

i. Rapid Safety Feedback Review Data

	2017-18	2016-17		2015-16
	Agency	Agency		Agency
Item	CBCCF	CBCCF	Item	CBCCF
1.1 Family Assessment is sufficient	39/115 34%	20/132 15%	Initial and Ongoing Assessments	66/131 50%
1.2 Family Assessment was completed timely	43/115 37%	40/132 30%		
2.1 Quality of visits between CM and child	56/115 49%	75/132 57%	Caseworker Visits with Child (WB)	52/131 40%
2.2 Frequency of visits between CM and child	108/115 94%	115/132 87%		
2.3 Quality of visits between CM and mother	59/112 53%	62/131 47%	Caseworker Visits with Parents (WB)	36/131 27%
2.4 Frequency of visits between CM and mother	89/113 79%	96/132 73%		
2.5 Quality of visits between CM and father	32/81 40%	31/95 33%		
2.6 Frequency of visits between CM and father	29/83 35%	35/106 33%		
3.1 Background checks and home assessments completed when needed	93/115 81%	89/129 69%		
3.2 Background info assessed	89/115 77%	92/132 70%	Background Checks & Home Assessment	88/131 67%
4.1 Sufficient safety plan	62/115 54%	63/132 48%	Safety Planning	58/131 44%
4.2 Safety plan monitored	36/115 31%	42/132 32%	Monitoring the Safety Plan	46/131 35%
5.1 Supervisor regularly consults with CM	50/115 43%	39/132 30%	Supervision	21/131 16%
5.2 Supervisor f/u	38/115 33%	33/132 25%		
Totals:			Totals:	542/1179 46%

85-100=green  
65-84=yellow  
<64 red

i. Florida CQI Reviews/Florida CFSR Reviews

Green: 80-100%  
yellow: 65-79%  
Red: <64

	Item	CBCCFI 17/18	CBCCFI 16/17	CBCCFI 15/16	State Baseline Round 3	Fed PIP Goal
Safety	1. Were the agency's responses to all accepted child maltreatment reports initiated, and face-to face contact with the child (ren) made, within time frames established by agency policies or state Statutes? (CPI Function)	60/68 88%	58/62 94%	52/54 96%	91.5%	96.7%
	2. Concerted efforts to provide services to the family to prevent children's entry into foster care or re-entry after reunification?	46/50 92%	37/45 82%	46/50 92%	76.5%	85.5%
	3. Did the agency make concerted efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns relating to the child (ren) in their own homes or while in foster care?	79/102 77%	82/96 85%	78/103 76%	71.3%	77.7%
Permanency Outcome 1	4. Is the child in foster care in a stable placement and were any changes in the child's placement in the best interests of the child and consistent with achieving the child's permanency goal(s)?	59/80 74%	48/62 77%	62/69 90%	81.8%	88.5%
	5. Did the agency establish appropriate permanency goals for the child in a timely manner?	58/80 73%	41/62 66%	39/69 57%	74.5%	82.1%
	6. Did the agency make concerted efforts to achieve reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement for the child?	46/80 58%	35/62 56%	29/68 43%	67.3%	75.4%
Permanency Outcome 2	7. Did the agency make concerted efforts to ensure that siblings in foster care are placed together unless separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings?	41/53 77%	27/40 64%	35/46 76%		
	8. Did the agency make concerted efforts to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father, and siblings was of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationships with these close family members?	46/73 63%	39/49 80%	32/63 51%		
	9. Did the agency make concerted efforts to preserve the child's connections to his or her neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, Tribe, school, and friends?	48/80 60%	47/62 76%	55/69 80%		
	10. Did the agency make concerted efforts to place the child with relatives when appropriate?	59/80 74%	50/62 81%	47/67 70%		
	11. Did the agency make concerted efforts to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father or other primary caregivers from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation?	29/70 41%	21/44 50%	26/64 41%		
Well-being Outcome 1	12. Did the agency make concerted efforts to assess the needs of and provide services to children, parents, and foster parents to identify the services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address the issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family?	54/102 53%	57/95 60%	56/105 53%	51.3%	58.4%
	13. Did the agency make concerted efforts to involve the parents and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis?	68/140 49%	46/89 52%	47/104 45%	63.6%	70.7%
	14. Were the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and child (ren) sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child (ren) and promote achievement of case goals?	63/150 42%	51/98 52%	47/107 44%	72.5%	78.9%
	15. Were the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the mothers and fathers of the child (ren) sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child (ren) and promote achievement of case goals?	45/137 33%	26/81 32%	27/98 28%	43.5%	51.1%
Well-being Outcome 2	16. Did the agency make concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs, and appropriately address identified needs in case planning and case management activities?	92/108 85%	50/53 94%	48/57 84%		
	17. Did the agency address the physical health needs of children, including dental health needs?	89/122 73%	57/70 81%	66/80 83%		
	18. Did the agency address the mental/behavioral health needs of children?	51/79 65%	36/45 80%	39/53 74%		
	Total:					