

Massachusetts Court Improvement Program 2016 Annual Self-Assessment Report

The annual self-assessment report provides a framework to evaluate the Massachusetts CIP initiatives – to reflect on what we are doing, why we are doing it and to utilize the continuous quality improvement process. Following the format and suggested questions provided by the Children's Bureau, we will identify what is working well, areas that need improvement and the type of support that would be most helpful.

The report consists of seven sections with corresponding questions. In Section I we identify two high priority projects and discuss them in-depth from a CQI perspective. Section II focuses on current priority areas and driving forces within Massachusetts that may be affecting our work. Section III provides a concise accounting of projects/activities in specific topical areas. Section IV focuses on collaborative efforts; Section V centers on CQI needs. In Section VI we do a self-assessment of Mass CIP's current capacity. In Section VII Mass CIP reports on our timeliness and other performance measures.

I. CQI Analyses of Projects

Our two FY16 highest priority CIP projects in some stage of the CQI process continue to be 1) completing the Massachusetts Confidentiality and Information Sharing Guide and 2) facilitating an inter-agency research project, "Designing Data-Driven Directions for School Success of Children in Care."

Project 1: Massachusetts Confidentiality and Information Sharing Guide

The purpose of the project is to produce a guide on confidentiality and information sharing for Massachusetts child welfare and juvenile justice professionals. When completed, the guide will promote adherence to the law and minimize unintended negative consequences for children and families. The initial development of the project began in December 2013, when an interdepartmental group of Massachusetts child welfare stakeholders attended an Information Sharing Training at Georgetown University. As an outgrowth of the training the group decided to move forward on developing a confidentiality and information sharing guide for Massachusetts.

1. Identify and assess needs: Frequently information is shared without compliance with Federal and State privilege and confidentiality laws. The laws are complicated and there isn't a reference guide specific to Massachusetts to inform decision making on sharing information concerning children and families, especially those in state care. While the sharing of information is usually intended to support children and families, sometimes there are unintended negative consequences. A comprehensive compilation of the Federal and State laws governing confidentiality and information sharing was needed to address these concerns.

What are the outcomes you were hoping to achieve? To improve well-being for children by reducing the negative consequences of improper/illegal information sharing. To share discretionary information only when it promotes positive outcomes for children, youth and families.

What evidence (e.g., data) did you have of the need for improvement? We had no data to support this information; only anecdotal findings of improper sharing of information impacting the well-being of children.

2. Develop theory of change. What is your “theory of change” (how do you think your activities/interventions will improve the outcomes)? Our theory of change: By developing a comprehensive Confidentiality and Information Sharing Guide for Massachusetts and through distribution and training, the illegal sharing of information will be reduced. This will lead to more positive outcomes for children and families.

3. Develop/select solution: Develop, distribute and provide training on the Guide: Activities were based on a best-practice model. A collaborative committee was created including representatives from: CIP, the Juvenile Court, the Department of Children and Families, the Department of Youth Services, Probation, Court Clinics, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Probate and Family Court, the Committee for Public Counsel Services, the Executive Office of Health and Human Services, assistant district attorneys, and service providers. CIP contracted with the Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice to facilitate the committee and offer guidance. The contract expired 6/30/16. Bi-weekly meetings of the committee were held to discuss/revise the guide. The Guide will be approved by all stakeholders; the Guide will be posted on the CIP website; trainings will occur.

4. Describe the implementation of the project.

What did the CIP do to implement the project? CIP provided administrative support: identified the committee members, contracted with RFK to facilitate the discussion at committee meetings and to design and revise the Guide, monitored the contract with RFK, scheduled, organized and attended meetings, provided meeting space and provided updates to committee members.

What did others (e.g. judges, attorneys) do? An attorney represented each court/agency at the meetings. A Juvenile Court judge co-chaired the committee. The attorneys drafted their own section of the guide, which was reviewed by the entire committee at bi-monthly meetings. These sections were then revised based on recommendations of the committee as a whole.

Did you do anything to ensure fidelity of the implementation (that is, anything to ensure the program was implemented as it was supposed to be)? Representatives from all child focused agencies (judicial and executive branches) were included on the committee. The

RFK consultant (who had developed information sharing guides in other jurisdictions) ensured fidelity to our model of inclusiveness and collaboration.

If the project has not yet been implemented, please briefly describe your intentions/plans for implementation. The project has been implemented but not completed. The committee expects to finish the guide by early 2017. The guide will then be vetted by agency Heads, Commissioners, Secretariats, and judges. Once approved, the guide will be published and placed on the court website. Interdisciplinary trainings will follow. This work has been and will be supported by CIP.

5. Describe any monitoring/evaluations/assessments of your project and how you intend to apply the findings. How are you monitoring implementation and changes? Information included in the Guide is reviewed by committee members at every meeting. Revisions are incorporated following the meeting. Agency heads and supervisors review and approve sections. As a result of discussions at committee meetings some agencies developed new policies and procedures which have been incorporated into the Guide.

What data collection tools/methods did you (will you) use to assess effectiveness? The Guide is not yet completed. Upon completion, CIP will monitor distribution and “hits” on the website. There will be an evaluation following all trainings. The Guide may be revised based on feedback following trainings. The CIP Steering Committee will develop a survey for judges, supervising attorneys and other users to evaluate the effectiveness of the Guide. In addition, data on children and youth in state custody will be collected and analyzed over the next five years, pending adequate funding.

