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

December 2, 2003

ALL COUNTY LETTER NO. 03-61

REASON FOR THIS TRANSMITTAL

[ ] State Law Change
[ ] Federal Law or Regulation Change
[ ] Court Order
[X] Clarification Requested by One or More Counties
[X] Initiated by CDSS

TO: ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS
ALL COUNTY WELFARE FISCAL OFFICERS
ALL COUNTY WELFARE SPOCs
ALL CHILD WELFARE SERVICES PROGRAM MANAGERS
CHIEF PROBATION OFFICERS

SUBJECT: CWS/CMS DATA ENTRY

This All-County Letter (ACL) is intended to assist counties in meeting critical Child Welfare Services Program (CWS) documentation, data reporting, and program performance measurement requirements. This and future ACLs will provide information to assist counties in uniformly following program policy and data entry protocols to continuously improve data in the Child Welfare Services Case Management System (CWS/CMS).

The recent federally approved CWS Program Improvement Plan (PIP) and Assembly Bill 636 (WIC 10601.2, Statutes of 2002) place increased importance on the need for accurate, timely, and complete CWS data. CWS/CMS is the primary source of information for both the PIP and AB 636 reports.

Effective January 2004, reports based on CWS/CMS data on State and federal outcome measures will be available to counties, advocates, and the public under the provisions of AB 636. These federal and State data reports will become the baseline and primary tool used to assess program outcomes and performance. The reports will be prepared and distributed on a quarterly basis. These reports will provide the basis for county management to focus efforts to improve program outcomes and support the allocation of staff and funding resources. Consequently, in addition to the critical importance of this information in providing effective services, the complete, accurate and timely entry and update of data in CWS/CMS is essential for accurate assessment of program needs and the ability to obtain resources and modify program practices by federal, State, and county government to improve outcomes for the children receiving services. The information produced from CWS/CMS will be used to evaluate Individual County as well as statewide CWS performance.

A key to understanding this process is an awareness of the California PIP and AB 636 measures (Attachment 1) as they relate to the core federal and State CWS program requirements. These measures are related to child safety, permanency, and

child and family well-being. They include multiple measures, many of which are in developmental stages and will not be ready for January 2004 reports. Examples of both outcome and process measures include the following:

- Recurrence of maltreatment
- Abuse and neglect in foster care
- Abuse or neglect following permanency
- Abuse and neglect in homes where children were not removed
- Time to investigate abuse and neglect referrals
- Assessment of kin and extended family foster homes
- Social worker contacts with children, parents and careproviders
- Frequency of foster care placement moves
- Length of time to exit foster care
- Foster care re-entries
- Length of time to reunification, adoption or other permanent outcome
- Placements with siblings
- Placements in least restrictive environments

In preparation for implementation of PIP/AB 636 performance outcome measures, county, State, and University of California, Berkeley staff have been participating in an AB 636 Data Workgroup sponsored by the County Welfare Directors Association and the California Department of Social Services. This workgroup has identified a number of policy and data entry issues and clarifications to assist county staff to improve documentation within the system and improve uniform and consistent reporting across the counties. The most critical items identified by the workgroup requiring standardization are addressed in this ACL. Future ACLs will include additional items identified as a result of on-going data report development.

Outcome Measures requiring clarification are as follows:

1B. Recurrence of maltreatment: In the year under review, of all children who had a substantiated report of maltreatment, what percent had a subsequent substantiated report and did it occur within 3, 6, 12, or 24 months?

