



Northeast Service Delivery Area

# Family Service Practice Audit

Report Completed: June 2014

## Table of Contents

<b>SECTION I: INTRODUCTION</b> .....	3
1.    PURPOSE .....	3
2.    METHODOLOGY .....	3
<b>SECTION II: SERVICE DELIVERY</b> .....	5
3.    OVERVIEW OF SDA.....	5
3.1 Geography.....	5
3.2 Demographics .....	5
3.3 Service Delivery .....	6
3.4 Staffing.....	6
3.5 Strengths and Challenges .....	7
3.6 Service Delivery to Aboriginal Children and Families.....	8
<b>SECTION III: FAMILY SERVICE PRACTICE AUDIT</b> .....	9
4.    FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS .....	9
4.1 Screening Assessment and Response Decision.....	9
4.2 Safety Assessment and Planning.....	12
4.3 Vulnerability Assessment and Protection Finding.....	14
4.4 Strengths and Needs Assessment.....	15
4.5 Family Plan .....	16
4.6 Formal Reassessment.....	17
4.7 Case Transfer and Case Closure .....	18
5.    OBSERVATIONS AND THEMES.....	19
5.1 Documentation.....	20
5.2 ICM.....	20
5.3 Use of Structured Decision Making Tools .....	21
5.4 Timeliness.....	21
5.5 Collaborative Practice.....	21
6.    ACTIONS TAKEN TO DATE .....	21
7.    ACTION PLAN .....	22

## SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

This section of the report provides information about the purpose and methodology of the Family Service (FS) practice audit that was conducted in the Northeast Service Delivery Area (SDA) in April and May 2013.

### 1. PURPOSE

The FS practice audit was designed to assess achievement of key components of the Child Protection Response Model set out in Chapter 3 of the *Child Safety and Family Support Policies*. Chapter 3 contains the policies, standards and procedures that support the duties and functions carried out by delegated child protection social workers under the *Child, Family and Community Service Act*.

The audit was based on a review of the following FS records, which represent different aspects of the Child Protection Response Model:

- Non-protection incidents and service requests
- Protection incidents (investigation and family development response)
- Cases

### 2. METHODOLOGY

Three samples of FS records were selected from lists of data extracted from the Integrated Case Management (ICM) system on February 21, 2013, using the simple random sampling technique. The data lists consisted of closed non-protection incidents and service requests, closed protection incidents, and open and closed FS cases. The data within each list were randomized at the SDA level, and samples were selected at a 90% confidence level, with a 10% margin of error.

**Table 1: Selected Records**

Record status and type	Total number at SDA level	Sample size
Closed non-protection incidents and service requests	223	52
Closed protection incidents	218	52
Open and closed cases	286	54

Specifically, the three samples consisted of:

1. Non-protection incidents closed between August, 2012, and January, 2013, where the response was *offer child and family services, youth services, refer to community agency, or no further action*, and service requests closed between August, 2012, and January, 2013, of the types *Request Service: CFS* and *Request Service: CAPP*. Closed was determined based on data entered in the closed date field.
2. Protection incidents closed between August, 2012, and January, 2013, where the response was *investigation* or *family development response*. Closed was determined based on data entered in the closed date field.

3. FS cases open on January 31, 2013, that had been open for at least two months, and FS cases closed between August, 2012, and January, 2013.

The sampled records were assigned to practice analysts on the provincial audit team for review. The analysts used the FS Practice Audit Tool to rate the records. The FS Practice Audit Tool contained 24 critical measures designed to assess achievement of key components of the Child Protection Response Model using a scale that had *achieved*, *not achieved* and *not applicable* as consistent rating options, and *partially achieved* as a fourth rating option for a small number of measures. The analysts entered their ratings in a SharePoint-based data collection form that included four textboxes, which they used to enter information about the factors they took into consideration in rating some of the critical measures, and a fifth textbox, which they used to enter general observations about the practice reflected in the records.

The SharePoint site and data collection form, sampling methods, ICM data extracts, and audit data reports were developed and produced with the support of the ministry's Modelling, Analysis and Information Management Branch.

In reviewing sampled records, the analysts focused on practice that had occurred during a 12-month period (March 1, 2012 - February 28, 2013) leading up to the time when the audit was conducted (April and May, 2013). During this 12-month period, there were two ministry-wide initiatives that directly affected practice: Implementation of Chapter 3 of the *Child Safety and Family Support Policies* and implementation of the ICM system. Chapter 3 contained new child protection policy, procedures and standards, including Structured Decision Making (SDM) tools.

Chapter 3 and the ICM system were implemented simultaneously on April 2, 2012. From that point forward, ministry social workers were expected to switch from using the former BC Risk Assessment Model (BCRAM) and Management Information System (MIS) to using the current SDM tools and ICM system. As a result, the audit examined documented practice during a time of transition, which involved reviewing MIS records and BCRAM tools completed prior to April 2, 2012, and ICM records and SDM tools completed on or after April 2, 2012.

Quality assurance policy and procedures require that practice analysts identify for action any incident or case record that suggests a child may need protection under section 13 of the *Child, Family and Community Service Act*. During the audit, practice analysts watched for situations in which the information in the record suggested that a child may have been left at risk of harm. When identified, these records were immediately brought to the attention of the appropriate team leader and community services manager, as well as the executive director of the SDA.