What evidence is there that the activities/interventions were effective? Committee members have met bimonthly over the last two years to work on the Guide which is finally nearing completion.

What evidence is there that the activities or intervention were implemented with fidelity? The project has developed as planned. While the committee did not anticipate the complexity of the work or the time frame it would take to complete the project, there has been careful analysis, review and revision throughout the process. The consultant from RFK ensured fidelity to the project.

Describe how evaluation/assessments were used to inform the project. Every committee meeting reviewed and revised sections. Revised sections were again sent to committee members for final approval – sometimes leading to further revisions.

Does the intervention need to be adjusted, stopped? Review and revision has assured that the Guide accurately reflects Federal and State privilege and confidentiality law. We will continue this intervention until the Guide is posted, trainings occur and assessments are made. Revisions will be ongoing.

Does the problem still exist? We have not completed the Guide. Was your theory of change supported?

a. If the project has not yet been evaluated/assessed, please briefly describe your intentions/plans for evaluation/assessment. Revisions of the guide will be on going based on assessments. Distribution of Guides and “hits” on the website will be monitored to assess utilization. Quantitative and qualitative evaluations will be developed, implemented and analyzed following trainings. Data will be analyzed to determine if number of dually involved youth decreases.

6. Is this project a priority for you in 2016? Yes

7. Would you like a CQI consult around this project? Yes

Project # 2: Designing Data-Driven Directions for School Success of Children in Care

Briefly describe the project and indicate the approximate date the CIP began working on it. The purpose of the project is to improve educational outcomes for children in state care by identifying barriers to school success in Massachusetts and developing interventions to improve outcomes. CIP has contracted with Boston University to complete an extensive quantitative and qualitative educational research study using data from Massachusetts Elementary and Secondary Education, the Department of Children and Families and the Juvenile Court. CIP began working on this project in December 2013. An interdisciplinary committee attended a conference on Information Sharing at Georgetown University. The committee developed two capstone projects: one on developing a Massachusetts Information Sharing Guide; a second one identifying and removing barriers to school success for children in state care.

1. Identify and assess needs. The Massachusetts 2007 CFSR reported that children in state care who receive services should be meeting their education goals. Test scores and high school graduation rates indicate that children in state custody have poorer educational outcomes. A discussion by Massachusetts participants in the 2011 Child Welfare, Education and the Courts conference indicated that much work was needed to understand the educational characteristics and experiences of this population in Massachusetts. The action plan developed at the conference was the basis for Outcome #7 of the CIP Strategic Plan 2012-2016 with a focus on two activities: improving stakeholder knowledge and enhancing data collection and utilization.

Think about why you decided to focus on this issue. What is the need you were trying to address? National research demonstrates that most children in state custody have poor educational outcomes. By identifying and removing barriers to educational success in Massachusetts, educational outcomes will improve.

What are the outcomes you were hoping to achieve? What evidence (e.g., data) did you have of the need for improvement? By identifying characteristics and educational experiences of children in state custody, barriers to educational success will be identified. Interventions will be developed to remove these barriers and to develop strategies for success. Educational data indicated that children in state custody had poorer educational outcomes than their peers. For example, most children in state care scored lower on standardized testing on competency in math, reading and science. Data indicated that our educational systems were not meeting the needs of children in state custody.

2. Develop theory of change. Do you have a theory about the causes of the problem? What is your “theory of change” (how do you think your activities/interventions will improve the outcomes)? National research indicates that protective risk factors associated with dependency (e.g., placement type, placement stability, school stability, length of time in care, trauma) strongly affect academic experiences and success. By identifying data driven risk factors associated with school failure, strategic interventions will be developed to ameliorate risk and improve educational outcomes.

3. Develop/select solution. How did you select your activities/interventions (e.g., evidence based, empirically supported best-practices, etc.). We selected a research study as an activity that will analyze data from education, child welfare and the courts. When analysis is completed and recommendations are made, the committee will develop interventions to address/ameliorate barriers to success.

Describe the implementation of the project. What did CIP do to implement the project? Implementation is ongoing. CIP developed an inter-agency Project Team comprised of members from the Juvenile Court, the Department of Children and Families, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Department of Youth Services and the Committee for Public Council Services. The Project Team framed a Request for Proposals, reviewed Grant Proposals, awarded the Grant and is managing the research study. The grant was awarded to Boston University and a contract was signed in September, 2015. The CIP child welfare data analyst has coordinated the sharing of data between the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Department of Children and Families and the courts.

What did others do? Legal counsel for the Department of Children and Families and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education drafted and signed a Memorandum of Understanding to enable the sharing of information for the research. It took approximately eight months to have the memo finalized and signed. This significantly delayed the project. The Project Team continued to meet with their respective agencies and court data teams to discuss the data extraction and analysis process. The CIP child welfare data analyst coordinated the

receipt of the data, performed preliminary matching and prepared the data for delivery to the research team. CIP conference calls between the project team members and researchers occurred as needed.

