

# Eckerd Sustainable Permanency Colorado Practice Guide 1.2



# Table of Contents

---

History of Eckerd Rapid Safety Feedback.....	3
Why the Sustainable Permanency Model?.....	5
Coaching & Mentoring .....	7
Completing the Sustainable Permanency Tool.....	8
Tips for Conducting Sustainable Permanency Review.....	10
Sustainable Permanency Review Questions.....	11
Scheduling Sustainable Permanency Coaching session.....	14
Sustainable Permanency Coaching sessions .....	15
Tips and Strategies for Successful Permanency Coaching sessions .....	17
Actions following the Coaching session.....	20
Tracking Action Tasks.....	21
Overdue Action Tasks/Accountability Coaching sessions.....	21
Interrater Reliability & Fidelity Reviews.....	21
Quarterly Review .....	22
Attachment A (Examples of Sustainable Permanency Communication).....	24
Attachment B (Core Competencies for Specialists and Supervisors).....	26
Attachment C (Sustainable Permanency Fidelity Checklist).....	28

---

# *History of Eckerd Rapid Safety Feedback*

---

## **Eckerd's Role in Child Welfare**

In Florida, the child welfare system utilizes a unique system of Community Based Care wherein the Florida Department of Children and Families contracts with 20 Community Based Care Lead Agencies that manage the child welfare system in each of the corresponding 20 Judicial Circuits. Eckerd is the Community Based Care Lead Agency in two Judicial Circuits which are comprised of three Florida Counties – Hillsborough, Pasco and Pinellas.

Eckerd manages child welfare services for a family from the time that a child protective investigator has reasonable cause for concern about a child's safety or wellbeing until case closure, whether that means the child is maintained in the home, is reunified with a parent, is adopted, or ages out of foster care. Eckerd subcontracts all of the direct case management and other services to local community partners.

Eckerd also manages a system of continuous quality assurance for all of its 60 operating programs through its headquarters in Clearwater. This allows for an unbiased approach to quality of care.

## **Eckerd Rapid Safety Feedback® History**

Eckerd, already the Community Based Care Lead Agency in Pasco and Pinellas Counties, competed to be and was selected to fulfill the same role in Hillsborough County in 2012, after that community experienced an unprecedented nine child deaths from maltreatment in less than three years in open cases actively receiving services from the prior lead agency. As Eckerd was preparing to assume responsibility for child welfare services in Hillsborough County, it was clear that an approach was needed that would stem the tide of child deaths in open cases.

To accomplish this task, Eckerd conducted a 100% review of the 1,500 open in-home and out-of-home child welfare cases in the county. Additionally, extensive research was conducted on the nine child death cases, including information from the Florida Death Review Coordinator and national child death review data sources. From this review, critical case practice issues were identified that, when completed to standard, could reduce the probability of serious injury or death. Among these case practices were quality safety planning, quality supervisory reviews, and the quality and frequency of home visits.

Now that Eckerd knew what common risk factors to look for, the next step was to determine which cases needed to be reviewed. Eckerd developed a profile of cases with the highest probability of serious child injury or death. These cases had multiple common factors: a child under the age of three, a paramour in the home, substance abuse/domestic violence history, and a parent who had previously been placed in foster care.

Eckerd also had to resolve the issue of lacking access to real time data. The Florida SACWIS system (the state child welfare data system) had limitations in its ability to provide real time data. Therefore, Eckerd contracted with Mindshare, its child welfare technology partner, to provide system overlay software that produces real time data and agency performance dashboards. This allows cases to be mined in real time for the common risk factors identified with cases that have a high risk of child tragedy or death.

## **How Eckerd Rapid Safety Feedback® Works**

Having identified the highest risk cases and the critical child welfare practices necessary to keep children safe, Eckerd launched its Rapid Safety Feedback process in Hillsborough County in January 2013. As part of this process, each of the high probability cases is reviewed by Eckerd quality assurance staff utilizing the Eckerd Rapid Safety Feedback® tool, which focuses on the nine critical case practices.

In the Hillsborough model, these cases are reviewed quarterly until case closure, removal of the children from the home, or when the youngest child turns three. If any safety concerns are identified during the review, Eckerd quality assurance staff meets with the case manager and supervisor within one business day to develop a plan to ensure any safety concerns are quickly mitigated, and to provide

immediate coaching and support for case management staff. Agreed upon tasks are then tracked to completion by Eckerd quality staff using an automated process that ensures accountability.

## Results of Eckerd Rapid Safety Feedback®

The results thus far are remarkable, demonstrated by comparison between baseline data and ongoing case reviews in Hillsborough County:

- 53% improvement in the sharing of critical case information among the various providers (mental health, substance abuse, domestic violence and others) that are assisting the family in the completion of their case plan. This information is used to document the extent of positive behavior change in the family, necessary to ensure child safety.
- 43% improvement in the effectiveness of supervisory reviews and follow-up by case managers on critical tasks that need to be completed, such as safety plans, home studies, and collateral contacts with case stakeholders.
- 33% improvement in the effectiveness of safety plans. For example, plans are more actionable, verifiable and less reliant on parental promises of changed behaviors.
- 24% improvement in the quality of the contacts that case managers have with the families and their children. For example, discussions are focused on real case issues and behavior changes the family is making.

## National Recognition

Eckerd Rapid Safety Feedback® is being recognized nationally for its promising results:

- Eckerd has been invited to present information about Eckerd Rapid Safety Feedback® by national child welfare entities such as Casey Family Programs, Child Welfare League of America and the National Association of Social Workers. In addition, the program has been noted in multiple publications.<sup>1</sup>
- Eckerd Rapid Safety Feedback® has been identified as a best practice by the Los Angeles County's Blue Ribbon Panel Commission on Child Protection.<sup>2</sup>
- Colorado State University is collaborating with Eckerd to potentially conduct an independent evaluation of this approach as it is being deployed in Colorado.

---

<sup>1</sup> John Kelly, "Los Angeles Eyes Florida's Child Fatality Prevention System," *The Chronicle of Social Change* 17 Sept. 2014. <https://chronicleofsocialchange.org/featured/los-angeles-eyes-floridas-child-fatality-prevention-system/8132>

John Kelly, "The Potential of Rapid Safety Feedback," *The Chronicle of Social Change* 18 Sept. 2014. <https://chronicleofsocialchange.org/youth-services-insider/the-potential-of-rapid-safety-feedback/8139>

"Editorial: A better way to protect children," *Tampa Bay Times* 24 Jan. 2014. <http://www.tampabay.com/opinion/editorials/editorial-a-better-way-to-protect-children/2162642>

<sup>2</sup> *The Road to Safety for Our Children: Final report of the LA County Blue Ribbon Commission on Child Protection 4 April, 2014.* [http://ceo.lacounty.gov/pdf/brc/BRCCP\\_Final\\_Report\\_April\\_18\\_2014.pdf](http://ceo.lacounty.gov/pdf/brc/BRCCP_Final_Report_April_18_2014.pdf) page 25.



## Innovation in Action



## *Why the Sustainable Permanency Model?*

There is no magical formula to prevent all child re-entries to the system of care; however, by using data to help determine which children are at the highest risk, we can maximize resources available to achieve the best permanency outcomes. The Sustainable Permanency process is an innovative data-informed approach to Quality Assurance. Most child welfare quality assurance systems have always worked under the same rule of thumb—completion of a retrospective file review after a critical incident or fatality. Case findings were often the same: appropriate case oversight was missing, case stakeholders and professionals involved with the family were not communicating effectively, and emerging dangers were not properly identified, to name a few. The Sustainable Permanency model provides a proactive approach to QA by changing the trajectory of a case and ultimately improving overall case practice. Reviews are completed in real time, which allows immediate feedback, so supportive coaching can occur increasing the opportunity for successful permanency outcomes. The review focuses on the most effective best practices, instead of traditional reviews with a large volume of questions which are equally weighed. Cases are not randomly chosen; in fact, Sustainable Permanency reviews target our system's highest risk population.