## SECTION II: SERVICE DELIVERY

This section provides an overview of the SDA, including a discussion of strengths and challenges, and service delivery to Aboriginal children, youth and families within the SDA.

### 3. OVERVIEW OF SDA

#### 3.1 GEOGRAPHY

The Northeast SDA is one of the largest geographic areas in the province. The SDA's borders extend from the Yukon and Northwest Territories in the north, past Tumbler Ridge to the south, and from the Alberta border in the east, following a diagonal line that extends just past the Liard River to the west. The SDA consists of two Local Service Areas (LSAs): Peace South and Peace North. The main communities in the SDA are Dawson Creek and Fort St. John. There are many smaller communities in the SDA, including seven First Nations communities and one Métis community.

#### 3.2 DEMOGRAPHICS

As shown in Table 2, the Northeast SDA has a population of approximately 72,086, or 1.5% of the provincial population (2013). Children and youth under 19 years of age number about 19,003, or 2.1% of the provincial child population (2013). The Aboriginal population in the SDA is approximately 7,890. Within the Aboriginal population, there are about 3,080 children and youth under 19 years of age, representing approximately 16.2% of the SDA child population (2006 Census).

**Table 2: Total Population and Child Population by Age Cohort and Aboriginal Status**

Northeast SDA Population		Northeast SDA Child Population by Age Cohort and Aboriginal Status				
		0 - 18	0 - 2	3 - 5	6 - 12	13 - 18
All	72,086	19,003	3,029	3,258	6,976	5,740
Aboriginal	7,890	3,080	385	470	1,225	1,000

Source: MCFD Operational Performance & Strategic Management Report, October 2012 – March 2013

Table 3 shows the Northeast SDA child population by age cohort and the percentage of the provincial child population represented by each cohort. For example, the table shows that three to five year-old children in the SDA comprise 2.3% of three to five year-old children in the province.

**Table 3: Child Population by Age Cohort and Percentage of Provincial Child Population**

Northeast SDA Child Population by Age Cohort	Percentage of Provincial Child Population
0 - 2	2.2%
3 - 5	2.3%
6 - 12	2.2%
13 - 18	1.9%

Source: MCFD Operational Performance & Strategic Management Report, October 2012 – March 2013

### **3.3 SERVICE DELIVERY**

The Northeast SDA has offices located in Fort Nelson, Fort St. John, Dawson Creek, Chetwynd, and Tumbler Ridge. Every centre offers child safety and family support services (including resources and guardianship) for the communities in those areas. Some of the offices provide a range of intake and family services, while others are more specialized. As the largest urban centre, with a population of approximately 18,600, Fort St John has both integrated and specialized offices, while smaller communities may have integrated offices with service specialists within those offices (e.g., FGC/OCC, guardianship, adoption, and child and youth mental health services).

### **3.4 STAFFING**

The SDA management team consists of an Executive Director of Service (EDS) and two Community Services Managers (CSMs). Child welfare staff includes the CSMs, as well as team leaders, child protection social workers, guardianship social workers, and resource social workers. Team leaders also supervise adoption workers, child and youth with special needs workers, child and youth mental health workers, and youth justice workers. Some team leaders supervise integrated teams with a mix of professional staff. The professional teams are supported by administrative staff.

Table 4 provides a count of the full time-equivalent (FTE) positions within each LSA at the time that the audit was conducted. The table shows that the ratio of team leaders to other professional staff (excluding the CSMs and EDS) was approximately 1 to 5.4, and the ratio of administrative staff to professional staff (including the CSMs and EDS) was approximately 1 to 5.6 for the SDA as a whole.

**Table 4: Staffing by LSA**

Position	Peace South	Peace North	Total
Community Services Manager	1	1	2
Team Leader	4	4	8
Child Protection	8	12	20
FGC/OCC	1	1	2
Guardianship	1.5	1.5	3
Resources	1.5	1	2.5
Adoption	.75		.75
Child and Youth Mental Health	3.5	5.5	9
Child and Youth with Special Needs	1	1	2
Youth Justice	2	2.5	4.5
Administrative Support	3.75	6	9.75
Total	28	35.5	63.5

Source: SDA-LSA-BIS-April 2013, SDD, Operational Management & Performance Branch

### 3.5 STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES

The EDS reported that there were challenges and strengths within the SDA. There are a number of remote communities in the SDA, including seven First Nations communities located far from ministry offices. As a result, ministry staff must travel long distances to provide services that are not readily available in those communities. This creates a challenge in terms of timely and continuous access to services.

However, the SDA has a management and leadership team with years of experience working in rural and remote communities. There are many long term employees, including several who have worked with the ministry for more than 30 years, who have deep roots in the communities. As a result, the SDA has developed positive relationships with community members and other stakeholders to overcome the challenges of providing services across a large geographic area.

While one of the SDA's strengths lies in its experienced and dedicated staff, the small staff complement makes it difficult to maintain appropriate service levels. The socio-economic composition of the SDA also presents both strengths and challenges from a service provision perspective. A number of communities in the Northeast are experiencing a financial boom from the oil and gas sector. Although unemployment rates are relatively low and many jobs in the

sector are high-paying, the nature of this work results in a transient workforce. Additionally, families may experience a lack of support if one parent works away from home in camps for extended periods of time.

