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CCR Vision

• All children live with a committed, permanent and nurturing family with strong community connections

• Services and supports are individualized and coordinated across systems and children don’t have to have move from their homes in order to get the services they need

• When needed, congregate care is a short-term, high quality, intensive intervention that is designed to stabilize children in crisis and develop and implement and integrated plan for the child’s transition back home

• Effective accountability and transparency drives continuous quality improvement for state, county and providers
Key Strategies

• Child and Family Teams are central to case plan development, assessment, engagement, transition planning and to supporting stability when challenges arise
• Child-specific recruitment of foster homes and intensive family finding for every child lacking permanent connections
• Using wrap-around principles to build on strengths and proactively address the individualized needs of every child and family
• Limiting reliance on congregate care to circumstances when intensive therapeutic care and supervision are required on a short-term basis
• Using data and transparency to inform policy, identify challenges, and monitor performance and progress to drive continuous quality improvement
• Intensive multi-agency collaboration and partnership across state, county and private entities
Between January 1, 2018 and September 30, 2018, 22,291 children ages 0 – 20 entered foster care. Of these, 9,934 children (44.6%) had a Child and Family Team (CFT) meeting entered into CWS/CMS as a delivered service on or before November 30, 2018. ACL 16-84 states that a CFT meeting shall be convened within 60 days of a child or youth coming into foster care.
STRTP Implementation

- New licensing category and licensing standards (ILS v.3)
- New application template that ensures:
  - Detailed trauma-informed program model
  - Clearly defined access to all core services
  - Entrance criteria and intake processes align with statute (ACL 17-122)
  - Clear processes to avoid placement disruptions
  - County letter of support to promote mutual understanding of facility and county roles in meeting the needs of children (ACL 17-14)

- Inter-divisional approval process
  - Comprehensive review of program components incorporates CCR Branch, Community Care Licensing, Foster Care Audits and Rates, Office of Foster Care Ombudsperson
  - Close monitoring of the process, including the Mental Health Program Approval, in partnership with DHCS
Technical Assistance

• Ongoing regional meetings, orientations, webinars
• Non-admissions/7-Day Notices calls designed to address barriers to placement for youth with complex needs and/or minimize placement disruptions
• Qualitative Program Statement Reviews & Technical Assistance
  ➢ Program statement review process includes technical assistance calls between provider, county and CDSS
  ➢ Detailed feedback sent to provider to enable timely revisions
  ➢ Labor intensive process, however this level of engagement is essential and reflects the need to align understanding of how children will be cared for
The transition to the new STRTP model of residential care began during the latter part of 2017. This chart shows a modest decline in the number of youth placed into residential care at any point within the quarter with a growing proportion of youth residing in licensed STRTPs.
STRTP Applications

Percent STRTP and Group Home with a Placement on Dec. 31, 2018
- STRTP 26.91%
- Group Home 73.09%

Percent STRTP and Group Home with a Placement on June 30, 2018
- STRTP 15.16%
- Group Home 84.84%

Percent STRTP and Group Home with a Placement on December 31, 2017
- STRTP 11.30%
- Group Home 88.70%
Median LOS of Children in Group Home and STRTP Placements

**Median LOS of Children in Group Home and STRTP Placements (All), 2017-2018 (00_Statewide)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWS Q1</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS Q2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS Q3</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS Q4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS Q1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS Q2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS Q3</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Q1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Q2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Q3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of Overall Median LOS (Days) for each Facility Type broken down by Agency, Calendar Year Year and Quarter vs. County. Color shows details about Facility Type. Details are shown for County. The view is filtered on County and Agency. The County Filter keeps 00_Statewide. The Agency filter keeps CWS and Probation.
Congregate Care Placement Counts over Time, Point in time, 1/1/16 to 10/1/18
## STRTP Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Child Welfare Youth</th>
<th>Probation Youth²</th>
<th>Total Foster Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Licensed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>1,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to licensure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor changes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial revisions</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Be Assessed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in Process</strong></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Apply</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Not Applying</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ongoing Transition Planning

• AB 1811 (Chapter 35, Statutes of 2018) provided authority to continue extensions of Group Homes for child welfare placements through 2019.
  – Required child welfare agencies to submit detailed transition plans including child specific transition information (ACIN 1-79-18)
  – Developed In partnership with MHPs
  – Specify STRTPs and FFAs the county intends to place with
    • Critical to ensuring timely access to SMHS
    • Data driven – established average daily population for each county in each facility as a proxy for available capacity to that county
    • Being used to identify regional gaps in capacity
  – Ongoing work to assess child specific information
  – Identify ongoing gaps in “continuum of care”
Foster Families to Resource Families

Resource Family Approval:

- Related and non-related families
- Training for all families
- Resource Families still choose the role they play in the system: temporary or permanent
- Working toward permanency from the beginning to avoid duplicative assessments later
- Considers qualitative aspects of caregiving to assess for family strengths and needs
Number of Applications by Status and Percentage of All Applications that are Approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2017</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>1,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2017</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>2,401</td>
<td>2,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 2017</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>2,259</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>1,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2018</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2018</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2018</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>3,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Approved</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Q1 2017 to Q3 2018, RFA applications increased from 4,724 to 9,942 while RFA approvals increased from 413 to 3,828. RFA applications have increased by roughly 110% while approvals have increased by roughly 826% during the same period.
Number of RFHs Approved During Quarter and Average Days to Approval, 2017-2018

The trends of Approved RFHs and Avg Days to Approval for Date Quarter broken down by County. Color shows details about Approved RFHs and Avg Days to Approval. The data is filtered on County (Combined_Children_LOS (CCRIP_master_data)), which keeps 00_Statewide.
Days to Approval for Placements Prior to Approval

Days to Approval
for Placements Prior to Approval

194
187
182
158
146
156

Q1 2018  Q2 2018  Q3 2018

Median  Average
Child Welfare RFA Placements, Ages 0 to 17, By Quarter and Substitute Care Provider (SCP) Type
Dr. Denise Goodman

- Nationally known foster care expert specializing in recruitment, retention & support of resource families and reducing reliance on congregate care
- Providing regional 2-day Resource Family Recruitment trainings for recruitment, retention and support of resources families
- Working directly with 5-6 county child welfare and probation departments to provide onsite training of policy and practice related to recruitment, retention and support of resource families and other related areas based on county need for implementing CCR
- Supporting Resource Family Approval
- Technical assistance available for CDSS, county agencies, tribes & FFAs
- Getting through the RFA process- Spring 2019
- Expert technical assistance team for home-based placements
Trauma Informed Care

• STRTP licensure process requires basic TIC program design and familiarity

• ACIN 1-28-18 requires later submission of a comprehensive program statement template addressing TIC organizational practices, policies, internal supports for, and supervisory processes to address both primary and secondary forms of trauma

• CDSS is piloting a TIC baseline assessment tool (ARTIC) which will be followed by regional learning collaborative model trainings

• Both STRTPs and FFAs must submit program statement updates following the learning collaborative/technical assistance process
What’s ahead

• Completing STRTP transition process including Mental Health Program Approvals
• Monitoring GH closure/transition plans
• Full Level of Care rates protocol implementation
• Close monitoring of child specific transition plans to address gaps in the continuum
  – Revitalizing wrap-around
  – Child specific recruitment for ISFC
• New models of STRTP program design emerging as providers gain experience
• CCR dashboard phased rollout supports outcomes monitoring and implementation transparency
• CANS informed performance monitoring
• Family First Prevention Services Act (FFPSA)