Each jurisdiction determines a problem they are working to mitigate using the Sustainable Permanency process. Eckerd works with each jurisdiction to create the problem statement based on unique needs including the timeliness of permanency, the reduction of children achieving permanency in months 12-24 and the prevention of children re-entering the system of care following reunification in the jurisdiction- this ultimately determines the sample for review.

### *The Colorado Problem Statement*

Colorado will use a rolling methodology to look at all children under age 17 who reunified from care with a parent and returned to care within 1 year

The Sustainable Permanency focused review is designed to address some known challenges in child welfare. A key decision-making flaw noted in retrospective reviews of child welfare fatalities is that front-line staff tend to have fixed ideas, or biases, of the family or case and have difficulty integrating new or conflicting information into their view of the family. Noted scholar, Eileen Munro, published on this tendency in her article, Common Errors of Reasoning in Child Protection Work:

*“The most striking and persistent criticism was that professionals were slow to revise their judgment despite a mounting body of evidence against them” and “professionals become absorbed in present day issues and fail to stand back and place current events into a longer term assessment of the family. This bias can be very powerful in preserving the current risk assessment by obscuring the pattern of behavior or the frequency with which small worrying incidents are happening.” She posited that “the crucial element in strategies to counteract bias is that they involve considering alternative perspectives.”<sup>3</sup>*

Part of the role of the Sustainable Permanency reviewer is to offer this alternative perspective, prompting conversations intended to challenge these biases.

During the Sustainable Permanency process, the Eckerd Quality Reviewer completes an independent file review and obtains a neutrally formed decision regarding the case. In fact, the premise of a Permanency Coaching session is a disagreement between the Quality reviewer and the case manager. This diminishes any natural tendencies toward consensus that might also occur as part of traditional case staffing. A Permanency Coaching session is scheduled with the case manager and supervisor only if opportunities for permanency practice improvement are identified during the case review process.

Dee Wilson wrote in the “January 2014 edition of The Sounding Board---Controlling Heuristic Biases”<sup>4</sup>: *“Caseworkers and supervisors may be unusually susceptible to heuristic or unconscious biases---they must make decisions regarding child safety quickly, often with inadequate information. Once caseworkers’ initial impressions regarding child safety develop into beliefs, confirmation bias ensures that these beliefs will be difficult to change.”*

The practice of challenging the deeply held notions of case managers and supervisors utilized in Permanency Coaching sessions is one way of improving child welfare practices to offset the susceptibility to bias described above.

Though the request to complete safety reviews was originally confined to Hillsborough County (Circuit 13) owing to a history of child tragedies under the previous lead agency, Eckerd expanded its reach into Pinellas & Pasco County (Circuit 6) effective July 1, 2013. This is based on the review’s initial success at reversing this trend and its value as a potential best practice as reported by CMOs and other stakeholders involved in the process.

---

<sup>3</sup> Eileen Munro “Common Errors of Reasoning in Child Protection Work” published in Child Abuse & Neglect, Vol. 23, No. 8, pp.745-758 1999

<sup>4</sup> Dee Wilson “Controlling Heuristic Biases” published in The Sounding Board, January 2014



# Coaching & Mentoring

---

A primary component of the ERSF and Sustainable Permanency models is mentoring and coaching child welfare professionals during the Permanency Coaching sessions process. Child welfare front-line staff and supervisors must constantly use critical decision-making skills as they face the complex needs and issues of the families they serve. “Implementation science researchers claim that ‘human services are far more complex than any other industry’ (Fixsen, Blasé, Naoom, & Wallace, 2009, p.531).”<sup>5</sup> It is important to keep in mind that rather than in industrial fields where a system change is a new policy or practice, “the practitioner is the focus of the change itself.” (Fixsen, et al., 2009). “Evidence-based practices and programs inform when and how they interact with consumers and stakeholders, but it is the person (the practitioner) who delivers the intervention through his or her words and actions.”<sup>6</sup> Through direct interaction with the practitioners themselves, the Sustainable Permanency quality reviewer is able to influence this change.

Child welfare staff need advanced critical decision-making skills that cannot be taught in a one-time training. According to the National Implementation Research Network, “most skills needed by successful practitioners can be introduced in training but are really learned on the job with the help of a *coach*. Coaches not only expand the knowledge and skills taught in training, they also impart craft knowledge.” (“Coaching: NIRN Project Site”). The Sustainable Permanency model allows for ongoing coaching for child welfare staff to develop these skills. When the case is staffed between Quality and the child welfare worker and supervisor, the coaching benefits are twofold. First, the quality staff provide case-specific coaching directly to the front-line worker, guiding them to develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills, as well as devise action items that can immediately change the trajectory of a case with regards to the best permanency outcomes for the children the agency is tasked to protect. This is done by asking open-ended questions and allowing the child welfare workers the opportunity to communicate thoughts and ideas with real-time feedback and guidance. The second coaching benefit is that the Quality staff are also able to model for the child welfare supervisors how to effectively coach their own staff to achieve these outcomes. By providing coaching to both the front-line and supervisory child welfare staff, the Quality reviewer and supervisor help to reinforce ideas and skills that have been introduced in trainings, which helps the workforce maximize retention and ongoing practice of these skills, as demonstrated by the table below (from Fixsen, et al., 2009).<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> The Coaching Toolkit for Child Welfare, Northern California Training Academy, 2012

<sup>6</sup> “Coaching: NIRN Project Site.” <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/learn-implementation/implementation-drivers/coaching>. National Implementation Research Network. Web.

<sup>7</sup> D. L. Fixsen, K. Blase, M. Duda, S. Naoom, & F. Wallace, published in “Core Implementation Components. *Research on Social Work Practice*, V19, pp. 531–540, 2009

TRAINING COMPONENTS	OUTCOMES % of Participants who Demonstrate Knowledge, Demonstrate New Skills in a Training Setting, and Use new Skills in the Classroom		
	Knowledge	Skill Demonstration	Use in the Classroom
Theory and Discussion	10%	5%	0%
...+Demonstration in Training	30%	20%	0%
...+ Practice & Feedback in Training	60%	60%	5%
...+ Coaching in Classroom	95%	95%	95%

—Joyce and Showers, 2002

According to the Coaching Toolkit for Child Welfare Practice, “a key adult learning strategy is the act of reflection. Reflection or self-inquiry is based on the belief that learners can improve by consciously and systematically reflecting on their work performance.” (“The Coaching Toolkit for Child Welfare Practice” 78). “Ziskin likened clinical practice (one shot training) to learning how to play golf in a dense fog. Hitting the ball has some feeling and immediate effect, but there is no reliable information to help correct the drive. One could labor for years on a fog-bound driving range without demonstrating any improvement in actual golfing skill.” (“The Coaching Toolkit for Child Welfare Practice” 29). Likewise, within the child welfare system, lasting improvements cannot be made in case practice without taking the time to sit down in a coaching environment and analyzing one’s casework with a critical eye. The Sustainable Permanency model provides the opportunity for the front-line worker and supervisor to take the time and be challenged to think more critically about their own work, with the intent of making long-lasting improvements in individual case practice.

### *Some Guidance for Coaching and Mentoring in Social Services Field*

- Coaching is most successful when it is voluntary
- Coaching is best when it is separated from supervision and/or performance evaluation.
- Coaching is an ongoing process that requires time; learners must be able to spend time in the learning process.
- Coaching requires an atmosphere of trust and experimentation and a strengths-based learning environment that encourages growth.
- Coaching increases success in the organization. Coaching an individual social worker improves job performance and development while profoundly impacting the success of the child welfare organization. (“The Coaching Toolkit for Child Welfare Practice” 9)

## *The Process: Completing the Review Tool*

Cases will be identified for review using the Mindshare prediction distribution listing and will be prioritized according to probability of achieving the desired successful outcome. Ideally, the initial review of a case should be within 6 months of the case opening. The Sustainable Permanency Coach completes a review of the current case, using the brief permanency practice-focused review tool. As part of the review process, all prior investigations/intakes to encompass all members of the household, including investigative summaries and narrative



logs; any Case Management and/or Service Provider records including any prior removal episodes; Supervisory review notes and guidance. Any other available documentation necessary to determine sufficiency of casework with regard to the domains on the case review tool.

