



2021 Family First Prevention Services Act Task Force Report: Updates & Progress



Members

Honorable Mary Tabor, Judge, Iowa Court of Appeals, Co-chair
Honorable Julie Schumacher, Judge, Iowa Court of Appeals, Co-chair
Honorable Linnea Nicol, District Associate Judge, District 1B
Honorable Adam Sauer, District Associate Judge, District 2A
Honorable Scott Strait, District Associate Judge, District 4
Honorable Brent Pattison, District Associate Judge, District 5C
Honorable Cynthia Finley, District Associate Judge, District 6
Honorable Cheryl Traum, District Associate Judge, District 7
Honorable Bill Owens, Associate Juvenile Judge, District 8
Christopher Wyatt, Chief Juvenile Court Officer, District 6
Scott Hobart, Chief Juvenile Court Officer, District 7
Chad Jensen, Director of Juvenile Court Services
Janee Harvey, Div. Admin, Department of Human Services
Molly Kottmeyer, Counsel to the Chief Justice
Kathy Thompson, Director, Children's Justice Initiative

I. Introduction

The Family First Prevention Services Act (“Family First” or “FFPSA”) was signed into law on February 9, 2018. To prepare Iowa for implementation, Chief Justice Mark Cady, on November 8, 2018, signed an order creating a Judicial Branch Family First Prevention Services Act Task Force. From the larger Task Force, four workgroups were identified for further evaluation on preparedness. The workgroups included Task Force members as well as community partners necessary for the successful enactment of Family First.

Under the leadership of Chief Justice Susan Christensen, the Task Force released a report in August 2020 making recommendations for Family First implementation. In that 2020 report, recommendations were made by the workgroups in four identified areas: (1) Prevention Efforts and Pre-Filing Legal Representation; (2) Family First Training; (3) Court Oversight of Qualified Residential Treatment Program (“QRTP”) Placements; and (4) Legislative initiatives.

Following the release of the 2020 report, changes were made to the workgroups, re-adjusting for needs going forward. Those changes sustain the momentum gained through collaborative efforts in our solution-focused approach. Below are updates provided by both the newly formed, and continuing workgroups. The lists, action steps, analyses, and continued needs expressed below are not exhaustive and remain subject to re-evaluation.

II. Work Groups

1. Prevention Efforts

Introduction

In the 2020 report, prevention efforts and pre-file legal representation were together in the same workgroup as generalized efforts to prevent foster care entry. Upon further consideration of what each effort entails, the two were separated and new groups were formed and supplemented with new members. Going forward, the two are discussed separately as distinct efforts under Family First to prevent a family’s entry into the child welfare system.

In our previous report, the workgroup identified the Four Questions, Seven Judges pilot as a prevention effort headed by the judicial branch. In recognizing the value of these questions, they were rolled out to all the judicial districts and juvenile court judges at the 2020 FFPSA Summit presented by Children’s Justice, the Judicial Branch’s Court Improvement Project focusing on child welfare practice. Due to the now-widespread use of these questions, it is no longer considered a pilot, but instead, a state-wide practice to prevent unnecessary removals. The prevention efforts that remain the

focus of reporting are those by the Department of Human Services (“the Department” or “DHS”) and Juvenile Court Services (“JCS”).

The Department of Human Services Title IV-E Prevention Program

For the Title IV-E Prevention Services and Programs Plan (“Prevention Services Plan”), the Department chose to utilize its current form, 470-4133, *Family Risk Assessment*, which comprises two scales that measure the level of risk regarding abuse and neglect in child abuse (“CA”) and child in need of assistance (“CINA”) assessments, to determine who is a candidate for foster care. Families with a CA assessment with a disposition of “confirmed” high risk indicate a child is at “imminent risk” of entering foster care. Further, CA assessments of moderate and high risk with a disposition of “founded,” and CINA assessments scored at high risk indicate a child is at “imminent risk” of entering foster care. The children in all of the aforementioned categories are “candidate[s] for foster care”¹ allowing for preventative service delivery.

On July 1, 2020, the Department implemented its new Family-Centered Services (“FCS”) package, which included SafeCare®, designated as a “supported” practice by the Title IV-E Prevention Services Clearinghouse.² Through a contract with the Georgia State University Research Foundation, Inc., the Department will be conducting a rigorous and well-designed evaluation of the implementation of SafeCare® and the outcomes achieved by families receiving the service. The evaluation will span approximately five years and will examine the process and short- and long-term outcomes, e.g. foster care entry, re-entry, and recurrence of maltreatment.

To faithfully observe the underlying FFPSA mission of keeping children in the home, with family, whenever able to be done safely, the Department implemented a hierarchy of decision-making to prevent a child’s unnecessary entry into foster care; and if foster care is deemed necessary, to assure the most appropriate placement:

1. Keep children with their parents whenever safely possible by:
 - a. Employing an FCS service, e.g. SafeCare®,³ Solution Based Casework,⁴ Child Safety Conferences, etc.;
 - b. Asking the four questions from the 4 Questions, 7 Judges pilot
 - i. What can we do to remove the danger instead of the child?
 - ii. Can someone the child/family knows move into the home to remove the danger?

¹ Family First defines a “child who is a candidate for foster care” as “a child who is identified in a prevention plan under section 471(e)(4)(A) as being at imminent risk of entering foster care . . . but who can remain safely in the child’s home or in kinship placement as long as services of programs specified in section 471(e)(1) that are necessary to prevent the entry of the child into foster care are provided.”

² The clearinghouse rates evidence-based programs as well-supported, supported, or promising practices (or as not currently meeting criteria) depending on the proven success of the service through reliable studies and review.

³ *SafeCare* is a trauma-informed parenting model program that has been shown to prevent and reduce child maltreatment and improve health, development, and the welfare of children ages 0 to 5. More information about this service was provided in the 2020 report.

⁴ *Solution Based Casework* (“SBC”) is an evidenced-based case management method for assessment, case planning, and ongoing case management. SBC prioritizes the family and is appropriate for families with children of all ages. More information about this service was provided in the 2020 report.

- iii. Can the caregiver and child go live with a relative/fictive kin?
 - iv. Could the child move temporarily to live with relative or fictive kin?
2. If children cannot remain safely with parents, have children stay with extended family members related to the child;
 3. If children cannot stay with extended family members, have children stay with fictive kin, i.e. individuals with whom the child has a strong connection but who are not related by blood;
 4. If children cannot stay with fictive kin, place children in family foster care.
 5. Utilize QRTP only when it is necessary to meet the child's clinical needs.

The 2020 report did not mention Child Safety Conference (“CSC”) as a preventative measure. However, the Department utilizes CSCs, a form of a team meeting, for children at risk of removal and placement in foster care. The Department invites parents to attend a CSC to help identify collaborative solutions that allow the children and family to remain together. If the children cannot remain in the home, the goal is to ensure that placement of the children occurs with kin or fictive kin caregivers rather than in a stranger foster care placement.

CSCs occur to make key decisions on:

- The safety of the child,
- Service and treatment needs necessary for the child to remain with their parent or parents and/or natural supports,
- Developing a plan to prevent removal,
- The appropriate placement of the child if removal is necessary,
- The child's access and opportunities for normal activities based on the reasonable and prudent parenting standard.

Juvenile Court Services & Preventative Efforts

Over the past year, through the effort of collaboration and multiple workgroups, JCS has diligently worked to implement FFPSA. If a youth under the supervision of JCS is identified as a Candidate for Foster Care,⁵ under Title IV-B, Iowa may claim some expenses for collaboration and coordinated services to address the risks associated with the child's candidacy for foster care.

JCS also has a Title IV-E prevention plan. Under JCS, an assessment of youth safety is part of the intake. At intake, JCS conducts a safety assessment to examine risks and protective factors for the youth and their family. Unlike the Department, JCS is not offering any in-home parenting skill-based program as part of its Title IV-E prevention plan.

