

County Improvement Plan (CIP) Guide and Template

The preliminary findings from the Quality Service Review (QSR) are presented and provided to the county, QSR reviewers and any additional stakeholders the county invites to attend the Exit Conference at the conclusion of the on-site QSR. Following the Exit Conference, the QSR Local and State Site Leads work collaboratively on a second-level of quality assurance of the preliminary findings.

The county will receive a QSR Final Report approximately four weeks from when the Local and State Site Lead team submits the final QSR findings for analysis. The final results are then presented by the Local and State Site Lead team at the county's Next Steps Meeting.

The Next Steps Meeting is the kickoff to the development of the County Improvement Plan (CIP), which will outline the priorities the county chooses to focus on to improve specific outcomes as a result of a comprehensive review of their practice which includes the QSR findings and may also include a review of additional data such as the county data packages provided by the state, quantitative measures produced by the county, as well as the results of other qualitative data.

Following the Next Steps Meeting, the county works collaboratively to develop their CIP. The county must submit their CIP to the appropriate Office of Children, Youth and Families (OCYF) Regional Office Director and QSR Site Leads no later than 60 calendar days from the date of the Next Steps Meeting. The OCYF Regional Office will review the county's CIP in conjunction with the QSR State Site Leads. Following the review of the CIP, the OCYF RO will accept the plan within 10 calendar days of receipt. The acknowledgment to the county of acceptance of the CIP marks the effective start date of the CIP.

Once the CIP is accepted, the following documents will be posted to the Department of Public Welfare's website:

- County's QSR Final Report
- CIP

The attached CIP template has been designed to assist the organization in thinking about how to plan and implement improvements.

County Improvement Plan

County Name: Lackawanna

Date of Plan: September 19, 2011 **X** Initial Update

Section I. Sponsor Team Members *(List the members of the Sponsor Team):*

The members of Lackawanna County Children and Youth's (LCCYS) Administrative Team form the core Sponsor Team: William Browning, Executive Director; Kerry Kimmick Browning, Court and Community Services Director; Adrian Maillet, Fiscal Officer; Kathy Snyder, Fiscal Administrative Officer II; Nancy Johnson, Casework Manager; Jason Kavulich, Casework Manager; and Amanda Helring, Quality Assurance Program Specialist.

Section II. Background: *(Describe, in detail, the process of how you developed the plan. Who was involved in planning? How did you prioritize your outcomes? List any sources of information that helped in decision making.)*

LCCYS' County Improvement Plan (CIP) was developed primarily by the Sponsor Team. In order to identify our priority outcomes, we reviewed (1) our Licensing Inspection Summaries (LIS) from the past several years including the most recent dated April 2011; (2) the report dated May 2011 from our first Quality Service Review (QSR) which included information from reviewer interviews and scoring, from LCCYS' data package which includes AFCARS data, and from four focus groups one each of caseworkers, supervisors, service providers, and mothers who are clients of LCCYS and participating in the one of the agency's Nurturing Mothers Group; (3) agency practice and our concentrated efforts over the past six years to improve practice and subsequent outcomes for families; and (4) agency policies and procedures. Once we narrowed our focus, we obtained some informal input from agency staff and collateral resources to identify the perceived gaps between where we are and where we strive to be. In choosing the outcomes, we considered that we did not want all of the outcomes to affect a single client sub-population (e.g., children in substitute care) and we chose the outcomes we believed would have the most significant and comprehensive impact on our practice as a whole.

Section III. Priority Outcomes: *(List and describe the overarching outcomes identified by the Sponsor Team. Outcomes should be limited to approximately three to four priority areas.)*

Outcome # 1: To consistently deliver Independent Living (IL) services to youth between the ages of 16 and 21 in substitute care through LCCYS with special

focus on youth transitioning out of care and on informal IL assessment and service delivery beginning for children aged 15.5 years and in substitute care.

Outcome # 2: To build on the strengths which enable us to partner with other child- and family-serving systems to form teams around children and families to improve the functioning and communication of these teams.

Outcome # 3: To engage fathers in the assessment and planning process for their children at all levels of and points in the family's involvement with LCCYS.