The Sustainable Permanency Reviewer will continue to follow the case as long as it remains open and will complete a subsequent permanency reviews quarterly until case closure or until a change of goal occurs. The subsequent reviews focus on activities which have occurred since the prior review and may result in subsequent Permanency Coaching sessions, should additional questions arise or opportunities to enhance permanency practice are identified.

When a case is selected within the Prediction Distribution, the Child Trace Utility (commonly referred to as the “Victim Page”) will open. Basic case information is obtained from the case and documented on the Permanency review tool. This includes:

### **Child Demographics**

- This information is prepopulated by Mindshare

### **Case Details**

- **Types and number of current & previous alleged maltreatments**
  - This information is prepopulated by Mindshare.

### **Fidelity Events**

- Fidelity events are used to document completion of activities related to fidelity to the model, including case reviews, coaching sessions, and accountability sessions
  - When a case is assigned for review in the Mindshare system, review events will automatically populate
  - Additional events should be created by the reviewer to correspond with additional fidelity activities, such as a coaching session or accountability session as needed
  - In order to enter a case review survey, there must be a “Review” fidelity event active with no completion date. The completion date will automatically populate when the survey is entered

### **Entering a Survey**

- In order to enter a case review survey, the reviewer should locate the fidelity events section on the individual Child Work Sheet and click on the initial review. The initial review will become highlighted grey and the survey button will appear green and be available for selection. Click on the survey button and the survey will pop up.

- The survey is intended to guide the staffing discussion, so the reviewer should include sufficient comments to justify the rating, including any concerns identified, or what additional information is needed to make a determination of child safety. A question should not be marked “no” if the concern has already been resolved (e.g. if the initial contact was not completed timely, but all case participants ultimately were seen prior to the case review), as there would be no need to conduct a staffing and develop an action plan.

## *Tips for Conducting Sustainable Permanency Review*

---

### **Case Review**

- When reviewing case history, it is important to identify trends and themes, such as patterns of similar allegations, or allegations escalating in severity. Look out for historical concerns that could impact the family today, such as mental health, substance use, domestic violence or past perpetrators. Also make note of people previously involved who may be able to provide information now, such as family, friends, and service providers.
- All reviewers over time develop a particular process for how to most efficiently review current and historical information. Some read chronologically starting at the earliest report, while some read the current report first and then read priors. Try a few different techniques to determine what works best for you.
- When reading the current case it is beneficial to take notes of case specifics that will help you complete the survey. That being said, extensive note taking can be very time-consuming; focusing on key factors in the case will save time.

### **Review Documentation**

- Document strengths that are specific to the case and include detailed descriptions of key caseworker or supervisor actions. This will be helpful in your preparation for the coaching session or emailing to inform a supervisor no coaching session is needed.
- Make note of strengths as you are reviewing the case file, rather than waiting until the end. It can be difficult to remember specific strengths at the end of reading a case, particularly when overall casework needs improvement.
- The section for opportunities for improvement is intended to be a parking lot for non-safety-related suggestions, such as those relating to wellbeing. Ensure that safety-related and permanency-related opportunities are captured only within the Permanency Review survey.

- Not every review must have identified opportunities for improvement. Use this section sparingly; only note items that, while outside of the scope of the Permanency review, are of significant importance for the child (e.g. an identification that a child needs glasses with no documented resolution).
- While it is not required by the model to enter a comment justifying a “yes” response, there are benefits to doing so. Being reminded of your previous thinking saves you time when completing an ongoing review of the case. Comments also help your supervisor or other person reading the survey understand how you determined your rating.

## *Sustainable Permanency Review Questions*

---

1. Does the current case manager demonstrate a sufficient understanding of both significant milestones and recent progress?

*Considerations:* the reviewer must determine:

- Whether case decisions and actions reflect the case worker’s knowledge of the family’s history and current circumstances.
- Whether an assessment of readiness for reunification was completed and considered; or whether there was a plan developed using a family engagement meeting.
- Has the case manager addressed the appropriateness of the current permanency goal in court reports, family engagement meetings, etc.?

2. Are face-to-face contacts conducted with the child’s parents/caregivers with sufficient urgency and frequency to assess the status of the reunification and to engage them in safety and case planning?

*Considerations:* The reviewer must determine:

- Whether the quality of contacts were sufficient to ascertain and respond to known threats and emerging dangers.
- Whether the quantity of contacts were sufficient to ascertain and respond to known threats and emerging dangers.

3. Are sufficient services and supports provided to the child to address the effects of trauma from removal itself as well as stressors associated with returning home?

*Considerations:* The reviewer must determine:

- Whether the child received trauma-informed services/placements for his/her behavioral and/or mental health needs.
- Whether measurable treatment goals were noted for each service provided and lack of progress toward the goals was addressed.
- Whether frequent and meaningful contacts are being made between the worker and the child to gather input from the child on the state of the reunification.
- Whether the child’s informal support system was engaged as appropriate.

4. Are sufficient services and supports provided to assist the parents during the transition to reunification?

*Considerations:* The reviewer must determine:

- Whether parents are actively engaged (or have a plan to be actively engaged) in intensive, in-home services at critical junctures to address behavior and underlying conditions impacting child safety and parent protective capacity.
- Whether parents are continuously linked to agencies offering concrete supportive services, especially housing and financial assistance, if needed.
- Whether the parent's ongoing substance abuse and/or mental health treatment is being adequately addressed and documented during the reunification process.
- Whether parents are being assisted with strengthening their social support networks including extended family, former child caregivers, etc. to improve family functioning, and increase family stability.
- Were parents connected to respite services, if available and appropriate?

5. Is the visitation/contact between the parent and the child of sufficient frequency and quality to promote an ongoing relationship?

*Considerations:* The reviewer must determine:

- Whether the case manager continually ensures the parent and child have frequent visits. Multiple forms of contact can be taken into consideration, such as supervised visitation, video visitation, letters, and phone calls, as appropriate.
- Whether the visit is of sufficient quality, taking into consideration location, duration, activities, supervision, court restrictions, and whether the parent was provided the opportunity to build and/or demonstrate parenting skills, etc.
- Supportive feedback is provided promptly to the parent regarding visit observations.
- Whether the case manager continually ensures the siblings have frequent visits. Multiple forms of contact can be taken into consideration, such as face to face visitation, video visitation, letters, and phone calls, as appropriate.

6. Is the parent's ongoing behavior change sufficiently demonstrated related to known dangers?

*Considerations:* The reviewer must determine:

- Whether the case manager regularly observes and documents behavior change
- Whether the case manager routinely obtains input from collateral contacts documenting the parent's behavior change.

7. Are safety concerns sufficiently addressed?

*Considerations:* The reviewer must determine:

- Are there any key areas of assessment missing?
- Are there any known safety issues that are unmitigated?
- Are the safety planning and safety actions sufficient to address the mitigating issues such as missing background checks, prior history implications, etc.?

8. Are communication and coordination with other parties sufficient to make informed decisions and respond to known threats and emerging dangers?

*Considerations:* The reviewer must determine:

- Whether multidisciplinary teams met (either formally or informally) to identify plans for known threats and emerging dangers.
- Whether family team meetings are being held to maximize the use of all the resources and strengths of the family, and their supports, and service providers.
- Whether case stakeholders such as foster parents, other caregivers, court advocate and service providers input regularly sought and considered in decision-making.
- Whether conflicting stakeholder reports of case events/progress are sufficiently reconciled.

