

**ATTACHMENT #2**

## **QUALITY SERVICE REVIEW (QSR)**

### **Summary Update**

The Quality Service Review (QSR) Department conducted QSRs of 60 children from July through December 2022. Specifically, QSRs of 30 children were conducted within the Out-of-Home (OOH) program and QSRs of 30 children/families were conducted within the Family Preservation Program (FPP). The QSR department will conduct a similar number of reviews in OOH and FPP for the next reporting period.

### **Strategies for Improvement to Data Results for L.J. Measures**

The QSR department's Program Manager produced the following QSR data results for July – December 2022 by applying the math formulas outlined in the L.J. measure instructions agreed upon by the IVA and Agency. The QSR department also conducted 60 QSRs during this reporting period, which the IVA and BCDSS agreed upon as meeting the quota for the agency to report QSR data for the L.J. report.

BCDSS leadership continues to review the QSR data results closely. These data results show some key performance areas where improvement is needed. BCDSS is using this data to identify strategies for performance improvement and measure whether performance is improving in future L.J. cycles based upon executed strategies.

To improve outcomes, the strategies below were identified:

- The QSR department conducted its second cycle of QSRs in FPP this reporting period. This process includes continuing to familiarize FPP members with QSR processes and share the QSR findings and recommendations in a collaborative manner with FPP members.
- The QSR department continues to conduct QSR debriefings with Unit Managers, Supervisors and Caseworkers at the completion of each QSR. The QSR debriefings allow for collaborative discussion about the QSR findings and suggested recommendations for the OOH and FPP teams to consider about lessons learned and to identify next steps for performance improvement.
- As implemented in the prior cycle, the QSR continues the process of emailing the QSR recommendations after QSR debriefings to the Caseworkers, Supervisors and Unit Managers, as well as leadership members, including the Child Welfare Deputy Director, the Assistant Deputies, and Program Managers. The objective is for leadership to review these recommendations to identify practice themes and to further identify targeted strategies for performance improvement.

- The CQI/QSR Program Manager will share and discuss the below data results with Child Welfare Executive Leadership and senior managers from OOH and FPP to discuss the practice themes and for them to strategize on next steps for performance improvement.

**Data Results for L.J. Measures from QSRs in FPP**

The following presents the results for the L.J. measures derived from data for the 30 QSRs conducted in FPP from October – December 2022.

**L J. Measures 2 and 4**

Measure	Agency Performance: <sup>1</sup>
<b>Measure 2:</b> Percent of children and families in family preservation that timely received services identified in the case plan.	<b>10% (3/30)</b>
<b>Measure 4:</b> 85 percent of children and families in family preservation timely received the services identified in the case plan.	<b>10% (3/30)</b>

**Data from QSR Instrument used for performance calculation:**

**Practice Indicator 5. Plan Implementation**

Part A. Ratings	Adverse 1	Poor 2	Marginal 3	Fair 4	Good 5	Optimal 6	% Acceptable
Plan Implementation	0	1	7	16	6	0	20% (6/30)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

- § Whether strategies, services and activities are taking place as designed
- § Timeliness of plan and relations to urgency of the situation
- § Whether needed services are being provided to child and family regardless of a written plan
- § Whether needed services are being provided, and appropriately monitored, for

---

<sup>1</sup> LJ Measure 2 and 4 Instruction Numerator: All children in the denominator who have a 5 or 6 rating for Practice Indicators 6A Plan Implementation - Safety and Well-being, 6B Plan Implementation - Permanency, and 7 Tracking and Adjustment.