Section IV. Findings (*Identify the findings that explain why each priority outcome was chosen. List any related findings: e.g., strength and gap trends, data, and connections to CFSR indicators of Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being and/or QSR Practice Performance indicators*)

Findings related to Outcome # 1: This outcome relates directly to QSR Child/Youth and Family Indicator 8: Pathway to Independence for which four cases were assessed with 50% rated as acceptable and 50% rated as unacceptable. This outcome further relates directly to Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs and indirectly to CFSR Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children, relative to youth in care having opportunities to such connections since most youth transitioning out of care after age eighteen seek to return to their family-of-origin and to their community.

LCCYS has one caseworker dedicated to providing only IL services. Youth who are not approaching a transition receive an IL assessment by a contracted service provider; IL assessments for youth approaching a transition are completed by the IL caseworker. Because of differences in the assessment process between LCCYS and the service provider, some youth have not been assigned a priority level that accurately reflects their abilities, their resources, and their needs. This has caused some gaps in services to these youth. The level of service and amount of contact a youth receives from the IL caseworker is based on the priority level they are assigned. Additionally, because of the number of youth needing IL services, the intensity and duration of the services some youth need, the special needs of and focus on transitioning or post-transition mothers aged 18-21 and youth facing homelessness, and the agency's practice of never turning away youth ages 18-21 who have left care but are requesting after-care IL services, one caseworker cannot provide formal IL services to all of the youth who qualify for it and who require it. As such, this caseworker has had to prioritize youth who are approaching transition. Because of the practice of IL services being viewed as a

separate and secondary service, protective services caseworkers have not consistently incorporated informal IL assessments and services into their case planning which causes gaps in services to youth eligible for and requiring IL services, especially once they begin to approach transition and it is discovered that they do not have the foundation to move forward in a successful way.

Although we have refined the agency's IL process over the past few years, there are still gaps in delivery of IL services to youth and we strive to employ a more comprehensive approach to IL assessment, planning, and service delivery.

Findings related to Outcome # 2: This outcome relates directly to QSR Practice Performance Indicator 2: Teaming with the focus on team functioning rather than team formation. All 15 QSR cases were assessed on the teaming indicator and team formation was rated as acceptable in 80% of cases while team functioning was rated as acceptable in 60% of the cases. This data indicates that teams are frequently successfully formed, but have not been functioning cohesively toward a shared goal for the family, possibly resulting in service gaps, overlaps, or incongruity. Although it is difficult to relate this outcome to a specific CFPSR outcome, team functioning most directly affects both permanency and well-being. Having teams properly formed but lacking clear and consistent communication can result in a significant negative impact on all areas of a family's involvement with LCCYS and all other child- and family-serving systems, including, but not limited to, assessment, planning, and service delivery.

Although gaps in team functioning may exist between LCCYS and other child- and family-serving systems, the most significant gap appears to be between LCCYS and the educational system. This was identified not only through the QSR reviewer interviews with school personnel, but also through the QSR focus groups with agency staff. The identified issues appeared seem to be due to poor communication between LCCYS and the educational system. At times, school personnel with direct knowledge of the child were not participating on the team or were not aware of LCCYS involvement even though another school employee was actively involved with the team.

Through interactional helping skills and the strengths-based, solution-focused model, LCCYS has been able to engage other child- and family-serving systems more effectively over the past few years. Although there is always room for improvement, we believe that our focus now needs to move from team formation to improving the functioning of the teams we have heretofore strove to assemble. Even though we welcome school personnel who provide direct services to students to participate in and to provide input into how the Improvement Team can effectively achieve this outcome, we undoubtedly need the participation of administrative-level school personnel who have the authority to make changes and resolve issue within their school or school district. This outcome has the potential to affect all of the families we serve.

Findings related to Outcome # 3: This outcome relates directly to Practice Performance Indicator 1b: Engagement with the focus on engaging fathers. For the 14 cases assessed for engagement of the mother, 86% were rated as acceptable whereas for the 12 cases assessed for engagement of the father(s), 58% were rated as acceptable. This outcome is related directly to CFSR Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations, Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children, and Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs. Similar to the gaps in team functioning, gaps in engaging fathers can result in a significant negative impact on all areas of a family's involvement with LCCYS, including, but not limited to, assessment, planning, and service delivery. This impact can negatively affect a child's permanency related to reunification, identification of kinship resources, and family relationships and connections and a child's well-being related to accurate assessment of the father, the father's involvement in case planning, and the father receiving appropriate services to enhance his ability to meet his child(ren)'s needs.