To date, the policies and procedures required to support Family First implementation, including a Candidate for Foster Care Screening Tool (“CFST”) and a Child Prevention Case Plan (“CP2”) have been developed and implemented. The CFST is a screening instrument developed by JCS to identify

⁵ JCS defines “Candidates for Foster Care” as a youth involved with JCS with the specific purpose of “either removing the child from the home or providing prevention services, such that if the services are unsuccessful, the plan is to remove the child from the home and place [them] in foster care.

the presence of multiple risk factors that are associated with an increased prevalence of out-of-home placements. It utilizes a threshold score to identify those youth who are at serious risk of out-of-home placement. Youth who score above the identified threshold are considered eligible Candidates for Foster Care.

The CP2 is a federal requirement.⁶ For youth identified as a Candidate for Foster Care, state agencies are required to have an active Child Prevention Case Plan to claim for any prevention services or administrative costs. The plan must (1) “identify the foster care prevention strategy” allowing the youth to remain in the home safely; (2) “list the services or programs to be provided to or on behalf of the child to ensure the success of that prevention strategy;” and (3) comply with other requirements, as established by the secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services.⁷

JCS created a SharePoint library to ensure juvenile court officers’ access to these and other FFPSA documents, and the forms have been integrated into JCS’s case management. Two services – Functional Family Therapy (“FFT”)⁸ and Multisystemic Therapy (“MST”)⁹ – both of which have been designated as “well-supported” by the Title IV-E Clearinghouse, were identified as JCS prevention services and a strategic plan for adding services in the future is currently being developed. Additionally, JCS has developed a protocol for monitoring child safety based on best practice approaches and service evaluation plans for FFT and MST.

2. Pre-File Legal Representation

Introduction

On December 21, 2018, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ Children’s Bureau amended Title IV-E funding guidelines to allow for “administrative cost” reimbursement to states for providing “independent legal representation” for a family and child who is a “candidate for title IV-E foster care.”¹⁰ Funding can also be sought for multidisciplinary team members, such as investigators, peer partners, social workers, and others.¹¹

Based on the federal change, the State Public Defender (“SPD”) pursued a legislative change during the 88th General Assembly. As provided in the 2020 report, SF2182 was passed, amending the

⁶ 42 U.S.C. 671(e)(4)

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ FFT is a “short-term, family-based therapeutic intervention for delinquent youth at risk for institutionalization and their families” that is shown to prove family relations and reduce recidivism.

⁹ MST is a community based therapy for high-risk youth aged 12 to 17. MST’s goal is to decrease delinquent behaviors and empower youth and families to thrive in their natural environments, centering the child and their community.

¹⁰ See Appendix for the Child Welfare Policy Manual pages explaining the funding changes.

¹¹ *Id.*

Iowa code to include section 13B.13. Before this change, the SPD office was unable to provide pre-file representation to a family at risk of out-of-home placement. For a parent to receive legal assistance, a court filing was necessary thereby making preventative legal work nearly impossible. Through this change, the SPD was granted authority to establish pilot projects in up to six counties in Iowa to assist families involved in the child welfare system. To date, Iowa has been able to draw down significant Title IV-E dollars to fund the pilot projects.

Locations & Models

As of the writing of this report, six counties have been identified, three rural and three metropolitan or urban. The three rural counties are Emmet, Fayette, and Appanoose counties. The three metropolitan are Woodbury, Pottawattamie, and Linn counties.

The SPD identified various multidisciplinary models for pre-file representation. Some decided upon models were inspired by models used elsewhere, such as the Detroit Center for Family Advocacy and the pre-existing model utilized by Iowa Legal Aid. In some locations, the pilot attorneys will be attorneys currently employed by the SPD or Legal Aid. For example, families in Fayette County will be represented by attorneys in the Black Hawk County juvenile field office and families in Linn County will utilize Legal Aid attorneys. In other locations, attorneys will enter contracts, similar to the ones used for court-appointed privately employed attorneys.

According to the SPD, all teams will be multidisciplinary. However, there will be variations within the models regarding how “multidisciplinary” will look. Planning is still ongoing, but at this time, it is believed that some locations will have a parent partner and others will not. Some teams will have an independent social worker¹² to be a member of the family’s legal team. Alternatively, in other locations, there will not be a social worker as a member of the team, but instead, the attorney, family, and other team members will work with the Department’s social worker to address the needs of the family. Positions for contract attorneys will be posted in the areas to be served. Additionally, judges in the area will be solicited for recommendations of attorneys who would be a good fit for pilot representation.

Referrals of families for the pilot will come from one of three sources: (1) the Department; (2) hospitals; and (3) the crisis line.¹³ Referral sources will vary by location and other referral sources may

¹² Independent social worker is not in reference to licensing, but employment. An “independent social worker” in this respect means a social worker who is not employed by the Department.

¹³ The Crisis Line is operated by Foundation 2 Crisis Services. Foundation 2 is located in Cedar Rapids and operates the statewide crisis line primarily addressing mental health & suicide prevention.

be sought based on the needs of the communities. Admittedly, in all circumstances, child welfare system involvement cannot be avoided. For pre-file representation, the family must have DHS participation due to the requirement that a child be considered a “candidate for foster care”¹⁴ under FFPSA. Optimistically, legal intervention before a formal CINA filing or removal will prevent families from deep-end of child welfare intervention.

In May 2020, Jeff Wright hosted a meeting on Zoom including judges, legal professionals, and Department professionals announcing the launch of these pilot sites. During the meeting, participants received a brief explanation of the process and efforts being made by the SPD office to organize and start the sites. Mr. Wright plans on traveling to the identified counties during August 2021 to do meetings with stakeholders in their respective communities. Based on Mr. Wright’s timeline, referrals to the pilot are expected to start September 1, 2021.

Conclusion

The pilot project aims to utilize a multidisciplinary approach to pre-filing representation that may deliver more positive outcomes to families and children throughout Iowa. Based upon results of pre-file practice in other states, the pre-file project in Iowa has the potential to change the trajectory of many families who may otherwise be subject to more intrusive state intervention. As the project begins, modifications may be required to best respond to the needs of each community. The SPD office remains open and flexible to best respond to needs when raised.

3. Training Opportunities

Introduction

Initial training for the implementation of Family First involved its foundational theory that children do best in the home and through increased investment in prevention services, families may safely remain together, thereby reducing the unnecessary use of foster and congregate care. In furtherance of that goal, beginning in 2019, identified disciplines received training in the foundational concepts of FFPSA. To determine previous training opportunities and the number of individuals that attended the training, the subcommittee members reported individually on their specific areas of expertise. Together, they created a clearinghouse of the training provided beginning in 2019, as well

¹⁴ See footnote 1 for definition of “candidate for foster care” under FFPSA and pg. 3 for the section explaining The Department of Human Services Title IV-E Prevention Program and how they consider a child a “candidate for foster care”.

as present and future training opportunities. The workgroup also worked to identify any training gaps or needs.

a. Judges

At the June 2019 Iowa Judge’s Conference, all judges received introductory training on Family First. Beginning in November 2019, juvenile judges received additional training regarding FFPSA and implementation efforts. Ongoing training was provided throughout 2020 as the Department finalized service changes, contract revisions, and began implementation steps. Along with the Department’s training, the Iowa Children’s Justice FFPSA Summit was held in September 2020. The Summit involved an opportunity for each judicial district to include a multidisciplinary team of stakeholders in the child welfare system. Those teams included juvenile judges, county attorneys, child and parent attorneys, guardians ad litem, Department workers, and providers. The Summit presented national speakers, as well as breakout sessions to discuss strengths and opportunities for local districts. Due to Covid-19, the Summit, along with the other training opportunities in 2020 were primarily held on a virtual platform. Those remote formats continued through the time of this report.

Multiple training opportunities are available in 2021. Many have been coordinated by Children’s Justice, the Department, JCS, the State Public Defender’s Office, and the County Attorneys Association. Please refer to the clearinghouse in the appendix for further information regarding training opportunities.