Note: When the QSR Program Manager and the IVA made revisions to the FPP instrument, Practice Indicator Plan Implementation became Practice Indicator 5 and this was consolidated into one rating rather than two distinct parts between Safety/Well-being and Permanency; and, Tracking and Adjustment Indicator became Practice Indicator 6.

child for educational or early intervention/special education needs  
 § Assistance provided to parents/legal guardian to achieve case closure goals

**Practice Indicator 6. Tracking and Adjustment**

Part A. Ratings	Adverse 1	Poor 2	Marginal 3	Fair 4	Good 5	Optimal 6	% Acceptable
Tracking & Adjustment	0	1	7	18	4	0	13% (4/30)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

- § Level of follow-up to monitor progress, changing needs and effectiveness of the plan
- § Accuracy, timeliness and relevance of information in assessments (Safe-c, MIFRA, MFFRA)
- § Level of follow-up to monitor the child’s progress, changing needs, and connection to needed educational, early intervention/special education services
- § Modification conducted in response to changing situations
- § Family response to learning what works

**L.J. Measure 3b**

Measure	Agency Performance: <sup>2</sup>
Measure 3b: 90 percent of children and families in family preservation had a case plan.	53% (16/30)

**Practice Indicator 4. CASE PLANNING**

Part A. Ratings	Adverse 1	Poor 2	Marginal 3	Fair 4	Good 5	Optimal 6	% Acceptable
Case Planning	0	0	3	11	16	0	53% (16/30)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

- § Design, timeliness and quality of plan (Service Plan) to assist child and

<sup>2</sup> LJ Measure 3b Instruction Numerator: All children in the denominator who have a 5 or 6 rating for Practice Indicators 5A Case Planning - Safety & Well-being and 5B Case Planning - Permanency. Note: When the QSR Program Manager and the IVA made revisions to the FPP instrument, Practice Indicator 5 Case Planning became Practice Indicator 4 and this was consolidated into one rating rather than two distinct parts between Safety/Well-being and Permanency.

- family in achieving identified goals and address needs
- § Quality of Service Plan - comprehensive, individualized, realistic, strength-based
- § Plans designed to unify agencies and service providers
- § Level of involvement of family members in the plan’s development; signatures on plans
- § Completion of accurate and timely Safe-C; CANS-F, and Educational Plan

**Data Results for L.J. Measures from QSRs in OOH**

The following presents the results for those L.J. measures derived from data for the 30 QSRs conducted in OOH from July - September 2022.

**L.J. Measure 7**

Measure	Agency Performance: <sup>3</sup>
<p><b>Measure 7:</b> Percent of all children with a permanency plan of reunification for whom BCDSS had a service agreement with the child’s parents or guardians or for whom BCDSS made reasonable efforts to get the child’s parents or guardians to enter into a service agreement.</p>	<p><b>29%</b> <b>(4/14)<sup>4</sup></b></p>

**Data from QSR Instrument Used for Performance Calculation:**

**TABLE 1. SERVICE PLAN**

*This question is not relevant (“NA”) if neither the primary or secondary permanency plan is reunification to either parent or to a guardian during the six months prior to the review. Unless one parent is unknown or the court has specified that reunification is only to be with the other parent, you must assume that a permanency plan of reunification is with both parents.*

*For a service plan to be “current,” it must be developed within the past 6 months and have an end date that is after the date of the review.*

<sup>3</sup> LJ Measure 7 Instruction Numerator: All children in the denominator who have one of the following sets of answers for the applicable QSR “Service Plans” sub-tables (A (father), B (mother) or C (guardian)):  
 (1) “Yes” answer to the question in row 1 AND “Yes” answer to the questions in rows 2 and 5-9; OR  
 (2) “Yes” answer to the question in row 1 AND “Yes” answer to the questions in rows 3 and 4.  
 If the answer to any of the questions in rows 3 – 9 of any sub-table is “No,” the child is not included in the numerator.

<sup>4</sup> For this calculation, the denominator is 14. There were 10 QSRs that were applicable for the father and mother; 2 QSRs that were applicable for the father only; and, 2 QSRs that were applicable for the mother only.

If a parent is not located or is not willing to sign the service plan, the Agency must document the efforts to locate and engage the parent.

