



Okanagan Service Delivery Area

Resource Practice Audit

Report Completed: December 2020

Office of the Provincial Director of Child Welfare and Aboriginal Services

Quality Assurance Branch

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
1. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	3
1.1 Screening and Assessing Prospective Caregivers and Family Care Homes.....	3
1.2 Providing Training, Ongoing Learning, and Placement Information for Caregivers	5
1.3 Ongoing Monitoring of Caregivers and Family Care Homes.....	6
1.4 Supportive Practice with Caregivers	7
1.5 Assessing and Reviewing Quality of Care Concerns in Family Care Homes	8
2. ACTIONS TAKEN TO DATE	9
3. ACTION PLAN.....	9
APPENDIX	11
A. METHODOLOGY	11
B. DETAILED FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	12
b.1 Screening and Assessing Prospective Caregivers and Family Care Homes.....	13
b.2 Providing Training, Ongoing Learning, and Placement Information for Caregivers	15
b.3 Ongoing Monitoring of Caregivers and Family Care Homes.....	16
b.4 Supportive Practice with Caregivers	17
b.5 Assessing and Reviewing Quality of Care Concerns in Family Care Homes	19

INTRODUCTION

This report contains information and findings related to the resource practice audit that was conducted in the Okanagan Service Delivery Area (SDA) in January – July 2020.

Practice audits are conducted regularly by practice analysts in the Quality Assurance branch of the Provincial Director of Child Welfare and Aboriginal Services division across several of the Ministry of Children and Family Development (MCFD) service lines and for services provided by a Delegated Aboriginal Agency (DAA) under the *Child, Family and Community Service Act* (CFCSA). The audits inform continuous improvements in policy, practice and overall service delivery. They provide quality assurance oversight and demonstrate public accountability.

Resource practice audits are designed to assess the practice of MCFD resource workers in relation to policy and key standards and procedures in the Caregiver Support Service Standards (CSSS) and the Resource Work Policies, which replaced the CSSS in 2017. Resource workers provide services for caregivers in MCFD-contracted family care homes. These services are designed to promote and enhance the safety and well-being of children and youth in care who are placed in these homes.

1. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This practice audit was based on a review of physical and electronic records in a representative sample of resource files obtained from the Okanagan SDA. The sample contained 49 files. The review focused on practice within a three-year timeframe that started on December 1, 2016 and ended on November 30, 2019. The following sub-sections contain the findings and observations of the practice analysts who conducted the audit, within the context of the policy, standards and procedures that informed the audit design and measures.

1.1 Screening and Assessing Prospective Caregivers and Family Care Homes

Ministry policy requires prospective caregivers for children in care to undergo a number of checks and assessments before their home is approved and a child is placed in their care. The intended outcomes of this policy include that the children are safe and cared for by caregivers who meet their developmental needs and respect their rights under section 70 of the CFCSA.

The standard of practice associated with this policy includes a consolidated criminal record check (CCRC) and child protection background check for each prospective caregiver and anyone 18 years of age or older who lives in the caregiver's home or who spends significant amounts of unsupervised time with a child placed in the caregiver's home; a medical assessment and reference checks for the caregiver; and a thorough assessment of the caregiver's home and the caregiver's ability to care for children. The resource worker ensures that all of these checks and assessments are completed, and the caregiver's home is approved before a child is placed there.

Just over half of the 49 resource files reviewed for this audit contained documentation confirming that all required consolidated criminal record checks, child protection background checks, medical assessments, and reference checks were completed before a child was placed in the home. Almost one third of the files lacked confirmation that a child protection background check was completed. In addition, one in eight files lacked confirmation that a medical assessment or the required number of reference checks were completed for one or more caregivers, and one in ten files lacked confirmation that the CCRC was completed for one or more caregivers. Further, one in six files had documentation indicating that a child was placed in the home before all of the initial checks were completed.

The practice analysts found home study reports containing information gathered through the checks and assessments of the caregiver and the caregiver's home in slightly more than half of the 49 resource files reviewed. One in ten files were missing the home study report, and one in five lacked confirmation that a *Criminal Records Review Act* (CRRRA) check was completed for a caregiver. The CRRRA check is the final step in the approval process.

Overall, in slightly more than a third of the files in the sample, the analyst was able to confirm that all of the required screening and assessment activities were completed before a child was placed in the home.