In coordination with the National Association of Counsel for Children (“NACC”), Children’s Justice offered an online opportunity for NACC’s Red Book training. The Red Book training is a comprehensive study of child welfare with history, major case precedents, and landmark legislation, including the Family First legislation. It includes practical discussions of the role and duty of legal counsel in child welfare cases and courtroom advocacy. Through a nomination process, approximately 150 individuals¹⁵ were chosen to participate in the Red Book training. Sessions were offered twice in 2021, one in March and another in May. After completing the training, judges and attorneys have the option of taking NACC’s test, and upon passing, can become a certified Child Welfare Law Specialist. In addition to NACC’s Red Book training, which focuses primarily on federal law and policy, NACC is creating a special training to discuss practice specific to Iowa, including DHS practice in Iowa and

¹⁵ The March session was comprised of attorneys and judges. Children’s Justice staff also participated in the March session. In May, the opportunity was extended to those outside of the legal field, such as administrators and workers in the Department and service providers.

Iowa law, including case law. The custom session began in July 2021 and the first class included those who participated in the NACC's Red Book training in either March or May.

Two large events are forthcoming in 2021. First, a juvenile judge conference took place in June. In July, Children's Justice, JCS and CJJP will hold a summit on youth engagement. Inquiries into ongoing training will be addressed at that time.

b. Department of Human Services

The Department of Human Services has trained or is training its personnel on requirements and expectations for Family First as follows:

Solution Based Casework (“SBC”): staff received their initial virtual training on the fundamentals of this evidence-based model in March and April 2020, providing them a solid understanding of the model's essential components. Solution Based Casework will be utilized with all cases managed by Department staff, as well as non-agency cases (those formerly served under the Community Care contract).

SafeCare®: in conjunction with existing resource materials, staff completed an additional online overview of this evidence-based model in April 2020. This parental skill development model will be utilized on all eligible cases with at least one child between the ages of 0 to 5 in the household.

Danger vs. Risk: staff received their initial virtual training related to the Department's work with Evident Change (formerly NCCD) in the development of a new Safety Assessment. The May 2020 training began with first focusing on reframing and defining safety in terms of “danger.” This training was provided to Children's Justice and the Coalition for Family and Children's Services in Iowa to distribute to juvenile justice and provider partners respectively.

Risk Re-Assessment: staff received virtual training on the Department's new Risk Re-Assessment tool in May 2020. The tool is to be used in all cases managed by Department staff to assess changes in family risk factors as well as determine eligibility for the continuation of DHS services.

FCS/QRTP Contract Fundamentals: staff received virtual training in June 2020 on the rollout of the new FCS¹⁶ and QRTP¹⁷ contracts effective July 1, 2020. Training included clearly

¹⁶ Family-Centered Services

¹⁷ Qualified Residential Treatment Program

defining Department staff vs. provider staff responsibilities, practice changes, information system changes, and form changes. A recording of the training was provided to Children's Justice and the Coalition for Family and Children's Services in Iowa to distribute to juvenile justice and provider partners respectively.

SBC Follow-up: staff received a follow-up virtual training in October 2020 on the SBC model and the role they play in identifying and developing Individual Level Objectives, Family Level Objectives, and family consensus building in collaboration with contracted FCS providers.

SBC - Documentation in the Summary & Analysis of Safety/Risk Assessments

Section: child protection staff received in-depth virtual training in February 2021 regarding how to formulate and document Individual Level Objectives, Family Level Objectives, and family consensus building in child abuse and CINA assessments.

SBC - Case Permanency Planning: ongoing case management staff received in-depth virtual training in February 2021 regarding how to formulate and document Individual Level Objectives, Family Level Objectives, and family consensus building in both initial and comprehensive case permanency plans.

Strengthening Family Connections: Janee Harvey, Division Administrator for Adult, Children, and Family Services, presented from March to May 2021 to the Department, the legal community, and provider partners on the importance of placing children with relatives or fictive kin whenever safe to do so and how vital it is to support them (e.g., emotional support, skills development, referrals to resources, financial supports, etc.) to ensure successful outcomes.

Solution Focused Meeting/Child Safety Conference Fundamentals: staff received virtual training in March and April 2021 on the new Solution Focused Meeting ("SFM") protocol and practice. SFMs will replace the Department's current Family Team Decision Making meeting, allowing for a more natural alignment with the SBC model. Staff also received a refresher on protocols and practice expectations around Child Safety Conferences.

Enhancing Practice in Engaging Fathers: staff will receive training in June 2021 around enhanced protocols and practices in identifying, locating, and engaging fathers to be more fully involved in cases involving their children.

Structured Decision Making ("SDM") Safety Assessment: the Department anticipates in-depth training on the new SDM Safety Assessment will occur around July 2021. Currently, the

training is being finalized in collaboration with Evident Change. This training will build upon the Danger vs. Risk concepts training in May 2020.

Ongoing training will focus on enhancing Department staff's knowledge in understanding their role in the implementation of Solution Based Casework, as well as training staff on changes and additions being made concerning the Family-Centered Services array.

c. Attorneys

Attorneys who appear in juvenile court have the opportunity for training on Family First from a variety of sources.

Since a large number of attorneys who appear in juvenile court are court-appointed, the SPD provides a free juvenile CLE on the third Thursday of every month. The CLEs are available virtually and a link is sent to a mailing list of contract attorneys and a listserv for public defenders. Schedules of upcoming and past CLEs are available on its website.¹⁸ Additionally, a link for on-demand juvenile training can be found on this page. There are no restrictions on participation and attorneys may use most of the available training for juvenile CLE credit. On-demand training that is currently available includes Families First Prevention Services Act, Family-Centered Services training, and beginner juvenile attorney training.

Attorneys were afforded training opportunities outside of those offered by Children's Justice, the Department, and the SPD. The Iowa State Bar Association's Juvenile Law Seminar in 2020 included a presentation by Allison Green, from the National Association of Counsel for Children, titled *Implementing the Family First Prevention Services Act: Requirements, Lessons Learned and the Road Ahead*. The program also included a presentation by Janee Harvey of the Department of Human Services and Judge Owens titled *Reasonable Efforts Under Families First: Evidence Based Practices*. These presentations were recorded and are available for viewing by members of the Iowa State Bar Association. In 2021, at the Juvenile Law Conference, the Department presented *Family First: Lessons Learned*.

Additional resources are available for attorneys who belong to various associations. Examples include the American Bar Association's 46-page document: *The Family First Prevention Services Act of 2018: A Guide for the Legal Community* and its 9-page document: *Tool for Engaging the Legal Community in Implementing Family First*.

¹⁸ <https://spd.iowa.gov/defense-resources/training-opportunities>

d. County Attorneys

This past year, the Iowa County Attorneys Association (ICAA) was identified as a partner that should be included in the discussion of Family First. The task force invited Jessica Reynolds, the executive director of the ICAA to join the training workgroup. Ms. Reynolds, who is also the state’s Prosecuting Attorneys Training Coordinator, agreed to join the task force efforts to identify the educational needs of attorneys who represent the State in juvenile court. Through this new partnership, potential training opportunities may be provided for county attorneys at their spring and fall conferences. For example, a juvenile training was provided by David Dawson of the Woodbury County Attorney’s Office at the 2020 Spring ICAA Conference. Additional training for county attorneys was held in March 2021 on the QRTP process. Identified ongoing training needs include practical training about deadlines for prosecutors, specific orders like QRTP orders, and best practices.

e. Juvenile Court Officers

Juvenile Court Services (“JCS”) implemented a training plan to ensure all JCS staff have the knowledge and skills required to successfully incorporate FFPSA policies into daily practices. JCS identified and trained nearly 100% of its juvenile court officers (“JCO”) in 10 steps, with step 10 launched on January 19, 2021. JCOs have until March 31, 2021, to complete step 10. At this time, total completion data is not yet available. Below are the 10 steps utilized by JCS.

