

January, 1996 Review of "02" Cases

Introduction

In January of 1996 a review was done of a representative sample of cases with a "return home goal" ("02" cases) from the Cook and Northern regions. The reviewers found that DCFS has not significantly improved its certification of 02 cases since the 1993 review.

Methodology

DCFS was asked to draw a representative sample of cases from each of the two regions. 115 cases were requested from Northern Region and 120 cases were requested from Cook. There was a 62.5% return rate from the Cook Region and 86% from the Northern Region. These returns were adequate to ensure a sample size for precision of plus or minus ten percent with a 95% confidence interval from each region.

The cases were then reviewed for Norman issues by the Monitor and her associates. In addition, all cases were then reviewed on the Cysis system to assure that all certification information in the case records was accurate.

Findings

22% of the cases reviewed were already certified as Norman. Another 18% of the cases had a goal change. The reviewers found 35 cases, 16% of the whole sample for which there was evidence of a Norman issues but were not certified. In addition, in seven of the twelve cases with insufficient information of whether they had been certified or not, there were indications of Norman issues.

No changes in DCFS performance in past two and half years.

In 30 cases the monitors judged that the cases should be certified. In the remaining twelve they felt that there was insufficient information in the record for them to make a determination. There was no significant difference in the performance of DCFS between the Cook and Northern regions (Table 1).

There is no significant change in DCFS's performance when you compare these results to those from the previous 1993 survey which has comparable and adequate data for the Cook Region¹ (Table 2).

¹ The number of cases for the Northern Region in 1993 are not adequate to draw statistically significant conclusions.

Over one-third of Norman cases missed by workers.

The error rates that we determined in Table 2 could be affected by factors unrelated to Norman that impacted the denominator. For example, a change in DCFS policy might increase the number of non-Norman cases, thereby causing the percentage of "02" Norman certified cases to decrease. To test the validity of these numbers it is therefore advisable to develop another measure of the performance of DCFS workers that is not impacted by changes in the denominator.

We can measure the proportion of all certifiable Norman cases that were in fact certified by DCFS. We have this data for both the 1996 and the 1993 "02" surveys. In 1993, in the Cook and North regions, DCFS workers certified twenty-seven of the reviewed cases. In addition, the Norman monitor and her associates identified an additional 14 certifiable Norman cases that were not certified by DCFS. Therefore, there is an error rate of 34%. In 1996, we find a comparable error rate. Fifty cases from the Cook and North survey were certified by DCFS workers. An additional 30 certifiable cases were identified by the monitoring review team. Therefore of the total 80 certifiable cases, 38% were not certified by DCFS. Given our margin of statistical error, DCFS in the Cook and North Regions is not certifying within a range of 28% to 48% of certifiable Norman Cases.

What were the issues in these cases?

Of the cases for which the reviewers could clearly identify the Norman issues, the most prevalent Norman issues were lack of shelter (28 cases) and environmental neglect (12 cases). (Table 3)

The monitors found much better documented case records than in previous 02 reviews. The timeliness of ACR reviews has improved. This allowed them to ascertain with certainty when the worker missed Norman issues. Monitors' comments included:

"On the 7/16/95 service plan, it states that _____ will maintain safe and stable housing for herself."

"Case notes indicate pts. face eviction. Also drug prob. but tested negative May and July for drugs, 1995."

"Mo in drug treatment in Minn...moving in with kids there to be close to mom. permanent return home. Has no means of support-will need housing."

"In the Family Assessment work sheets under whatever actions/service were provided there is the following 'emergency food and listing of CHA scattered site housing.'"

"On the Client Service Plan 9/27/93 says family should 'find and move into place of their own.'"

"In the 9-26-95 Service Plan it states 'the mother needs to find adequate housing and demonstrate she can provide a stable environment for the children and herself.'"

"Case rec'd indicates lack of food as an issue when ch @ home and inadq. housing a problem for return home."

"Mother undomiciled."

"Service plan 2/28/95 states 'mo will inform wkrs when housing is found.'"

"Mother came from jail to recovery home for drugs treatment -- will need housing before 6/96 return home date. No indication of certification."

"When the family entered system in 1988 --father was working but not making enough money to support his family and landlord selling apartment, so they had to move."

"Mo moved in with her mo when she left husband --lives only on SSI--will need housing if children are to be returned home."

"Mother's service plan indicates housing is to be secured."

"First report indicated for inadequate shelter."

"DOS rept. indicates mom's July, Aug, and Sept rent pd by 'exception to policy to maintain residence.'"

"Unclear how well prepared mother can be for return for adequate housing."²

"It states in the Aug. 30th. 1995 case plan that the mother and father need to get 'stable housing' in order to get their kids home."

"There is a description in the 491 dated 12/19/95, 'their home was found to be dirty and there was no food.'"