**1A. Father**

Select Yes or No	Yes	No
1. Is the primary or the secondary permanency plan reunification with the Father? <i>If no, skip to Table 1B. Mother</i>	12	18
2. Is there a current service plan signed by the Father? “Current” means that the service plan “end date” is <u>after</u> the QSR review date. <i>If yes, skip to Row 5</i>	0	12
3. If there is no current signed service plan, is there documentation that reasonable efforts have been made to locate and engage the Father? <i>3a. If yes, specify what were the documented efforts: If no, skip to Table 1B. Mother</i>	9	3
4. Is there documentation that the Father was not available or was not willing to sign the service plan? <i>4a. If, yes, specify what was the documentation:  If yes or no to Row 4, skip to Table 1B. Mother</i>	2	7
5. Does the service plan include the current barriers for reunification with the Father? “Barriers” should be clearly stated or reflected in the written goals, objectives, needs, and comments.		
6. Does the service plan include the steps that the Father must take to have the child return home to him/be placed in his home?		
7. Does it include the timelines for the Father to complete these steps?		
8. Does the service plan include services that the caseworker and BCDSS will provide to the Father (for example, referral to alcohol abuse counseling)?		
9. Does the service plan include the timelines within which any service will be provided by the Agency/caseworker?		

**1B. Mother**

Select Yes or No	Yes	No
1. Is the primary or the secondary permanency plan reunification with the Mother? <i>If no, skip to Table 1C. Legal Guardian</i>	12	18
2. Is there a current service plan signed by the Mother? "Current" means that the service plan "end date" is <u>after</u> the QSR review date. <i>If yes, skip to Row 5</i>	2	10
3. If there is no current signed service plan, is there documentation that reasonable efforts have been made to locate and engage the Mother? 3a. <i>If yes, specify what were the documented efforts:</i> <i>If no, skip to Table 1C. Guardian</i>	8	2
4. Is there documentation that the Mother was not available or was not willing to sign the service plan? 4a. <i>If, yes, specify what was the documentation:</i>  <i>If yes or no to Row 4, skip to Table 1C. Legal Guardian</i>	1	7
5. Does the service plan include the current barriers for reunification with the Mother? "Barriers" should be clearly stated or reflected in the written goals, objectives, needs, and comments	2	0
6. Does the service plan include the steps that the Mother must take to have the child return home to her/be placed in her home?	2	0
7. Does it include the timelines for the Mother to complete these steps?	2	0
8. Does the service plan include services that the caseworker and BCDSS will provide to the Mother (for example, referral to alcohol abuse counseling)?	2	0
9. Does the service plan include the timelines within which any service will be provided by the Agency/caseworker?	2	0

**1C. Guardian**

Select Yes or No	Yes	No
------------------	-----	----

<p>1. Is the primary or the secondary permanency plan reunification with the Guardian?  <i>If no, skip to Table 2. Relative Search</i></p>	<p>0</p>	<p>30</p>
<p>2. Is there a current service plan signed by the Guardian?  “Current” means that the service plan “end date” is <u>after</u> the QSR review date.  <i>If yes, skip to Row 5</i></p>		
<p>3. If there is no current signed service plan, is there documentation that reasonable efforts have been made to locate and engage the Guardian?  3a. <i>If yes, specify what were the documented efforts:</i>  <i>If no, skip to Table 2. Relative Search</i></p>		
<p>4. Is there documentation that the Guardian was not available or was not willing to sign the service plan?  4a. <i>If, yes, specify what was the documentation:</i>   <i>If yes or no to Row 4, skip to Table 2. Relative Search</i></p>		
<p>5. Does the service plan include the current barriers for reunification with the Guardian?  “Barriers” should be clearly stated or reflected in the written goals, objectives, needs, and comments</p>		
<p>6. Does the service plan include the steps that the Guardian must take to have the child return home to him/her?</p>		
<p>7. Does it include the timelines for the Guardian to complete these steps?</p>		
<p>8. Does the service plan include services that the caseworker and BCDSS will provide to the Guardian (for example, referral to alcohol abuse counseling)?</p>		
<p>9. Does the service plan include the timelines within which any service will be provided by the Agency/caseworker?</p>		