1. **Family First Prevention Services Act (“FFPSA”)**: an overview of the purpose, goals, and key concepts of FFPSA, and its impact on JCS practice, policy, and funding.
2. **Qualified Residential Treatment Program (“QRTP”)**: an overview of the definition of a QRTP, assessment requirements, JCS procedures, and the responsibilities of the court.
3. **Treatment Outcome Package (“TOP”)**: an overview of the TOP tool and how to use it to assess a child's psychological and emotional well-being.
4. **Title IV-E Child & Family Eligibility Training – Candidate for Foster Care Screening Tool (“CFST”)**: a summary of the federal criteria and requirements for determining Title IV-E candidacy for foster care. The training includes instruction and guidance on how to complete the JCS CFST tool and opportunities to apply knowledge using authentic case scenarios.
5. **Child Prevention Case Plan (“CPCP”)**: a summary of the federal criteria and requirements for Title IV-E Prevention Plans. The training includes instruction and guidance in how to

complete the JCS Title IV-E Child Prevention Case Plan and opportunities to apply knowledge using authentic case scenarios.

6. **Identifying, Matching, Monitoring, and Evaluating Prevention Services:** an overview of what constitutes a Title IV-E prevention service and the prevention services available specific to each district. Instruction and guidance will also be provided in how to identify, match, monitor, and assess the efficacy of prevention services offered by JCS.
7. **Safety Assessment, Monitoring, and Planning:** an introduction to the components of formal safety assessment, monitoring, and planning. Instructs and guides JCS staff in the practical skills and knowledge required to complete safety assessments and plans for youth and their families.
8. **FFPSA Data Requirements and Reporting:** an overview of FFPSA reporting requirements that include the type of data required for FFPSA, where the data will come from, and who is responsible for entering the data.
9. **Continuous Quality Improvement (“CQI”):** an introduction to the CQI process that covers the basics of CQI, benefits of CQI, and how CQI will be used to improve JCS practice.
10. **FFPSA Refresher.**

Additional training has been developed and will be provided to all JCO’s on April 28, 2021, on the application of FFPSA.

f. Multidisciplinary Partners

The Children’s Justice FFPSA Summit held September 10-11, 2020 was open to all disciplines involved in child welfare. These partners, along with judicial leadership, participated in breakout sessions to identify an area in current child welfare practice necessitating improvement. Together, the team members brainstormed means of achieving improved practice. These district teams continue meeting today.

The NACC Red Book training sponsored by Children's Justice was open to attorneys and judges. The Red Book training is and will continue to be, open to other disciplines outside of legal professionals. NACC is currently working on Iowa-specific training sessions about case theory, in-, and out-of-court advocacy efforts, and trial strategies.

Various judges and associations have presented training in their local districts. See the clearinghouse for training provided by Chief Justice Christensen (D4), Judge Nicol (1B), and Judge Owens (8A).

The Polk County Model Court Project held training in 2020 on issues related to the implementation of Family First.

Janee Harvey from the Department conducted multi-disciplinary training on several FFPSA topics and implementation updates throughout the state.

Ongoing needs include district teams evaluating the impact of the FFPSA roll-out and collection topic areas for future education opportunities.

g. Training Opportunities

Training on Family First should be ongoing and not simply a one-time event. Specific training needs have been identified in the various group sections above. The training workgroup is pursuing opportunities to provide ongoing training on the practical impact Family First is having on child welfare practices across the state.

Recommendations

This workgroup recommends Children's Justice continues to support the training of judges and attorneys on FFPSA. Further, it is recommended that collaboration with the Department continue to provide the necessary support and training to attorneys, judges, county attorneys, JCOs, and court staff on issues related to the implementation of and adherence to FFPSA.

District teams who participated in the 2020 FFPSA Summit should continue to meet regularly and be active in the local training needs and implementation of Family First. Judges should be encouraged to take an active role in training lawyers and court staff in their judicial district.

Conclusion

By continuing dialogue between the various competencies, we have enabled collaboration among stakeholders to identify additional disciplines and build upon early foundational training as Iowa's Family First Plan was finalized by both local and federal officials. Stakeholders across disciplines have worked together in determining what types of training would be needed in Iowa's implementation and maintenance of FFPSA.

In 2020, the training developed and presented throughout the state, on various disciplines, expanded from foundational to specific. Services, policies, and roles are now more clearly defined.

The Covid-19 pandemic certainly made training and implementation challenging but all parties rose to the challenge and adapted. We are all now very well versed in virtual platforms and have

accomplished a tremendous amount of training and collaboration for the successful implementation of FFPSA in Iowa.

As all stakeholders continue to learn and implement Family First, training needs will evolve, and continue to expand.

4. QRTP Placements

Introduction

Following the 2020 report, the Department and JCS continued their efforts for Qualified Residential Treatment Program ("QRTP") implementation for youth in care. The QRTP workgroup continued to focus on the judicial review process, internal processes and procedures for QRTP placement, and training needs. These efforts aimed to address the needs and recommendations identified in the 2020 FFPSA report.

A QRTP is a licensed and certified program with a trauma-informed treatment model “designed to address the needs, including clinical needs as appropriate, of children with serious emotional or behavioral disorders or disturbances.”¹⁹ The creation of QRTPs by Family First requires various components, such as 24 hours 7 days a week access to nursing or other licensed clinical staff, family participation in treatment and discharge, and aftercare services upon discharge from the facility. For placement in QRTP, the youth must undergo an assessment to determine the most appropriate level of care. Further, to verify the child is in the least restrictive environment during their time in care, the court conducts ongoing reviews to monitor the youth’s progress.

The group continued the conversation surrounding federal timeline compliance and judicial review.²⁰ Different judicial districts have allocated the responsibility to either the Department or JCS to notify the court of the placement date and request a timely judicial review. In other districts, the judge is setting the date for judicial review along with another planned hearing, like disposition. In an

¹⁹ 42 U.S.C. §672(k)(4)(A)(2021)

²⁰ “Within 60 days of the start of each placement in [QRTP], . . . a juvenile court . . . shall” conduct a review of documentation to determine if the child’s needs can be met in a less restrictive environment, such as family foster care; and approve or disapprove QRTP placement. 42 U.S.C. §675a(c). So long as the child remains in QRTP placement, the State must submit evidence at each status review and permanency hearing regarding the child. *Id.*

attempt to standardize the practice and to better safeguard compliance with timelines, the workgroup discussed the option of a statewide structured protocol to ensure timely judicial review.

1. Structured Protocol

a. Department Protocol

The Department developed a process to determine the necessity of placing a child into a QRTP, which became effective October 1, 2020, for federal Title IV-E purposes. The process includes the DHS caseworker and the Licensed Practitioner of the Healing Arts²¹ (“LPHA”) completing the Targeted Outcome Package (“TOP”), with the LPHA also completing a clinical review, as part of the Admission Clinical Review Form to determine the appropriateness of a QRTP placement. If the LPHA recommends QRTP placement, the Department’s caseworker completes the necessary steps to place the child in the QRTP, e.g. obtain a court order, use the TOP Level of Need Tool to identify and make a referral to the most appropriate QRTP, and upload the necessary completed documents as an exhibit to the court for the required judicial review.

Family First also requires approval from the Director of the child welfare agency if a child remains in the QRTP for more than 12 consecutive months or 18 nonconsecutive months (or, in the case of a child who has not attained age 13, for more than six consecutive or nonconsecutive months). To meet this requirement, the Department developed a Focused QRTP Length of Stay Review²² through solution-focused meetings, QRTP monthly staffing, clinical supervision with a supervisor, or a separate meeting. At a minimum, attendees include the Department worker, supervisor, social work administrator (“SWA”)/service area manager (“SAM”), and the current QRTP provider. The team reviews, at a minimum, the most recent Department case plan, the child’s placement history, the QRTP clinical assessment, and current reports from the provider. The review determines whether the youth needs to remain in the QRTP. The meeting centers on:

- assessing the child’s strengths and needs which continue to support that the child’s needs cannot be met in a family-like setting and that the QRTP provides the most effective and appropriate level of care for the child;
- documenting the child’s specific treatment or service needs that will be met in the placement and the length of time needed for the treatment or services; and

²¹ A Licensed Practitioner of the Healing Arts is a health care practitioner, such as a physician, physician assistant, advanced registered nurse practitioner, psychologist, social worker, marital & family therapist, or mental health counselor who is (1) licensed by the applicable authority for the profession; (2) enrolled in the Iowa Plan for Behavioral Health; and (3) is qualified to provide clinical assessment services. ICA 441–78.12(1).