Contracted service providers also experience staffing challenges due in part to the socio-economic composition of the SDA. Contracted service providers are not able to match the high wages offered by the oil and gas sector, nor are they able to adjust wages to the cost of living in the Northeast, which is approximately 15-30% higher than the provincial average. As a result, staff retention can be challenging.

Ministry data indicate that the number of children in care has declined, as more planning with extended family members is occurring and other safety options are being considered. There are low rates of both reported and verified child abuse in the SDA. In addition, the contracted services sector focusses on prevention and family support services.

### **3.6 SERVICE DELIVERY TO ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AND FAMILIES**

Ministry offices serving Aboriginal children, youth and families were included in this audit. There are no delegated agencies in the SDA. Nenan Dane zaa Deh Zona Children and Family Services was formed with the intent of serving all seven First Nations communities as well as off-reserve Aboriginal children and families. However, the organization was recently informed by both the federal government and the Office of the Provincial Director of Child Welfare that it will not be moving toward delegation at this time. Nenan Dane\_Zaa Deh Zona Children and Family Services Society provides a number of services that include social work, family support, Roots Program, and community development. In addition, the ministry contracts directly with several First Nations communities and Aboriginal agencies in the SDA for family support services (Fort St. John, Dawson Creek and Chetwynd).

The First Nations communities in the Northeast SDA work collaboratively with the ministry. They have leaders who are focussed on improving the lives of children and families. They are a stable group with a longstanding treaty and good working relationships with both the provincial and federal governments.

## **SECTION III: FAMILY SERVICE PRACTICE AUDIT**

This section provides information about the findings of the FS practice audit that was conducted in the Northeast SDA in April and May, 2013.

### **4. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS**

The findings are presented in tables that contain counts and percentages of ratings of “Achieved,” “Partially Achieved” (where applicable) and “Not Achieved” for each of the 24 critical measures in the FS practice audit tool. The records that were assessed as “Not Applicable” were excluded from the counts and percentage calculations, and the reasons for excluding these records are provided in the notes below the tables. Each table presents findings for measures that correspond with a specific component of the Child Protection Response Model, and is labelled accordingly. Each table is also followed by an analysis of the findings for the measures presented in the table.

There were a combined total of 158 records in the samples selected for the audit. Five of these records were subsequently assessed by the practice analysts as “Not Applicable” for every measure in the audit tool and discarded, leaving a revised combined total of 153 records in the samples. However, not all of the 153 records were assessed as applicable for every measure in the audit tool. The “n” under each measure in the tables refers to the number of records for which the measure was applicable.

#### **4.1 Screening Assessment and Response Decision**

Table 5 provides compliance rates for measures FS1.1 to FS3.1, which have to do with receiving, screening and responding to child protection reports, or requests for service. The rates are presented as percentages of all records to which the measures were applied. The records included service requests, closed incidents, and open and closed cases. There were a total of 153 of these records in the sample. The notes below the table provide the number of records for which the measures were assessed as “Not Applicable” and explain why.

**Table 5: Screening Assessment and Response Decision (Number of records in sample = 153)**

<b>Critical Measure</b>	<b>Achieved</b>	<b>Partially Achieved</b>	<b>Not Achieved</b>
FS1.1 Obtaining a child protection report or request for service n=128*	83% (106/128)		17% (22/128)
FS1.2 Assessing the child protection report or request for service n=128*	36% (46/128)	7% (9/128)	57% (73/128)
FS2.1 Timeframe for assigning the response priority n=103**	38% (39/103)		62% (64/103)
FS2.2 Determining an appropriate response priority n=103**	49% (50/103)		51% (53/103)
FS3.1 Determining the response n=103**	49% (50/103)	12% (12/103)	39% (41/103)
FS3.2 Supervisory approval of the response n=103**	50% (52/103)		50% (51/103)
FS3.3 Response decision consistent with the assessment information n=128*	55% (71/128)		45% (57/128)

\* 25 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” because they fell outside the audit timeframe

\*\*50 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” (25 fell outside the audit timeframe, 23 were requests for support services and 2 were reports that did not require a screening assessment)

**FS1.1 Obtaining a Child Protection Report or Request for Service**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **83%**. The measure was applicable to 128 of the 153 records in the sample; 106 of the 128 records were rated as achieved and 22 were rated as not achieved. Records that were rated as not achieved contained insufficient detail about the report or request for service. In some instances, the practice analysts who conducted the audit were unable to determine whether the records were child protection reports or requests for service, because the information in the Notes tabs in ICM was vague or ambiguous and there was no information in the records indicating that the callers had terminated the calls prematurely. In regard to the records rated as not achieved for this measure, the analysts found no indication that a child may have been left at risk of harm.

**FS1.2 Assessing the Child Protection Report or Request for Service**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **36%**, with an additional **7%** partial compliance. The measure was applicable to 128 of the 153 records in the sample; 46 of the 128 records were rated as achieved, 9 were rated as partially achieved, and 73 were rated as not achieved. Partial

compliance was achieved when the screening assessment was completed more than 24 hours after the initial report or request for service was received and the information in the record indicated that the delay had not affected the immediate safety of the child. The low compliance rate was largely due to the absence of screening assessments. The screening assessment tool was made available in ICM more than three months after the system was implemented. This contributed to the absence of screening assessments.

