



DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

F A C E S . N E T



CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES AGENCY

40th Annual ISM Conference

Boston, MS

Brady Birdsong

Interim Director of Information Systems

District of Columbia Child & Family Services Agency



Outline

- **Round 1 versus Round 2**
 - Comparison of Statewide Assessments
 - Comparison of Findings
- **How did the improvements happen?**





You can't get to where you're going if you don't know where you are.





Comparison of Statewide Assessments

2001

- SACWIS was approximately one year old
- People weren't using the system
- “Using pencil and paper and would always use”
- Weren't able to submit AFCARS
- Difficulty in producing legitimate data

• 2007

- Web-based SACWIS is approximately one year old
- Users have great confidence in the system
- Used as a comprehensive case management system
- Submit AFCARS successfully and produce hundreds of on-line management reports
- Knew in advance what the problem areas were



Round 1 vs. Round 2

Item 3: Services to Families to Protect Children in their Homes and Prevent Removal

2001 Finding	2007 Preliminary Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case plan format does not effectively facilitate the identification of needs and documentation of service provision for children and families. • Workers have difficulty writing and printing the case plan in FACES, as well as entering pertinent information that accurately reflects their effort. 	<p>100% of foster care cases and 83% of in-home cases were rated as strengths. Overall, this was a strength in 89% of cases.</p> <p>Case plans were printed from FACES and placed in the records. Reviewers noted that case plans were completed in a timely manner and that youth participated in case planning.</p>



Round 1 vs. Round 2

Item 5: Foster Care Re-entries

2001 Finding	2007 Preliminary Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application often inappropriately enters children into the database as "removed from home", "entered into foster care", "removed from placement", and then re-entered as "entered into foster care". This application flaw erroneously documents two foster care episodes for a child instead of one. 	<p>Item 5 was rated a strength in 100% of foster care cases during the on-site review.</p> <p>The national standard regarding re-entry into foster care decreased from 24.5% in FY2005 to 12.1% in FY2006.</p>



Round 1 vs. Round 2

- **Item 6:** Stability of Foster Care Placements

2001 Finding	2007 Preliminary Findings
•FACES program logic for “placements” did not coincide with that of AFCARS definitions and interpretations.	Stability of foster care placements was rated a strength in 77% of cases. In cases where stability of foster care was an Area Needing Improvement, it was not a result of data entry or logic issues in FACES.



Round 1 vs. Round 2

- **Item 7:** Permanency Goals for Children

2001 Finding	2007 Preliminary Findings
<p>• Many of the 60 judges assigned to family cases employed a unique format for court reports. This inconsistency of format created confusion among social workers and delayed the submission of court reports, which ultimately delayed permanency for children.</p>	<p>Permanency goals for children was rated a strength in 56% of cases. Quarterly, standardized Court Reports were printed from FACES and placed in every case record.</p> <p>Further, the review noted that the Systemic Factors regarding Periodic Reviews and Permanency Hearings was a strength. Court Reports in the FACES system contributed to the achievement of the Factors.</p>



Round 1 vs. Round 2

- **Item 13:** Visiting with Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

2001 Finding	2007 Preliminary Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple FACES screens have been used to document visitation. 	<p>Visiting with parents and siblings was rated as a strength in 65% of cases. The cases in which these were rated as Areas Needing Improvement, were attributable to a lack of engagement with fathers, rather than a lack of documentation.</p> <p>FACES contact logs were printed and placed in every case record, which reviewers noted were invaluable.</p>



Round 1 vs. Round 2

- **Item 17:** Needs and Services of Children, Parents and Foster Parents

2001 Finding	2007 Preliminary Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Case plan format has limited social workers' ability to document information regarding service provision. 	<p>Item 17 was rated a strength in 48% of all cases. The cases in which these were rated as Areas Needing Improvement, were primarily attributable to a lack of engagement with fathers, rather than a deficiency in case planning.</p> <p>Case plans were printed from FACES and placed in every record, documenting the needs and services of the families.</p>



Round 1 vs. Round 2

- **Item 18:** Children and Family Involvement in Case Planning

2001 Finding	2007 Preliminary Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social workers have not been adequately trained on case plan techniques or the FACES case plan application. 	<p>This item was rated a strength in 62% of foster care cases and 27% of in-home cases. Overall, this item was rated a strength in 47% of cases. The cases in which these were rated as Areas Needing Improvement, were primarily attributable to a lack of engagement with fathers, rather than a deficiency in case planning.</p> <p>Case plans were printed from FACES and placed in the records, providing evidence that social workers now utilize the FACES case plan application.</p>



Round 1 vs. Round 2

- **Item 19:** Worker Visits with Children

2001 Finding	2007 Preliminary Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•The computer logic guiding the documentation of visit information in FACES may be systematically flawed. At least three different fields capture information on visits. Social workers routinely enter data into the contact screen, yet the information management team (IMT) pulls visit information from the two visitation logs.	<p>Caseworker visits with children was rated a strength in 90% of foster care cases and 81% of in-home cases. Overall, it was rated a strength in 86% of all cases.</p> <p>FACES contact logs were printed and placed in every case record, providing documentation of all visits.</p>



Round 1 vs. Round 2

- **Item 21:** Educational Needs of Children

2001 Finding	2007 Preliminary Findings
<p>Educational data had been maintained in a separate database not integrated with FACES. Due to heavy caseloads, social workers have not had the time to submit educational data to CFSA educational specialists.</p> <p>Educational planning had not been included as part of the case plan making it difficult to track needs and services.</p>	<p>This item was rated as a strength in 100% of foster care cases and 67% of in-home cases. Overall, this item was rated a strength in 88% of cases.</p> <p>Education is a specific area included on all FACES case plans, as well as the standardized court reports in FACES. These documents were printed and placed in case records for the review.</p>



Round 1 vs. Round 2

- **Item 22:** Physical Health Of Children

2001 Finding	2007 Preliminary Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Social workers have not adequately documented health service needs and provision due to time constraints of their workload. <p>Health service information has not been fully integrated in FACES.</p>	<p>This item was rated as a strength in 100% of the foster care cases and 79% of in-home cases. Overall, it was rated a strength in 94% of all cases reviewed.</p>



How did the improvements happen?

- **Put data into the hands of users**

- On-line management reports (LaShawn Amended Implementation Plan)
- Drill down capability
- Access started with management; Web-reports for workers
- Data reports were brought into the CFSR interviews

- **Implemented the Change Support Committee**

- Got the SACWIS right
- Committee prioritized the SACWIS changes
- System changes were determined by users of the system rather than IT staff

- **Integrated IT staff into program operations activities**

- IT staff became integral part of practice related workgroups
- Program Ops staff trust IT staff's understanding of social work