**L.J. Measures 8, 16 and 41**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Agency Performance:<sup>5</sup></b>
Measure 8: Percent of all children for whom BCDSS provided referrals for services identified in the child’s parents’ or guardians’ service agreement.	3% (1/30)
Measure 41: Percent of all children for whom identified service needs were followed by timely and appropriate referrals.	3% (1/30)
Exit Standard 16: 90 percent of children in OHP and their families timely received the services identified in their case plans.	3% (1/30)

**Data from QSR Instrument used for performance calculation:**

**Practice Indicator 6. Plan Implementation**

<b>Part A. Ratings</b>	<b>Adverse 1</b>	<b>Poor 2</b>	<b>Marginal 3</b>	<b>Fair 4</b>	<b>Good 5</b>	<b>Optimal 6</b>	<b>% Acceptable</b>
<b>A. Safety &amp; well-being</b>	0	0	3	13	12	2	47% (14/30)
<b>B. Permanency</b>	0	0	7	18	5	0	17% (5/30)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

- § Whether strategies, services and activities are taking place as designed
- § Timeliness of plan and relationship to urgency of the situation
- § Whether needed services are being provided to child and family regardless of written plan

**Practice Indicator 7. Tracking & Adjustment**

<b>Part A. Ratings</b>	<b>Adverse 1</b>	<b>Poor 2</b>	<b>Marginal 3</b>	<b>Fair 4</b>	<b>Good 5</b>	<b>Optimal 6</b>	<b>% Acceptable</b>
<b>Tracking &amp; Adjustment</b>	0	0	8	19	3	0	10% (3/30)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

<sup>5</sup> LJ Measures 8, 16 and 41 Instruction Numerator: If the ratings for Practice Indicators 6A Plan Implementation – Safety & Wellbeing, 6B Plan Implementation – Permanency, and 7 Tracking & Adjustment are “5” or “6,” that child’s case will be considered compliant with the measure and included in the numerator.

- § Level of follow up to monitor progress, changing needs and effectiveness of the plan
- § Modification conducted in response to changing situations
- § Family response to learning what works.

**L.J. Measure 14**

Measure	Agency Performance: <sup>6</sup>
Measure 14: Percent of children for whom BCDSS searched for relatives or other resources.	45% <sup>7</sup> (5/11)

**Data from QSR Instrument used for performance calculation:**

**TABLE 2. RELATIVE SEARCH**

Relative search can include (but is not limited to) searches of Agency database (CIS, FIA, Child Support), Parent Locator, Family Find, Internet searches, and inquiries with other family members. If the relative is not located, more than one type of search must be completed for “Yes” to be chosen.

---

<sup>6</sup> LJ Measure 14 Instruction Numerator: All children in the denominator (from QSR “Relative Search” question) for whom the required relative searches were done as indicated by one of the following sets of answers:

- (1) “Yes” to the questions in rows 5 and 6;
- (2) “Yes” to the question in row 5, and “NA” to the question in row 6; OR
- (3) “NA” to the question in row 5, and “Yes” to the question in row 6.

<sup>7</sup> For 2 of the 13 cases that completed rows 5 and 6, the answer was Not Applicable “NA” in both rows 5 and 6 about conducting a search of the relatives of the father and mother. As these 2 cases were Not Applicable for both parents, they were subtracted from the denominator of applicable cases to assess performance with this measure.