#### **FS2.1 Timeframe for Assigning the Response Priority**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **38%**. The measure was applicable to 103 of the 153 records in the sample; 39 of the 103 records were rated as achieved and 64 were rated as not achieved. The practice analysts who conducted the audit observed that response times and priority fields in ICM were often left blank. This contributed to the low compliance rate for this measure. In regard to the records rated as not achieved, the analysts found no indication that a child may have been left at risk of harm.

#### **FS2.2 Determining an Appropriate Response Priority**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **49%**. The measure was applicable to 103 of the 153 records in the sample; 50 of the 103 records were rated as achieved, and 53 were rated as not achieved. The analysts observed that response times and priority fields in ICM were often left blank, and in some instances the notes in ICM documenting team leader consultation points did not clearly identify the response priority decision. As in FS2.1, the low compliance rate for this measure was largely due to the absence of screening assessments. In addition, some records that had screening assessments were rated as not achieved because response priorities were not assigned, or assigned response priorities were assessed as inappropriate given the information in the screening assessments.

#### **FS3.1 Determining the Response**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **49%**, with an additional **12%** partial compliance. The measure was applicable to 103 of the 153 records in the sample; 50 of the 103 records were rated as achieved, 12 were rated as partially achieved, and 41 were rated as not achieved. Partial compliance was achieved when the response was determined more than 5 calendar days after the initial report or request for service was received and the information in the record indicated that the delay had not affected the immediate safety of the child. The analysts observed that in all 41 records rated as not achieved either the screening assessments were missing or the response decisions were not recorded anywhere in ICM. The analysts who conducted the audit referred 2 of these 41 records to the respective team leaders for action for the following reasons: in one record a protection report was documented within a note without a response decision, and no intervention was documented, and in the other record the caller information was blank and no response decision was recorded.

#### **FS3.2 Supervisory Approval of the Response**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **50%**. The measure was applicable to 103 of the 153 records in the sample; 52 of the 103 records were rated as achieved and 51 were rated as not

achieved. Records rated as not achieved did not have supervisory approvals of the response decisions documented within the required 24 hour timeframe.

### FS3.3 Response Decision Consistent with the Assessment Information

The compliance rate for this critical measure was 55%. The measure was applicable to 128 of the 153 records in the sample; 71 of the 128 records were rated as achieved and 57 were rated as not achieved. The moderate compliance rate was largely due to the absence of screening assessments and/or response decisions. The analysts found that 7 of the records rated as not achieved had non-protection response decisions that should have been assessed as requiring protection responses. In 6 of these records, further information was collected and supports were subsequently provided, which adequately addressed the risk factors presented in the initial reports and family histories. The remaining record was referred to the team leader for action, because information in the record suggested that the children may have been left at risk of harm.

## 4.2 Safety Assessment and Planning

Table 6 provides compliance rates for measures FS4.1 to FS4.4, which have to do with completing a child safety assessment, making a child safety decision, and involving the family in the development of a safety plan. The rates are presented as percentages of records to which the measures were applied. The records included closed incidents, and open and closed cases. There were a total of 130 of these records in the sample. The notes below the table provide the numbers of records for which the measures were assessed as “Not Applicable” and explain why.

**Table 6: Safety Assessment and Planning (Number of records in sample = 130)**

Critical Measure	Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
FS4.1 Complete safety assessment n=90*	48% (43/90)		52% (47/90)
FS4.2 Make safety decision n=90*	28% (25/90)	36% (32/90)	36% (33/90)
FS4.3 Develop safety plan with family n=75**	39% (29/75)		61% (46/75)
FS4.4 Collaborative planning and decision making n=29***	24% (7/29)		76% (22/29)

\* 40 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” (10 fell outside the audit timeframe, 27 were non-protection and 3 had supervisory approval to terminate the INV or FDR)

\*\*55 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” (10 fell outside the audit timeframe, 27 were non-protection, 3 had supervisory approval to terminate the INV or FDR, and 15 did not identify safety factors in the safety assessment)

\*\*\* 101 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” (9 fell outside the audit timeframe, 27 were non-protection, 3 had supervisory approval to terminate the INV or FDR, and 62 reached agreement on a safety plan and did not require the use of alternative dispute resolution processes)

#### **FS4.1 Completing the Safety Assessment**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **48%**. The measure was applicable to 90 of the 130 records in the sample; 43 of the 90 records were rated as achieved and 47 were rated as not achieved. The 47 records rated as not achieved met one or more of the following criteria: the safety assessment process was not completed during the first in-person meeting with the family; the child was not seen during the first in-person meeting with the family. In regard to the records rated as not achieved, four were brought to the attention of the respective team leaders for action because the absence of safety assessments combined with a lack of corresponding information within the overall record suggested that the children may have been left at risk of harm.