²² JCS plans to follow the same process developed by the Department. The Department began the new process in April 2020.

- documenting the efforts made by the Department to prepare the child to return home or to be placed with a fit and willing relative, a legal guardian, an adoptive parent, or in a foster family home.”²³

An electronic form is used to document the Focused QRTP Length of Stay Review meeting. That form and associated documentation are attached and uploaded for the Director’s review. The Director’s Review Workgroup then meets to perform a second-level review of the information with all applicable members of the team before the Department Director’s sign-off. Documentation of the Director’s sign-off is subject to inspection by the federal Children’s Bureau.

b. JCS Update

JCS does not currently have the financial or staffing capability to implement Part IV of FFPSA, the QRTP component of Title IV-E. This lack of capacity is due to the federal requirement that a QRTP must provide all youth who discharge from its care six months of aftercare services. While this is currently a barrier, JCS is committed to finding a solution, so that it can participate in Part IV in the future.

c. Judicial Review

When a youth is placed in a QRTP without a prior evaluation, under FFPSA, the youth is required to undergo an assessment within 30 days of placement. In those instances, the workgroup proposed a "Judicial Review Hearing" which may assist in creating accountability to those involved in adhering to federal mandates. Should all required assessments be completed before the hearing date, the hearing time and date may still be reserved for that case; and, if there is a contested issue regarding placement, the time and date previously set for a review hearing allows for those contested issues to be heard at the reserved time, thus avoiding further delays.

Members of the group expressed concern about tying up the court docket with hearings that will most likely not be held. To address this concern, the recommendation may be that, at minimum, a paper review is conducted, but judicial discretion may allow for in-person reviews as deemed necessary. Additionally, as a way to not unnecessarily block times out of a judge’s docket, the subgroup suggested an internal method to notify the judge that judicial review is required. A possibility may

²³ 42 U.S.C. §675a(e)(4)(A)–(C).

include a notification system built in by JBIT²⁴ as a way to automatically notify the court of the need for a review.

An additional solution for timely judicial review discussed amending the Iowa Code to include language explicitly requiring a judicial review. Alternatively, due to the difficulties involved with having the code amended, the subgroup concluded that exploring changes to the Juvenile Court Rules would likely be more successful.

To assist judges in the orders required for QRTP placement, the subgroup expressed interest in the development of simplified and unified court orders. For example, the court can have access to a template order for when the clinical assessment is completed before placement and a different template order for when the assessment occurs after placement in a QRTP.

2. Internal Processes & Procedures

a. Case reviews

Since October 1, 2020, the Department and JCS has reviewed 60 QRTP cases (28 DHS and 32 JCS). From those results, the Department found that 22 cases met the 30-day clinical review/assessment timeframe requirement and 13 met the 60-day judicial review requirement. JCS found that two cases met the 30-day clinical review/assessment timeframe while six met the 60-day judicial review requirement.²⁵ Below, find a complete breakdown of the 60 cases reviewed.

- 28 DHS case management
 - 30-day requirement
 - 22 met requirement
 - 5 didn't meet this requirement
 - 1 no determination of this requirement yet (still within or right after 30 days of placement)
 - 60-day judicial review/approval requirement
 - 13 met requirement
 - 7 didn't meet this requirement
 - 2 IV-E unit didn't review this requirement as didn't meet the 30-day requirement
 - 6 no determination of this requirement yet (have requested orders on all; still within or right after 60 days of placement)
- 32 JCS case management²⁶
 - 30-day requirement
 - 26 didn't receive any assessment information

²⁴ Judicial Branch Information Technology

²⁵ QRTP placements by JCS are not eligible for Title IV-E reimbursement regardless of whether the 30- or 60-day review timeframes are achieved.

²⁶ Data from JCS may be approximate as it reflects the number of cases reported to JCS from the Department. JCS does not have the capability to verify data provided by the Department.

- 2 met requirement
- 1 didn't meet this requirement
- 3 no determination of this requirement (court order referenced reviewing completed assessment but the assessment wasn't sent to IV-E unit or worker provided LPHA, not QRTP assessment)
- 60-day judicial review/approval requirement
 - 23 didn't receive any assessment information
 - 6 met requirement
 - 2 didn't meet this requirement
 - 1 IV-E unit didn't review this requirement as it didn't meet the 30-day requirement

Discussions within the respective systems, JCS & DHS, will continue to determine how and when case reviews will continue to assist in data tracking and measurements. If a formalized plan for case reviews is drafted and agreed upon, those updates will be provided to the larger FFPSA Task Force and will be reported on at a later date.

b. Reimbursement & further training.

In May 2021, the Department amended its QRTP payment rate²⁷ and referral protocol. Now, providers are no longer able to deny out-of-service-area referrals without justification. This change will hopefully expand the network of available beds when the youth is assessed to be an appropriate fit for the facility.

Finally, the workgroup recommended ongoing training needs for all partners. Some training may be offered as a "refresher" and others may focus on ensuring information sharing across the board – from providers to DHS or JCS – to the attorneys and courts.

Conclusion

The QRTP workgroup addressed many of the issues raised in the 2020 FFPSA report. Training remains an ongoing need to ensure compliance with FFPSA review deadlines. Template orders have been proposed to assist in the judicial workflow regarding placement requests. Changes to the juvenile court rules remain a consideration as a possibility to codify or formalize how and when judicial review occurs.

5. Data & Outcome Measurements

Introduction

Following the 2020 report, the legislative initiative group was dissolved and in its place, the data & outcome measurement group was created. The data & outcome measurement workgroup looked

²⁷ \$195/day for an occupied bed & \$145/day for an unoccupied bed

to answer the question of how will the various stakeholders know that efforts and changes from the FFPSA are working. Additionally, will the implementation of Family First be carried out in a way that safety reduces out-of-home placements, reduces the amount of time a child spends in an out-of-home placement, and will efforts improve the outcomes of children and families in Iowa by meeting their needs with available and culturally responsive services and supports?

The group identified three phases for data collection: pre-file, ongoing, and post-court data. After identifying the three phases, the group determined data points that would help see the overall picture of how efforts to meet the identified goals were met. To assist in this, the data & outcome measurements group members reached out to the other groups for feedback on what they may have identified in their respective meetings. That feedback was taken and incorporated into this portion of the report.

a. Pre-filing data.

Pre-filing data would consist of various data points targeting the period before a CINA petition was filed in the courts. The pre-filing data would be used as a snapshot to understand: the number of children in Iowa, child abuse reports and assessments, and efforts made to prevent removal. Through discussions, it was determined that the Department, for various federal reporting requirements, houses much of the information currently sought. JCS currently collects data on items specific to their practice. However, in other identified areas, data points identified will still require further discussion on how best to capture those numbers. In the below list, if there is already a mechanism for data collection, it has been identified. Those still requiring consideration are indicated as such.

Identified Data Points & Collection Methods

- Number of children & families assessed by DHS, including a racial breakdown – currently captured by the Department
- Iowa population by race – currently captured by the Department and displayed on Family First Data Dashboard.
- Number of children who are “candidates for foster care” (both JCS & DHS) – currently captured by the Department and housed in JARVIS or FACS.
 - This will be further broken down by those who receive: (1) prevention services, and (2) foster care
- Number of children & families offered family preservation services – currently, the Department captures the number of children offered family preservation services
- TOPs data & community-based supports and services (JCS)
- Removal rate per 1,000 including racial breakdown – currently captured by the Department and displayed on Family First Data Dashboard.
- Types of placement – currently captured by Department and displayed on Family First Data Dashboard and reported for AFCARS.