Six years ago LCCYS recognized that fathers had often not been engaged to participate in the agency's assessment or case planning, even when their children were in substitute care. Likewise, fathers were often not considered as resources for reunification or for identifying potential permanent kinship resources or connections for their children. Over the past four years, LCCYS has increased the engagement of fathers which began with implementation of a fatherhood group. This 26-week group is open to all fathers and the groups are staggered with a new group starting every four to six weeks so that there is not a lengthy wait for this service.

Some of the reasons that fathers are not engaged as often and as intensively as mothers likely relate to societal or individual beliefs about the family and who is most suited to care for children, especially as a single parent; however, it is important to note that anecdotal information from the Improvement Team presents that on many cases, the non-custodial, absent, and/or non-resident parent is not engaged by the agency even when that parent is the mother. Since the vast majority of families headed by a single parent and involved with the agency are headed by single mothers, fathers are engaged disproportionately. In the QSR sample of in-home cases, 60% were headed by the biological mother while none were headed by the biological father. Because of these disproportionate numbers, if children are removed from their mother's care and reunification efforts focus solely or significantly on providing services to the original custodial parent, then fathers are far less likely to be engaged as a resource for reunification. Focus groups of fathers and of agency staff will help to further identify barriers to engaging fathers.

Although we have made much progress in engaging fathers, we have found that engagement of fathers is most consistent on cases involving placement and much less consistent on in-home cases. Our venture on this outcome is for fathers to be engaged consistently throughout the life of a case beginning at the point of intake.

Section V. Strategies and Action Steps for each Outcome

The following should guide the development of specific strategies and action steps for each of the priority outcomes.

- a. Identify existing strengths
- b. Identify existing gaps
- c. Identify the root causes for the gaps
- d. Identify potential remedies for the root causes
- e. Identify which remedies can be quick wins, midterm, and long term

The following components should be included in the plan for each priority outcome:

Strategy: *The overall approach/plan to achieve the outcome. Several strategies may be identified for each, but should all connect to the particular outcome you are trying to achieve.*

Action Steps: *Clear and specific steps to be taken to achieve the strategy. There may be several action steps identified for each particular strategy.*

Indicators/Benchmarks: *These indicate how the strategies and action steps have impacted the outcome as well as indicating how progress is measured and monitored.*

Evidence of Completion: *Evidence that verifies that each individual action step has been completed.*

Persons Responsible: *The individual who is responsible for completing each individual action step.*

Timeframe: *Expected time of completion for each individual action step.*

Resources Needed: *Resources needed to achieve the strategy or action step. May include, but is not limited to, financial resources, partnerships with technical assistance providers, and staff resources.*

Status: *Progress toward completion of each action step upon review of the County Improvement Plan.*

Section V. Strategies and Action Steps for each Outcome

Outcome # 1: To consistently deliver Independent Living (IL) services to youth between the ages of 16 and 21 in substitute care through LCCYS with special focus on youth transitioning out of care and on informal IL assessment and service delivery beginning for children aged 15.5 years and in substitute care.

STRATEGIES	ACTION STEPS	INDICATORS/ BENCHMARKS	EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TIMEFRAME	RESOURCES NEEDED	STATUS
1. Educate protective services caseworkers and supervisors on the IL process and requirements and the need for IL to be addressed consistently for youth in care ages 15.5 to 21 years old even if the youth does not receive formal IL services.	1. Train protective services caseworkers and supervisors about the IL process.	1. Protective services caseworkers and supervisors understand the IL process and the importance of ongoing preparation of a youth for adulthood.	Training report. Survey of staff to assess their understanding of the process and the need for their participation in the IL process.	Improvement Team, Protective Services Caseworkers and Supervisors	By 11/18/2011	Updated policies and procedures, staff training	In process as part of refining policies and procedures related to Independent Living.

	<p>2. Reinforce the importance of consistent IL practice to ensure youth's needs are properly addressed.</p>	<p>2. Discussion at supervisor and group meetings.</p> <p>Conduct ongoing transfer of learning sessions.</p>	<p>Supervisor and group meeting notes, training report.</p>	<p>Improvement Team, Administrative Team, Protective Services Supervisors</p>	<p>By 02/10/2012</p>	<p>Updated policies and procedures</p>	
	<p>3. Ensure that youths' IL needs are addressed consistently even at times that they do not need formal IL services.</p>	<p>3. Caseworkers are consistently discussing youths' educational and life goals to determine if they are taking the correct steps to achieve their goals.</p>	<p>Documentation of ongoing communication with the youth, the resource parents, and the school counselor about the child's goals and needs.</p> <p>Review of a sample of youth eligible for IL services to ensure that their IL needs have been consistently addressed.</p> <p>Survey of youth to determine how they believe their IL needs were addressed.</p>	<p>Improvement Team, Protective Services Caseworkers and Supervisors</p>	<p>By 02/10/2012</p>	<p>Staff training, communication with school personnel</p> <p>Possible technical assistance from the CWTP</p>	<p>In process as part of refining policies and procedures related to Independent Living.</p>