#### **FS4.2 Making a Safety Decision Consistent with the Safety Assessment**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **28%**, with an additional **36%** partial compliance. The measure was applicable to 90 of the 130 records in the sample; 25 of the 84 records were rated as achieved, 32 were rated as partially achieved, and 33 were rated as not achieved. Partial compliance was achieved when the safety assessment form was completed more than 24 hours after the safety assessment process with the family and included a safety decision, and the information in the record indicated that the delay had not affected the immediate safety of the child. The 33 records rated as not achieved lacked completed safety assessment forms and documentation of supervisory approvals. Apart from the four records that were brought to the attention of team leaders for action (as noted in FS4.1), the analysts verified and confirmed that the immediate safety of the children had not been affected.

#### **FS4.3 Involving the Family in the Development of a Safety Plan**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **39%**. The critical measure was applicable to 75 of the 130 records in the sample; 29 of the 75 records were rated as achieved and 46 were rated as not achieved. The measure was only applicable when safety factors were identified during the safety assessment process with the family. The 46 records rated as not achieved lacked documented safety plans that adequately addressed the safety factors identified during the assessment process, or failed to show that the safety plans had been developed in collaboration with the families, or that documented plans had been shared with the families, as required. In regard to the records rated as not achieved, the analysts verified and confirmed that the children had not been left at risk of harm.

#### **FS4.4 Collaborative Planning and Decision Making**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **24%**. The measure was applicable to 29 of the 130 records in the sample; 7 of the 29 records were rated as achieved and 22 were rated as not achieved. The measure was only applicable when agreement on meeting child safety issues or a safety plan had not been reached with the family. In regard to the 22 records rated as not achieved, it is possible that collaborative planning and decision making processes had occurred or were occurring outside of the incident timeframe. Mediation and family group conferences can often take more than 30 days to organize and implement, and are often not documented in the record due to legislative restrictions governing disclosure of the content of the decisions and agreements that result from these processes.

### 4.3 Vulnerability Assessment and Protection Finding

Table 7 provides compliance rates for measures FS5.1 to FS6.1, which have to do with completing a vulnerability assessment and making a decision about the need for protection services. The rates are presented as percentages of all records to which the measures were applied. The records included closed incidents and open and closed cases. There were a total of 130 of these records in the sample. The notes below the table provide the numbers of records for which the measures were assessed as “Not Applicable” and explain why.

**Table 7: Vulnerability Assessment and Protection Finding (Number of records in sample = 130)**

Critical Measure	Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
FS5.1 Completing vulnerability assessment n=93*	48% (45/93)		52% (48/93)
FS5.2 Determine level of vulnerability n=93*	55% (51/93)		45% (42/93)
FS5.4 Timeframe for vulnerability assessment n=93*	18% (17/93)	19% (18/93)	63% (58/93)
FS6.1 Decision on need for protection services n=93*	55% (51/93)		45% (42/93)

\*37 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” (8 had no INV or FDR in progress within the audit timeframe, 27 were non-protection, and 6 had supervisory approval to terminate the INV or FDR)

#### FS5.1 Completing the Vulnerability Assessment

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **48%**. The measure was applicable to 93 of the 130 records in the sample; 45 of the 93 records were rated as achieved and 48 were rated as not achieved. Records were rated as not achieved when they lacked a completed vulnerability assessment form, had an incomplete vulnerability assessment form, or lacked supervisory approval of the vulnerability assessment.

#### FS5.2 Determining a Final Vulnerability Level

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **55%**. The measure was applicable to 93 of the 130 records in the sample; 51 of the 93 records were rated as achieved and 42 were rated as not achieved. The moderate compliance rate for this measure was largely due to the absence or incomplete state of vulnerability assessments. In addition, one record that contained a completed vulnerability assessment that was approved by the supervisor was rated as not achieved because the level of vulnerability selected was not consistent with the information in the assessment (i.e., the vulnerability level was too high).

**FS5.4 Timeframe for Completing a Vulnerability Assessment**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **18%**, with an additional **19%** partial compliance. The measure was applicable to 93 of the 130 records in the sample; 17 of the 93 records were rated as achieved, 18 were rated as partially achieved, and 58 were rated as not achieved. Records were rated as partially achieved when the vulnerability assessments were completed after the required 30 day timeframe, and not achieved when the vulnerability assessments were lacking.

**FS6.1 Decision on Whether the Child or Youth Needs Protection Services**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **55%**. The measure was applicable to 93 of the 130 records in the sample; 51 of the 93 records were rated as achieved and 42 were rated as not achieved. The 42 records rated as not achieved met one or more of the following criteria: there was insufficient information in the assessments and notes to determine whether ongoing protection services were needed; the record did not contain a decision on whether ongoing protection services were provided; there were unaddressed protection concerns documented in the record; there was information in the record indicating that ongoing monitoring of the child’s wellbeing was required but not provided. The analysts who conducted the audit referred 6 of these 42 records to the appropriate team leaders and community services managers for action because the information in the records suggested that the children may have been left in need of ongoing protection services. The executive director of service was also notified.

**4.4 Strengths and Needs Assessment**

Table 8 provides compliance rates for measures FS7.1 and FS7.2, which have to do with completing a family and child strengths and needs assessment and documenting supervisory approval of the assessment. The rates are presented as percentages of all records to which the measures were applied. The records included open and closed cases. There were a total of 50 of these records in the sample. However, not all of the 50 records were assessed as applicable for every measure. The “n” under each measure in the table refers to the number of records for which the measure was applicable. The note below the table provides the number of records for which the measure was assessed as “Not Applicable” and explains why.