9. Do supervisory consultations guide permanency planning and case decision-making, as well as identify and address gaps in the areas captured in the above eight questions, through provision of coaching? Is accountability to guidance ensured?

*Considerations:* The reviewer must determine:

- Whether the supervisor provided consultation to the worker in creating the transition plan prior to reunification.
- Whether consultation continued on an ongoing basis during supervisor and manager staffings in order to address known threats and emerging dangers and aid in case decision-making.
- Whether the components of each of the eight prior questions are clearly being addressed, and timely and appropriate coaching/mentoring is provided to address any gaps.
- Whether accountability was ensured to completion for all guidance given.

## *Additional Information Captured in the Survey*

---

- **Summary of Noted Strengths**

- Strengths observed in case practice are documented in this section
- Strengths should be comprehensive and case-specific

- **Summary of Opportunities for Improvement**

- Non-safety-related casework areas that need strengthening, unrelated to the nine areas on the Permanency Review tool are documented in this section. These are not required in all cases, but rather on an “as needed” basis

## *Scheduling the Permanency Coaching Session*

---

After the Quality Reviewer completes the review, the case is debriefed with the Quality Review Supervisor. During this debriefing, the Quality Reviewer provides the rating rationale for each permanency question. Additional case information such as the family composition, reason for involvement with the child protection system, status of parental behavioral change (or lack thereof) is also discussed. If no opportunities for improved permanency practice are identified, the Quality Review Supervisor sends an email to the caseworker, the caseworker's supervisor, the program administrator, and any other parties designated by county administration. The email should be congratulatory for the quality of casework and documentation and should include strengths observed in the case review as well as any identified opportunities for improvement.

If concerns regarding permanency are identified or if the case file does not contain sufficient information to determine if permanency concerns are present, a Permanency Coaching session is scheduled. It should be noted that historical insufficiency of documentation that has already been resolved does not require a Permanency Coaching session; there is no need to meet about a case that does not contain any permanency concerns, even if one was previously present during the documentation reviewed. The Permanency Coaching session is scheduled between the quality team (Quality Review Supervisor and the Quality Reviewer who reviewed the case) and the caseworker and the caseworker's direct supervisor. It is important for the social work staff to feel comfortable speaking candidly and engaging in the coaching process. For this reason, leadership should not attend this coaching session, as their presence may appear punitive.

The Permanency Coaching session should be held based upon the availability of the caseworker, unless safety issues are present. These Permanency Coaching sessions may occur via phone, which expedites the coordination of all parties coming together; however, it is recommended these Permanency Coaching sessions occur face to face when possible or through the use of other technology.

To schedule a Permanency Coaching session, the Quality Review Supervisor contacts the caseworker's direct supervisor to determine the availability of both the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor. If the caseworker is unavailable then the caseworker's direct supervisor may participate alone; however, if the supervisor (or someone in leadership who has knowledge of the case) is unavailable the Permanency Coaching session should be scheduled accordingly. Permanency Coaching sessions should not occur with only Quality staff and the caseworker.

When contacting caseworkers and caseworkers' direct supervisor to schedule Permanency Coaching sessions, ensure:

- The objective of the Permanency Coaching session is clearly explained.
- Your tone is upbeat so the message that a Permanency Coaching session is needed is understood but won't likely create a defensive response or cause them to put up barriers. Never should your tone be accusatory or imply they did something wrong. Some successful techniques are as follows:



- Inform caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor that you have a couple of questions regarding the case that you would like to discuss with them.
- Let the caseworker's direct supervisor know their input is invaluable and you are looking forward to having a detailed conversation with them during the coaching session.
- You are respectful of their time and schedule.

Once the coaching session is scheduled, the Quality Review Supervisor and Quality Review Coach will meet or call the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor at the agreed date and time and location (if an in-person coaching session is possible).

## *The Permanency Coaching Session*

---

The **goals** of the Permanency Coaching session are:

- Mitigate permanency concerns in cases with a high probability of meeting problem statement criteria through communication and joint development of an action plan.
- Child Welfare staff to utilize the feedback provided by Quality Review Staff to allow for case practice change in real time.
- Quality Review staff to convey understanding of best practices to achieve sustainable permanency, and provide mentoring, coaching and support to child welfare staff. The field staff should leave the coaching session feeling supported and part of a team.

In service of these goals, the Permanency Coaching session uses a four-step process.

- 1) Debrief any permanency concerns and/or emerging concerns with the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor
- 2) Develop a plan to strengthen casework permanency practices.
- 3) Identify who will be responsible for action tasks and assign timeframes for resolution
- 4) Provide positive feedback regarding case strengths, as well as discuss case concerns and opportunities for improvement.

This process is not intended to be linear. Rather, positive feedback can be given before launching into potential permanency concerns. That being said, every coaching session should cover all four steps.

Oftentimes the initial contact between the field staff and the Quality Review team to discuss a case is met with challenges. Caseworkers may feel the Quality Review team is trying to catch them doing something wrong. The role of the Quality Review team is to ease the anxiety so the caseworker feels free to openly discuss the case. To accomplish this, a short dialogue with the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor is recommended prior to beginning the coaching session. This can range from discussing their day to discussing the weather, or even upcoming vacation plans, etc. Please be aware of your audience when engaging in this type of conversation and tailor its length and content appropriately.

The Permanency Coaching session should be strength-based and the Quality Reviewer should always begin the coaching session discussing the good case practice observed. There is rarely an occasion when no case strengths can be identified. By initially discussing the strengths, the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor are made to feel their work is appreciated and valued, which ultimately builds ongoing rapport. However, the focus of why the coaching session is occurring must remain paramount—to address identified potential permanency concerns with best practice. Asking open ended questions to the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor is the ideal method for engagement and to determine if permanency concerns truly exist.

Examples of open ended questions relating to unaddressed quality of parental visits with the children identified during a review are provided below:

- What can you tell me about the quality of the visits the mother and father are having with the children?
- Tell me about how the mother interacts with the children during her visitation?
- How can we capture the progress the father has made in his ability to parent the children during visitation?

If the caseworker and/or caseworker's direct supervisor cannot verbalize how the quality of visitation is being addressed, the Quality Reviewer should elicit a discussion of what can be done to ensure the quality of visitation is observed and documented. This is the point when the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor are encouraged to come up with some intervention strategies. It is important for the Quality Reviewer to allow this process to occur. Often, this results in an awkward, but necessary silence. This struggle is welcome and important, for it is only through this activity that growth and learning occur. In fact, it typically also results in tasks that are more actionable and specific as the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor have comparatively greater knowledge of family circumstances. Only as a last resort, if the caseworker and/or caseworker's direct supervisor can't develop any strategies, the Quality Reviewer can make some suggestions. Once the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor are in agreement with the feedback provided from the Quality Reviewer, a plan to execute the

intervention is developed. The Quality Reviewer provides the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor with the opportunity to determine the timeframe of when they will meet with the family to begin implementing the permanency best practices (action task) agreed upon, keeping in mind timeframes for completion of action tasks recommended by the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor must be urgent to mitigate all permanency concerns. If these timeframes are not sufficient, the Quality Reviewer will explain why tighter timeframes are needed and will assign earlier timeframes.

In some cases the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor may not have the same concerns as the Quality Reviewer; but the Quality Reviewer should be able to clearly communicate the rationale for assigning the task. Action tasks assigned should be directly related to permanency concerns identified in the review and from discussion with the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor.

Some examples of permanency related action tasks include:

- Obtain progress notes from child's therapist and treatment recommendation regarding the child's mental health diagnosis.
- Refer parents to an appropriate in-home program to prepare the family for reunification.

If it is determined during the coaching session that a permanency concern or question receiving a "No" response on the tool has already been resolved independently of the coaching and documentation can be provided to the reviewer promptly, no action item is needed, and the tool may be updated to reflect a "Yes" response.

## *Tips & Strategies for Successful Permanency Coaching Sessions*

---

### **Provide an introduction:**

Case Management staff will likely be nervous at their first coaching session, and this is the review team's opportunity to set them at ease and highlight the collaborative nature of the process. Below is an example of an introduction to give to staff at the beginning of their first coaching session. Even though it is written as a script, do your best to keep it light, friendly, and conversational. Don't be afraid to use appropriate humor to help ease any tension they may be feeling. This introduction will set the course of their initial coaching session and likely their perceptions of Sustainable Permanency as a whole, so it is important to make a positive first impression. This introduction can be abridged for staff who have participated in coaching sessions before. An example of this is also included below.

- Caseworker's first coaching session:

“Thank you for taking the time to meet with us today. Have you had a Sustainable Permanency coaching session before?”

Okay, well let me give you a little bit of history, so you understand the purpose of what are doing here. Sustainable Permanency was developed to try to prevent the reentry of children to the system of care after being reunified with their parents. We use historical information from our SACWIS system to determine the similarity of a child to children who are most likely to reunify and then re-enter foster care; then we review the case using a very short review tool that focuses on permanency best practices. After the review, if we have questions or need some clarification, we have a quick coaching session so we can talk about the case. Please don’t be nervous – this doesn’t mean that you did anything wrong, only that we had a few things we weren’t super clear on.

During the coaching session, if the team thinks that additional steps are needed to address any concerns with permanency, we will help you develop a plan. Our role is to provide a second set of eyes and an outside perspective on the case, but you are the experts on the family and the resources in your area, so the coaching session is definitely a team effort. You can pick the due dates for the action items, since you know what your workload is like and what will be realistic, but if we think something is a little more urgent, we will ask for a shorter timeframe.

After the coaching session is over, we’ll send you an email with the action items and timeframes we discussed. Please let us know when things get completed and documented so we can mark them off in our system. If you run into any barriers, just let us know and we can help you brainstorm a way around them or come up with a new plan. We can extend the timeframes if needed unless there is a safety concern.

Do you have any questions before we get started?”

■ Abridged version:

“Thank you for meeting with us today. We just had a few quick questions from our review and we really appreciate you taking the time to sit down with us and talk about it.

Just a reminder, during the coaching session, if the team thinks that additional steps are needed to address any concerns with permanency, we will help you develop a plan and pick some realistic timeframes to get them done. And, as always, we will send you an email afterward with the action items and timeframes we discussed. Please let us know when things get completed and documented so we can mark them off. If you run into any barriers, just let us know and we can help you brainstorm a way around them or come up with a new plan. We can extend the timeframes if needed unless there is a concern with safety.

Do you have any questions before we get started?”

**Be prepared:**

- Be familiar with the case including all prior involvement with the child welfare system and previous investigations.
- Have notes readily available during the coaching session to refer to.
- Write down questions or permanency concerns you want to address with the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor.
- Ask for clarification if you don't understand something happening in the case.
- Begin each coaching session with a case-specific strength and identify additional strengths throughout the coaching session. Highlighting the strengths validates the casework and helps foster a comfortable and collaborative environment.

### **Listen:**

- The caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor are the best resources of information on the family so listen thoroughly as they discuss their experience with the family.
- Encourage the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor to tell the "family's story."
- Let the caseworker and caseworker's direct supervisor come up with solutions and interventions for the family.

### **Be Assertive, but Non-Judgmental**

- The Quality Review Supervisor should be in control of the coaching session, but not too "authoritarian."
- The Quality Review Supervisor should be able to handle different personality types and behaviors.
- Don't be afraid of silence; the use of strategic silences can be very effective in strengthening a point or in eliciting descriptive responses and/or action items from a reticent caseworker.
- If resistance is detected, exploring barriers and planning actions to overcome them during the coaching session may be beneficial.
- If the quality team and social work team cannot agree on a sufficient plan to address any permanency concern, the Quality Review Supervisor has an obligation to stop the coaching session and elevate it for conflict resolution.

### **Be Professional**

- Sustainable Permanency Coaching sessions can get contentious and make you feel uncomfortable; however, there should never be a power struggle between the quality team and district office staff - you will receive better results by remaining respectful of others' views.

### **Use Open-Ended Questions to Elicit Information**

- Tell me about...
- How did you come to the conclusion...
- How could we verify...

- Who could provide further information on...
- What would be another way to...
- Help me understand...
- What are your concerns about...
- What would it take...
- What is the plan for...
- What would be a different way to...
- “Why” questions can be useful in gathering factual information (such as “Why did the parent stop attending services prior to completion), but use with caution; some “why” questions may come across as accusatory, as described below.
- How could we reconcile...

### **Avoid Questions Which May Inhibit Discussion**

- Yes/No questions discourage thoughtful explanations
- “Did you...” or “Why didn’t you...” may put people on the defensive
- Avoid “why” questions which focus on the worker’s motivations and rationales (such as “Why didn’t you complete weekly visits with the family?”)
- It is not recommended to ask questions using the past tense as this can put the worker on the defensive. Instead using present or future tense questions is recommended. This emphasizes that we are collectively looking for opportunities to change the case’s trajectory.

## *Actions Following the Permanency Coaching session*

---

Following the Sustainable Permanency coaching session, the Quality Reviewer will document the action steps in the Sustainable Permanency dashboard. (Access to the dashboard is found in Mindshare.)

- A summary of the action items and due dates will be sent via email by the Quality Reviewer to the case manager and any other parties designated by the jurisdiction. This email should be sent the day of the coaching session.
  - The Quality Review Supervisor will document the coaching session in a designated secure database. *What is documented?*
    - The name and title of the persons attending the coaching session, which at a minimum should be the Quality Review Supervisor and Quality Reviewer, caseworker and caseworker’s direct supervisor



- Brief summary of permanency concerns/safety concerns/emerging dangers
- What mutually agreed action tasks were assigned
- The due dates of the action tasks.

The follow-up to the Sustainable Permanency coaching session is just as important as the coaching session itself. It is vital to ensure that agreed upon tasks are completed within the timeframe assigned.

## *Tracking Sustainable Permanency Action Tasks*

---

The Quality Reviewer is responsible for tracking the completion of assigned action steps. Mindshare has a feature which can send automated “Action Task Reminders” to the assigned caseworker and caseworker’s direct supervisor once an assigned task becomes overdue. During the coaching session, the caseworker is asked to inform the Quality Reviewer when the assigned task(s) are complete. If the caseworker is unable to complete the action task(s) by the assigned due date, they are encouraged to communicate any barriers with the Quality Reviewer. The Quality Reviewer has discretion to extend the due date if warranted.

Once the caseworker informs the Quality Reviewer a task is complete, the Quality Reviewer verifies the completion of the task in the case file. Once verification has been made, the Sustainable Permanency Dashboard is updated to reflect the task is complete.

## *Overdue Action Tasks/Accountability Staffing*

---

The Quality Reviewer should make every effort to follow up with the caseworker and/or the caseworker’s direct supervisor if an action task has not been completed by the assigned due date. If an attempt to have an overdue action task completed cannot be resolved, an accountability staffing will be scheduled with the director of quality and the caseworker’s program director. The purpose of the accountability staffing is to discuss the barriers in the completion of assigned action tasks, determine an explanation of what caused the delay, and to create an action plan to prevent a recurrence for the agency.

The tone used during Accountability Staffings is deliberately sharp and the opposite of a Sustainable Permanency Coaching session. It is imperative that district office staff understand that sustainable permanency for the child is paramount and a justification of why an action task has not been completed is necessary.

Sustainable Permanency scores are never used punitively; however repeat Accountability Staffings are a warning sign, and it is recommended that jurisdictions treat them as such.