Did you do anything to ensure fidelity of the implementation (that is, anything to ensure the program was implemented as it was supposed to be)? Implementation is ongoing. There has been significant communication (weekly telephone conferences) between CIP and the BU research team. The Research Director of the Massachusetts Trial Court has assisted in oversight of the Project. The research contract has been revised twice due to time constraints.

If the project has not yet been implemented, please briefly describe your intentions/plans for implementation. Implementation is ongoing. Due to delays in finalizing a memo of understanding and delays in data transfer the project was stalled. BU is now in the process of analyzing the data. Once the data report is completed and recommendations made, the Project Team will develop strategies for interventions to address identified barriers to success.

4. Describe any monitoring/evaluations/assessments of your project and how you intend to apply the findings. How are you monitoring implementation and changes? What data collection tools/methods did you (will you) use to assess effectiveness? What evidence is there that the activities/interventions were effective? What evidence is there that the activities/intervention were implemented with fidelity? Describe how evaluation/assessments were used to inform the project. Does the intervention need to be adjusted, stopped? Does the problem still exist. Was your theory of change supported? Project is ongoing. There have been no evaluations to this point.

If the project has not yet been evaluated/assessed, please briefly describe your intentions/plans for evaluation/assessment. Once the research is completed and barriers to success are identified an action plan will be developed. CIP will work with stakeholders to understand data; will develop strategies to remove barriers to success; and will support training activities aimed at improving educational outcomes for children in state custody. Future rounds of data sharing/analysis will occur to assess the effectiveness of the intervention.

5. Is this project a priority for you in 2016? Yes

6. Would you like a CQI consult around this project? Yes. We could learn from similar projects in other states.

For questions 1-9, provide a *concise* description of work completed or underway in FY 2016 (October 2015-September 2016) in the below topical subcategories. For question 1, focus on

significant training events or initiatives held or developed in FY 2016 and answer the corresponding questions.

For questions 2-9, indicate (*yes/no*) if you worked on a project or activity in this area. If the answer is yes, that you conducted a project or activity in the area, please complete the table. If the answer is no, skip to the next question. For each project/activity, please provide a brief description, categorize the project by selecting one of the sub-categories available in the drop down box (e.g., for quality hearings, the sub-categories include *court observation/assessment, process improvements, specialty/pilot courts, court orders/title IV-E, mediation, appeals, other*) and identify the stage of your work by selecting the appropriate state from the drop down box (*identifying and assessing needs, developing a theory of change, selecting a solution, implementing your project, or assessing/evaluating your work*)¹.

Questions 2-9 ask you to describe the purpose of the project or activity and how the project or activity will contribute to continuous quality improvement (CQI) in the identified area. Please use the “other” categories to include specific projects that are important to you but do not necessarily fit as part of the CQI process. ***If you have a project/activity that fits into multiple categories (e.g., youth engagement and well-being), please choose the category you think fits it best and only report the project once.***

1. Trainings

<i>Topical Area</i>	<i>Did you hold or develop a training on this topic?</i>	<i>Who was the target audience?</i>	<i>What were the intended training outcomes?</i>	<i>How did you evaluate this training?</i>
Data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	CIP Steering Committee	Understand court timeliness measures	Assessed understanding of data through discussion
Hearing quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Child welfare attorneys	Trial practice skills; mentoring training to facilitate professional growth of newly certified attorneys in substantive, procedural law, case preparation and trial skills	On line survey. Satisfaction surveys post trainings
Improving timeliness/permanency	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

¹ A description of each stage of work is available in an appendix to this document.

Quality legal representation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Attorneys	Improving litigation skills (NITA training); representing parents and children in guardianship cases; communication with clients; child development	Post training survey
Engagement & participation of parties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Attorneys; Parents	Improve parenting skills Funded attendance at state wide juvenile justice child welfare training for attorneys, judges and social workers. Funded National Adoption Day	Post training surveys; evaluation plan in development
Well-being	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Social Worker	Increase knowledge of addiction/treatment; trauma; mental illness in children	
ICWA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Child welfare attorneys	New ICWA Guidelines	The training is being developed to be held in 2017
Sex Trafficking	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Attorneys, judges, social workers, probation officers	Education about trends, interventions when working with vulnerable females.	Presenters evaluated
Other: 1. Judicial trainings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Judges	Child welfare program at yearly judicial conference; 4 Judges and one court administrator attended National Association of Juvenile and Family Court Judges annual four day conference	
2. Dually Involved Youth		Attorneys, probation, judges, social workers, DYS, service providers, DCF	To develop strategies to prevent youth from becoming dually involved.	CIP Steering Committee Discussion
3. Addressing legal needs of girls		Attorneys, probation, judges, social	Understanding trends, successful	Presenters evaluated

4. Keeping Kids in School by Building Positive School Climates		workers, DCF, DYS School personnel, research experts, attorneys, judges, probation	interventions, developing sensitivity to unique needs/challenges of female clients. Reduce suspensions and expulsions and increase positive school climate	CIP/organizers developed survey and assessed results
--	--	---	---	--

2. Data Projects. Data projects include any work with administrative data sets (e.g, AFCARS, SACWIS), data dashboards, data reports, fostering court improvement data, case management systems, and data sharing efforts.

Do you have a data project/activity? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Development of Dashboards- monthly reports on case filings and number of children in cases.	Data dashboards	Implementation
Data Reports: generated quarterly for CIP timeliness measures, and timeliness of appellate court cases.	Agency Data Sharing Efforts	Identifying/Assessing Needs

Do you have **data reports** that you consistently view? Yes No

If **Yes**, around which topics?