This outcome measure has to do with the ability to identify and report subsequent substantiated reports of child abuse and neglect of children within the State. It is important that the data extracted for this outcome include only those children with successive new instances of substantiated abuse or neglect. Duplicate reports may be made to the county on the same child from different sources or with different details. Duplicate referrals are referrals that have different reporters but share all of the following:

- Same child victim(s)
- Same allegation
- Same incident

In order to insure that duplicate referrals are identified for exclusion from this measure, counties must follow one of these two options for entering data on duplicate referrals:

- Associate all subsequent referrals to a primary referral. Help text in CWS/CMS provides specific details on how to complete this action Under the "Add Associated Referral" section. It should be noted that the association must occur before the first face-to-face contact is entered on CWS/CMS. If the referrals have been associated, the N/A Secondary Report can be selected as the Decision Type in the Determine Response Dialog Box. The Determine Response Dialog Box is accessed by selecting the Determine Response command from the Action menu.

- Evaluate Out the Referral, selecting that choice as the Decision Type in the Determine Response Dialog Box. The Determine Response Dialog Box is accessed by selecting the Determine Response command from the Action menu.

Additional clarifications: For data reported on this outcome measure, allegations of "At-risk" will not be counted. Only subsequent substantiated reports of abuse or neglect allegations on a child will be included for data reporting purposes. If there are multiple substantiated allegations on a specific child, the most severe per incident will be counted.

1D. Incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care: Of all the children in foster care in the State during the period under review, what percent were the subjects of

substantiated or indicated maltreatment by a foster parent or facility staff, adjusted by time in care and type of placement.

This outcome requires the ability to identify those substantiated abuse or neglect reports where the perpetrator is a foster parent or facility staff members. Although the recent CWS/CMS release added a perpetrator type of SCP/Rec. Facility Staff to the ID page of the Allegation Notebook in CWS/CMS, this identifying type can only be chosen if one of the clients associated with this referral is selected. Changes to CWS/CMS are being planned to correct this problem. Pending completion of those changes, the required work around and current rules to improve the completeness of this data are as follows:

- All reports of abuse or neglect in out-of-home settings with a substitute care provider must have a referral created within CWS/CMS, even in those counties where CCL does facility licensing. This does include reports on relative homes.
- The date of these referrals should be the date that the agency became aware of the incident – not the date that the reported incident occurred.
- The referral must be created whether or not the specific identity of the perpetrator is known beyond the fact that it is an SCP or facility staff person.
- If the perpetrator is known – he/she should be created in the Client Notebook or associated with the referral if already available.
- If the perpetrator is unknown, the workaround is to create a client following a temporary naming convention. This naming convention is to use the facility type as the first name and the facility name as the last name. For example, if the abuse occurred in the relative home of the John Smith family, the created client would be Relative (first name) and Smith (first name). The choice for first name given the various facility types in CWS/CMS would be as follows: Court, FFA, Foster, Group, Guardian, Medical, Relative, SmallFamily and Tribe,
- If the perpetrator is unknown but subsequently identified, the correction should be made to CWS/CMS to reflect the identified person.
- After identifying the appropriate client, select *the radio button SCP/Res Facility Staff* person in the perpetrator type box on the ID page of the Allegation Notebook.

Additional clarifications: For data reported on this outcome measure, allegations of "At-risk" will not be counted. Only subsequent substantiated reports of abuse or neglect allegations on a child will be included for data reporting purposes. If there are multiple substantiated allegations on a specific child, the most severe per incident will be counted.

2B. Child abuse and neglect referrals by time to investigate: Percent of child abuse and neglect referrals that have resulted in an in-person investigation stratified by IR and 10 days referrals.

This process measure will report the degree of compliance with time requirements for response to referrals. This calculation will be the time difference between the recorded date that the referral was received by the county and the first face-to-face contact on the referral. It is Important to enter information in CWS/CMS as follows:

- Record all initial in-person responses to referrals on the Contact Page of the Contact Notebook. Face-to-face Contacts which are *attempted or completed* will be selected for the calculation of time. Telephone or written contacts do not count.
- Selected contacts must have a contact purpose of *Investigate Referral.*
- If there are multiple contacts with the purpose of Investigate Referral, the earliest date to the referral date will be the one used in the calculation.