- Breakdown including (1) family like placement, (2) foster care, and (3) congregate care
- Number of families receiving pre-file legal representation through pilot – still requires consideration as the Public Defender will need to identify a process for data collection
 - Outcomes of families who received pre-file representation
- Number of petitions filed including race of the child – still requires consideration
 - From the number of petitions, identifying how many received pre-file representation through the pilot.

When a data point was identified as needing a collection method, the data & outcome measurement subgroup alerted the chairs of the respective subgroup about the need for data collection methods to be discussed in the identified subgroup.

b. Ongoing case.

Data points during ongoing CINA proceedings will assist in answering if children are spending less time in out-of-home placements, should efforts to keep the child in the home be unsuccessful. It will also assist in tracking children in QRTP placements for psychiatric or behavioral health issues. Similar to the above list, if there is already a mechanism for data collection, it has been identified; and those still requiring consideration are indicated.

Identified Data Points & Collection Methods

- Length of time in out-of-home placements, by type of placement – currently captured by the Department and reported for AFCARS.
- Removals after filing petition or adjudication – currently, the Department captures adjudication dates. May still require consideration on how to best capture the data in a more efficient manner.
 - If removals occur during the life of the CINA, how long was the case opened before removal occurred
- Number of ICWA cases & removal rates in ICWA cases²⁸ – currently captured by the Department
- How many children are in QRTP placements, including racial breakdown – currently captured by both the Department and JCS.
 - How many placements are for CINA versus delinquency
 - Delinquency specific “therapeutic bed” use²⁹
 - QRTP placement for more than 12 months or 18 non-consecutive months
- Number of clinical assessments & judicial reviews for QRTP placement – still requires consideration on how best to capture data
- Timeliness of assessments & judicial orders – still requires consideration on how best to capture data

²⁸ The Department’s updated Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System (CCWIS) will increase ICWA data points to reflect 2020 AFCARS data element updates. The projected completion date for the Department’s new CCWIS is FFY 2023.

²⁹ These beds are not QRTP placements, they are at a higher level of care compared to QRTP placement. Per JCS, there will be 24 beds for this therapeutic use – 18 male beds & 6 female beds.

c. Post-court (or system involvement).

Data points identified for after-court or system involvement focus on long-term outcomes for children and families who entered the child welfare system. Some of the outcomes are already reported federally.

Identified Data Points & Collection Methods

- Federal re-entry into foster care – currently captured by Department and displayed on Family First Data Dashboard
- Number of children returning on a subsequent CINA petition - still requires consideration on how best to capture data

The two above data points measure the rate of re-entry of children into the child welfare system through formal CINA proceedings and placement. Outside of re-entry, other efforts may show successful efforts in FFPSA implementation & practice.

Identified Data Points & Collection Methods

- Decrease in CINA petitions
- Decrease in removals
- If removed, more children will remain with kin or fictive kin
- Reunification data & outcomes
- Decrease in TPR filings
- Timely permanency

While not specifically related to the outcomes of children and families, the workgroup also identified the tracking of training offered and participation rates for each identified training. It is believed the data should be broken down by training topics to give a more detailed view of what has been offered and who has been offered the training. This will assist in identifying training opportunities going forward.

d. Further considerations.

During discussions regarding data collection, it became obvious to the group members that much of the data is housed within the Department without any capability for data collection outside of the Department's and JCS's accounting. Currently, the judicial branch does not operate any data tracking system that would assist in source variety. Due to these restrictions, the team identified the following areas for further consideration regarding how data is collected and shared.

Identified areas

- What is the best way to share data?
- How frequently should data sharing occur?
- Is an agreement needed for data sharing across systems?

- How are raw numbers in complex questions tracked? (Ex: removals after adjudication)

In addition to data points, the subgroup identified the need for universal definitions. Discussions regarding universal or shared definitions will be needed to ensure an accurate accounting of Family First efforts. Examples include when tracking “reunification,” when is reunification achieved; does repeat maltreatment occur when a family receives another report for suspected child abuse or neglect, or must the report be confirmed or founded for it to be counted as repeat maltreatment.

Conclusion

Data collection will be vital in tracking whether the implementation and practice of FFPSA can be considered successful. Overall, Family First’s prescript of children safely remaining in the home will need to be demonstrated through a decrease in the number of children in foster care. Further, tracking of this data will illustrate the efforts being made, across both juvenile systems, in addressing the needs which brought the family to the attention of the Department, JCS, and the court.

III. Conclusion

The work of implementing and maintaining the services and supports necessary to advance the overarching goal of Family First is still in its infancy. Through the partnerships formed in the task force and various workgroups, actors in the child welfare system remain active and dedicated to reducing the number of separated families and children in care. As these efforts are underway, it is important to continue ongoing evaluations of what is, and what is not going well; where can efforts or attention be reassigned to assist; and how as a system can we do better at keeping kids safe at home with their family.

As families engage in these services outlined above, evaluation is key in determining success. The Department’s long-term evaluation with Georgia State University will produce valuable data and trends that may be used in advancing practice in the future. While that long-term study is being conducted, Iowa needs to perform its own data collection and analysis. Through the collection of data locally, more immediate adjustments may be made to preventative efforts, pre-file representation, or QTRP judicial orders, to name a few areas. Further, data and constant evaluation will give light to

training needs so they may be addressed at the soonest possible point to avoid further delays in service delivery, legal non-compliance, or other adverse factors

Partnerships across the Judicial Branch, the Department of Human Services, Juvenile Court Services, service providers, families, and others are vital to Iowa's success in Family First. We look forward to continued efforts with those partners to improve the lives and outcomes of Iowa's children and families.

Iowa FFPSA Training Clearinghouse

Date	Target Audience	Judicial District	Geographical Location	Topic	Platform	Presenter	CLE Hours
Past Training Opportunities							
2/27/19	County Attorneys	5	Polk County	Polk County Attorney's Office; FFPSA	In Person		1.5
June 2019	Juvenile Judges	All	Statewide	Annual Conference; Theory of FFPSA	In Person	Judge Owens	4.5
6/20/19	Juvenile Attorneys	All	Statewide	Annual Conference; DHS Update; FFPSA	In Person	Jerry Foxhoven; Doug Wolfe	5.25
Fall 2019	County Attorneys	All	Statewide	Iowa County Attorney Association Fall Conference; FFPSA	In Person		
9/30/19	Multidisciplinary	7	Davenport, IA	Alia Training; The Human Need for Belonging: Building a New Way, Together!	In Person	Amelia Franck Meyer	2.75
10/1/19	Multidisciplinary	6	Cedar Rapids, IA	Alia Training; The Human Need for Belonging: Building a New Way, Together!	In Person	Amelia Franck Meyer	2.75
10/2/19	Multidisciplinary	1B	Waterloo, IA	Alia Training; The Human Need for Belonging: Building a New Way, Together!	In Person	Amelia Franck Meyer	2.75
10/2/19	Multidisciplinary	1B	West Union	Fall Juvenile Conference; FFPSA & Evidence Based Practices (Judge Nicol)	In Person	Judge Nicol	6
10/4/19	Multidisciplinary	4	Harlan	4 Our Kids Conference	In Person		6.5
10/28/19	Multidisciplinary	5C	Johnston, IA	Alia Training; The Human Need for Belonging: Building a New Way, Together!	In Person	Amelia Franck Meyer	2.75
10/29/19	Multidisciplinary	4	Council Bluffs	Alia Training; The Human Need for Belonging: Building a New Way, Together!	In Person	Amelia Franck Meyer	2.75
10/30/19	Multidisciplinary	3B	Sioux City	Alia Training; The Human Need for Belonging: Building a New Way, Together!	In Person	Amelia Franck Meyer	2.75
11/5/19	Juvenile Judges	All	Statewide	Fall Juvenile Judge Conference	In Person		6.25
1/16/20	Juvenile Attorneys	All	Statewide	New Legal Resources for Incorporating FFPSA Into Your Practice	Virtual	NACC	1.5
Feb 2020	Multidisciplinary	8A	Ottumwa	Alia Training (Judge Owens)	In Person	Amelia Franck Meyer	2.75
3/30/20	Multidisciplinary	3B	Sioux City	Family-Centered Services (FCS) Rollout; presented by DHS	Virtual	Janee Harvey	
3/30/20	Multidisciplinary	4	Council Bluffs	Family-Centered Services (FCS) Rollout; presented by DHS	Virtual	Janee Harvey	
Apr 2020	DHS	All	Statewide	Solution-Based Casework (SBC)	Virtual	Janee Harvey	
Apr 2020	DHS	All	Statewide	SafeCare	Virtual	Janee Harvey	