- Hearing quality Timeliness Permanency Well-being Education Engagement of youth Engagement of Parents Other Engagement Quality Legal Representation
 ICWA DCST Runaway Youth Other: _____
 Other: _____

3. Hearing Quality. Hearing quality projects include any efforts you have made to improve the quality of dependency hearings, including court observation/assessment projects, process improvements, specialty/pilot court projects, projects related to court orders or title IV-E determinations, mediation, or appeals.

Do you have a hearing quality project/activity? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize	Work Stage (if applicable)
---------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------

	this project?	
Legal interns to improve youth engagement	Process Improvements	Evaluation/Assessment
Provide copy of <u>Reasonable Efforts</u> to each new Juvenile and Probate and Family court judge	Courts Orders/Title IV-E	Implementation
Revision of Trial Court Permanency Hearing Rule	Process Improvements	Selecting Solution

4. Improving Timeliness of Hearings or Permanency Outcomes. Timeliness and permanency projects include any activities or projects meant to improve the timeliness of case processing or achievement of timely permanency. This could include general timeliness; focus on continuances or appeals; working on permanency goals other than APPLA, or focus on APPLA and older youth.

Do you have a Timeliness or permanency project/activity? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Data analysis on timeliness	Other	Identifying/Assessing Needs
Revision of Trial Court Rule on Permanency Hearings	General/ASFA	Selecting Solution

5. Quality of Legal Representation. Quality of legal representation projects may include any activities/efforts related to improvement of representation for parents, youth, or the agency. This might include assessments or analyzing current practice, implementing new practice models, working with law school clinics, or other activities in this area.

Do you have a quality legal representation project/activity? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Client Contact Coordinator for CAFL	Assessment	Implementation
Clinical Training Consultant for CAFL trainings	New Practice Models	Implementation
Child Welfare Training consultant	Other	Implementation
National Institute of Trial Attorneys Training	Other	Implementation

6. Engagement & Participation of Parties. Engagement and participation of parties includes any efforts centered around youth, parent, foster family, or caregiver engagement, as well as projects related to notice to relatives, limited English proficiency, or other efforts to increase presence and engagement at the hearing.

Do you have an engagement or participation of project/activity? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Invitations from Chief Justice to youth to attend their permanency hearing.	Youth Engagement	Evaluation/Assessment
Triple P parent education program	Parent Engagement	Evaluation/Assessment
CIP Website moved to MASS.GOV website	Parent Engagement	Implementation
Printed handbooks in English and Spanish for parents of youth involved in CRA cases	Parent Engagement	Implementation
Support National Adoption Day celebration	Parent Engagement	Implementation
Edit, Publish, Distribute “Answer Book 2015 and 2016”	Youth Engagement	Implementation

7. **Well-Being.** Well-being projects include any efforts related to improving the well-being of youth. Projects could focus on education, early childhood development, psychotropic medication, LGBTQ youth, trauma, racial disproportionality/disparity, immigration, or other well-being related topics.

Do you have any projects/activities focused on well-being? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Distributing Answer Book to Family Resource Centers, DCF and other agencies in communities	Education	Implementation
Drafting Confidentiality and Information Sharing Guide	Education	Implementation
BU Research Project	Education	Implementation

8. **ICWA.** ICWA projects could include any efforts to enhance state and tribal collaboration, state and tribal court agreements, data collection and analysis of ICWA compliance, or ICWA notice projects.

Do you have any projects/activities focused on ICWA? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
----------------------------	---	-----------------------------------

Collaborating with ICWA specialist at DCF	ICWA Notice	Implementation
Collaborating with new ICWA CIP	Tribal Collaboration	Planning
Participation in National ICWA conference calls	Other	Implementation

9. Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (PSTFSA). PSTFSA projects could include any work around domestic child sex trafficking, the reasonable and prudent parent standard, a focus on runaway youth, focus on normalcy, collaboration with other agencies around this topic, data collection and analysis, data sharing, or other efforts to fully implement the act into practice.

Do you have any projects/activities focused on PSTSFA? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Participation in webinars on implementing RSTFSA	Reasonable & Prudent Parent	Identifying/Assessing Needs

II. Priority Areas & CIP Resources

a. What would you consider your top two priority areas for FY 2016?

- Data projects
- Hearing quality
- Timeliness/permanency
- Quality of legal representation
- Engagement of Parties
- Well-being
- Preventing Sex Trafficking & Strengthening Families
- ICWA
- other: Completion of an educational research project and information sharing guide.

- b.** Are there any outside driving forces that determine your priorities or consume a lot of your time? (For example, legislative involvement or directives, budget concerns, consent decrees and class action litigation, highly publicized child fatalities, unaccompanied minors, etc.) Highly publicized child fatalities and the opioid crisis have resulted in a significant increase in case filings with no increase in resources. Cases have become more complex. Judges have retired and have not been replaced in a timely fashion. Systems are overwhelmed. There are insufficient resources (judges, court personnel, social workers, lawyers) to handle the increased case load. This impacts time/resources to move forward on projects.