# *Interrater Reliability & Fidelity Reviews*

---

It is critical to ensure interrater reliability is addressed so Sustainable Permanency review data will be of good quality. All Sustainable Permanency reviews are completed by a reviewer who has been certified by the local jurisdiction. The following interrater procedures/activities are implemented to ensure consistency among reviewers:

- Cases that are re-reviewed will be completed by alternating Quality Reviewers periodically.
- The entire Quality Review team will independently review multiple cases (3-5 are recommended quarterly) and compare findings (strengths and opportunities for improvement) for consistency. Eckerd fidelity reviewers can assist with facilitating this activity as needed during quarterly site visits.
- Eckerd will review and consult on Sustainable Permanency review results data on a quarterly basis.
- Once the process has become normalized (following 6 months of reviews) any large score fluctuations such as a 50% improvement in a single month by question or by unit should be viewed skeptically and verified through a secondary review.
- New reviewers should have a 5-10% case sample of their reviews checked by a more senior reviewer to check for scoring agreement and accuracy.
- Eckerd staff will review one case weekly for the first 8 weeks of implementation to ensure interrater reliability and will be available to observe one coaching session and one debriefing session for the same period.
- This will continue to be provided as needed following the initial 8-week period.

## *Quarterly Review of Sustainable Permanency Data*

---

Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) is vital for the success of the Sustainable Permanency process. In fact, feedback is “rapid” to staff in two ways. As described above, feedback is given to the front-line within 2 weeks on all case reviews. In addition, feedback is also given to management following the end of the quarter, in the form of trend identification and analysis. This is made possible by automated reports, which refresh daily, that reflect all reviews entered in the system. Sustainable Permanency data is reviewed and stratified by each question to evaluate trends, anomalies, areas in need of improvement and areas of high performance. Then in-person meetings are scheduled with agency leadership to develop a plan to improve performance. These meetings occur at the agency’s office. The agency is asked to address the areas where they are struggling. When positive trends are observed from a particular unit their performance is shared with all units so learning opportunities can be implemented. Lower

performing units are routinely paired with higher performing units so their system processes which have shown to be successful can be duplicated.

## Sample Quarterly Report:



### 2014-15 Quarter 3 (January 1, 2015-March 31, 2015) All CMO Eckerd Rapid Safety Feedback Review Summary

	# of Reviews	Applicable Questions	Unusable # Yes	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Question 8	Question 9	Qtr 3 Average 1/1/15-3/31/15	Qtr 2 Average 10/1/14-9/30/14	Qtr 1 Average 7/1/14-6/30/14
	28	180	112	92.91%	100%	90.26%	83.79%	96.2%	93.75%	83.47%	84.79%	83.03%	86.4%	86.2%	86.8%

	Total Cases Reviewed	Average
Unit 700	7	85.71%
Unit 760	5	100%
Unit 810	5	92.78%
Unit 830	13	92.84%
Unit 840	9	91.98%
Unit 890	5	91.43%
Unit 960	11	84.34%
Total	55	90.61%

ERSF QUESTIONS (All Units)	Qtr1 7/1/14-6/30/14	Qtr2 10/1/14-9/30/14	Qtr3 1/1/15-3/31/15
Question 1 - Is safety planning sufficient to risk?	87.23%	88.89%	91.07%
Question 2 - Is the case plan individualized for family's needs and related to known dangers?	100%	96.97%	100%
Question 3 - Is the parent's behavior change monitored related to these risks?	86.96%	100%	96.36%
Question 4 - Is the case manager aware if any emerging dangers? If so, are they followed up on urgently?	90.48%	85%	82.76%
Question 5 - Is the quality of contacts sufficient to ascertain and respond to known threats and emerging dangers?	89.36%	94.44%	96.3%
Question 6 - Is the quantity of contacts sufficient to ascertain and respond to known threats and emerging dangers?	87.23%	88.89%	92.73%
Question 7 - Are background checks/home studies sufficient and responded to appropriately?	88.89%	73.53%	83.67%
Question 8 - Is communication with the case stakeholders sufficient to the known dangers and to ascertain if emerging dangers are present (Court, Providers, Collaterals etc.)?	62.16%	65.71%	66.79%
Question 9 - Is Does supervision identify concerns in service provision related to all of the above and are recommended actions followed up on urgently?	81.82%	87.68%	83.02%
Average	86.36%	89.82	90.61%

## **Attachment A**

### **Examples of Effective Email Communication**

#### **Initial notification email:**

Good morning,

I am completing a Sustainable Permanency Review of the \*\*\*\*\* case. I expect to complete this review by Friday. I will let you know as soon as possible if we have any questions, so we can schedule a coaching session. If you have any additional paperwork that has not made it in the file yet please feel free to send it to me.

Thanks!

(Note: Some jurisdictions schedule a tentative coaching session at the point they send out their notification email, so the field has time to plan around it, and then cancels the coaching session if it is determined not to be needed.)

#### **No coaching session needed email:**

Good morning,

I completed the review of the \*\*\*\*\* case and was very impressed with your casework. I particularly wanted to highlight the way that you were able to use the rapport you've built with the family to engage the mother to participate in DV classes – no one has been able to get her to do that before! We had no questions and have no need for a coaching session. At the end of Quarter 1, we will hold a drawing for a gift card, which you will be entered to win. Awesome job, keep up the great work!

Thanks!

#### **Coaching session request email:**

Good afternoon,

I have completed the Sustainable Permanency review on the \*\*\*\*\* case and had a few questions. Can you please let us know a time you would be available to discuss the case with us? We are not available tomorrow between 1 and 3pm, but we are otherwise wide open, so we can be flexible with your schedules.

Thanks!

**Action items email:**

Good afternoon,

Thank you again for discussing this case with us today. We really appreciated the detailed information you were able to provide us about what the parents are demonstrating from their parenting course. The action items we agreed upon are listed below. Please ensure that each task is completed and documented by the due date. Also, please let Sara know when the action items are documented so she can mark them as complete. If you encounter any barriers or have any questions, please let us know. Also, as a reminder, please make sure that the home study you showed us gets filed this week.

Thanks!

**Overdue action items email:**

Good afternoon,

Can you please provide a status update on the below action items that are past due as of today? If these action items are not resolved by close of business today, we will need to schedule an accountability staffing with your program director tomorrow. Thanks in advance for your prompt response!

## Attachment B

### Case Reviewer – Coaching Core Competencies: Specialists and Supervisors

Specialist	Supervisor (all Specialist competencies are also Supervisor competencies)
<b>Detailed Oriented</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pays attention to detail and strives for perfection without compromising overall productivity</li> </ul>	<b>Coaching &amp; Mentoring</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enable others to grow and succeed through feedback, instruction, and encouragement</li> <li>Motivates team to a high level of production while maintaining overall quality</li> <li>Uses questions to solicit team and subordinate growth and thinking in a parallel process to ERSF</li> </ul>
<b>Critical Thinking and Analysis</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makes timely, informed decisions that take into account the system and work unit goals and constraints</li> <li>Appraises and integrates multiple sources of verbal and written information with practice wisdom</li> <li>Able to make connections between and synthesize information from multiple sources verbally and in writing.</li> <li>Able to analyze and articulate the gap between documented practice and quality child welfare practice standards</li> </ul>	<b>Rapport-Building Skills/System Relationships</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Builds and maintains relationships with others to gain their trust and confidence</li> <li>Ideal candidates have an existing network of high value relationships within the system of care under review</li> <li>Engages effectively with multi-system partners from management to the front-line</li> <li>Builds working relationships characterized by cooperation and mutual respect regardless of position</li> </ul>
<b>Organizational Skills</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to multi-task and prioritize work</li> <li>Demonstrates preparedness</li> </ul>	<b>Influencing Others/Rapport Building</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uses multiple strategies including leveraging the organization's mission to increase team impact</li> </ul>
<b>Communication Skills</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proficiency in verbal and written communication that includes the ability to</li> </ul>	<b>Flexibility</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adapts to changing work needs, conditions and responsibilities</li> </ul>



