Why focus on data?

Provides us the ability to:

• **Compare** metrics with agency mission and practice model
• **Connect** to evidence-based practice and link processes to desired outcomes
• **Target** and **Strategize** for improvements
• **Focus** on end outcomes
• **Identify** what needs attention
• **Tell** the story
Basic Terminology

**Process Measures** - familiar to staff, relevant at a caseworker level, current

“About 92% of children in care had a visit each and every month”

**Outcome Measures** - the “big picture” measure of system performance, especially when looked at longitudinally

“About 49% of children entering care for the first time will reunify within 12 months”
Prioritize Measures in line with Agency Values

• To keep children safe and at home
• To improve a child or youth’s well-being
• To facilitate a child or youth’s move to swift & certain permanency
Sacramento: Dashboard for Accountability

ER-Det
Structured Decision Making
Signs of Safety
Team Decision Making
Regionalization
Centralized Placement Supports Unit
RBS
Vertical Case Management
Concurrent Planning

Families experience continuity of workers
Clearly defined and consistently applied decision-making criteria
Partnership and collaboration with families; Individualized services
Community based services
Enhanced recruitment, retention and matching of relative and non-relative placements
Improved collaboration among staff
Early and aggressive identification of all permanency options; open and direct communication

Data Integrity and Staff Accountability
Safety
Timely response to new referrals
Timely completion of SDM tools
Permanency
Placement in region
Placement stability
Placement with relatives
Placement in Congregate Care
Placement with all or some siblings
Face-to Face Visits (worker/child)

Well-Being
Tracking of timely medical/dental appointments
Graduation rates
Additional well-being outcomes under discussion; including statewide measures for AB12

Improved Safety
Report rate and proportion referred
Recurrence of allegations
Recurrence of allegations after reunification
Entry rates (placement rates)
Re-entries into care after reunification

Increased Permanency
Likelihood and timeliness of permanency (reunification, adoption, guardianship) for new entries (at 6, 12, 24, 36 months or longer)
Permanency for children in care two years or more

Most outcomes are available by age and race/ethnicity
Connecting the Dots

Management Report: Frequency of Visits with Caretakers

Case Review Measure: Caregiver involvement in case planning

Case Review Measure: Individualized Services

Outcome Measure: Timely Reunifications

Process Data: Accountability Relevant to workers and supervisors

Intermediate Outcomes Relevant to workers, supervisors, managers

Outcomes: “So What?” Reflect Key Priorities of Leadership
CFSR Findings: Relationship of Well-Being to Permanency

**Positive ratings on**
- Services to children, parents, foster parents
- Involvement of parents in case planning
- Caseworker visits with children
- Caseworker visits with parents

**Substantial achievement on**
- Timely achievement of permanency
- Preserving children’s connections while in foster care

Factors Associated with Timely Reunification, Guardianship, and Permanent Relative Placement

The strongest associations with timely permanency included:

- Caseworker Visits with Parents
- Child’s Visits with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care
- Services to Children, Parents, & Foster Parents
- Family/Child Involvement in Case Planning
- ASFA Requirements Regarding Termination of Parental Rights
- Placement Stability

Strongest Associations Between Visits and Other Indicators

Both Caseworker Visits with Parents and Caseworker Visits with Children were strongly associated with:

- Risk of harm to children
- Needs & Services for children, parents, foster parents
- Child and parent involvement in case planning

Other Significant Associations Between Visits and Indicators

Caseworker Visits with Parents and Caseworker Visits with Children were also strongly associated with:

- Services to protect children at home
- Safety Outcome 1
- Safety Outcome 2
- Timely permanency goals
- Timely reunification
- Child’s visits with parents and siblings
- Relative placements
- Meeting educational needs
- Meeting physical health needs
- Meeting mental health needs

Telling the Story: Key Child Welfare Outcomes
Interdependence between measures...

Community Safety and Prevention of Maltreatment: Rate of Referrals/ Substantiated Referrals

Reentry to Care

Permanency Through Reunification, Adoption, or Guardianship

Shorter Lengths Of Stay

Stability Of Care

Counterbalanced Indicators of Overall System Performance

Use of Least Restrictive Form of Care

Maintain Positive Attachments To Family, Friends, and Neighbors

Home-Based Services vs. Out-of-Home Care
the current placement system* (highly simplified)

Foster Care Dynamics

The Dynamics of Entries and Exits: Sacramento County

- **Entries**
- **Exits**
- **Exits to Permanency**
- **# In Care**

Years: 2000 to 2012
So What’s the Story?
Describe the issue with as much detail as possible, variation is key to hypothesis development.

• What’s happening right now for all kids?
• Has it always been this way?
• Is it true in all places, for all ages, for all racial/ethnic groups?
• Is this indicator correlated with any others?
• Does it look the same for all types of cases, or in places where practice is different?
...if he had one hour to save the world he would spend 55 minutes defining the problem and only 5 minutes finding the solution.