III. CIP Collaboration and Participation in Child Welfare Program Planning and Improvement Efforts

10. For FY2014, you described how the CIP planned to assist with and participate in round three of the CFSR and program improvement process. We are interested in your progress or any changes to this plan.

- a.** Has your plan changed? If so, how? No
- b.** How have you moved this plan forward in FY2015? CFSR completed. CIP Steering Committee conferenced with CFSR personnel on development of CFSR.
- c.** What barriers have you encountered (if any) in increasing your participation with round three of CFSR? CIP staff has discussed increased participation with DCF on reaching CFSR goals. Time constraints impacted DCF's ability to fully collaborate with CIP on CFSR.
- d.** Have you received any technical assistance on this issue? No, however technical assistance would be helpful.

11. For FY2014 you described how the CIP will assist with and participate in the CFSP/APSRS processes with the child welfare agency in an ongoing fashion. We are interested in your progress or any changes to this plan.

- a.** Has your plan changed? If so, how? Plan has not changed.

- b. How have you moved this plan forward in FY2015? CIP Steering Committee conferenced with CFSR personnel. We continue to work with DCF to achieve our mutual goals.
- c. What barriers have you encountered (if any) to working with the child welfare agency in the CFSP/APSR process in an ongoing fashion? DCF has undergone a major restructuring and reorganization (rewriting policies and procedure, major hiring initiative). During this time there has been a significant uptick in filings. Systems are taxed, reducing time to collaborate with CIP. We continue to work on collaboration.
- d. Have you received any technical assistance on this issue? If so, what was it and how was it helpful to you? No. Technical assistance would be helpful.

12. How are you involved, if at all, with the child welfare agency's CQI efforts?

- Contributing data receiving data Jointly using data
- Collaborative meetings Collaborative systems change project(s)
- Other:_____

IV. CQI Current Capacity Assessment

- a. How is the CIP progressing with CQI overall? Please provide a brief description of how you integrate CQI into your work.
CIP uses data to drive decision making on CIP projects. We support efforts to solve the identified challenges and utilize data to develop projects, assess effectiveness and redirect projects.
- b. Do you have any of the following resources to help you integrate CQI into practice?
 - CIP staff with CQI (e.g., data, evaluation) expertise
 - Consultants with CQI expertise a University partnership
 - Contracts with external agencies to assist with CQI efforts
 - Other resources:_____

(1) Describe the largest challenges your CIP faces with implementing CQI into your work.

The CIP Steering Committee agrees on challenges that need to be addressed. There is consensus on the theory of change. We are challenged by developing a solution and implementing change. Agencies and the courts have core functions that must be given priority over CIP initiatives. Resources are currently very limited and with

federal funding uncertainties, assessing needs by the collecting and analyzing of data will be a challenge.

- c. Please review the list of capacities below. Select the **three** capacity areas that you would like to increase your knowledge of or enhance your ability to do in the next fiscal year.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> CQI generally | <input type="checkbox"/> Data collection methodologies |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Data analysis | <input type="checkbox"/> Understanding/applying data |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation design | <input type="checkbox"/> Tool development |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy change implementation | <input type="checkbox"/> CQI commitment (buy-in) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Collaboration w/agencies | <input type="checkbox"/> Data-driven decision-making |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Participation in CFSR process | <input type="checkbox"/> Performance measurement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Participation in CFSP/APSR process | <input type="checkbox"/> Community partnerships |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness of evidence-based practices | <input type="checkbox"/> Research partnerships |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership | <input type="checkbox"/> Data systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Currently available data (e.g., AFCARS) | <input type="checkbox"/> Tracking implementation/changes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training evaluation | |

Evaluation/CQI efforts specific to:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Preventing Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quality legal representation | <input type="checkbox"/> Hearing quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timeliness/Permanency | <input type="checkbox"/> Well-being |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Engagement/Presence of Parties | <input type="checkbox"/> ICWA |
- Other: Supporting the implementation of Every Student Succeeds Act.

Other: _____

V. Self-Assessment – Capacity

We would like you to assess your current capacities related to knowledge, skills, resources, and collaboration by responding to the following 3 sets of questions.

1. Please indicate your level of agreement to the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I have a good understanding of CQI.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand how to integrate CQI into all our work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am familiar with the available data relevant to our work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
I understand how to interpret and apply the available data.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The CIP and the state child welfare agency have shared goals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The CIP and the state child welfare agency collaborate around program planning and improvement efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We have the resources we need to fully integrate CQI into practice.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have staff, consultants, or partners who can answer my CQI questions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. How frequently do you engage in the following activities?

	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Always</i>
We use data to make decisions about where to focus our efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We meet with representatives of the child welfare agency to engage in collaborative systems change efforts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
We evaluate newly developed or modified programs/practices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
We use evaluation/assessment findings to make changes to programs/practices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CQI is integrated into all our projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Please review the descriptions of the different levels of collaboration. Using the scale provided, please indicate the extent to which you currently interact with each other partner identified below.