4/6/20	Multidisciplinary	1B	Waterloo	Family-Centered Services (FCS) Rollout; presented by DHS	Virtual	Janee Harvey	1.5
4/6/20	Multidisciplinary	2B	Fort Dodge	Family-Centered Services (FCS) Rollout; presented by DHS	Virtual	Janee Harvey	1.5
4/10/20	Multidisciplinary	5B	Osceola	Family-Centered Services (FCS) Rollout; presented by DHS	Virtual	Janee Harvey	1.5
4/10/20	Multidisciplinary	5C	Des Moines	Family-Centered Services (FCS) Rollout; presented by DHS	Virtual	Janee Harvey	1.5
4/16/20	Legal Community	All	All	SPD Office: FFPSA Live Webcast	Virtual		1
4/27/20	Multidisciplinary	8A	Washington County	Family-Centered Services (FCS) Rollout; presented by DHS	Virtual	Janee Harvey	1.5
5/4/20	Multidisciplinary	7	Davenport	Family-Centered Services (FCS) Rollout; presented by DHS	Virtual	Janee Harvey	1.5
5/8/20	Multidisciplinary	5C	Polk	Family-Centered Services (FCS) Rollout; presented by DHS	Virtual	Janee Harvey	1.5
5/11/20	Juvenile Judges	All	Statewide	Family-Centered Services (FCS) Rollout; presented by DHS	Virtual	Janee Harvey	1.5
May 2020	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	Danger vs. Risk	Virtual	Janee Harvey	
May 2020	DHS	All	Statewide	Risk Re-Assessment	Virtual		
6/10/20	County Attorneys	All	Statewide	Iowa County Attorney Association Spring Conference; Juvenile Law Update & FFPSA	Virtual	Dave Dawson	
6/18/20	Legal Community	All	Statewide	SPD Office: Family Centered Services Training	Virtual	Janee Harvey	1.5
6/24/20	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	Why Compassion Must be the Foundation of All Reasonable Efforts (MI State Courts)	Virtual	Dr. Amelia Franck Meyer, Vivek Sankaran, Shrounda Selivanoff	1
6/26/20	Juvenile Judges	All	Statewide	Court Oversight Role of QRTP Placements	Virtual		1.5
June 2020	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	FCS/QRTP Contract Fundamentals	Virtual	Janee Harvey	
8/24/20	Legal Community	All	Statewide	Child Welfare Law Conference	Virtual	NACC	30
9/9/20	Multidisciplinary	1B	West Union	S'mores & CLE's (Judge Nicol) <i>Social distanced</i>	In Person	Judge Nicol	2
9/10/20	Multidisciplinary District Teams	All	Statewide	FFPSA Summit; Keynote: Reimagining Child Welfare, Informed Disruption to Achieve a Better Normal, Supreme Court FFPSA Task Force, FFPSA: Protecting Children, Keeping Families Together, and Advancing Equity	Virtual	Dr. Jerry Milner, David Kelly; Marlo Nash; Judge Schumacher, Judge Tabor; Alex Citrin, Shadi Houshyar	see second date

9/11/20	Multidisciplinary District Teams	All	Statewide	FFPSA Summit; Director Update from DHS, Structuring Decisions for Systemic Change, The Will to Keep Going, 4 Questions, 7 Judges Pilot and Results, Why Compassion Must Be the Foundation of All Reasonable Efforts to Reunify Children	Virtual	Kelly Garcia; Kate Beier; Janessa Carr; Judge Owens, Judge Nicol, Janee Harvey; Vivek Sankaran, Shrouds Selivannof, Dr. Amelia Franck Meyer	12.5
9/23/20	Multidisciplinary	1B	West Union	S'mores & CLE's (Judge Nicol) <i>Social Distanced</i>	In Person	Judge Nicol	2
10/9/20	Multidisciplinary		Harlan	4 Our Kids Seminar; FFPSA	Virtual	Judge Schumacher and Judge Tabor	
Oct 2020	DHS	All	Statewide	SBC Follow-up	Virtual		
11/6/20	Juvenile Judges	All	Statewide	Juvenile Judge Lunch & Learn; QRTP Update	Virtual	Kristin Konchalski	1
11/13/20	Juvenile Judges	All	Statewide	Juvenile Judge Lunch & Learn; Solution Based Casework	Virtual	Dr. Dana Christensen	1
4/2/20	Legal Community	All	Statewide	ISBA Juvenile Law Seminar; Implementing FFPSA: Requirements, Lessons Learned & the Road Ahead	Virtual		7.25
2020	Legal Community	All	Statewide	ISBA Juvenile Law Seminar; Reasonable Efforts Under FFPSA: Evidence Based Practices	Virtual & On Demand		
2020	Multidisciplinary	5C	Polk County	Model Court Project; Implementation of FFPSA	Virtual		
2020	JCS	All	Statewide	JCS Training Step 1; Overview of FFPSA and its requirements	On Demand		
2020	JCS	All	Statewide	JCS Training Step 2; QRTP	On Demand		
2020	JCS	All	Statewide	JCS Training Step 3; Treatment Outcome Package (TOP)	On Demand		
2020	JCS	All	Statewide	JCS Training Step 4; Title IV-E Child & Family Eligibility Training - Candidate for Foster Care Screening Tool (CFST)	On Demand		
2020	JCS	All	Statewide	JCS Training Step 5; Child Prevention Case Plan (CPCP)A	On Demand		
2020	JCS	All	Statewide	JCS Training Step 6; Identifying, Matching, Monitoring, and Evaluating Prevention Services	On Demand		
2020	JCS	All	Statewide	JCS Training Step 7; Safety Assessment, Monitoring, and Planning	On Demand		

2020	JCS	All	Statewide	JCS Training Step 8; FFPSA Data Requirements and Reporting	On Demand		
2020	JCS	All	Statewide	JCS Training Step 9; Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)	On Demand		
1/19/21	JCS	All	Statewide	JCS Training Step 10; FFPSA Refresher	On Demand		
Feb 2021	DHS	All	Statewide	SBC – Documentation in the Summary & Analysis of Safety/ Risk Assessments	Virtual	Jackie Stubbers Connie Jones	
2/26/21	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	Dr. Ira Chasnoff; Is Prevention an Ethical Obligation: Session 1	Virtual	Dr. Chasnoff	1.5
Feb 2021	DHS	All	Statewide	SBC – Case Permanency Planning	Virtual	Jackie Stubbers Connie Jones	
3/3/21	Legal Community	All	Statewide	ABA; Achieving the Families First Act Goals: A new implementation Tool	Virtual		1
3/5/21	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	Dr. Ira Chasnoff; Is Prevention an Ethical Obligation: Session 2	Virtual	Dr. Chasnoff	1.5
3/12/21	County Attorneys	All	Statewide	Iowa County Attorney Association; QRTP	Virtual		
3/19/21	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	Dr. Ira Chasnoff; Is Prevention an Ethical Obligation: Session 3	Virtual	Dr. Chasnoff	1.5
3/22/21	JCS	All	Statewide	JCS Training; Random Moment Sample (RMS) accurate Title IV-E documentation	On Demand		
3/23/21	CASA/FCRB	All	Statewide	CASA/FCRB Training; FFPSA	Virtually	Judge Schumacher, Judge Nicol, Judge Tabor	
3/26/21	Multidisciplinary	6	Cedar Rapids	Strengthening Family Connections - Live Webinar	Virtual	Janee Harvey, Dawn Kekstadt	1.5
Mar 2021	Judges/Attorneys	All	Statewide	Redbook Training	Virtual	NACC	7.5
Mar – Apr 2021	DHS	All	Statewide	Solution Focused Meeting/ Child Safety Conference Fundamentals	Virtual		
4/2/21	Juvenile Judges	All	Statewide	QRTP Presentation for Juvenile Judges. Iowa Children's Justice. Live Webinar	Virtual		1
4/9/21	Multidisciplinary	2,3,4,5	DHS Western Svc Area	Strengthening Family Connections - Live Webinar	Virtual	Janee Harvey, Dawn Kekstadt	1.5
4/12/21	Multidisciplinary	1,7,8B	DHS Eastern Svc Area	Strengthening Family Connections - Live Webinar	Virtual	Janee Harvey, Dawn Kekstadt	1.5
4/15/21	Legal Community	All	Statewide	ISBA Juvenile Law Seminar; Family First – Lessons Learned; Prefiling Representation Project	Virtual	Janee Harvey, Lori Frick; Jeff Wright	7.5