Select Yes or No	Yes	No
1. Is the child placed with a relative? <i>If no, Skip to Row 3</i>	15	15
2. Is this relative the planned permanency resource? <i>If yes, stop here, skip to Table 3</i>	12	3
3. Is the child aged 18 – 20 years old? <i>If no, skip to Row 5</i>	5	13
4. Does the child want BCDSS to initiate contact with relatives? <i>Note: the answer to this question needs to be based on what the youth told the QSR reviewer during his/her interview.</i> <i>If no, stop here, skip to Table 3</i>	0	5

Select Yes, No or NA	Yes	No	NA
At any time during the past 12 months, was a search made for:			
5. Father's Relative(s) <i>Not Applicable =</i> - <i>Father was never identified</i> - <i>Paternal relatives were already located</i> - <i>Other (List reason):</i>	4	6	(3)
6. Mother's Relative(s) <i>Not Applicable =</i> · <i>Mother was never identified</i> · <i>Maternal relatives already located</i> · <i>Other (List reason):</i>	5	1	(7)

**L.J. Measures 15 & 40**

Measure	Agency Performance: <sup>8</sup>
Measure 40: Percent of all children who have service needs identified in their case plans.	23% (7/30)
Exit Standard 15: 90 percent of children in OHP had a case plan	23% (7/30)

**Data from QSR Instrument used for performance calculation:**

**Practice Indicator 5. Case Planning**

Part A. Ratings	Adverse 1	Poor 2	Marginal 3	Fair 4	Good 5	Optimal 6	% Acceptable
<b>1. Safety well-being</b>	1	0	1	8	14	6	67% (20/30)
<b>2. Permanency</b>	1	1	4	15	8	1	30% (9/30)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

- § Design of plan to assist child and family in achieving identified goals and address needs
- § Is the plan comprehensive, individualized and realistic?
- § Plans designed to unify agencies
- § Strength based nature of plan
- § Level of involvement of family members in the plan’s development
- § Presence of signed service agreements for parents and youth.

---

<sup>8</sup> LJ Measures 15 and 40 Instruction Numerator: If the ratings for Practice Indicators 5A Case Planning - Safety & Well-being and 5B Case Planning – Permanency are “5” or “6,” that child’s case will be considered compliant with the measure and included in the numerator.

**L.J. Measures 25(b) & 29(b)**

Measure	Agency Performance: <sup>9</sup>
Measure 25: Percent of children ages 14 and over who had a transition plan included in the child's case plan and were timely receiving the services identified in the case plan.	0% (0/9)
Exit Standard 29: 90% of children ages 14 and over had a transition plan included in the child's case plan and timely received the services identified in the case plan.	0% (0/9)

**Data from QSR Instrument used for performance calculation:****TABLE 3. MARYLAND YOUTH TRANSITIONAL PLAN**

Select Yes or No	Yes	No
1. Is the youth aged 14 – 20 years old at the start of the QSR? <i>If no, stop here, skip to Table 4</i>	9	21
2. Is there a current Maryland Youth Transitional Plan?  For a transitional plan to be “current,” it must be developed within the past 6 months and have an end date that is <u>after</u> the date of the review. <i>If no, stop here, skip to Table 4</i>	4	5
3. Was the Maryland Youth Transitional Plan substantially complete? <i>3a. If no, what was missing?</i>	4	0
4. Does the Maryland Youth Transitional Plan accurately describe the Youth's Strengths, Issues/Concerns, and Service Delivery Needs?	4	0
5. Does the Maryland Youth Transitional Plan include reasonable Short-Term Goals/Next Steps for each subject area? “Reasonable” means applicable to the circumstances of the youth's case.	4	0
6. Does the Maryland Youth Transitional Plan include tasks for the caseworker?	3	1

<sup>9</sup> LJ Measures 25(b) and 29(b) Instruction Numerator: All children in the denominator who have a rating of 5 or 6 on Status Indicator 11A or 11B AND who have one of the following sets of answers for the QSR “Maryland Youth Transitional Plan” question:

- (1) “Yes” answer to the questions in rows 2 - 8; OR
- (2) “Yes” answer to the questions in rows 2 - 6 and “No” answer to the question in row 7.