		Networking 1	Cooperation 2	Coordination 3	Coalition 4	Collaboration 5
Relationship Characteristics		--Aware of organization --Loosely defined roles --Little communication --All decisions made independently	---Provide info to each other --Somewhat defined roles --Formal communication --All decisions made independently	--Share information and resources --Defined roles --Frequent communication --Some shared decision making	--Share ideas --Share resources --Frequent and prioritized communication --All member have a vote in decision-making	--Members belong to one system --Frequent communication is characterized by mutual trust --Consensus is reached on all decisions
	No Interaction at all 0	Networking 1	Cooperation 2	Coordination 3	Coalition 4	Collaboration 5
State Child Welfare Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tribal Child Welfare Agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tribal Courts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Department of Education/ School	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Law enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Juvenile justice agency (e.g., DOJ)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Behavioral/mental health	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Substance abuse/addictions management agency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: Probation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

VI. Timeliness Data & Performance Measurement

The purpose of asking all the CIPs to report on timeliness measures has been to prompt you to identify available data, examine how you are currently doing, and make comparisons to how you have done in the past on specific measures. The goal is to help you identify where you are and encourage you to use data in a meaningful way in your systems change efforts. As such, we have restructured the timeliness requirements so that you can still report on the timeliness measures but have the option to report on other measures that you have found particularly meaningful in your work.²

1. **Timeliness.** Provide a narrative below describing where you are getting data and how you are calculating the timeliness measures you report. What is your universe of cases (e.g., what is your sample, exit or entry cohort, etc.)? Is the data from the agency (e.g., SACWIS), from a court case management system (e.g., Odyssey) or from another source? Do you have any concerns with the accuracy of the data?

The source of data for federal fiscal years 2012 – 2014 timeliness measures was DCF’s case management system, iFamilyNet. The source of data for federal fiscal years 2015 -2016 was the court’s case management system, MassCourts, with the exception of the time to TPR petition and time to reunification which still originate from DCF. There are limited concerns with the accuracy of the data but more so with data entry practices that differ by division across the Commonwealth (e.g. defining when a permanency hearing is held vs. when the permanency hearing was completed). Furthermore, the transition from the use of DCF data to court data during federal fiscal year 2015 affects our ability to track improvements from year-to-year.

Time to First Permanency Hearing: For federal fiscal years 2012-2014, the universe of cases was an entry cohort of cases (i.e. children in care for at least 12 months). The start date for the measure was the day the child actually entered foster care and the end date was the date the permanency hearing was held. For federal fiscal years 2015-2016, the universe of cases was an entry cohort (e.g. all first permanency hearings held in the 2015 federal fiscal year). The start date was the date the care and protection petition (case) was filed in the court and the end date was the date the permanency hearing was held. For federal fiscal year 2016, the start date was modified to the date of the first temporary custody to DCF.

Time to Subsequent Permanency Hearings: For federal fiscal years 2012-2014, the universe of cases was an entry cohort of cases (i.e. children in care for at least 24 months). The start date for the measure was the date of the second, most recent permanency hearing and the end date was the date of the most recent permanency hearing. For federal fiscal years 2015-2016, the universe of cases was an entry cohort (ie.g. all permanency hearings held in the 2015 federal fiscal year where the case had at least two held permanency hearings). The start date for the measure was the date of the second, most recent permanency hearing and the end date was the date of the most recent permanency hearing.

² The OJJDP Toolkit that includes these performance measures is available online at: <http://www.ojjdp.gov/publications/courttoolkit.html>

Time to Permanent Placement (includes time to reunification, time to guardianship and time to adoption): For federal fiscal years 2012-2014, the universe of cases was an exit cohort of cases (i.e. children reunified, children adopted, and children in legal guardianship). The start date for the measure was the date the child actually entered foster care and the end date was the date the child: 1) reunified with the parent(s), 2) the adoption was finalized or, 3) the guardianship subsidy was activated. For federal fiscal years 2015-2016, the universe of cases was an exit cohort of cases. The start date for the measure was the date the case was filed in court and the end date was the date: 1) the child reunified with the parent(s), 2) the adoption petition was granted by the court, or 3) the guardianship petition was granted by the court.

Time to Termination of Parental Rights Petition: For federal fiscal years 2012-2016, the universe of cases was an exit cohort of cases (i.e. children with a goal change from reunification to termination of parental rights). The start date was the date the child actually entered foster care and the end date was the date of DCF's Permanency Planning Conference when the permanency plan changed from reunification to a termination of parental rights. It should be noted that in Massachusetts notice of petition to terminate parental rights is included in the filing of the care and protection petition.

Time to Termination of Parental Rights: For federal fiscal years 2012-2014, the universe of cases was an exit cohort of cases (i.e. children with a termination of parental rights). The start date is the date the child actually entered foster care and the end date was the date on which termination of parental rights of the last parent was finalized. For federal fiscal years 2015-2016, the universe of cases was an exit cohort of cases. The start date for the measure was the date the case was filed in court and the end date was the date of the last parent's termination of parental rights.

