

## Trends Analysis Committee Meeting Notes

### **Meeting held April 9, 2012, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. – Child and Family Services Administrative Building**

*In attendance:* Aude Bermond-Hamlet (State Office), Beverly Hart (Western), Brad Newbold (State Office), Carol Miller (State Office, by phone), Jared Stafford (State Office), Jeff Harrop (State Office), Judy Hull (State Office), Kevin Webb (Eastern), Jennifer Larson (State Office), Mary Wilder (Salt Lake Valley), Marty Shannon (State Office), Nancy Barowski (Northern), Sam Syphrett (Southwest; by phone), Vanessa Amburgey (State Office)

### General Information / Follow-Up from Last Meetings

Topic	Discussion	Decisions/Assignments
Annual Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linda was going to send an electronic version of the Annual Report to all members.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This has been fixed on the website.</li> </ul>
CPS QAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No decision has been made on how to make these reviews consistent on a statewide basis.</li> <li>Some regions are using the QAs in SAFE, but some are using a paper tool. Currently, the Quarterly Report shows only the completion of the CPS CPR QA, which varies greatly among regions. It was suggested to take out the measure of QAs performed in each region or to add a showing the completion of the QA flag in SAFE until a decision is made.</li> <li>This may change once SDM is implemented as supervisors will be required to sign-off on QAs.</li> <li>Neither Linda nor Marnie were in attendance in today's meeting to report on this item.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aude will add this to the next meeting's agenda.</li> </ul>
Primary Reason for Removal Categories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northern had many children in care for neglect, so the regional representatives were to find out information about who enters these data and what criteria are used within their region.</li> <li>Abandonment, parent relinquishment, parent condition/absent are duplicative, which makes it difficult for workers to select which one applies.</li> <li>Selection of adoption categories is also difficult to determine.</li> <li>Tanya and Vanessa are working together to determine what we need to report according to the federal reporting requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tanya, Vanessa, Marty, Aude, Kevin, and Jennifer will meet to discuss these categories and come up with definitions. Aude will invite Navina to attend the meeting.</li> </ul>

## Trends Analysis Committee Meeting Notes

Topic	Discussion	Decisions/Assignments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ungovernable cases are on the rise.</li> <li>• We will need to determine which primary reasons we want to keep and how they will be used.</li> <li>• Practice Guidelines are updated on a continual basis by the PPIT, but much of it is very old and needs to be reviewed for updates.</li> <li>• Regions gave reports on who enters this information.</li> <li>• Kevin said caseworkers enter the information in his region.</li> <li>• Bev stated that it is caseworkers in her region that enters this information. She questioned how the ungovernable category is being used.</li> <li>• Nancy reported that caseworkers are entering this information in their region, based on supported findings (with the exception of ungovernable).</li> <li>• Mary said they have a significant court piece for determining the category. Caseworkers enter the information.</li> <li>• Sam said that the foster care caseworkers are entering the information. They had three ungovernable cases in which the category seemed appropriate.</li> <li>• Aude suggested we form a subgroup to determine what categories we need and the definitions for those categories. We could then add a dropdown in SAFE to help caseworkers select the correct categories.</li> </ul>	
Kin Locators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judy was to prepare a proposal of how to track kinship information. Judy is still working on this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be addressed at the next meeting.</li> </ul>
Data Assignments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vanessa had several assignments from the last meeting. She is still working on these items</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• She will continue to work with Aude on these items.</li> </ul>
QCR Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After the debriefing and once case stories are received, scores on individual indicators have been coming down at an alarming rate. This item will be looked at over the summer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

## Trends Analysis Committee Meeting Notes

### Data from the Quarterly Report, 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter FY 2012 (Oct. to Dec. 2011)

Topic	Discussion	Decisions/Assignments
Unaccepted Referrals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Centralized Intake is having an effect on these data as it is now similar across the regions. Marnie is working with the regions on any troubles that the regions are experiencing due to Centralized Intake.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Number of New CPS Cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These are on the rise for the most recent quarter. Due to the changes in DVRCA, it was felt that we would decrease the number of new CPS cases but this is not the case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Timeliness of CPS Investigations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Every region has improved in their face-to-face contacts. We met the statewide goal!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Percent of CPS Investigations Supported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are now closer to the national average as we are supporting fewer cases. The reasons for this vary across regions. It is unclear what needs to be included in the "Other" category. This committee could decide how to break it down and make that recommendation to administration. It was suggested to break it out over time to better show the trends.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vanessa will provide the broken down data at the next meeting.</li> </ul>
Percent of Substantiated Victims Receiving Out-of-Home Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The trend is up, meaning more substantiated victims entering foster care. But this might be due to the fact that fewer allegations are supported.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Number of In-Home Cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are seeing a slight increase in these cases.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Supervisor Finishing Touches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an increase of how many of these reviews are being completed. Father involvement in foster care cases is a struggle, as seen in the SFT scores</li> <li>The SFT data should be cross-referenced with the QCR data.</li> <li>It appears that these SFT data are reported on a six-month basis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vanessa will check to see if these data are pulled quarterly.</li> </ul>
Number of SCF Open Cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Foster care cases are on the rise. These data trended downward for the last quarter, but data as of yesterday show a large increase. After a steady decrease from 2820 cases in fall of 2010 to about 2579 at the beginning of this year, we are now back up to almost 2700 cases. This means higher caseloads for workers. It's across all regions except SW.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Levels of care: Percent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eastern and Salt Lake Valley Regions have a higher percentage of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

## Trends Analysis Committee Meeting Notes

Topic	Discussion	Decisions/Assignments
of Youth in Placements by Structure Type	youth in Level IV and up placements. Western, Northern, and SW have around 30-32% of their kids in higher levels. SLV about 38% and Eastern 42%! Of course, one has to take the smaller number of Eastern cases into consideration.	
SCF Cases with a Supported CPS Case within 12 Months After Leaving Care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is trending downward.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Re-Entry Cases (Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification: Composite 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-Entry cases are on the rise again. That's re-entry of cases that were returned home or placed with relatives and closed. <b>Vanessa and Navina</b> are still working with the feds on the accuracy of this data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Aude and Vanessa</b> will compare these data from how the feds are pulling it to how we used to pull it (the old re-entry data measure), and this will be reviewed at the next meeting.</li> </ul>
Placement Stability (2 or fewer placements)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These data remain flat.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Number of Resource Families	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have dropped in the number of licensed foster parents. We can look at the exit survey information to see why foster parents are leaving.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The committee will look at exit survey information from the UFCF at the next meeting. <b>Tanya</b> will bring this information.</li> </ul>
Children Placed with a Relative for First Placement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Western Region has increased significantly in these data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Caseloads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These numbers are staying about the same (as of the end of the year, but this may be changed with the increased number of SCF cases).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

### Next Trends Analysis Committee Meeting

**June 11, 2012, 10am to 12pm**

**Child and Family Services Administrative Building**