The practice analysts also verified whether the CCRC was up to date at the time of the audit for each caregiver and anyone 18 years of age or older who was living in the caregiver's home or who spent significant amounts of unsupervised time with a child placed in the caregiver's home, and whether the CRRRA check was up to date for each caregiver. The CCRC must be renewed or updated every three years, and the CRRRA every five years. The analysts found that both of these checks were up to date in slightly more than half of the files in the sample.

When primary caregivers need relief, ministry policy requires them to use services that are appropriate to the needs of each child placed in their home, provided by relief caregivers who have been screened, assessed and approved before the child is temporarily left in their care. The intended outcome is safety for the child.

The standard associated with this policy is that the primary caregiver uses a ministry approved family care home for relief whenever possible, and alternatively, that a proposed relief caregiver is first screened by the resource worker and then jointly assessed and approved by the primary caregiver and the resource worker.

In conducting this audit, the practice analysts were able to identify relief caregivers in about two thirds of the 49 resource files in the sample. The total number of relief caregivers identified was 79. The number of relief caregivers used by each primary caregiver during the three-year audit timeframe ranged from 1 to 6, although more than three quarters used only 1, 2 or 3 relief

caregivers. Overall, the analysts found that most of the 79 relief caregivers were fully screened and assessed.

1.2 Providing Training, Ongoing Learning, and Placement Information for Caregivers

Ministry policy requires that caregivers complete mandatory training sessions within a specified timeframe, and that they continue to access learning and training opportunities for as long as they have an active family care home agreement with the ministry. One of the intended outcomes of mandatory training and ongoing learning is that caregivers increase their caregiving knowledge and skills and provide a higher quality of care for the children placed in their homes.

The standard is that the resource worker develops a learning plan with each caregiver, provides the caregiver with information and education on relevant topics of interest to the caregiver, and reviews the learning plan and development and training needs and activities with the caregiver during the annual review of the family care home.

In conducting this audit, the practice analysts found that most of the files in the sample contained documentation indicating that the resource workers had provided the caregivers with information or education on relevant topics. However, half the files were missing documents or notes that could be identified as learning plans or that resembled learning plans, and a similar number lacked confirmation that caregivers completed mandatory training within the required two-year timeframe. Overall, about one in five files contained both a learning plan and confirmation that the caregivers completed mandatory training within the required timeframe.

Ministry policy requires that caregivers receive written information about the strengths and needs of each child placed in their care and their responsibilities in meeting the child's needs. The intended outcome of this policy is that caregivers have enough information about a child to support the child's safety and are aware of their responsibilities toward the child as set out in the child's care plan.

The standard is that ministry workers provide caregivers with written information about a child before the child is placed, at the time of placement, and throughout the child's stay. While the information comes from the child's social worker or the child protection worker involved with the child's family, the resource worker ensures that the caregiver receives it. If the child has a care plan, the resource worker ensures that the caregiver also receives a copy of the caregiver's responsibilities under the child's care plan.

In this audit, only one file in the sample contained documentation confirming that the caregivers were given both written referral information and a copy of their responsibilities for every child placed in their home during the audit timeframe. A total of 244 children were placed in the 49 family care homes in the sample during the three-year timeframe. The number of child placements per home ranged from 1 to 11, although two thirds of the homes had six or fewer

child placements during this timeframe. In reviewing the records, the analysts found confirmation that caregivers received written child referral information for 17 of the 244 children, and a copy of the caregiver's responsibilities for 12 of these children. Overall, the records indicated that caregivers received both referral information and a copy of the caregiver responsibilities for 3 of the 244 children placed in their homes.

1.3 Ongoing Monitoring of Caregivers and Family Care Homes

Ministry policy requires that resource workers monitor caregivers on an ongoing basis from the start of a child's placement in a caregiver's home right through to the child's departure from the home. The intended outcome of ongoing monitoring is a placement environment in which the caregiver is supported and any concern about the quality of the child's care is addressed in a manner that provides safety for the child.

The standard for ongoing monitoring of a family care home includes direct contact with the caregiver in the caregiver's home at least once every 90 days. These contacts are commonly referred to as 90-day visits.

In reviewing the records for this audit, the practice analysts found no documentation of 90-day visits in two files in the sample. In files that contained documentation, the total number of visits that occurred during the audit timeframe ranged from 1 to 14, with an average of 6 visits within three years. In over half the files, the analysts found 6 or fewer documented visits during the three years. None of the files contained documentation indicating that the standard interval of no more than 90 days between visits had been maintained.