4/28/21	JCS	All	Statewide	JCS Training; FFPSA Application	On Demand		
May 2021	Judges/Attorneys	All	Statewide	Redbook Training	Virtual	NACC	7.5
5/3/21	Multidisciplinary	1,2	DHS Northern Svc Area	Strengthening Family Connections - Live Webinar	Virtual	Janee Harvey, Dawn Kekstadt	1.5
5/7/21	Multidisciplinary	5C	Des Moines	Strengthening Family Connections – Live Webinar	Virtual	Janee Harvey, Dawn Kekstadt	1.5
5/10/21	Multidisciplinary	1,7,8B	DHS Eastern Svc Area	Strengthening Family Connections – Live Webinar	Virtual	Janee Harvey, Dawn Kekstadt	1.5
June 2021	DHS	All	Statewide	Enhancing Practice in Engaging Fathers	Virtual		
6/8/21	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	Psychological Trauma & Juvenile Justice: Impact on Mind, Body, Behavior and Community - Current Research and Practice Trends (Day 1). Iowa Children's Justice. Live Webinar.	Virtual		
6/8/21	Legal Community	All	Statewide	ISB Annual Meeting – QRTPs	Virtual	Kristin Konchalski	
6/9/21	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	Psychological Trauma & Juvenile Justice: Impact on Mind, Body, Behavior and Community - Current Research and Practice Trends (Day 2). Iowa Children's Justice. Live Webinar.	Virtual		
6/13/21-6/17/21	County Attorneys	All	Statewide	Iowa County Attorney Association Spring Conference; Potential Training Opportunity			
Future Training Opportunities							
Nov 2021	DHS	All	Statewide	SDM Safety Assessment	Virtual		
11/7/21-11/10/21	County Attorneys	All	Statewide	Iowa County Attorney Association Fall Conference; Potential Training Opportunity			
On Demand Materials or Webinars							
n/a	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	SPD Recorded Webinars: DHS Family Centered Services	On Demand	Janee Harvey	1
n/a	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	SPD Recorded Webinars: DHS FFPSA	On Demand	Janee Harvey	1
n/a	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	SPD Recorded Webinars: Juvenile Case Law Update	On Demand	Judge Pattison	1
n/a	Juvenile Judges	All	Statewide	ICJ Court Oversight Role of QRTP Placements Webinar. Juvenile Judges' Training on Court Oversight Role of QRTP Placements, including an overview by DHS and JCS.	On Demand	Chad Jensen, Kristin Konchalski	1

n/a	Legal Community	All	Statewide	ICJ What Lawyers Need to Know about Juvenile Court. New initiatives at JCS Hosted by Model Court Training Academy. Recorded live by SPD Office on 10/17/19	On Demand	John Hawkins, Sam Powell, Diamond Denney, Elly Nunez	1
n/a	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	ICJ Alia Training; The Human Need for Belonging: Building a New Way, Together! Recorded live 10/28/19	On Demand	Amelia Franck Meyer	2.75
n/a	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	ICJ Why Compassion Must be the Foundation of All Reasonable Efforts to Reunify Children. Hosted and recorded by Michigan State Court Administrative Office - Child Welfare Services on 6/24/20.	On Demand	Amelia Franck Meyer, Vivek Sankaran, Shrounda Selivanoff	1
n/a	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	ICJ Qualified Residential Treatment Program (QRTP)	On Demand		1
n/a	Multidisciplinary	All	Statewide	ICJ Introduction to Family First Prevention Services Act (FFPSA)	On Demand		1
n/a	Juvenile Judges	All	Statewide	ICJ Juvenile Judge Lunch & Learn; QRTP Update	On Demand		
n/a	Juvenile Judges	All	Statewide	ICJ Juvenile Judge Lunch & Learn; Solution Based Casework	On Demand		1

Child Welfare Policy Manual

Source: 10/14/2011

Reference: Social Security Act § section 474(a)(3)(E), PI-10-01, Child Welfare Policy Manual section 8.1A

- 30** **Q:** May a title IV-E agency claim title IV-E administrative costs for attorneys to provide legal representation for the title IV-E agency, a candidate for title IV-E foster care or a title IV-E eligible child in foster care and the child's parents to prepare for and participate in all stages of foster care related legal proceedings?
- A:** Yes. The statute at section 474(a)(3) of the Act and regulations at 45 CFR 1356.60(c) specify that Federal financial participation (FFP) is available at the rate of 50% for administrative expenditures necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the title IV-E plan. The title IV-E agency's representation in judicial determinations continues to be an allowable administrative cost.

Previous policy prohibited the agency from claiming title IV-E administrative costs for legal services provided by an attorney representing a child or parent. This policy is revised to allow the title IV-E agency to claim title IV-E administrative costs of independent legal representation by an attorney for a child who is a candidate for title IV-E foster care or in foster care and his/her parent to prepare for and participate in all stages of foster care legal proceedings, such as court hearings related to a child's removal from the home. These administrative costs of legal representation must be paid through the title IV-E agency. This change in policy will ensure that, among other things: reasonable efforts are made to prevent removal and finalize the permanency plan; and parents and youth are engaged in and complying with case plans.

Source: 1/7/2019

Reference: 45 CFR 1356.60(c), section 474(a)(3)

Child Welfare Policy Manual

31 Q: Are title IV-E administrative costs for the legal representation provided by agency attorneys and for independent legal representation of children and parents in all stages of foster care related legal proceedings available to tribes and public agencies that have an agreement under section 472(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act?

A: Yes. A title IV-E agency that has an agreement with a tribe or any other public agency under section 472(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act may claim title IV-E administrative costs for legal representation provided by tribal or public agency attorneys under the agreement in all stages of foster care related legal proceedings. The title IV-E agency may also claim administrative costs for independent legal representation provided by an attorney for a candidate for title IV-E foster care or a title IV-E eligible child in foster care who is served under the agreement, and the child's parents, to prepare for and participate in all stages of foster care related legal proceedings.

Source: 7/26/2019

Reference: 45 CFR 1356.60(c), section 474(a)(3); CWPM Q/A 8.1B #30

32 Q: Does the policy at CWPM 8.1B #30 allow a title IV-E agency to claim title IV-E administrative costs of paralegals, investigators, peer partners or social workers that support an attorney providing independent legal representation to a child who is a candidate for title IV-E foster care or is in title IV-E foster care, and his/her parent, to prepare for and participate in all stages of foster care legal proceedings, and for office support staff and overhead expenses?

A: Yes, the policy permits a title IV-E agency to claim such title IV-E administrative costs to the extent that they are necessary to support an attorney in providing independent legal representation to prepare for and participate in all stages of foster care legal proceedings for candidates for title IV-E foster care, youth in foster care and his/her parents. The costs must be consistent with federal cost principles per 45 CFR Part 75 Subpart E. The title IV-E agency must allocate such costs so as to assure that the title IV-E program is charged its proportionate share of costs (See CWPM sections 8.1B and 8.1C).