**Table 8: Strengths and Needs Assessment (Number of records in sample = 50)**

<b>Critical Measure</b>	<b>Achieved</b>	<b>Partially Achieved</b>	<b>Not Achieved</b>
FS7.1 Complete strengths and needs assessment n=37*	16% (6/37)		84% (31/37)
FS7.2 Supervisory approval of strengths and needs assessment n=37*	16% (6/37)		84% (31/37)

\*13 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” (6 were open in error due to MIS conversions and 7 were open to provide voluntary support services)

### FS7.1 Completing a Family and Child Strengths and Needs Assessment

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **16%**. The measure was applicable to 37 of the 50 records in the sample; 6 of the 37 records were rated as achieved and 31 were rated as not achieved. The 31 records rated as not achieved had no completed strengths and needs assessments documented in ICM or the physical files. One of these records was referred to the respective team leader for action because there was no documentation of ongoing protection services and none of the subsequent SDM tools, including the family and child strengths and needs assessment, were completed.

### FS7.2 Supervisory Approval of the Strengths and Needs Assessment

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **16%**. The measure was applicable to 37 of the 50 records in the sample; 6 of the 37 records were rated as achieved and 31 were rated as not achieved. As in FS7.1, there were 6 records that had completed strengths and needs assessments and supervisory approvals. The other 31 records rated as not achieved had no strengths and needs assessments documented in ICM or the physical files.

## 4.5 Family Plan

Table 9 provides compliance rates for measures FS7.3 and FS7.4, which have to do with developing a family plan in collaboration with the family, and integrating a safety plan within the family plan. The rates are presented as percentages of all records to which the measures were applied. The records included open and closed cases. There were a total of 50 of these records in the sample. However, not all of the 50 records were assessed as applicable for every measure. The “n” under each measure in the table refers to the number of records for which the measure was applicable. The note below the table provides the number of records for which the measure was assessed as “Not Applicable” and explains why.

**Table 9: Family Plan (Number of records in sample = 50)**

Critical Measure	Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
FS7.3 Develop family plan with family n=36*	14% (5/36)	25% (9/36)	61% (22/36)
FS7.4 Integrate safety plan in family plan n=29**	7% (2/29)	7% (2/29)	86% (25/29)

\*14 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” (6 were open in error due to MIS conversions, 7 were open to provide voluntary support services, and one was assessed as “Not Applicable” because family members were not available)

\*\*21 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” (6 were open in error due to MIS conversions, 7 were open to provide voluntary support services, and 7 did not contain unresolved concerns from the safety plan that needed to be integrated into the family plan)

### FS7.3 Developing the Family Plan with the Family

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **14%**, with an additional **25%** partial compliance. The measure was applicable to 36 of the 50 records in the sample; 5 of the 36 records were rated as achieved, 9 were rated as partially achieved, and 22 were rated as not achieved. Records were rated as partially achieved when family plans had been developed in collaboration with the families, but not within the applicable timeframe. The practice analysts who conducted the audit were looking for risk reduction service plans or family plans that were completed within 15 days of completing the FDR or INV phase, or within 30 days of completing the FDR or INV phase, if the cases had been transferred to other workers. Records rated as not achieved did not have family plans documented in ICM or the physical files.

### FS7.4 Integrating the Safety Plan into the Family Plan

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **7%**, with an additional **7%** partial compliance. The measure was applicable to 29 of the 50 records in the sample; 2 of the 29 records were rated as achieved, 2 were rated as partially achieved, and 25 were rated as not achieved. Records were rated as partially achieved when elements of the safety plans that needed to remain in place were integrated into the family plans, but not within the applicable timeframe. Similar to FS7.3, records rated as not achieved did not have family plans documented in ICM or the physical files.

## 4.6 Formal Reassessment

Table 10 provides compliance rates for measures FS8.1 and FS8.2, which have to do with completing a vulnerability reassessment or a reunification assessment. The rates are presented as percentages of all records to which the measures were applied. The records included open and closed cases. There were a total of 50 of these records in the sample. However, not all of the 50 records were assessed as applicable for every measure. The “n” under each measure in the table refers to the number of records for which the measure was applicable. The note below the table provides the number of records for which the measure was assessed as “Not Applicable” and explains why.

**Table 10: Formal Reassessment (Number of records in sample = 50)**

Critical Measure	Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
FS8.1 Complete vulnerability reassessment n=31*	3% (1/31)		97% (30/31)
FS8.2 Complete reunification assessment n=2**	0% (0/2)		100% (2/2)

\*19 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” (6 were open in error due to MIS conversions, 7 were open to provide voluntary support services, 4 did not have vulnerability reassessments due within the audit timeframe, and 2 related to children in care and were therefore assessed under critical measure FS8.2)

\*\*48 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” (6 were open in error due to MIS conversions, 7 were open to provide voluntary support services, 4 did not have vulnerability reassessments due within the audit timeframe, and 31 were related to children out of care and therefore assessed under critical measure FS8.1)

### FS8.1 Completing a Vulnerability Reassessment

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **3%**. The measure was applicable to 31 of the 50 records in the sample; 1 of the 31 records was rated as achieved and 30 were rated as not achieved. Records rated as not achieved did not have vulnerability assessments documented in ICM or the physical files.