<p>2. Refine the agency's IL process, policies, and procedures.</p>	<p>1. Update the IL process to require a referral for an IL assessment for any youth from entering substitute care at ages 15.5 to 17 years old.</p>	<p>1. All youth entering care between the ages of 15.5 and 17 years old will receive an IL assessment.</p>	<p>Completed policies and procedures. Documentation of youth referred for IL services.</p>	<p>Improvement Team</p>	<p>By 11/18/2011</p>	<p>Staff time commitment to develop the new process, staff input</p>	<p>In process.</p>
	<p>2. Staff IL referrals at internal administrative permanency case staffings.</p>	<p>2. All IL referrals are staffed by an administrator to determine what course of action best meets the youth's IL needs.</p>	<p>Documentation as a part of the agency's permanency packet.</p>	<p>Improvement Team, Caseworker Managers, IL Caseworker, Protective Services Caseworkers and Supervisors</p>	<p>By 11/18/2011</p>	<p>Development of a form for documentation specific to IL</p>	<p>Completed consistently on most cases with a youth who qualifies for formal IL services.</p>
	<p>3. Develop specific criteria required for the IL assessment so multiple individuals and/or agencies will complete the assessments in a consistent manner.</p>	<p>3. Consistent IL assessments will prevent gaps in services and will ensure a youth's needs are met within a timeframe that meets the urgency of the need.</p>	<p>Consistent IL assessment document and procedures.</p>	<p>Improvement Team</p>	<p>By 12/16/2011</p>	<p>Input from service providers and youth</p>	<p>In process as part of refining policies and procedures related to Independent Living.</p>

	4. Access external services such as the Older Child Matching Initiative (OCMI) and SWAN units of service (e.g., child-specific recruitment/CSR) and internal services such as Family Finding to identify and develop connections for youth in substitute care and aged 15.5 to 21 years old.	4. Youth have the opportunity to renew and develop family relationships and kinship connections to be considered as permanency resources or to become life connections and resources for the youth's transition to adulthood.	Policies and procedures which specify when a referral to these services needs to be made.	Improvement Team	By 12/16/2011	Education of agency staff on these resources	In process as part of refining policies and procedures related to Independent Living.
--	--	---	---	------------------	---------------	--	---

Note: *If Counties already have documents or plans that connect to the outcome, that plan should be noted in the table above.*

Improvement Team(s)/ Members *(List the members of the Improvement Team and identify co-chairs with an asterisk if applicable):*

Jason Kavulich, LCCYS, Chair
 Attorney Corinne Thiel, North Penn Legal Services, children's Guardian ad Litem for dependency cases, Co-Chair
 Attorney Pam Janus, North Penn Legal Services, children's Guardian ad Litem for delinquency cases
 Jim Pusateri, LCCYS
 Lisa Gruszewski, LCCYS
 Jane Leach, LCCYS
 Jill Moyle, United Neighborhood Centers
 Lorelei Johnson, Legal Services Initiative Coordinator

Outcome # 2: To build on the strengths which enable us to partner with other child- and family-serving systems to form teams around children and families to improve the functioning and communication of these teams.

STRATEGIES	ACTION STEPS	INDICATORS/ BENCHMARKS	EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TIMEFRAME	RESOURCES NEEDED	STATUS
1. Engage school personnel to participate on the Improvement Team and provide input into the planning, training, communication, and problem resolution processes.	1. Contact personnel in county school districts to explain the QSR/CQI process and invite their participation on and input into the Improvement Team.	1. The Improvement Team is in communication with participating school personnel at least monthly for information sharing and exchange of ideas.	School personnel regularly attend Improvement Team meetings and plans reflect their input.	Improvement Team	By 11/04/2011	Time commitment from school personnel	In process with several school districts, ultimate goal is for some involvement from all school districts
2. Cross-education between the educational system and LCCYS on what each system's responsibility is when working with families	1. Overview training for LCCYS staff to learn how the educational system works and their practices for working with families involved with CYS.	1. LCCYS staff understands the process for how the educational system works with families involved with LCCYS and the process for the educational system's communication with LCCYS.	Training report.	Improvement Team, Protective Services Caseworkers and Supervisors, School Personnel	By 01/13/2012	Commitment from school districts to participate in the cross-training process	