7. Was the youth capable of participating in and signing the Maryland Youth Transitional Plan? <i>7a. If no, specify the reason: If no, skip to Table 4</i>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
8. Is the Maryland Youth Transitional Plan signed by the youth?	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

**Status Indicator 11: Preparation for Adulthood**

Part A. Ratings	Not Applicable	Adverse 1	Poor 2	Marginal 3	Fair 4	Good 5	Optimal 6	% Acceptable
<b>A. 14 - 17 Years old</b>	(26)	0	0	1	1	2	0	50% (2/4)
<b>B. 18 - 20 Years old</b>	(25)	0	0	1	4	0	0	0% (0/5)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

- § Progress made toward any preparation and transition goals. BCDSS transition plans. Special education transition plans.
- § Access to and transition into any adult services that are required.
- § Any necessary supports provided
- § Skills for adulthood

**11A. Not Applicable = The youth is under age 14 years or aged 18-20.**

**11B. Not Applicable = The child is under age 18 years old.**

**LJ Measure 33**

Measure	Agency Performance: <sup>10</sup>
Exit Standard 33: 90 percent of all children were placed promptly in the least restrictive and appropriate placement based on their individualized needs.	80% (24/30)

**Data from QSR Instrument used for performance calculation:****Status Indicator 4. Living Arrangement**

Part A. Ratings	Adverse 1	Poor 2	Marginal 3	Fair 4	Good 5	Optimal 6	% Acceptable
Living Arrangement	1	0	1	4	12	12	80% (24/30)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

§ Appropriateness in relation to: needs, family relationships, connections, age, abilities, special needs, peer group, culture, and language

*Not Applicable = Youth is incarcerated.*

**L.J. Measures 42 and 44**

Measure	Agency Performance: <sup>11</sup>
Measure 42: Percent of children who receive services necessary and sufficient to meet the child's needs and to support stability in the least restrictive placement.	50% (15/30)
Exit Standard 44: 90 percent of children and caregivers received services necessary and sufficient to meet their needs and to support stability in the least restrictive placement.	50% (15/30)

**Data from QSR Instrument used for performance calculation:****Status Indicator 3A. Stability**

<sup>10</sup> LJ Measure 33 Instruction Numerator: If the rating for Status Indicator 4 Living Arrangement is "5" or "6," that child's case will be considered compliant with the measure and included in the numerator.

<sup>11</sup> LJ Measures 42 & 44 Instruction Numerator: If the ratings for Status Indicator 3A Stability Home/Family and Status Indicator 4 Living Arrangement are "5" or "6" and the rating for Practice Indicator 13C Family Supports & Services: Caregiver is "5" or "6" or "NA," that child's case will be considered compliant with the measure and included in the numerator.

A. Part Ratings	Adverse 1	Poor 2	Marginal 3	Fair 4	Good 5	Optimal 6	% Acceptable
Home/Family	0	1	5	5	1	18	63% (19/30)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

- Level of stability in relation to home, school and community
- Probability for disruption of stability
- Services in place to maximize stability and reduce chance of disruption

**Status Indicator 4: Living Arrangement**

Part A. Ratings	Adverse 1	Poor 2	Marginal 3	Fair 4	Good 5	Optimal 6	% Acceptable
Living Arrangement	1	0	1	4	12	12	80% (24/30)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

§ Appropriateness in relation to: needs, family relationships, connections, age, abilities, special needs, peer group, culture, and language

*Not Applicable = Youth is incarcerated.*

**Practice Indicator 13C. Family Supports & Services**

Part A. Ratings	Not Applicable	Adverse 1	Poor 2	Marginal 3	Fair 4	Good 5	Optimal 6	% Acceptable
C. Caregiver	(5)	0	0	1	6	8	10	72% (18/25)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

- Training and in-home support the family needs to provide the child with a safe, stable environment
- Special support that may include respite or therapies (if needed).