### FS8.2 Completing a Reunification Assessment

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **0%**. The measure was applicable to 2 of the 50 records in the sample, both of which were rated as not achieved. Records rated as not achieved did not have reunification assessments documented in ICM or the physical files.

## 4.7 Case Transfer and Case Closure

Table 11 provides compliance rates for measures FS9.1 to FS9.4, which have to do with transferring and closing cases. The rates are presented as percentages of all records to which the measures were applied. The records included open and closed cases. There were a total of 50 of these records in the sample. However, not all of the 50 records were assessed as applicable for every measure. The “n” under each measure in the table refers to the number of records for which the measure was applicable. The note below the table provides the number of records for which the measure was assessed as “Not Applicable” and explains why.

**Table 11: Case Transfer and Case Closure (Number of records in sample = 50)**

<b>Critical Measure</b>	<b>Achieved</b>	<b>Partially Achieved</b>	<b>Not Achieved</b>
FS9.1 Decision on case transfer n=6*	50% (3/6)		50% (3/6)
FS9.2 Supervisory approval for case transfer n=6*	83% (5/6)		17% (1/6)
FS9.3 Decision on case closure n=14**	50% (7/14)		50% (7/14)
FS9.4 Supervisory approval for case closure n=14**	64% (9/14)		36% (5/14)

\*44 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” because they did not involve a case transfer

\*\* 36 records were assessed as “Not Applicable” because they did not involve a case closure

### FS9.1 Decision on Transferring a Case

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **50%**. The measure was applicable to 6 of the 50 records in the sample; 3 of the 6 records were rated as achieved and 3 were rated as not achieved. The records rated as not achieved did not have documented approval from the supervisors of both the originating and receiving workers for the decision to transfer the case.

### **FS9.2 Supervisory Approval for Transferring a Case**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **83%**. The measure was applicable to 6 of the 50 records in the sample; 1 of these 6 records was rated as not achieved because supervisory approval was not documented.

### **FS9.3 Decision on Closing a Case**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **50%**. The measure was applicable to 14 of the 50 records in the sample; 7 of the 14 records were rated as achieved and 7 were rated as not achieved. The analysts who conducted the audit were looking for information indicating that, at the point of closure, the goals in the family plan were achieved, protection concerns were resolved, vulnerabilities were being managed safely, and the family was able to access and use resources. The records rated as not achieved did not meet one or more of these criteria before the decision to close the case was made.

### **FS9.4 Supervisory Approval for Closing a Case**

The compliance rate for this critical measure was **64%**. The measure was applicable to 14 of the 50 records in the sample; 9 of the 14 records were rated as achieved and 5 were rated as not achieved. The analysts who conducted the audit were looking for information indicating that supervisory approvals were obtained and documented prior to case closure, or that the supervisors had granted an exception. The records rated as not achieved did not have documented supervisory approval to close the case.

### **Records Identified for Action**

Quality assurance policy and procedures require practice analysts to identify for action any incident or case record that suggests a child may need protection under section 13 of the *Child, Family and Community Service Act*. During the course of this audit, 14 records were identified for action because the information in the records suggested that the children may have been left at risk of harm or in need of ongoing protection services. (See FS3.1 on page 11, FS3.3 on page 12, FS4.1 on page 13, FS6.1 on page 15, and FS7.1 on page 16.) The team leaders, community services managers, and executive director of service were immediately notified, and subsequently confirmed that all protection concerns had been addressed.

## **5. OBSERVATIONS AND THEMES**

This section summarizes the observations and themes arising from the record reviews and audit findings and analysis. The observations and themes relate to identified strengths and areas needing improvement. Some relate to specific critical measures and corresponding policy and standards, while others are informed by themes that emerged across several measures. The purpose of this section is to inform the development of action plans to improve practice.

The SDA overall compliance rate was **32%**, with an additional **4%** partial compliance.

## **5.1 DOCUMENTATION**

The practice analysts who conducted the audit found that social workers were diligent in documenting information from callers and identifying the circumstances of the concerns being reported. In many incidents, the analysts found within the ICM notes tabs extensive descriptions of the actions that were initiated and the support services that were provided.

In reviewing the entirety of the records, however, the analysts found that guidelines in Physical Document Management related to ICM Service Request, Incident or Case (2012) were not always followed. Specifically, there were inconsistencies in how and where key decision points and supervisory approvals were documented in ICM. In addition, the analysts sometimes had difficulty locating documentation related to Prior Contact Checks (PCC). The analysts noted that PCC documentation was frequently missing from the records. When evidence of PCCs was found in notes, there were often insufficient summaries of past service involvement. This includes dates, nature of concerns and responses and their relevance to the need for protection, as part of the screening process. Lastly, family contact information in ICM was not always comprehensive and up-to-date.

The analysts also found that the transition from the FDR assessment phase to the FDR protection services phase was not being documented. As a result, analysts were unable to determine, within an incident, when the FDR assessment phase ended and the FDR protection services phase began. This posed a rating challenge for the analysts, as the FDR protection services phase requires the completion of additional structured decision making tools.