Additional clarifications: Counties need to note the difference between contacts used in the calculation of this outcome versus those for social work visits in the FM and FR programs. This outcome measure *does* allow for attempts to contact a client where the latter measure uses only completed in-person contacts.

2 C. Social worker visit: Stratified by program type and visits with child, parent and caregivers.

- Percent of cases with monthly social worker visits
- Percent of cases with valid visit exceptions

This outcome measure will determine the number of cases where the required monthly contact between the child and social worker has been met. Accurate credit for this outcome measure is dependent upon the following CWS/CMS data entry:

- Social workers must complete the following fields on the Contact Page of the Contact Notebook in CWS/CMS after completing a face-to-face visit with one child on one contact:
  - Contact Type: Staff person/child
  - Method: In-person
  - Status: Completed
  - Start and end date

- These same fields must be completed each time a social worker has an In-person contact with a child. Workers must not record multiple visits (dates) on one contact. Social Workers may record multiple participants on one contact, e.g. social worker/child and social worker/parent or guardian.
- Visits will not be expected on cases where the children have run away or have been abducted. These can only be identified when the placement episode is open and the last placement has been ended for the reasons runaway or abduction.

Cases with exceptions to the monthly visit requirement:

In order to identify cases where a visit is not required because a *signed contact waiver/exception* exists in the case,

- County staff must complete their case plans in CWS/CMS.
- Waiver/exceptions must be documented on the Case Management page of the Case Plan notebook. The specific field can be found under the Schedule for Service Frame, "Contact Exceptions Drop Down" Box on that page.
- The case plan in CWS/CMS needs to be approved and in effect. The effective date and approval date in CWS/CMS must be the same as on the signed hard copy document located in the paper case file.

Additional clarifications: Waivers/exceptions do not exist for children placed in group homes.

Reports on this outcome measure will be sorted by the program service component type – FM, FR or PP. It is important that workers make timely changes to update their service components to ensure that cases are correctly identified. Updates should be made on the Services Component Page in the Case Notebook on CWS/CMS.

3 A. Length of time to exit foster care: Of those children in entry cohort, percent exiting foster care within 3, 6, 12, 24, 36, 48 and 60 months of entry.

- Percent exiting to adoption
- Percent exiting to Kin-GAP
- Percent exiting to other guardianship
- Percent exiting to reunification
- Percent exiting to emancipation
- Percent exiting to probation or incarceration
- Percent exiting for other reasons
- Percent still in care

This outcome measure relies upon county staff to *end placement episodes* timely and accurately in CWS/CMS on those cases where children leave out-of-home care. Whenever possible, placement episode termination type will be used for these measures. Accuracy includes using the most appropriate identifier for a child's placement episode termination type, or case closure reason as identified below. Workers need to select one of the reasons related to specific outcome measures if that

is accurate for the situation of the episode being closed. The following are guidelines for county staff to use to insure that data from CWS/CMS accurately reflects outcomes:

- Placement episode termination type, selected for adoption, guardianship, reunification, emancipation and incarceration will be the following: Adopt Finalized, Guardianship, Re-Unified with Parent/guardian (Court), Reunified with Parent/Guardian (Non-Court), and Emancipation/Age of Majority and Incarcerated**.** These are located on End Placement /Episode Page *of the Placement Notebook.*
- Kin-GAP cases will be identified specifically by the *case closure reason* since a placement episode termination type to Kin-GAP does not exist. This is entered in the End Case Dialog Box and displayed on the Case Closure Page of the Case Notebook. The End Case Dialog box is accessed by selecting the End Case command from the Action menu. This is the only identifier for these cases as they will no longer be identified by Special Projects labels.
- Cases exiting to probation or incarceration also will be identified by the *case closure reason* Not Incarcerated – Adjudicated 601-602 since a placement episode termination type indicating a transfer to probation does not exist. Again this information is entered in the End Case Dialog Box accessed through the End Case command from the Action menu.

Any other placement episode closing reasons will be counted in the category "exiting for other reasons."