	Baseline Measure (FY 2012)	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	CIP Projects Targeting Measures (if applicable) <i>[If this measure was targeted by an intervention (e.g., efforts made to improve timeliness), please list the project or activity here]</i>
Required Timeliness Measures³						
4G. Time to First Permanency Hearing	Median: 364 days %: 55.79% meeting TS	Median: 358 days %: 56.68% meeting TS	Median: 360 days %: 52.10% meeting TS	Median: 363 days %: 54.4% meeting TS	Median: 362 days %: 56.8% meeting TS	Revising Trial Court Rule on Permanency Hearings
4H. Time to Termination of Parental Rights Petition	Median: 257 days %: 88.95% meeting TS	Median: 267 days %: 88.51% meeting TS	Median: 266 days %: 89.51% meeting TS	Median: 307 days %: 88.47% meeting TS	Median: 331 days %: 83.5% meeting TS	Data discussed at CIP Steering Committee meetings and provided to Juvenile Court, Probate and Family Court, CPCS and DCF
4I. Time to Termination of Parental Rights	Median: 547.5 days %: 50.00% meeting TS	Median: 555 days %: 48.55% meeting TS	Median: 574.5 days %: 44.71% meeting TS	Median: 609 days %: 41.7% meeting TS	Median: 639 days %: 39.1% meeting TS	Data discussed at CIP Steering Committee meetings and provided to Juvenile Court, Probate and Family Court, CPCS and DCF
4A. Time to Permanent Placement	Median: 268 days %: 77.20% meeting TS	Median: 251 days %: 80.50% meeting TS	Median: 193 days %: 83.10% meeting TS	Median: 299 days %: 82.8% meeting TS	Median: 257 days %: 83.3% meeting TS	Data discussed at CIP Steering Committee meetings and provided to Juvenile Court, Probate and Family Court, CPCS and DCF
<i>Optional Measures</i>						
<i>Time to Reunification</i>	Median: 139 days %: 77.35% meeting TS	Median: 145 days %: 78.36% meeting TS	Median: 111 days %: 81.45% meeting TS	Median: 141 days %: 78.4% meeting TS	Median: 130 days %: 76.7% meeting TS	

³ The time standard (TS) is a percentage of cases that meet the set TS for a measure. The TS measure for first permanency hearing, subsequent permanency hearing, and reunification is 12 months; measure for permanent placement, adoption and guardianship is 24 months; MA measure for termination of parental rights petition is 18 months; and measure for termination of parental rights is 18 months. The source of data for federal fiscal years 2012 – 2014 timeliness measures was DCF’s case management system, iFamilyNet. The source of data for federal fiscal years 2015-2016 is the court’s case management system, MassCourts, with the exception of the time to TPR petition and time to reunification which still originate from DCF.

<i>Time to Adoption</i>	Median: 991 days %: 23.64% meeting TS	Median: 925 days %: 39.97% meeting TS	Median: 988 days %: 30.14% meeting TS	Median: 981 days %: 25.5% meeting TS	Median: 1,059 days %: 17.5% meeting TS	
<i>Time to Guardianship</i>	Median: 710 days %: 50.89% meeting TS	Median: 712 days %: 51.32% meeting TS	Median: 708 days %: 56.80% meeting TS	Median: 738 days %: 49.3% meeting TS	Median: 746 days %: 48.7% meeting TS	
<i>Time to Emancipation</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Time to Subsequent Permanency Hearings</i>	Median: 364 days %: 53.51% meeting TS	Median: 364 days %: 54.47% meeting TS	Median: 364 days %: 47.31% meeting TS	Median: 337 days %: 78.4% meeting	Median: 337 days %: 77.3% meeting TS	
<i>1B. Percentage of Cases that Re-enter within 1 year</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

3. **Other Measures.** What other measures do you collect that you find particularly useful? Do you currently or have you recently collected any data on quality legal representation or quality court hearings that you would be willing to discuss and share?

Other data points that we find useful for CQI activities are: case-flow metrics of dependency cases in the Juvenile Court, timeliness of appeals court cases involving child welfare petitions, and number of ICWA inquiries; these data points are reviewed quarterly/annually.

A. Case-Flow Metrics of Dependency Cases

The Massachusetts Trial Court collects and reports court performance measures to improve the case management process. The four case-flow metrics featured in this report include: Metric Case Filings, Clearance Rate, Time to Disposition, and Age of Pending Cases. Metric Case Filings is the number of cases filed. Clearance rate is the number of cases disposed as a percentage of the number of cases filed. Time to Disposition is the percentage of cases disposed or resolved within established time standards⁴. Age of Pending Cases is the number of active pending cases that are beyond the disposition date set by the time standards.

⁴ The case types Care and Protection, Adoption, and Guardianship have a time standard of 18 months; the case type Child Requiring Assistance has a time standard of 240 days and; the case type Young Adult Permanency Hearing does not have a time standard.