### **1.2 ICM**

The analysts identified a number of issues related to social workers' use of ICM. The compliance rate for use of the screening assessment tool was low. This was likely due to the tool not being available in ICM when the system was first implemented on April 2, 2012. It is expected that use of the screening assessment tool in ICM has increased (and will continue to increase) over time, and therefore the compliance rates for critical measures that rely on completion of the screening assessment should also increase over time.

In a small number of records, the analysts found corrupted attachments and instances where physical copies of documents had not been saved, or where saved documents were blank. The Helpdesk was notified and tasked with the responsibility of recovering the corrupted documents. When a corrupted document was not recoverable, the social worker was notified and another service request or incident within that case was audited. If the case did not contain another service request or incident, a new case was selected for the audit.

In another small set of records, analysts discovered attachments that were intended for incidents incorrectly uploaded into cases, and vice versa. Specifically, SDM tools and notes associated with a protection or non-protection response were found within ICM cases. Similarly, SDM tools and notes associated with ongoing protection services were found within ICM incidents. Greater

attention needs to be given to closing incidents after the decision to provide ongoing protection services is made. Subsequent documentation should then be uploaded into the associated case.

Finally, ICM notes were often labelled incorrectly. Better identification of note types would improve access to information, and efficiency.

### **5.3 USE OF STRUCTURED DECISION MAKING TOOLS**

Overall, the compliance rates for use of the structured decision making tools were low to moderate. The analysts found that the structured decision making tools associated with incidents were completed at a much higher rate than the structured decision making tools associated with the provision of ongoing services. Specifically, compliance rates for screening assessments, safety assessments, and vulnerability assessments were in the 29-48% range, while compliance rates for completion of family and child strengths and needs assessments (16%) and vulnerability reassessments (1%) were much lower. This suggests that workers may be prioritizing the use of structured decision making tools related to investigations of child protection reports.

The analysts also found that, within some of the completed structured decision making tools, only the boxes were checked and no narrative information was added. Adding descriptions of the families' circumstances would provide a better understanding of how decisions are made.

### **5.4 TIMELINESS**

An area that analysts found needed improvement was meeting required timeframes. Specifically, completion of structured decision making tools and corresponding supervisory approvals within required timeframes often had low compliance rates. The analysts also found that many incidents coded as needing a protection response were open well beyond the 30 and 120-day timeframes specified in the practice standards.

### **5.5 COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE**

Finally, the analysts found that the documentation of efforts to collaboratively engage families in planning processes could be improved. For example, safety assessments often did not meet the standards or comply with procedures that are in place to ensure that families are participating in identifying their own needs and finding solutions. It was also difficult to determine if the documented efforts to involve the family and the child or youth had occurred during the safety assessment process or first in-person meeting with the family. Compliance rates for involving family members in developing family plans were also very low. The analysts found that very few of the applicable cases contained consolidated family plans that itemized the interventions or services the families identified as most supportive. One way of improving compliance in this area would be to document all family case planning meetings, conferences and mediations in consolidated forms, within the required timeframes.

## **6. ACTIONS TAKEN TO DATE**

As part of the ICM continuous improvement process, the first set of enhancements to ICM (ICM Release 2.1) was implemented in July, 2012, and further changes (ICM Release 2.2) were

introduced in September, 2012. These changes resulted from feedback from ministry staff and contractors in key areas that benefited service delivery. Relative to the ministry's child safety and family support services, ICM Release 2.2 focused on:

- Improving the ability to find information quickly, enhancements that were intended to allow users to quickly find information and respond to concerns
- Improving the ability to enter information quickly, enhancements that were intended to save users time by decreasing the amount of time spent entering information into ICM
- Improving data quality, enhancements that were intended to improve data quality in ICM, providing staff with accurate and up-to date client information
- Forms and ICM production reports, enhancements that were intended to improve the integration and usability of forms, saving staff time and improving the quality of information in the system. This category also includes *Child, Family and Community Service Act* (CFCSA) and General Disclosure ICM Production Reports.

ICM Release 2.2 was the largest update to the system since Phase 2 went live in April, 2012, incorporating over 300 enhancements and updates. In conjunction with these changes, frontline practitioners and team leaders received training in 17 core competencies for ICM users. This competency validation training is provided to all newly-hired staff, as needed.

## 7. ACTION PLAN

<u>Action</u>	<u>Person responsible</u>	<u>Date to be completed by</u>
Managers meet with audit team to walk through audit tool/results, and identify 5 critical measures that will be targeted to significantly improve compliance rates for INV/FDR (target = 85%)	EDS	September 30, 2014
With support from specialized practice analyst on audit team, develop system that will allow CSMs and Team Leaders to conduct self-audits every 6 months and report results to EDS	CSMs/Clinical Team Leader	September 30, 2014
Identify sub-set of FS files with children under 5 years of age, and track use	CSMs	First tracking report – September, 2014

of SDM tools by worker and office to be able to demonstrate increased compliance in monthly reports to EDS		
Clarify procedures for documenting collaborative practice and planning in ICM, and motivate workers to follow procedures	EDS	September 30, 2014