

COLORADO DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE MODEL CONTINUED QUALITY ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Purpose:

Determine a local jurisdictions quality of implementation of a Differential Response Model in Child Protective Services

Background:

The Quality Assessment Tool is utilized by jurisdictions who have fully implemented a Differential Response Model in Child Protective Services to conduct an audit or review of the foundational components of the process supporting Practice. Jurisdictions approved by the state participate in a continued quality assessment process that includes the delivery of the Differential Response Model components.

Nine Differential Response Model Components considered in the Quality Assessment include:

- 1. Differential Response Model
- 2. Enhanced Screening
- 3. RED Teams
- 4. Group Supervision
- 5. Facilitated Family Meetings
- 6. Front Loaded Services
- 7. Support Planning
- 8. Training & Consultation for Partnership Based Collaborative Practice
- 9. Continuous Quality Improvement



INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE COLORADO DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE MODEL QUALITY ASSESSMENT

- 1. Review each of the Nine Differential Response Model Components.
- 2. Consider Quality Assessment Component Elements & respective factors then record a score.
- 3. Provide an overall Quality Assessment score for each Differential Response Model Component.
- 4. Provide commentary on any strengths, challenges, &/or components requiring attention.
- 5. Discuss the Quality Assessment process, including, any strengths or challenges noted in the review and any plans for improving performance with the local jurisdiction.

The scoring process: Each of the nine component elements is scored on a range of 0-5 with a total possible score of 45. Each component contains elements identifying activity to be rated-examples of scoring formula follows:

```
Element is rated (0-1): 0 = \text{No} \quad 1 = \text{Yes}
```

Element is rated (0-2): $0 = \text{No} \quad 1 = \text{Some} \quad 2 = \text{Yes}$

Element is rated (0-3): 0 = No 1 = Some 2 = Most of the time 3 = Thoroughly

Quality Assessment Result:

High Quality: A High Quality result ensures the jurisdiction is performing at or above 85% of all the quality components of Differential Response. This jurisdiction is a Model for other jurisdictions to be based off of.

Quality: Quality Assessment performance meets foundational elements to support current practice of Differential Response. All components of Differential Response are being practiced satisfactorily. $= 60^{\circ}/o +$

Area of Focus: Quality Assessment performance on foundational elements does not reach a consistent level of performance to support unchanged practice of Differential Response. = 59°/o or less



Differential Response Model Foundational Component	Quality Score	Comments: Strength, Challenges, Barriers, Areas Requiring Attention	Area Score
1.0 Differential Response Model:			
The local jurisdiction has organized child protective services to offer a High Risk Response & Family Assessment Response to screened in reports of child maltreatment. A proportional response to accepted reports of child maltreatment offers the jurisdiction flexibility in how children, youth & family are engaged to insure child safety, well-being & stability of care. (0-1) 1.1 High Risk Assessment response is in place and being properly utilized ¹ (0-1) 1.2 Family Assessment Response is in place and being properly utilized ¹ (0-1) 1.3 Safety Assessments are in place and being properly utilized ² (0-1) 1.4 Risk Assessments are in place and being properly utilized ² (0-1) 1.5 Organizational design and team arrangements are thoughtful and purposeful	1 = Yes $0 = No$		High Quality (4-5) Quality (3) Area of Focus (0-2) SCORE:

¹ Jurisdictions are properly utilizing C.R.C. 19-1-103 for criteria of child abuse and neglect, Volume 7 to determine response timeframes, and the Agency Response Guide to determine track.

² Jurisdictions will report on the use of the tool and ARD data may also be used to grade this area.