Additional clarifications: CWSCMS requires the entry of a reason for ending a placement episode and case. Since cases for the various categories of this outcome measure will be drawn from the placement episode termination types wherever possible and the case closure reasons when the required episode termination type does not exist, it is important to note some other considerations:

For Placement Episode Endings:

- It is important to end placement episodes timely. For children on runaway or probation, or who have been abducted, the placement must be ended but it may be appropriate to leave the placement episode open. For all other situations, the placement episode should be ended even if there is some possibility that the child will return to care. Returns to care should start a new placement episode.
- Ending a placement does not end a placement episode. This may be particularly important for counties who do trial home visits. For counties doing trial home visits, it is suggested that the worker create a reminder to end the placement episode at the end date of the trial visit status period.
- Counties may be ending placement episodes when children have been incorrectly put into an out-of-home placement. These kinds of erroneous out-of-home placements should be removed from CWS/CMS rather than just ended.

For case closures:

- It is recommended that Counties encourage workers to complete their CWS activities and close cases in CWS/CMS within 30 days after the last provision of service. This time frame includes supervisor approval in CWS/CMS.
- Supervisor approval for case closure must be given on CWS/CMS in order to have timely case closure. The case will not be considered closed on the system until it is approved.

4A. Sibling placements: For children in care, percent placed with some or all of their siblings?

This outcome measure will be looking at all children with open placements and depends upon the proper coding of the relationships between clients on CWS/CMS in order to determine sibling placements. The most significant rules are as follows:

- It is important that in making a selection on the relationship between the primary client and others associated to the referral or case that the client in-focus, meaning the one open on the screen, be the first half of relationship being selected. In other words, if you are working on the child, Joe Smith's case, and you want to change his relationship with his mother from step to adopted, you need to have the child, Joe Smith, Client Notebook in focus. Then you need to select the relationship Son/Mother (Adoptive) rather than Son/Mother (Step) on the Relationships Page of the Client Notebook.

4B. Use of least restrictive care settings: For children entering care, what is the predominant placement time:

- By entry cohort
- Stratify by distance
- Identify by relative and non-relative placement type

This outcome measure utilizes the placement settings of children with open placements in out-of-home care to determine how many are placed in the various placement types in order of the least restriction. Guidelines for counties in completing data entry to CWS/CMS are as follows:

- It is important that workers correctly identify the type of placement setting in which a child is placed. This should occur when a placement is being created or is selected because it already exists within CWS/CMS and the child is placed in the facility.

- Reported data for this outcome measure will use the following order of least to most restrictive for placement types: Relative, Foster, FFA, and Group homes. Placement types other than these four will not be selected for this outcome.
- The second specific measure under this outcome, compares the distance that children are currently placed from where they were when they came into placement. This will be done by calculating distance between the address of the current placement facility and the address of the address of the child at the beginning of the placement episode. This means that it is important that workers correctly enter addresses, including zip codes for placement facilities.
- In addition, it is important to be sure that zip code information is complete and accurate for parents as well as other primary clients associated with a child's case. Client addresses can be created or updated on the Address Page in the Client Notebook for any client related to a case. There are various types of client addresses within CWS/CMS – residence, business, day care, homeless, penal institute, and permanent mailing. The complete address, including zip code, should be entered for each type, as appropriate. For each type, all addresses except the current address should have an end date. Future changes to CWS/CMS are being planned which will make the maintenance of the current addresses for clients more efficient. These include end-dating an address when a new address is created and ending the residence address when penal or homeless types are entered. However, at the current time, it is necessary to manually make these changes to CWS/CMS fields.

Additional clarifications: The correct entry of client address into CWS/CWS has many benefits to workers beyond the PIP/AB636 measures. First and foremost is that it is good practice and provides immediate critical data on the location of primary people associated with a case. In times of emergency or provision of services such as visitation, this information could be vital. Once correctly entered, the address does populate to reports and other critical forms such as court notices and templates, including county and State surveys.

In general, program outcome measures include length of time in program service components and out of home care as well as the frequency and number of placement changes. Terminations or transfer of children and families between program components as well as changes or termination of out of home placement must be documented in the system as soon as possible. Failure to do so creates a possibility of inappropriate foster care payment, results in incorrect caseload counts, and does not accurately document successful provision of services by staff.

If you have any questions about this ACL, please contact Tom Burke at (916) 651-7884 or Judi Boring at (916) 654-0874.

Sincerely,

Original Document Signed By

SYLVIA PIZZINI
Deputy Director
Children and Family Services Division

Attachment

c: CWDA

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Below is a proposed set of outcomes and indicators, developed by the Child Welfare Outcomes and Accountability Workgroup, in consultation with the Chapin Hall Center for Children.

- The far left column represents the outcome we would like to achieve.
- The second column, “Federal,” lists the measures included in the U.S. DHHS’ federal review of state child welfare programs, Child and Family Service Review.
- The middle column, “State Enriched,” describes the measures that the Workgroup is proposing to use. These measures will supplement the federal measures to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the State’s child welfare system.
- The fourth column, “Short-term Development,” holds measures we hope to develop for the next cycle of the California Child and Family Service Review. For data reasons, these measures were not available for the first cycle, but are planned for CWS/CMS enhancements.
- The far right column, “Future Development,” includes measures we would like to develop for subsequent C-CFSR cycles. These measures are contingent upon larger system changes, such as the implementation of the CDSS CWS Stakeholders’ Group’s Redesign efforts.

NOTES:

* These indicators were taken directly or adapted from the CWDA list of outcome measures.

Italicized & Bolded indicators measure process

Where possible, we propose that data be reported using these sub-populations.

- Age, by year and/or age group (under 1, 1-2, 3-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16+)
- Type of placement
- Race and ethnicity, and Native American/Indian heritage
- Gender

PROFILE INFORMATION	Data Collected to Provide Background, Context and Demographics
	A. Demographic and Census information by county and/or zip code, including information such as: • age, race, ethnicity, or Native American/Indian heritage, other basic demographic characteristics • poverty rate • household income • unemployment rate • rate of families with no health insurance • level of education for head of household • receipt of public assistance • active tribes • other B. Referral information: Rate of children with initial and/or substantiated report(s) of abuse and/or neglect per 1,000 children in child population by age group, type of abuse and disposition (e.g. substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded and evaluated out) county by county. C. Foster care entries: Rate of children entering out-of-home care per 1,000 children D. Child mortality information: Number of child mortalities reported on CWS/CMS matched against vital statistics and other data sources. This data will come from the State Child Death Review Council Reconciliation Project, and will be made available on a flow basis.

Safety Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
1. Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	1A. Recurrence of maltreatment: Of all children who were victims of substantiated or indicated child abuse and/or neglect during the first six months of the reporting period, what percent had another substantiated or indicated report within a six month period? 1C. Incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care: Of all children in foster care in the State during the period under review, what percent were the subjects of substantiated or indicated maltreatment by a foster parent or facility staff?	1B. Recurrence of maltreatment: Of all children who had a substantiated report of maltreatment, what percent had a subsequent substantiated report and did it occur within 3, 6, 12, or 24 months? Separate report for recurrence after first substantiated referral.	1D. Incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care: Same as 1C, but adjusted for time in care and type of placement. 1E. Rate of abuse and/or neglect following permanency: Percent of children with allegation/ substantiated report of abuse or neglect, within 12 months following permanency (guardianship, kingap, reunification).*	

Safety Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
2. Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.	2A: Recurrence of abuse/neglect in homes where children were not removed: Percent of children with an allegation (inconclusive or substantiated) who were not removed and whose next event was a substantiated allegation. • Subsequent substantiated allegation at 3, 6, 12 months (a) after initial report, and (b) after case closure • By inconclusive vs. substantiated initial allegation • By abuse type • By perpetrator • By receipt of ER and FM services ***2B: Child abuse and neglect referrals by time to investigation:*** • ***% of child abuse and neglect referrals that have resulted in an in-person investigation stratified by IR and 10-day referrals.***	2D. Recurrence of abuse/neglect in homes where children were not removed: Percent of children with an allegation (inconclusive or substantiated) who were not removed and whose next event was a substantiated allegation, by receipt of remedial and rehabilitative services that are culturally appropriate ***2E. Assessment of kin and non-related extended family member homes: % of children in homes that have not had an annual reassessment within 12 months of the initial assessment or latest reassessment.*** NOTE: 2E is pending CWS/CMS system change.	2F: Recurrence of abuse/neglect for at-risk children: Of "enrolled" (i.e., open case with circumstantial abuse/neglect), children & families receiving services, what percent went on to have a substantiated report/allegation? NOTE: 2F is contingent upon implementation of CWS Stakeholders differential response proposal, and defining and flagging "enrolled" children on CWS/CMS.

Safety Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
2. Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.		***2C: Social worker visits:*** ***Stratified by program type, and visits with child.*** • ***% of cases with monthly social worker visits.*** • ***% of cases with a valid visit exception.***	2C. Social worker Visits: Percent of children with an exception to monthly visits who have had a visit based on the exception related frequencies and social worker visits with parents and caregivers stratified by program type.	

Permanency Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
3. Children have permanency and stability in their living situations (State modification: without increasing reentry).	3B. Stability of foster care placement: Of all children who have been in foster care less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal, what percent had no more than two placement settings? 3D. Length of time to achieve adoption goal: Of all the children who exited foster care during the period under review to a finalized adoption, what percent exited care in less than 24 months from the time of latest removal from home? 3E. Length of time to achieve reunification: Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of the discharge from foster care, what percent were reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from the home? 3F. Foster care re-entries: Of all the children who entered care during the year under review, what percent re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode**?**	3A. Length of time to exit foster care: Of those children in an entry cohort, % exiting foster care over time* • % exiting to adoption • % exiting to Kin-GAP • % exiting to other guardianship • % exiting to reunification • % exiting to emancipation • % exiting to probation or incarceration • % exiting for other reasons • % still in care 3C. Multiple placements: Of those children in an entry cohort, % of those remaining in care with 3,4,5 or more placements over time. 3G. Foster care re-entries: Of children in an entry cohort, for those exiting to *reunification* , % who re-entered care over time, stratified by time in care.	3H. Foster care re-entries: Of children in an entry cohort, for those exiting to KinGAP, guardianship, or *adoption*, % who re-entered care within 12, 24 36, 48 and 60 months of a prior foster care episode.* ***3I: Timely court hearings:*** ***% of children who have had timely status review hearings, stratified by program type and age.*** 3C.Constellations, and reason for placement change. 3G. Foster Care Re-entries: Of children in an entry cohort, for those exiting to guardianship, % who re-entered care over time, stratified by time in care.	3J. Foster care re-entries: Note: need an enhancement to CWS/CMS to track severity of abuse allegation to access the severity of events that preceded re-entry

Permanency Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
4. The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.	4A. Sibling placements: For children in care, % placed with some or all of their siblings? stratified by placement type and sibling group size 4B. Use of least restrictive care settings: The placement facility type. • By initial placement • By primary placement • By point in time placement	4B.Distance from home of removal to placement NOTE: Dependent on CWS/CMS changes clarifying removal address issues and reconsideration of use of removal address or current address of family. 4C. Identification of Native American Heritage: % of children in out of home care identified as Native American within 1, 3, 6,12, or 24 months of removal. NOTE: Dependent on inclusion of date in CWS/CMS when county first learned of possible Native American Heritage.	

Permanency Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
4. The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.		. <u>4E. ICWA placement preferences:</u> Of those children identified as Native American: • % placed w/ extended family • % placed w/ other members of the child's Tribe • % placed w/ other Indian families • % placed w/ non-Indian families	**4D. <u>Notification to Tribes</u>: Of those children identified as Native Americans, % where Tribal notification occurred within 30, 60, or 90 days.** **NOTE: Dependent on inclusion of date in CWS/CMS on which the county first identified possible Native American Heritage.** ***<u>4F. Visitation between parents and children.</u> % of children who visit their parents. Stratify by program type and visitation frequency i.e., weekly, monthly.***	

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
5. Children receive adequate services to meet their physical, emotional and mental health needs.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.		5A. Health Information: Percent children in care more than 30 days with a Health Passport. 5B. Receipt of Health Screenings: Percent children in care with CHDP, dental exams, psychotropic medications, and immunizations that comply with periodicity table. NOTE: 5A and 5B dependent on CWS/CMS system changes to identify children who do not have health, medication needs in order to calculate the % who should have information on specific health factors. 5C. Receipt of mental health services among those referred: Percent of CWS children with mental health referrals who receive mental health services. Stratify by in-home versus out-of-home care. NOTE: Calculation dependent on clarification and revisions to CWS/CMS referral types.	5D. Prevention services: FM Children receive Health Passport and screenings. 5E. Receipt of mental health screening: Percent of children in care who received an initial mental health screening within 30 days of initial placement.

C-CFSR Outcomes and Indicators

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
6. Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.		6A. Education information: % in care more than 30 days with an Health Education Passport, and % in care more than 180 days with a complete HEP.* 6B. School stability, attendance: For children in out of home care for one or more school years*: • % with school change during year, and # of school changes • % of children with IEP., • % of children performing below grade level	6E. School performance: Percentage of children in care at grade level on standardized state tests (requires match to planned statewide education data); stratified by special and regular education (by entry cohort, age, and placement type).

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
			6C. School enrollment: • % of school aged children enrolled within 1, 2, 3, and 4 weeks or more of initial out-of-home placement % enrolled within 1, 2, 3, and 4 weeks of a placement change. NOTE: Dependent on improvement of mechanism to obtain information from schools and document it in CMS. 6D. School stability, attendance: • % with adequate (TBD) yearly attendance • # of school days missed • % in non-public schools • % of children enrolled in the same school • Of those children with an IEP, % who receive services **NOTE: 6D unavailable via CWS/CMS, and would require data match with education. May require MOU w/ CDE or statutory change.**	

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
7. Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.		7. Receipt of support services: Percentage of parents able to access and use support services identified in case plans, by case closure. NOTE: Post exit survey needed to access 7.	

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
8. Youth emancipating from foster care are prepared to transition to adulthood.		8A. Transition to self-sufficient adulthood: Of youth emancipating from foster care, the percentage *: • with High School diploma or GED • enrolled in college or higher education program • with receipt of ILP services • who completed a vocational training program • are employed or have other means of support NOTE: Data source for this measure is the County ILP report. This data is subject to the limitations of the data reporting form. RECONCILE THIS LIST W/ NATIONAL STANDARDS TO BE RELEASED BY ACF (ie, Chaffee requirements and probation)	***8B. Transition to self-sufficient adulthood: Of youth exiting from foster care, the percentage *:*** • ***with a legal emancipation hearing or termination of jurisdiction hearing.*** • ***with the documents required by AB 686*** ***8C. Self-sufficiency skills training: Of youth in foster care, who completed a Living Skills Assessment, the % who are identified as needing self sufficiency skills training.*** NOTE: 8C is contingent upon revision of Transitional Independent Living Plan form and changes to CWS/CMS.	8D. Probation or juvenile justice: Of youth in foster care, the percentage *: • who are on probation or incarcerated.* • who are transferred into the juvenile justice system. NOTE: This measure would require a data match the Department of Corrections.