Case-Flow Metric: Metric Case Filings	FY 2016 Q1	FY 2016 Q2	FY 2016 Q3	FY 2016 Q4
Adoption	203	151	155	130
Care & Protection	1,088	931	907	829
Child Requiring Assistance	1,767	1,767	1,329	847
Guardianship	175	208	214	254
Young Adult Permanency Hearings	109	96	93	120
Total	3,342	3,153	2,698	2,180
Case-Flow Metric: Clearance Rate	FY 2016 Q1	FY 2016 Q2	FY 2016 Q3	FY 2016 Q4
Adoption	107.9%	86.8%	89.0%	110.8%
Care & Protection	51.8%	65.1%	71.3%	76.4%
Child Requiring Assistance	73.3%	78.6%	134.0%	140.5%
Guardianship	94.9%	97.6%	91.6%	83.5%
Young Adult Permanency Hearings	62.4%	90.6%	74.2%	65.0%
Total	69.2%	76.6%	104.9%	103.5%
Case-Flow Metric: Time to Disposition	FY 2016 Q1	FY 2016 Q2	FY 2016 Q3	FY 2016 Q4
Adoption	100.0%	97.7%	97.8%	100.0%
Care & Protection	58.9%	62.2%	59.4%	59.9%
Child Requiring Assistance	73.1%	74.7%	82.7%	75.6%
Guardianship	76.5%	82.3%	81.6%	84.9%
Young Adult Permanency Hearings	Does not have a time standard.			
Total	72.4%	73.4%	77.9%	73.6%
Case-Flow Metric: Age of Pending Cases	FY 2016 Q1	FY 2016 Q2	FY 2016 Q3	FY 2016 Q4
Adoption	72.9%	65.0%	60.5%	63.1%
Care & Protection	20.3%	17.2%	17.8%	18.2%
Child Requiring Assistance	35.6%	18.2%	24.9%	31.1%
Guardianship	42.3%	36.7%	32.1%	34.2%
Young Adult Permanency Hearings	Does not have a time standard.			
Total	29.6%	20.4%	22.5%	24.7%

Footnote: Figures reflect 2016 federal fiscal year (Quarters 1-4)

B. Timeliness Measures of Disposed Appeals Cases in Appeals Court and Supreme Judicial Court

50% Percentile (Time to Median Days) for Child Welfare Cases in the Appellate and Supreme Judicial Court			
	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
Total Appellate Court Cases Decided	61	57	63
Total Supreme Judicial Court Cases Decided	1	1	2
<i>Appellate Court Measures</i>			
	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
Time to Decision	258 days	265 days	255 days
Trial Court Entry to Appeals Court Entry	986 days	899 days	984 days
Trial Court Notice of Appeal to Appeals Court Entry	254 days	241days	241 days
<i>Supreme Judicial Court Measures</i>			
	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
Time to Decision	274 days	73 days	251 days
Trial Court Entry to SJC Entry	2063 days	187 days	2,397 days
Trial Court Notice of Appeal to SJC Entry	257 days	N/A	640 days

Source: MA Supreme Judicial Court and Appeals Court; figures reflect the 2014, 2015, and 2016 federal fiscal year.

90% Percentile (in days) for Child Welfare Cases in the Appellate and Supreme Judicial Court			
	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
Total Appellate Court Cases Decided	61	57	63
Total Supreme Judicial Court Cases Decided	1	1	2
<i>Appellate Court Measures</i>			
	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
Time to Decision	449 days	381 days	353 days
Trial Court Entry to Appeals Court Entry	1,601 days	1,610 days	1,602 days
Trial Court Notice of Appeal to Appeals Court Entry	471 days	403 days	427 days
<i>Supreme Judicial Court Measures</i>			
	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
Time to Decision	N/A	N/A	N/A
Trial Court Entry to SJC Entry	N/A	N/A	N/A
Trial Court Notice of Appeal to SJC Entry	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: MA Supreme Judicial Court and Appeals Court; figures reflect the 2014, 2015, and 2016 federal fiscal year.

C. ICWA Inquiries

There were 187 ICWA inquiries about possible Native American/Alaska heritage during the state fiscal year 2016. The state fiscal year 2016 begins FY2016 (July 1, 2015 and ends on June 30, 2016).

D. Youth Permanency Hearing Attendance Pilot

There is no available data to report for FY2016; this pilot ended during the federal fiscal year 2016.

APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS

Definitions of Evidence

Evidence-based practice – evidence-based practices are practice that have been empirically tested in a rigorous way (involving random assignment to groups), have demonstrated effectiveness related to specific outcomes, have been replicated in practice at least one, and have findings published in peer reviewed journal articles.

Empirically-supported- less rigorous than evidence-based practices are empirically-supported practices. To be empirically supported, a program must have been evaluated in some way and have demonstrated some relationship to a positive outcome. This may not meet the rigor of evidence-base, but still has some support for effectiveness.

Best-practices – best practices are often those widely accepted in the field as good practice. They may or may not have empirical support as to effectiveness, but are often derived from teams of experts in the field.

Definitions for Work Stages

Identifying and Assessing Needs – This phase is the earliest phase in the process, where you are identifying a need to be addressed. The assessing needs phase includes identifying the need, determining if there is available data demonstrating that this a problem, forming teams to address the issue.

Develop theory of change—This phase focuses on the theorizing the causes of a problem. In this phase you would identify what you think might be causing the problem and develop a “theory of change”. The theory of change is essentially how you think your activities (or intervention) will improve outcomes.

Develop/select solution—This phase includes developing or selecting a solution. In this phase, you might be exploring potential best-practices or evidence-based practices that you may want to implement as a solution to the identified need. You might also be developing a specific training, program, or practice that you want to implement.

Implementation – the implementation phase of work is when an intervention is being piloted or tested. This includes adapting programs or practices to meet your needs, and developing implementation supports.

Evaluation/assessment – the evaluation and assessment phase includes any efforts to collect data about the fidelity (process measures: was it implemented as planned?) or effectiveness (outcome measures: is the intervention making a difference?) of the project. The evaluation assessment phase also includes post-evaluation efforts to apply findings, such as making changes to the program/practice and using the data to inform next steps.