*Not Applicable =*

- *The caregiver when the child is living with a parent or in independent or semi-independent living (including Job Corps) or jail or prison.*
- *The child is in congregate care, and there is no plan to place the child with a specific caregiver. If the child is in congregate care but there is a plan to place the child with a specific caregiver, this indicator does apply, and "caregiver" should be rated.*

**L.J. Measures 71(b) & 72(b)**

Measure	Agency Performance: <sup>12</sup>
Measure 71b: Percent of children who had documented visits from their caseworker once monthly in the child's placement.	77% (23/30)
Exit Standard 72b: 95 percent of children had documented visits from their caseworker once monthly in the child's placement.	77% (23/30)

**Data from QSR Instrument used for performance calculation:****Practice Indicator 8: Caseworker Visitation**

Part A. Ratings	Adverse 1	Poor 2	Marginal 3	Fair 4	Good 5	Optimal 6	% Acceptable
<b>Caseworker Visitation</b>	0	0	0	7	15	8	77% 23/30

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

- § Timeliness and duration of visits
- § Sufficient privacy and duration to permit engagement and assessment
- § Assessment of status, progress, especially as to quality of care, appropriateness and success of placement and adequacy of services provided
- § Whether additional visits outside the home are occurring as needed to observe the child in other frequently visited settings or for comfort in speaking openly

<sup>12</sup> LJ Measures 71(b) & 72(b) Instruction Numerator: All children in the denominator who have a 5 or 6 rating for Practice Indicator 8.

**L.J. Measures 85(b), 87 and 88(b)**

Measure	Agency Performance: <sup>13</sup>
Measure 85b: Percent of children who received timely all Needed Health Care Services.	70% (21/30)
Exit Standard 88b: 90 percent of children received timely all Needed Health Care Services.	70% (21/30)
Measure 87: Percent of cases in which the case worker monitored the child's health status once monthly.	60% (18/30)

**Data from QSR Instrument used for performance calculation:****Practice Indicator 9. Physical & Mental Healthcare Services**

Part A. Ratings	Adverse 1	Poor 2	Marginal 3	Fair 4	Good 5	Optimal 6	% Acceptable
<b>A. Services</b>	0	0	3	6	13	8	70% (21/30)
<b>B. Monitoring</b>	0	0	3	9	15	3	60% (18/30)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

§ Degree healthcare services provided address what is required for child to achieve best attainable health status

§ Timely screenings, dentals, equipment, routine care

§ Area special needs addressed if necessary? How often is health monitored by case worker? What kind of monitoring is done, e.g., asking child and caregiver, reviewing MATCH health plan, reviewing medical records, speaking with medical providers?

**L.J. Measure 97**

<sup>13</sup> LJ Measures 85(b) & 88(b) Instruction Numerator: All children in the denominator who have a 5 or 6 rating for Practice Indicator 9A Physical & Mental Healthcare Services: Services.

LJ Measure 87 Instruction Numerator: All children in denominator who have a 5 or 6 rating for Practice Indicator 9B Physical & Mental Healthcare Services: Monitoring.

Measure	Agency Performance: <sup>14</sup>
Measure 97: Percent of children eligible for special education who received special education services without interruption when they transfer schools.	100% (2/2)

**Data from QSR Instrument used for performance calculation:**

**TABLE 4. SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES**

Select Yes or No	Yes	No
1. Was the child in Pre-K - 12 grade at any time within the past 6 months? <i>If No, skip to Table 5</i>	19	11
2. Did the child transfer school at any time within the past 6 months? <i>If the child had more than one school transfer within the past 6 months, focus on the most recent school transfer. If No, skip to Table 5</i>	3	16
3. Was the child receiving special education services <u>BEFORE</u> the child transferred schools? <i>If No, skip to Table 5</i>	2	1
4. Were Special Education services provided without interruption when the child moved to the new school? <i>(e.g., there was no delay in enrollment in the new school, no delay in the child being able to attend the new school, no delay in the child receiving all the identified needed Special Education services in the new school)</i>	2	0

<sup>14</sup> LJ Measure 97 Instruction Numerator: With Table 4. Special Education Services, all children in the denominator for whom the answer to the question in row 4 is “Yes.”

**L.J. Measures 86, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110 and 111**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Agency Performance:<sup>15</sup></b>
Measure 101: Percent of children who have an educational plan	67% (16/24)
Exit Standard 104: 90 percent of children had an educational plan.	67% (16/24)
Measure 102: Percent of children for whom BCDSS had met its obligations as set forth in the child's educational plan.	92% (22/24)
Exit Standard 105: For 90% of children, BCDSS had met its obligations as set forth in the child's educational plan	92% (22/24)
Measure 103: Percent of children whose educational progress was monitored monthly.	21% (5/24)
Exit Standard 106: For 90 percent of children, BCDSS had monitored the child's educational progress monthly.	21% (5/24)
Measure 86: Percent of cases in which the identification of a developmental delay was followed by a prompt referral for special education or early intervention services.	88% (15/17)
Exit Standard 110: BCDSS made a prompt referral for special education or early intervention services for 90 percent of children for whom there was an indication of developmental delay or disability	88% (15/17)
Measure 107: Percent of children for whom any identification of developmental delay or disability was followed by a prompt referral for special education or early intervention services.	88% (15/17)
Measure 109: Percent of children who were eligible for special education or early intervention services for whom BCDSS made reasonable efforts to secure services.	88% (15/17)

<sup>15</sup> Measure Instructions Numerator:

LJ Measures 101 & 104: All children in the denominator who have a 5 or 6 rating for Practice Indicator 10A Education: Plan.

LJ Measures 102 & 105: All children in the denominator who have a 5 or 6 rating for Practice Indicator 10B Education: Services.

LJ Measures 103 & 106: If the rating for Practice Indicator 10C Education: Monitoring is 5 or 6, that child's case will be considered compliant with this measure and included in the numerator.

LJ Measures 86 & 110: All children in denominator who have a 5 or 6 rating for Practice Indicator 10D Education: Early Intervention/Special Education.

LJ Measures 107, 109 & 111: All children in denominator who have a 5 or 6 rating for Practice Indicator 10D Education: Early Intervention/Special Education.

Exit Standard 111: BCDSS made reasonable efforts to secure services for 90 percent of children who were eligible for special education or early intervention services.	88% (15/17)
--	----------------

**Data from QSR Instrument used for performance calculation:**

**Practice Indicator 10. Education**

Part A. Ratings	Not Applicable	Adverse 1	Poor 2	Marginal 3	Fair 4	Good 5	Optimal 6	% Acceptable
A. Plan	(6)	1	0	0	7	4	12	67% (16/24)
B. Services	(6)	0	0	0	2	5	17	92% (22/24)
C. Monitoring	(6)	0	0	4	15	4	1	21% (5/24)
D. Early Intervention/ Special Ed	(13)	0	0	0	2	2	13	88% (15/17)

**Part B. Facts & Reasoning Relied Upon to Determine Rating Value**

- i. See indicator protocol for specific facts required

*Not Applicable =*

*(1) All subparts - Youth ages 18-20 who have a high school diploma or GED, are employed and do not wish to pursue any further education at this time. (2) Early Intervention/Special Education Services – The child does not receive and does not need such services.*

**L.J. Measure 108**

Measure	Agency Performance: <sup>16</sup>
Measure 108: Percent of children in special education or early intervention for whom the provider or case worker attended the IEP meeting.	77% (10/13)

**Data from QSR Instrument used for performance calculation:**

**TABLE 5. SPECIAL EDUCATION/EARLY INTERVENTION MEETING ATTENDANCE**

Select Yes or No	Yes	No
1. At any time within the past 12-months, has the child had a meeting regarding special education or early intervention services? <i>(include every meeting that occurred for this analysis)</i> a. If yes, how many meetings were there: (Range 1 – 2 meetings) <i>If No, Stop Here</i>	13	17
2. For each meeting, was either a BCDSS staff person or the child’s provider (kinship caregiver, foster parent, or congregate care representative) in attendance?	10	3

---

<sup>16</sup> LJ Measure 108 Instruction Numerator: All children in the denominator (Table 2. Special Education/Early Intervention Meeting Attendance) for whom the answer to the question in row 2 is “Yes.”