<p>comprehend, prioritize, and disseminate to keep others informed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proficiency in active listening skills and interpersonal skills</li> <li>• Uses practice questions to solicit growth and thinking in child welfare practitioners</li> <li>• Gives verbal feedback that is clear, descriptive, specific and useful</li> <li>• Offers relevant information or a different perspective on case manager's practice and values in a non-judgmental manner</li> <li>• Able to sincerely articulate observed strengths</li> </ul>	<p>including shifts in management priorities with ease</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Able to alter schedules/timeframes when needed and to convey the impact of changes on the work unit and process stakeholders</li> </ul>
<p><b>Technical Knowledge of the Child Welfare System</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates in-depth knowledge of quality child welfare practice standards</li> <li>• Understands systemic barriers to achieving outcomes in the child welfare system and strategies to address them</li> </ul>	<p><b>Decisiveness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Able to make decisions based on the totality of circumstances even if information is incomplete</li> <li>• Comfortable with ambiguity</li> <li>• Willingness to course correct if new information or priorities are identified</li> </ul>
<p><b>Teamwork</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotes cooperation and commitment within a team to achieve goals and deliverables.</li> <li>• Identifies team strengths and opportunities and assigns tasks to maximize strengths and mitigate liabilities</li> </ul>	<p><b>Conflict Management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helps others resolve complex or sensitive disagreements and conflicts</li> <li>• Quickly identifies and leverages win-win situations</li> <li>• Works well with multiple personality types</li> </ul>
<p><b>Self-Awareness and Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understands and reflects upon own strengths and limitations and the implications for their professional role. Uses this awareness to modify behavior as appropriate.</li> <li>• Actively solicits feedback, recognizes needed changes and integrates them into performance. Uses self-awareness to modify behavior as required to improve efficacy.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Professionalism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains control of case teaming even when contentious, yet is able to avoid power struggles</li> <li>• Uses appropriate humor to deepen the professional relationship and deflect conflict</li> </ul>



## Sustainable Permanency Fidelity Assessment

Instructions: Wherever checkboxes are given as an option, check all that apply. All boxes must be checked in order to receive an acceptable or superior rating. If some, but not all boxes are checked, revert to next lower score.

State: Choose an item. Year: Choose an

item. Quarter: Choose an item.

Date of Permanency Review: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Date of Debrief: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Date of Coaching Session: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Case Name/ #: \_\_\_\_\_

Skill level needs significant improvement 1	Needs improvement 2	Acceptable skill level 3	Above average skill level 4	Superior skill level 5	N/A
<b>Pre-Coaching session</b> <i>Highest possible score for this section = 30</i>					
<b>Pre-Coaching session: Yes or No (Must Check all to get a "Yes" Rating)</b> <i>Highest possible score for this question= 5; All 3 boxes checked = 5; 1-2 boxes checked = 1; zero boxes checked = 0</i>					
Skill level needs significant improvement 1	Needs Improvement 3	Acceptable skill level 5			
1. <input type="checkbox"/> All items were not reviewed		<input type="checkbox"/> The quality reviewer reviewed the current investigation <input type="checkbox"/> The quality reviewer reviewed all prior abuse reports <input type="checkbox"/> The quality reviewer reviewed the most recent 6 months of any applicable service case			
Skill level needs significant improvement 1	Needs improvement 2	Acceptable skill level 3	Above average skill level 4	Superior skill level 5	N/A
2. <input type="checkbox"/> If any Case Practice Assessment Tool (survey) questions are answered with a "No," comments do not include specific examples which justify the permanency concern.		<input type="checkbox"/> If survey questions are answered with a "No," comments include specific examples to address the permanency concern, but may be cursory references with little explanation. <input type="checkbox"/> Responses are sufficient for the reviewer who is already familiar with the case to understand the "no" rating, but an unfamiliar reader would not have sufficient context to justify the rating.		<input type="checkbox"/> If survey questions are answered with a "No," comments and examples provided clearly address the permanency concern. <input type="checkbox"/> Responses are sufficient for the reviewer who was unfamiliar with the case to understand the nature of the concern. <input type="checkbox"/> Responses are comprehensive in nature.	N/A

Skill level needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Acceptable skill level	Above average skill level	Superior skill level	N/A
1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	FINAL ITEM SCORE <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> N/A (because all survey questions were marked yes) Comments/notes				
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Case strengths are not summarized in the Permanency tool.		<input type="checkbox"/> Case strengths are generic/routine: not tailored to case specifics.		<input type="checkbox"/> Case strengths are comprehensively summarized in the Permanency tool. Strengths include detailed descriptions of key caseworker or supervisor actions. <input type="checkbox"/> Strengths are identified and articulated even on cases where overall casework needs improvement.	
	FINAL ITEM SCORE <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Comments/notes				
4. <input type="checkbox"/> Case opportunities for improvement are not summarized in the Permanency tool.  AND/OR  <input type="checkbox"/> Safety-related and permanency-related notes pertaining to No responses are listed in the Opportunities section instead of under the appropriate question.		<input type="checkbox"/> Case opportunities are summarized in the Permanency tool, but minimal details are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Issues identified in the Opportunities for Improvement Section relate only to wellbeing (safety-related and permanency-related items are captured in the comment section of each review question).		<input type="checkbox"/> Case opportunities for improvement are summarized in the Permanency tool in detail. <input type="checkbox"/> Issues identified in the Opportunities for Improvement Section relate only to non-safety-related such as wellbeing (safety-related and permanency-related items are captured in the comment section of each review question). <input type="checkbox"/> Opportunities are individualized and clearly understood by the reader even if unfamiliar with the case.	
	FINAL ITEM SCORE <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> N/A (because there are no non-safety-related and permanency-related areas needing improvement) Comments/notes				

Skill level needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Acceptable skill level	Above average skill level	Superior skill level	N/A
1	2	3	4	5	N/A
5. <input type="checkbox"/> Quality Reviewer did not debrief the case with Quality Supervisor.  AND/OR  <input type="checkbox"/> Safety issues or concerns that are present in the case are not explained to the Quality Supervisor prior to the coaching session with front line.		<input type="checkbox"/> Quality Reviewer debriefed case with Quality Supervisor after his/her review, but details are not provided.  <i>The pre-coaching session also addresses:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies to elicit desired responses from participants during the coaching session <input type="checkbox"/> N/A (no staffing needed)		<input type="checkbox"/> Quality Reviewer debriefed case with Quality Supervisor after his/her review to include, but not limited to, a discussion of: <input type="checkbox"/> Family dynamics <input type="checkbox"/> Reason(s) for referral/report <input type="checkbox"/> Permanency concerns <input type="checkbox"/> Current intervention strategies or the lack of sufficient strategies (Note: if not all 4 boxes are checked, skill level would be 4)  <i>The pre-coaching session also addresses:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies to elicit desired responses from participants during the coaching session <input type="checkbox"/> The past history of coaching sessions with the worker and/or supervisor is considered when creating the strategies to elicit desired responses If none, strategies for a first time coaching session are discussed.	
FINAL ITEM SCORE <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Comments/notes					
6. After obtaining case information from the Quality Reviewer, the Quality Supervisor made a determination: <input type="checkbox"/> The need for the coaching session was not based on a "No" response in any of the review tool questions. <input type="checkbox"/> A no response was ignored and/or handled through another means such as email.  AND/OR  <input type="checkbox"/> A coaching session was scheduled as needed due to a no		After obtaining case information from the Quality Reviewer, the Quality Supervisor made a determination: <input type="checkbox"/> The coaching session was needed based on (a) a "No" response in any of the review tool questions, or (b) an inability to make a permanency determination based on current documentation. <input type="checkbox"/> A coaching session was scheduled within 2 weeks of review.  OR		After obtaining case information from the Quality Reviewer, the Quality Supervisor made a determination: <input type="checkbox"/> The coaching session was needed based on (a) a "No" response in any of the review tool questions, or (b) an inability to make a permanency determination based on current documentation. <input type="checkbox"/> A coaching session was scheduled within 2 weeks from the day of review. <input type="checkbox"/> The tone of the coaching session request struck an appropriate balance between accommodation of front line schedules and the urgency of the	

Skill level needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Acceptable skill level	Above average skill level	Superior skill level	N/A
1	2	3	4	5	N/A
response, but was held outside of one business day of review.		<input type="checkbox"/> An appropriate decision was made not to staff the case due to no permanency concerns.		permanency concerns meriting the coaching session. The request exhibits the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Upbeat (conveys warmth) <input type="checkbox"/> Non-accusatory/does not convey an expression of judgement	
FINAL ITEM SCORE <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 Comments/notes					
<b>Initial Coaching session</b> Highest possible score for this section = 20					
7. The Quality Reviewer and/or Quality Supervisor did not conduct the coaching session according to the model <input type="checkbox"/> Perceived gaps or limitations in the case assessment or action plans were explained didactically instead of through questions.  AND/OR  <input type="checkbox"/> Predominantly closed ended questions were used.  AND/OR  <input type="checkbox"/> No attempts evident to use rapport building techniques.		The Quality Reviewer and/or Quality Supervisor conducted the coaching session according to the model <input type="checkbox"/> At least some perceived gaps or limitations were addressed through questions instead of didactic statements. <input type="checkbox"/> At least some open ended questions were used. <input type="checkbox"/> At least some noted case strengths were validated during the coaching session. <input type="checkbox"/> Composure was mostly maintained during challenging conversation (if applicable). <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Attempts to use rapport building techniques were evident (e.g., appropriate humor, warm and friendly attitude). <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate balance of positive and negative reinforcement.		The Quality Reviewer and/or Quality Supervisor exceeded expectations when conducting the coaching session according to the model <input type="checkbox"/> All perceived gaps or limitations were addressed through questions instead of didactic statements. <input type="checkbox"/> Predominantly open ended questions were used. <input type="checkbox"/> All noted case strengths were validated during the coaching session. <input type="checkbox"/> Composure was maintained during challenging conversation (if applicable). <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Attempts to use multiple rapport building techniques were evident (e.g., appropriate humor, warm and friendly attitude). <input type="checkbox"/> Strategic silences were allowed in order to elicit needed responses (if needed). <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Ability to convey shared insight to initially resistant staff was demonstrated (if applicable). <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate balance of positive and negative reinforcement.	

Skill level needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Acceptable skill level	Above average skill level	Superior skill level	N/A
1	2	3	4	5	N/A
				<input type="checkbox"/> Creativity and the ability to adjust staffing based on participants' needs. <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure everyone is familiar with the model and explaining as needed. Also giving the investigations staff the opportunity to ask questions.	
FINAL ITEM SCORE <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> N/A (If no staffing was needed) Comments/notes					
8. The Quality Reviewer and/or Quality Supervisor did not allow the worker and/or supervisor to (a) lead the development of an action plan and (b) the action plan will not mitigate noted permanency concerns. <input type="checkbox"/> The action plan did not address all permanency concerns.  AND/OR  <input type="checkbox"/> The Quality Reviewer/Supervisor did not provide worker/supervisor with an opportunity to verbalize their plan to mitigate risk. <input type="checkbox"/> Action task completion dates were not assigned with appropriate urgency to mitigate the permanency concern.		The Quality Reviewer and/or Quality Supervisor allowed the worker and/or supervisor to (a) lead the development of an action plan and (b) the action plan will mitigate noted permanency concerns. <input type="checkbox"/> The action plan addressed all permanency concerns. <input type="checkbox"/> The Quality Reviewer/Supervisor provided CPS Supervisor with an opportunity to verbalize their plan to mitigate risk. <input type="checkbox"/> Action task completion dates were assigned appropriate to mitigate the permanency/safety concern, tailoring timeframes to the urgency of the concern. <input type="checkbox"/> The Quality Reviewer/Supervisor provided suggestions for intervention strategies. Sometimes this occurred before sufficient efforts to elicit an appropriate plan from the worker and supervisor were utilized (if applicable). <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		The Quality Reviewer and/or Quality Supervisor allowed the worker and/or supervisor to (a) lead the development of an action plan, and (b) the action plan will mitigate noted permanency concerns. For example: <input type="checkbox"/> The action plan addressed all permanency concerns. <input type="checkbox"/> The Quality Reviewer/Supervisor provided CPS Supervisor with an opportunity to verbalize their plan to mitigate risk. <input type="checkbox"/> Action task completion dates were assigned appropriate to mitigate the permanency/safety concern, tailoring timeframes to the urgency of the concern. Action steps were specific and clearly documented. <input type="checkbox"/> The Quality Reviewer/Supervisor only provided suggestions for intervention strategies once sufficient efforts to elicit an appropriate plan from the investigation team were utilized (if applicable). <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The Quality Reviewer/Supervisor sought agreement from the worker and supervisor regarding whether they could carry out the	

Skill level needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Acceptable skill level	Above average skill level	Superior skill level	N/A
1	2	3	4	5	N/A
				<i>recommended intervention strategy and/or permanency plan (if applicable).</i> <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Quality Reviewer/Supervisor helped the workers develop action items with specificity and strategies for action step completion.</i>	
FINAL ITEM SCORE <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> N/A (If no staffing was needed or no action plan was required following the staffing) Comments/notes					
9. Strengths/Opportunities: <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The Quality Reviewer and/or Quality Supervisor did not provide positive feedback regarding overall case strengths during the Permanency coaching session.</i>  AND/OR <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Quality Reviewer/Supervisor did not discuss opportunities for improvement with the worker and supervisor during the PERMANENCY coaching session.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> <i>The Quality Reviewer and/or Quality Supervisor provided positive feedback regarding case strengths during the Permanency coaching session.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The Quality Reviewer/Supervisor discussed opportunities for improvement (if any identified) with the worker and supervisor during the Permanency coaching session</i> <input type="checkbox"/> N/A		<input type="checkbox"/> <i>The Quality Reviewer and/or Quality Supervisor provided positive feedback regarding case strengths during the Permanency coaching session.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The Quality Reviewer/Supervisor discussed opportunities for improvement (if any identified) with the worker and supervisor during the Permanency coaching session.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Strengths are articulated even on cases where overall casework needs improvement.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Case opportunities (if any) were phrased in a strength-based manner which honored the front line worker's expertise with the family.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	
FINAL ITEM SCORE <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> N/A (If no staffing was needed) Comments/notes					



<b>Post-Coaching session: Yes or No</b> <b>(Must Check all to get a "Yes" Rating)</b> <i>Highest possible score for this section = 5; All 6 boxes checked or N/A = 5; 1-5 boxes checked or N/A = 1; zero boxes checked = 0</i>		
Skill level needs significant improvement	Needs Improvement	Acceptable skill level
1	3	5
10. <input type="checkbox"/> All items not present		<input type="checkbox"/> The action items entered capture all needed actions faithfully. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> The action items are entered within two business days. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Action tasks were tracked to completion as verified by the Quality Reviewer and marked as such in Mindshare. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Barriers were addressed within 1 business day of the item's expiration date, either through extension of timeframes when appropriate or initiation of the accountability coaching session. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> An accountability staffing was held if action items were not completed timely. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Was initiated timely (within 1 business day of a missed action item deadline). <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

Scoring of PERMANENCY Fidelity Tool	
Section	Score
<b>Pre-Coaching session</b> <i>Highest possible score for this section = 30</i>	
<b>Initial Coaching session</b> <i>Highest possible score for this section = 15</i>	
<b>Post-Coaching session</b> <i>Highest possible score for this section = 5</i>	
<b>TOTAL PERMANENCY FIDELITY SCORE</b>	

(Revised: 6-26-19)