Before jumping right into solving a problem
• Step back
• Invest time and effort
• Improve understanding

Improved Safety: Entry Rates

Entry rates have historically been much higher in Sacramento County than the rest of the state. After a period of consistent decline, entry rates in Sacramento are now similar to the overall state entry rate.
Use Data to Create Urgency for Action – Target improvements based on your own baseline

Regional variation should generate productive discussion about differences in:

• Service array
• Community differences in reporting and tolerance for “risk”
• Differences across partner agencies, courts, juvenile justice, behavioral health etc…
• Demographic risk factors and “case mix”
• Case loads, turnover (staff and leadership), and training
• A variety of other policy/practice differences
Improved Safety: Entry Rates

While also declining substantially, entry rates remain higher for African Americans and infants (<1) than for other children.
Absence of Repeat Maltreatment:

Sacramento has maintained performance on this measure while reducing entries into care.
Practice Discussion: Entries

• What are some of the practice or policy changes that have resulted in this decline in entries?
• Is the change sustainable?
• What strategies are in place/planned to maintain, or to continue to reduce entries into care?
CHILDREN IN CARE
PLACEMENT TYPE AND PLACEMENT STABILITY
Placement Type: Of all first entries, what percent are first placed with kin?

After improving for the past four reporting periods, performance in Sacramento dipped for children who entered care for the first time between July 2011 and June 2012.
Placement Type: Of all first entries, what percent are first placed with kin?

Kin placements across all ages and ethnicities have declined in the most recent time period. Latino children and those children ages 6 to 12 are most likely to have relative placements at the onset. The percent of African American children coming into care for the first time and placed with relatives has declined.
Another view: What proportion of all children in care are *currently* placed with kin?

A smaller and declining proportion of all children in care are currently placed with relatives in Sacramento. Relative placement is associated with better placement stability and permanency outcomes.
Placement stability has improved

Looks at children entering care for the first time who stay at least one year – what percent have only been in one or two placements?
Placement stability by age

Stability by Age In 1st or 2nd Placement at 1 Yr.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>JUL09-DEC09</th>
<th>OCT09-MAR10</th>
<th>JAN10-JUN10</th>
<th>APR10-SEP10</th>
<th>JUL10-DEC10</th>
<th>OCT10-MAR11</th>
<th>JAN11-JUN11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13+</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Placement stability by placement type

### Stability by First Placement Type In 1st or 2nd Placement at 1 Yr.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JUL09-DEC09</th>
<th>OCT09-MAR10</th>
<th>JAN10-JUN10</th>
<th>APR10-SEP10</th>
<th>JUL10-DEC10</th>
<th>OCT10-MAR11</th>
<th>JAN11-JUN11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Placement Kin</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Placement NOT Kin</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practice Discussion: Placement Type and Placement Stability

• How does placement type relate to placement stability?
• What practice/policy changes have had, or will have an impact on these indicators?
• How can we continue to improve support to kinship homes?
• What are some of the remaining barriers?
the view matters…

Source: Aron Shlonsky, University of Toronto (formerly at CSSR)
In Sacramento, 49% of all children who entered care for the first time between January 2011 and June, 2011 reunified within 12 months. Performance on this measure has been inconsistent. In the most recent reporting period, Sacramento exceeds the National standard and California performance. There are no clear differences by race/ethnicity.
Timely Reunification in Sacramento by Age at Entry

Infants are the least likely to reunify in 12 months, and children ages 6 to 12 are the most likely. There has been improvement for teens over the past few reporting periods.
Children whose first placement type is a group home or shelter are slightly more likely to reunify within 12 months. However, children who remain in group care may be less likely to exit to other forms of permanency.
Re-Entry after Reunification

The data indicate that re-entries were becoming more common among Latino children, this seems to have improved.

Teens have been more likely to re-enter care, but this has improved in recent reporting periods.
Permanency for new entries: Any permanent exit within 24 months

In the last period for which 24 months have passed, 77% of new entries in Sacramento achieved legal permanency within 24 months. This is slightly higher than the overall state performance.
While the overall proportion of exits to permanency within 24 months of entry does not vary substantially by race, there are differences in exit type. Latino children are more likely to be reunified.
Permanency for new entries: Guardianship in 24 months

While the overall proportion of exits to permanency within 24 months of entry does not vary substantially by race, there are differences in exit type. African American children are somewhat more likely to exit to guardianship.
Permanency for new entries: Adoption in 24 months

White children had been the most likely to exit to adoption within 24 months – African American children are now similar.
Permanency for children and youth already in care longer periods of time (at least 24 months)

Sacramento continues to improve on this measure and now exceeds statewide performance. Latino children exceed the National Standard for exits to permanency.

Most recently performance has declined for White children.

This measure focuses on children who have been in care at least two years and follows them for an additional year to see if they exit to legal permanency prior to achieving age 18.
Permanency: Permanency for children and youth already in care at least 24 months

The data indicate that performance has improved the most and is consistently better among children in kinship placements.

This measure focuses on children who have been in care at least two years and follows them for an additional year to see if they exit to legal permanency prior to achieving age 18.
Practice Discussion: Timely Permanency

• What practice/policy changes have had, or will have an impact on these indicators?
• What are some of the barriers?
Thank you!