

# CFSR Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

**10/25/23**

## ► Introductions/Icebreaker

### ▪ Attendance

- Katie Igo (CD), JoDene Bogart (CD), Julie Starr (CD), Leanne Reese (CASA), Heather Hendley (Capacity Building Center for States), Nancy Capps (OSCA), Donna Anthony (Judge), Kindra Harms (JO 18<sup>th</sup> Circuit), Janet Braker (MACF), Lisa Ivy (DESE), Teresa Hayner (Good Shepherd), Kate Watson (DMH Youth Services Manager), Jamie Pinney (Foster Parent), Claire Terrebonne (Jackson County CASA), Tony Scott (Children's Bureau), and Casey Finnegan (OSCA)

## ► Preliminary Results from CFSR

### ▪ Areas of strength

- Placement with siblings highest at-88%
- Relative placement and placement stability-80%
- Assessment and services and preserving connections-72%

### ▪ Growth areas

- Timely permanency lowest
- Worker visits with parents
- Relationship of child in care with parents
- Assessment of needs and services for parents
- Child and family involvement in case planning

### ▪ Systemic factors

- Substantial Conformity on 8 of the 18 items
  - Not in Substantial Conformity for some but not surprising which ones those were
- Will send final report
- Now have 90 days to submit first draft of the program improvement plan
- ▶ PIP Kick-Off (November 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>) in Columbia
  - Divided into groups
    - Service array- mental health and substance abuse for parents and children
    - Placement stability-recruitment and retention of foster parents, services for foster parents (older kids and mental health concerns)
    - Timely permanency for children
    - Concurrent planning and how it is used in Missouri
    - Courts do things different and lack of consistency across the state-conversations around that and how it impacts permanency for kids
  - Looking for those with lived experience if anyone has anyone in mind get that information to JoDene
- What to expect
- Sign up here:  
<https://stateofmissouri.wufoo.com/forms/q1rwukjp1k6w04i/>

## ▶ Safety Context and Case Review Data

- Two data profile measures and two items in the case review process that talk about safety
- Data indicators we are better than national performance.
- Case review items there were areas of concern
- Recurrence of Maltreatment-MO is lower than national performance; also data considering race and age
- Maltreatment in foster care results discussed-on the rise for African American children, older kids have the maltreatment with a rate of 8.67-getting closer to the national rate
- 3 case review items look at safety specifically
  - Item 3
    - Onsite in July was much lower strength ratings. Difference in results from July and ongoing case reviews
    - Most concerns were with ongoing risk/safety assessment

## ▶ Jamboard Activity

- What is your initial reaction from reviewing the data?
  - Strengths
    - Placement
    - Kiddos staying with siblings
    - Preserving connections

- Strong Kinship placements
- Opportunities
  - Permanency
  - Thorough safety and risk assessments
  - Permanency for foster kids
  - Engagement with parents
  - Child and family involvement in case planning
  - Doing a safety assessment when there is a situation change

► Discussion

- In on-going FCS and foster care cases, how and when do you see the Children's Division assessing risk and safety?
- FSTs we are not talking about risk/safety in those terms. Talk about barriers. May be due to workforce issues. Those that used to talk that language are gone as far as frontline folks
- Informal is a problem. Expectations should be clear and formal. Expectation is there but follow through is the problem.
- SOS is not formally used anymore.
- Inconsistent process
- During worker/child visits at foster homes
- Use of Signs of Safety tools
- Doing more informal safety/risk assessments

- Re: Foster care, S/R assessments do not come across clearly in court reporting; it is more so addressed in testimony around questions of when/why kids can/can't go home
- Safety assessments aren't being done throughout trial home placements-only at the closure of a case
- ▶ Missouri has one of the most stringent policies around initiation timeframes. As a mandated reporter, what would be the impact in extending the timeframes?
  - What is the political impact?
    - People are overly cautious-would not be received well.
    - Abuse higher category and neglect would be maybe not be as emergent.
    - My initial reaction is that it wouldn't go over well with community members. I think that it would actually result in more calls to the hotline with multiple concerns during that timeframe. I also wonder if there would be an increase in reliance on multidisciplinary partners to ensure safety or become involved. I think that in cases where it things are less safety related such as educational neglect, then that may be a better use of time and could have a more positive impact.
    - Have so many reports to address that we are missing those children that need the most help.
- ▶ Next Meeting: January 24, 2024