Differential Response Model Foundational Component	Quality Score	Comments: Strength, Challenges, Barriers, Areas Requiring Attention	Area Score
2.0 Enhanced Screening: The child protective service practitioners receiving reports of child maltreatment from the community strive to expand the scope & depth of information available. An effort is made to obtain information that promotes a full understanding of the concern regarding the child. Further, an effort is made to seek information about the family & any circumstances supporting a balanced collection of available information to enhance initial decision making. (0-1) 2.1 Jurisdiction reports Enhanced Screening is occurring on all referrals for child protection. (0-1) 2.2 All employees answering calls have received the appropriate training (0-1) 2.3 Jurisdiction reports the Enhanced Screening Guide is used on all calls (0-2) 2.4 Expanded information is reflected in the RED Team observation of the content available due to Enhanced Screening practices	2 = Yes 1 = Some 0 = No		High Quality (4-5) Quality (3) Area of Focus (0-2) SCORE:



Differential Response Model Foundational Component	Quality Score	Comments: Strength, Challenges, Barriers, Areas Requiring Attention	Area Score
3.0 RED Teams: RED Teams offer a structured group decision making process to facilitate the processing of child maltreatment reports received by a local child protective service agency. RED stands for review, evaluate and direct. The RED Team process promotes critical thinking, transparency of decision making, shared risk taking and accountability regarding the initial response to a report of child maltreatment. RED Teams are developed to structure the decision making process in Differential Response MODELs	_	Strength, Challenges, Barriers, Areas	
reports $\underline{\qquad} (0-1) \ 3.5 \ \text{RED Teams consider 70\% or more of all}$ non-immediate reports received by the jurisdiction			



Differential Response Model Foundational Component	Quality Score	Comments: Strength, Challenges, Barriers, Areas Requiring Attention	Area Score
4.0 Group Supervision: Group Supervision is a structured group decision making process for child welfare practitioners to process their practice intervention effecting children, youth, families & others. The supervision group is led & facilitated by the staff team supervisor. The Group Supervision process is an internal agency function that regularly promotes critical thinking, transparency of decision making, shared risk taking and accountability regarding the planning & intervention with families in response to child maltreatment or other presenting challenges. Group Supervision is an agency supported strategy developed to provide clinical or practice support for the child welfare practitioners in Differential Response. (0-2) 4.1 Jurisdiction is able to illustrate the purpose and criteria for Group Supervision(0-1) 4.2 Consultation & Information Sharing Framework is being utilized(0-2) 4.3 All case carrying staff have access to Group Supervision in a timely manner	2 = Yes 1 = Some 0 = No		High Quality (4-5) Quality (3) Area of Focus (0-2) SCORE:



Differential Response Model Foundational Component	Quality Score	Comments: Strength, Challenges, Barriers, Areas Requiring Attention	Area Score
5.0 Facilitated Family Meetings: Facilitated Family Meetings provide a structured group process where the local jurisdiction engages family members, extended family and others to resolve presenting issues. Families engaged in a partnership based collaborative practice can build safety, enhance well-being and secure permanency through the development and implementation of family case plans. Family involvement strategies facilitate the marshalling of family strengths, by identifying and calling upon extended family and community supports to remove barriers to effective parenting. (0-1) 5.1 Jurisdiction illustrates Facilitated Family Meetings are operational (0-1) 5.2 Consolation & Information Sharing Framework is being utilized (0-1) 5.3 At least 70% of families entering a child protective case are involved with a Facilitated Family Meeting	2= Yes 1 = Some 0 = No		High Quality (4-5) Quality (3) Area of Focus (0-2) SCORE:
(0-2) 5.4 Meetings are facilitated by a third party; not the caseworker or supervisor working with the family			



Differential Response Model Quality Foundational Component Score	Comments: Strength, Challenges, Barriers, Areas Requiring Attention	Area Score
6.0 Front Loaded Services: Front Loaded Services refers to the strengthening of both community interventions available to children, youth & families & the capacity of the local jurisdiction to provide a robust initial response to reports of child maltreatment. The local jurisdiction collaborates with community organizations & informal support models to provide a network of intervention to support at-risk children, youth & families. The local jurisdiction strives to strengthen the first responses to families to insure safety, well- being and stability of care; this expands the jurisdiction's assessment function to include the delivery of interventions to meet the needs of children, youth & families during the assessment process. — (0 – 1) 6.1 Jurisdiction is able to illustrate how community based Front Loaded Services are in place — (0 – 1) 6.2 Jurisdiction is able to illustrate how agency Front Loaded Services are in place — (0 – 3) 6.3 Jurisdiction illustrates how families are receiving services without an open PA5 case or how cases are being opened sooner to meet the family's needs		High Quality (4-5) Quality (3) Area of Focus (0-2) SCORE:



Differential Response Model Foundational Component	Quality Score	Comments: Strength, Challenges, Barriers, Areas Requiring Attention	Area Score
Support Planning: Support Planning strives to generate a negotiated agreement between families and local jurisdictions on the work to be accomplished to insure child safety, well-being and stability of care. Consultation & Information Sharing Framework provides risk statements & agency bottom lines to be addressed with the family in the development & implementation of planned interventions. Family solutions & preferences for intervention plans are preferred. Support Plans may also be utilized as recidivism or relapse plan to give the family access to extended networks to provide safety after jurisdiction involvement has ended. (0-2) 7.1 Jurisdiction is able to illustrate the use and purpose of support plans (0-2) 7.2 Family is involved with the development and execution of the support plan (0-1) 7.3 Support Plans illustrate the plan for the family to provide safety without directly involving the jurisdiction	2 = Yes 1 = Some 0 = No		High Quality (4-5) Quality (3) Area of Focus (0-2) SCORE:



Differential Response Model Foundational Component	Quality Score	Comments: Strength, Challenges, Barriers, Areas Requiring Attention	Area Score
8.0 Continued Training and Consultation for Social Work Practices:			
Continued training and consultation for social work practices is a collection of training & consultation opportunities to provide child protective service practitioners with a knowledge foundation supporting the practice strategies included in the Differential Response Model. These include a rigorous and balanced assessment, strategies for including the children, how to properly utilize the Consultation & Information Sharing Framework, proper use to the evidence based tools, use of risk and goal statements, how to engage extended family and community networks, and how to utilize behaviorally based safety and support plans.	2 = Yes $1 = Some$ $0 = No$		High Quality (4-5) Quality (3) Area of Focus (0-2)
 (0 - 2) 8.1 Jurisdiction illustrates personal have access to and attend training and/or consultation on all of the social work practices (0 - 2) 8.2 Jurisdiction illustrates how these practices have supported safety focused, family engagement for families (0 - 1) 8.3 Jurisdiction provides training to the community on the practice of DR 			SCORE:



Differential Response Model Foundational Component	Quality Score	Comments: Strength, Challenges, Barriers, Areas Requiring Attention	Area Score
9.0 Continuous Quality Improvement: Continuous Quality Improvement process is developed & implemented to support jurisdictions efforts to monitor & enhance performance. (0-1) 9.1 Jurisdiction has a Continuous Quality Improvement Team (0-1) 9.2 Jurisdiction has access to data to track Differential Response activity and outcomes (0-3) 9.3 Jurisdiction is able to illustrate how Continuous Quality Improvement impacts county structure, process, and practice	3 = Thoroughly 2 = Most of the time 1 = Some 0 = No		High Quality (4-5) Quality (3) Area of Focus (0-2) SCORE:

Scoring:



There are Nine Differential Response Model Components considered in reaching a recommendation on the quality of the Differential Response practice and structure for a jurisdiction. Each element has a benchmark score to aid in the decision making process. The scores are grouped as follows:

39 – 45 (85% or higher) High Quality Practice 27 – 38 (60% or higher) Quality Practice

0-26 (under 60%) Area of focus

Results:

High Quality Practice: (85% or higher) Differential Response Model is being practiced at the highest level throughout the jurisdiction to include all components of both the Organizational and Social Work Practices. The jurisdiction is has fully integrated the agency, community and family to best provide long term safety for the children and support for the family and worker.

Quality Practice: (60% or higher) Differential Response Model is foundationally solid encompassing all aspects of the Organizational and Social Work Practice components of the Colorado Differential Response Model. The jurisdiction is practicing Differential Response Model as it was intended.

Area of focus: (Under 60%) Differential Response Model Component quality performance on foundational elements does not reach a consistent level of performance to support unaltered practice of a Differential Response Model. A training and improvement plan is needed to bring the jurisdiction in line with the remainder to Colorado child protection execution of Differential Response practice.

Results:								
1:	2:	3:	4:	5:	6:	7:	8:	9:
Total:								



Additional Comments or Training/Improvement Plan if jurisdiction did not reach Quality Practice results: