning Hearing and related documentation requirements; (3) issuing expanded guidelines on the required elements of the services and assessment plan; (4) clarifying time frames for completing services assessments and plans; and (5) clarifying requirements pertaining to legal guardian cases.

The State and the County Welfare Directors Association SB 14 Task Force have already begun addressing many of these issues as a result of the 1986 Child Welfare Services Case Review. The State will work closely with the Task Force to obtain resolution on any new issues raised by the FFY 1982-83 compliance review.

A copy of the review instrument used by the Department of Health and Human Services for the FFY 1982-83 compliance review is attached.

FFY 1983-84 Compliance Review

The FFY 1983-84, Title IV-B, Section 427 compliance review is scheduled to be conducted in January 1988. The sample size for California will again be 150 cases; however, a higher compliance level will be applied to this year. A case will be considered acceptable if all critical requirements are met and 15 of 18 (83.3 percent) essential requirements are met. The State will be considered in compliance if it is projected that at least 80 percent of all of the cases in the review population are acceptable cases.

County agencies should retain Child Welfare Services case records, including information on services provided by probation and adoption agencies, and court records for children who resided in out-of-home placement any time during the period from October 1, 1983 through September 30, 1984. Notwithstanding case retention regulations, agencies must provide the appropriate case records in the event a case that was active during this period is selected for review. The lists of cases selected for the FFY 83-84 compliance review will be provided to counties by the Department of Health and Human Services in October 1987.

Congratulations on passing the FFY 1982-83 compliance review, and thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

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

LOREN D. SUTER
Deputy Director
Adult and Family Services

Attachment

cc: CWDA

CASE RECORD SURVEY

Case Record ID Number: _____ Reviewer: _____

Sample Number: _____ Date: _____

Case Data

1. Date of Placement: _____

2. Periodic Reviews: (indicate dates)

Due	Held	Not Due

3. Dispositional Hearings: (indicate dates)

Due	Held	Not Due

SAMPLE

Findings

CASE IS ACCEPTABLE. _____

CASE IS NOT ACCEPTABLE. _____

1. Major Safeguards:

	Met	Not Met	Not Due
Written Case Plan			
Periodic Reviews			
Dispositional Hearings			

2. _____ of the remaining 18 protections are met. (NA's are counted as Yes). (At least 13 of the remaining protections are required for acceptability for initial and subsequent reviews. At least 15 of the protections are required for acceptability for triennial reviews.

CASE RECORD SURVEY

CASE PLAN

	YES	NO	N/A
	*****	*****	*****
A. THERE IS A WRITTEN CASE PLAN.			
(1) The case plan includes a description of the type of home or institution in which the child is to be placed.	____	____	____
(2) The case plan discusses the appropriateness of the placement.	____	____	____
(3) The case plan is designed to achieve placement in the least restrictive (most family-like) setting available consistent with the best interest and special needs of the child.	____	____	____
(4) The case plan is designed to achieve placement in close proximity to the parents' home consistent with the best interest and special needs of the child.	____	____	____
(5) The case plan discussed how the agency plans to carry out the judicial determination made with respect to the child in accordance with Section 472(a)(1).	____	____	____
(6) The case plan includes a plan for assuring that the child receives proper care.	____	____	____
(7) The case plan includes a plan for assuring that services are provided to the child and parents to improve the conditions in the parents' home and facilitate return of the child to his own home or the permanent placement of the child.	____	____	____
(8) The case plan includes a plan for assuring that services are provided to the child and foster parents to address the needs of the child while in foster care.	____	____	____
(9) The case plan discusses the appropriateness of the services that have been provided to the child under the plan.	____	____	____

SAMPLE

PERIODIC REVIEW

	YES	NO	N/A
B. THE STATUS OF EACH CHILD IS REVIEWED PERIODICALLY BUT NO LESS FREQUENTLY THAN ONCE EVERY SIX MONTHS BY EITHER A COURT OR AN ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.	*****	*****	*****
(10) The periodic reviews have determined the continuing necessity for and appropriateness of the placement.	____	____	____
(11) The periodic reviews have determined the extent of compliance with the case plan.	____	____	____
(12) The periodic reviews have determined the extent of progress which has been made toward alleviating or mitigating the causes necessitating the placement in foster care.	____	____	____
(13) The periodic reviews have projected a likely date by which the child may be returned to the home or placed for adoption or legal guardianship.	____	____	____
(14) If the periodic review was an administrative review, it was open to the participation of the parents of the child.	____	____	____
(15) If the periodic review was an administrative review, it was conducted by a panel of appropriate persons at least one of whom is not responsible for the the case management of, or the delivery of services to, either the child or the parents who are the subject of the review.	____	____	____

SAMPLE

PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS

	YES	NO	N/A
C. TO DETERMINE THE FUTURE STATUS OF THE CHILD THERE WAS A DISPOSITIONAL HEARING HELD IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 475(5)(C) NO LATER THAN 18 MONTHS AFTER ORIGINAL PLACEMENT AND PERIODICALLY THEREAFTER.	*****	*****	*****
(16) Procedural safeguards were applied with respect to parental rights pertaining to the removal of the child from the home of his parents.	____	____	____
(17) Procedural safeguards were applied with respect to parental rights pertaining to a change in the child's placement.	____	____	____
(18) Procedural safeguards were applied with respect to parental rights pertaining to any determination affecting visitation rights.	____	____	____

SAMPLE