	2. Overview training of educational personnel on how the social services and child protective services systems work and what the regulatory requirements and case process are.	2. Educational staff understand how the child protective services system functions and what its scope is.	Training report.	Improvement Team	By 01/13/2012	Staff identified to train school personnel	LCCYS has worked to informally educate the educational system about child protective services, including having a liaison in ongoing contact with school districts relative to truancy. LCCYS is increasing the number of truancy liaisons in the schools for a focus on referring families to preventative services before they need to become involved in the court system, juvenile probation, or child protective services.
2. Develop a process in collaboration with school districts to ensure that knowledge about the child is provided to the individuals directly involved with the child.	1. Survey school districts to determine their policies on how they communicate with LCCYS.	1. Information from all county school districts on their process for communication with LCCYS.	Survey report.	Improvement Team	By 11/18/2011	Collaboration with school districts	
	2. Review of school policies to identify which processes might be barriers to communication	2. Identification of barriers. Communication with the school districts about possible	Survey report.	Improvement Team	By 12/09/2011	Communication with school districts, input from school districts	

	from LCCYS and how identified issues can be resolved.	resolutions.					
	3. Develop policies and procedures for caseworkers to communicate with schools taking into consideration the school's process.	3. Caseworkers consistently provide and obtain information about children involved with LCCYS. Caseworkers consistently attend educational meetings for children they are providing services to.	Completed policies and procedures.	Improvement Team	By 02/17/2012	Input from the school districts	
	4. Regular communication between administrative staff at LCCYS and the school districts to assess and address any communication issues as they arise.	4. Issues which arise in communication between LCCYS and the educational system is addressed and resolved in a timely manner.	Documentation of meetings. Survey of agency personnel, school personnel and families with CYS-school interagency teams to	Improvement Team, Administrative Team	By 11/18/2011	Commitment from the school districts Possible technical assistance from the CWTP regarding survey	

			determine if increased collaboration and problem-solving is occurring.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note: *If Counties already have documents or plans that connect to the outcome, that plan should be noted in the table above.*

Improvement Team(s)/ Members *(List the members of the Improvement Team and identify co-chairs with an asterisk if applicable):*

- Nancy Johnson, LCCYS, Chair
- Debbie Marichak, LCCYS, Co-Chair
- Jennifer Carroll, LCCYS
- Tammy Reiprich, LCCYS
- Bryan Walker, LCCYS
- Judy Castrogiovanni, North Pocono School District
- Jessica Leitzel, Scranton School District

Outcome # 3: To engage fathers in the assessment and planning process for their children at all levels of and points in the family's involvement with LCCYS.

STRATEGIES	ACTION STEPS	INDICATORS/ BENCHMARKS	EVIDENCE OF COMPLETION	PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	TIMEFRAME	RESOURCES NEEDED	STATUS
1. Engage fathers at the point of assessment/ investigation	1. Obtain information about the father(s) from the referral source at the point of call intake.	1. Each referral has documentation of efforts to obtain information about the father and his location.	All referrals have the father of each child identified with his demographic and contact information or documentation of why that information is missing.	Improvement Team, Screening Unit and Supervisor	By 10/17/2011	Updated policies and procedures	In process as part of refining policies and procedures related to call intake.
	2. Train agency staff on what information to obtain about fathers, how to document their efforts to obtain information and locate fathers, and how and when to complete diligent search requests.	2. All protective service caseworkers and supervisors are trained and understand the process of obtaining information about fathers and initiating diligent search requests.	Training report.	Improvement Team, LSI Paralegals, Protective Services Caseworkers and Supervisors	By 12/02/2011	Staff and LSI paralegal time commitment	