"In the case plan dated 12/06/95, it states on goal #6 : 'mother needs to demonstrate the ability to budget money and pay for housing and groceries.'"

"No one has seen mother's residence to determine what needs

² In this case, the monitor felt the case should be further reviewed and there was not sufficient information in the case record for her to definitely ascertain that the case should be certified.

she has and return home still goal."³

"In the 10-25-95 service plan it states 'maintain adq. housing free of observable hazards such as....'"

"In the case plan on 7-13-94 it was stated that the mother 'will secure a residence to stay at by 8/30/94.'"

" Norman issues remain before return home."⁴

"Not in service plan, mentioned in case notes mo. needs better housing before return home. Drug problem with mom."

"Many other issues but service plan states 'At the time of her return home for the children , Ms _____ will need to provide adequate housing and furniture.'"

"7/17/95 service plan states '_____ will need to locate and secure safe and adequate housing...' There are other issues-- drug treatment."

"Case record refers to mo's homelessness as a factor in lack of return home."

"Service plan for mother states she is to obtain and maintain safe and adequate housing."

"11/95 service plan states 'The family needs counseling, adequate housing and _____ maintain sobriety.'"

"The child removed because were living in filthy motel -- should be certified. Why was't she certified and Norman funds utilized to prevent placement?"

"Ongoing review for certification so long as 02 is goal. Mother's whereabouts occasionally unknown. But no indication her living arrangements has EVER been seen to know about space needs and furniture needs if children were to be returned."⁵

"Case indicated for inadq. food, environmental neglect, indicated for inadq. supr. --have no clue what really happen here."⁶

³ See footnote #1.

⁴See footnote #1

⁵ See footnote #1

⁶See footnote #1.

"On the 2-23-94 service plan, it says "mother needs to locate adequate housing for the family."

TABLE 1
1996 REVIEW BREAKDOWN BY REGION

	COOK	NORTHERN	TOTAL
# OF CASES	125	99	224
% GOAL CHANGES	24%	11%	18%
% CERTIFIED BY DCFS	26%	17%	22%
% CASES THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN CERTIFIED IDENTIFIED BY REVIEWER	11%	16%	13%

% NON-CERTIFIED 02 CASES THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN CERTIFIED PER REVIEWER	23%	23%	23%
---	-----	-----	-----

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF THREE "02" REVIEWS
1992 1993 1996

Statewide sample	n=89	n=177	n.a.
% of sample that should have been Norman	19%	11%	n.a.
% of non-certified 02 that should have been certified	19%	17.6%	n.a.
Cook sub-sample	n=64	n=97	n=125
Northern sub-sample	n= 9	n=17	n=99
<u>Cook</u> % sample that should be Norman	22% ⁷	10%	11%
% sample of non-certified 02 cases	22%	17%	23%
<u>Northern</u> % sample that should be Norman	0%	24% ⁸	16%
% sample of non-certified 02 cases	0%	57%	23%

TABLE 3
NORMAN ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY REVIEWERS

⁷ The sub-samples for Cook and Northern, respectively, have an insufficient "n" for us to test for statistical significance.

⁸ Due to the small size of the 1993 Northern sub-sample we cannot test for statistical significance.

Norman Issue

Number of
Cases
(n=35⁹)*

Food	8
Shelter	28
Clothing	4
Environmental Neglect	12

*It is possible to have more than one allegation in a case.

⁹In addition to the 30 cases which the reviewers thought should be certified there were an additional five cases in which the reviewer could identify a Norman issue but there was insufficient information to determine certification.

January 22, 1996

7



"02" Monitoring QUESTIONNAIRE

Reviewer: D J M Date: _____ R/S/F _____

Worker: _____ Supervisor _____

SCR#: _____

Family name _____ (first) _____ (last)

Names of children:

1. _____, (first) _____ (last)

2. _____

1.case number _ _ _ _ (this is our number, leave blank)

2.Cysis # _ _ _ _ _

3.Region:

- 1A Rockford.....01
- 1B Peoria.....02
- 2A Aurora.....03
- 2B01 Cook County, North Region....04
- 2B02 Cook County, East Region....05
- 2B03 Cook County, South Region....06
- 2B04 Cook County, West Region....07
- 2B05 Cook County, CPS.....08
- 3A Springfield.....09
- 3B Champaign.....10
- 4A East St. Louis.....11
- 5A Marion.....12
- Other.....13

4. Has the permanency goal changed?

Yes.....1 No.....2 If yes, go to 5.
If no, go to 6.

5. Circle goal change and then STOP HERE:

01 03 04 05 06 07 08

6. Is the case currently certified?

Yes.....1 No.....2 Insuf. info.....3

IF YES, STOP HERE.

7. Evidence of lack of return home due to Norman issues?

yes.....1 no.....2 insuf data.....8

IF YES, PROCEED. IF NO, STOP HERE.

