

## SAFE QA/Certification Reviews – Statewide Report 2019

Sample Selection: In 2019, 98 providers were reviewed Statewide using this tool. In 2019, 24 individuals comprised the reviewer pool including 7 Foster Care Coordinators, 16 Certification Supervisors, and 1 SSS1. The reviews are done in coordination with the CFSR team and follow their schedule, ensuring all branches are reviewed. All types of providers are reviewed and each **district's** sample is pulled randomly.

Data Collected: The review covers the following in regards to fidelity to the SAFE home study model: issues addressed from both SAFE questionnaires being identified in the home study, rating accuracy in the Psycho-social Inventory, and whether or not mitigations are comprehensive and complete. For Rule and IV-E compliance, the following items are reviewed for accuracy: LEDS checks, FBI checks, Child Welfare background checks, and supervisor signature on the home study. Renewal home studies are also reviewed for these items. Finally, the reviewers check provider notes to ensure 90 and 180-day home visits are being completed and documented as required by rule.

The measures used in the review process are Always, Sometimes, Seldom, Never. Always means all requirements were met or items identified, Sometimes means some requirements were met or items identified, Seldom means few requirements were met or items identified and Never means requirements were not met nor items identified. The following data reflects the percentages based on the total numbers of answers received per question.

- SAFE QA Results
  - Were all issues identified on Questionnaire One which would require a Desk Guide Rating of 3, 4, or 5 identified in the home study? 64% of all items from Questionnaire One were Always identified in providers reviewed, 34% were Sometimes identified and 2% were Seldomly identified.
  - Were all issues identified on Questionnaire Two which would require a Desk Guide Rating of 3, 4, or 5 identified in the home study? 57% of all items from Questionnaire Two were Always identified, 38% were Sometimes identified, 3% were Seldomly identified, and 2% were N/A.
  - Did the Psycho-social Inventory reflect the correct Desk Guide ratings? 33% of home studies reviewed Always identified the correct desk guide rating, 60% Sometimes identified the correct desk guide rating, 5% seldomly identified the correct desk guide rating, and 2% were N/A.
  - Did the home study practitioner answer all the mitigation questions for ratings higher than 2? For the items rated 3, 4, 5, the practitioners often addressed the issue, the context, frequency and severity, but often did not address how the issue affected the applicant, and when reducing or erasing ratings, practitioners largely depended on the applicants' self-report, rather than collecting secondary evidence.
  
- Rule and IV-E Requirements
  - Is the date of the Supervisor signature on the Home Study on or before the date on the Certificate of Approval? 95% were signed on or before the Certificate of Approval date and 5% were not.
  - Has a LEDS criminal background check been completed for all adults in the home prior to placement? 98% were completed prior to placement, and 2% were not.
  - Was an FBI/Fingerprint Background check for all adults prior to full certification? 98% were completed prior to full certification, and 2% were not.
  - When required, were criminal history exceptions obtained? 96% were either obtained or not applicable, 4% were not obtained.
  - Were child abuse background checks completed for all adults in the home prior to placement? 96% were completed, and 4% were not.
  - When required, were management approvals obtained for specific certification rules? 99% were either obtained or not applicable, 1% were not obtained.

- Have the home visit requirements been met (90 and 180-day visits)? 70% were met, 30% were not met.
- Renewal requirements which were reviewed: Signature of the home study date, Face to Face contact, LEDS, Child Welfare background checks. 98% of the renewals reviewed met each of the required categories and 2 % of the renewals reviewed did not meet all of the required categories.

Themes: Due to the changes made to the OR-Kids Safety tab, Oregon's accuracy rate for LEDS and FBI results has dramatically improved.

With 30% of the providers reviewed not having documentation of home visits done at the 90 and/or 180-day mark, this is an identified area for improvement. Because visits to the home are how certifiers and adoption workers can document confirmation of a safe environment and whether a family continues to meet certification standards, improvement in this area is critical.

As compared to previous years, results from 2019 reviews demonstrate an improvement in practitioners' identification of issues from questionnaires that would result in a rating of 3, 4, 5. Practitioners improved in Always identifying issues from Questionnaire 1 by 20% and by 18% for Questionnaire 2.

Continued efforts to align Oregon's practice of the SAFE home study with exceptional fidelity to the model should include emphasis on fully narrating all the mitigation questions, specifically evaluating the impact the issue had on the applicant and when determining the issue is better, or no longer present, consistently providing secondary sources to corroborate the applicant's self-report.

Next Steps: During the 2019 review year, the Foster Home Certification Review Tool was slightly modified to align the questions regarding mitigation to the current SAFE Mitigation Questions. Additional reviewers were trained and added to the review schedule. Consistent with the previous year's goal, in 2019, 3% of all families with a bi-annual certificate in each branch/district were reviewed. This was an increase of 61 homes from the previous year, producing a larger sample size. In the last year, Oregon's Foster Care Program has begun hosting Zoom trainings with the Consortium addressing various topics of the SAFE home study for increased fidelity. Going forward, we will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the current review tool and how to assure the results yielded are useful in assisting the field to make necessary adjustments.