	3. Efforts are made to locate fathers whose information or whereabouts are unknown.	3. Contact with family members and friends to obtain information about the father's whereabouts. A diligent search request to locate the father.	Documentation in case files of efforts to locate fathers, including requests for diligent searches and the results. Supervisor reviews document directives on obtaining information and locating fathers.	Improvement Team, LSI Paralegals, Protective Services Caseworkers and Supervisors	By 12/09/2011	Updated policies and procedures	Currently only completed consistently on cases involving a placement.
	4. Contact the father during the assessment/ investigation to inform him of the process, to obtain information on his history and his situation, and to engage him in the assessment process.	4. Information obtained from fathers is included on safety assessments, risk assessments, and in family assessments. Information from collateral resources is obtained relative to fathers. Fathers have input into the assessment.	Documentation in the case file of interviews with fathers and collateral resources. Supervisor reviews document engagement efforts.	Improvement Team, Protective Services Caseworkers and Supervisors	By 01/13/2012	Updated family assessment process, updated intake policies and procedures	In process as part of refining the family assessment process for cases being opened for protective services. Not yet initiated for intake cases.
2. Engage fathers throughout the time the case is open for protective services.	1. Discuss the status determination with the father at the conclusion of the intake and include the father when sending a letter to close a case or to	1. Fathers are informed of the status of the case and given an opportunity to ask questions.	Copies of letters to fathers are included in the file. Documentation of contacts with fathers in the case file.	Improvement Team, Protective Services Caseworkers and Supervisors	By 01/13/2012	Updated policies and procedures	

	open the case for protective services.						
	2. Engage the father to participate in the development of the Family Service Plan (FSP) or Child's Permanency Plan (CPP) - inform the father of the process and send a letter ahead of time inviting him to participate. Inform the father of the opportunity to participate in Family Group Decision making (FGDM) and what the process entails.	2. Fathers participate in the development of objectives and tasks for the FSP/ CPP for themselves and their children. Fathers participate in FGDM to develop their Plan.	Objectives and tasks on the FSP/ CPP are specific to the risk factors and absent or diminished protective capacities relative to fathers. Documentation that fathers were informed in advance of the opportunity for FSP/ CPP/ FGDM participation and input.	Improvement Team, Protective Services Caseworkers and Supervisors, FGDM Caseworker(s)	By 01/13/2012	Updated policies and procedures, additional training	Currently addressed through a Quality Assurance review of a sampling of Plans.
	3. Refer fathers to the agency's fatherhood group more regularly on in-home cases. Educate fathers on how the group will benefit them and help them to complete their objectives on the	3. Fathers are assessed for this group at key case decision-making points and at the point of FSP/ CPP development.	Documentation of discussion with fathers about the group. Documentation of why fathers were not referred to the group.	Improvement Team, Protective Services Caseworkers and Supervisors, Fatherhood Group Coordinators	By 01/13/2012	Staff education, updated policies and procedures	Fathers are referred most consistently on cases involving a placement.

	FSP/PPP.						
	4. Conduct focus groups of fathers and of agency staff to identify additional barriers to consistent and ongoing engagement of fathers throughout the life of a case.	4. Fathers and agency staff have the opportunity for input into what barriers they identify and what possible additional solutions are.	Report from the focus group.	Improvement Team	By 10/28/2011	Technical Assistance from the CWTP	
	5. Train agency staff on engaging fathers, the effects that father absence could have on children, and how to assess the risk and safety threats they present to their children in order to identify suitable services for them.	5. All protective service caseworkers and supervisors are trained and understand why engagement of fathers is important. Information on the father(s) is obtained on all cases and fathers are assessed to determine if they present risks and safety threats to their children, what services they require, and if they can safely be involved with their children.	Training report. Review of a sampling of cases. Follow-up surveys or focus groups of fathers to determine if barriers have been resolved and if engagement of fathers has increased.	Improvement Team, Protective Services Caseworkers and Supervisors, Fatherhood Group Coordinators	By 02/03/2012	Technical Assistance from the CWTP; Possible agency-specific training by the CWTP	

Note: *If Counties already have documents or plans that connect to the outcome, that plan should be noted in the table above.*

Improvement Team(s)/ Members *(List the members of the Improvement Team and identify co-chairs with an asterisk if applicable):*

Amanda Helring, LCCYS, Chair

Nicole Lance, LCCYS, Co-Chair

Amanda Parks, Legal Services Initiative (LSI) Paralegal

Bea Ferguson-Murphy, LCCYS

Jerri Regan, LCCYS

Mary Ann Nolan, LCCYS

Caseworker from the Clinical Unit available on a rotating basis

R. C., father involved with the agency