Procedures for ongoing monitoring of family care homes include development of a plan with the caregiver that specifies regular telephone and email contact in addition to the 90-day visits. In reviewing the records, the practice analysts found no examples of monitoring plans in any of the files. However, more than three quarters of the files contained documentation of ongoing telephone, email and in-office contact between the resource workers and the caregivers.

The standard for ongoing monitoring also requires an annual review of the family care home. The annual review is supposed to occur within 30 working days of the anniversary date of the signing of the first contract with the caregiver, or within 30 days of the anniversary of the previous annual review. In this audit, the practice analysts found that annual reviews had either not occurred or not been documented in one out of every ten files in the sample, and almost three quarters of the files contained fewer than the required number of annual reviews for the three-year period covered by the audit.

1.4 Supportive Practice with Caregivers

As a matter of policy, the ministry expects that caregivers will be supported and encouraged in a manner that is responsive to the complexities of a child's placement and the child's needs. The intended outcome is that caregivers provide the best possible care and guidance for a child, based on the child's individual needs.

The standard is that resource workers consistently use supportive practices in their interactions with a caregiver and provide the caregiver with support services that are consistent with the expectations set out for the caregiver in the child's care plan, in the ministry's standards for family care homes, and in the contractual agreement that the ministry has with the caregiver.

In conducting this audit, practice analysts found evidence of supportive practice in three quarters of the files in the sample. This included the provision of support services, feedback and encouragement to the caregivers.

As a matter of policy, the ministry sets limits on the number of children who are looked after by a caregiver in a family care home, based on the children's ages, and including the caregiver's own children. Before placing additional children in an active family care home, the resource worker is expected to assess the caregiver's abilities and capacity in relation to the ages and needs of the children in the home and the ages and needs of the children for whom the home is being considered. The intended outcomes of this policy are family care homes that are structured to support the individual needs, level of development, and health and safety of the children placed there, and that caregivers have the abilities and resources to care for all of the children in their home.

The standard sets a maximum number of children per family care home based on the type of home. The resource worker obtains a manager's approval before the maximum allowable number of children can be exceeded. Once a home is approved to exceed the maximum allowable number of children, the resource worker is required to review the home every 90 days during the first year and every 6 months thereafter.

In conducting this audit, the practice analysts found that 11 of the 49 family care homes in the sample had exceeded the allowable number of children at some point during the audit timeframe, and only 5 of the files for these homes contained the required reviews and managerial approvals.

Ministry policy requires that caregivers report to ministry social workers all information of significance to the safety and well-being of a child in their care, and any significant change in their own situations. The intended outcomes are that social workers are promptly informed about a critical injury or serious incident involving a child in care; affected children, youth, families and

staff are supported; and the Public Guardian and Trustee has the necessary information to exercise their responsibilities on behalf of a child in care, when applicable.

The standard is that resource workers first inform the caregivers about their obligation to report, and then remind the caregivers on an annual basis about their obligation to report.

In this audit, a third of the files contained documentation confirming that the resource workers had informed the caregivers on an annual basis about their obligation to report. One in ten files had no documentation indicating that the caregiver was ever informed about the obligation to report, and just over half of the files had no documentation indicating that the caregiver was reminded on an annual basis about the obligation to report. These reminders typically occur during the annual review of the family care home and many of the files were missing annual reviews.

1.5 Assessing and Reviewing Quality of Care Concerns in Family Care Homes

Ministry policy requires that resource workers review any significant concern that arises about the quality of a child's care in a family care home. The intended outcome of this policy is that caregivers respect the rights of children in care and adhere to the terms of the Family Care Home Agreement and applicable policies.

The standard is that the supervisor of the resource worker decides whether to conduct a quality of care review within 24 hours of receiving a report that a caregiver may have breached the rights of a child, the terms of the Family Care Home Agreement, and/or applicable policies. If the supervisor decides that the information meets the threshold for a quality of care review, the supervisor obtains a manager's approval for the review. The review is expected to start, unfold and finish within specified timeframes. Extensions of the overall timeframe require a manager's approval. Caregivers are notified of an extension and their right to request an administrative review of a decision involving a serious sanction. If the supervisor decides that the information does not meet the threshold for a review, the resource worker and the child's social worker discuss and resolve the issues informally with the caregiver.

In this audit, the practice analysts reviewed records in 19 files in which one or more quality of care concerns were documented during the audit timeframe. In a clear majority of these files, the analysts found documentation confirming that the concerns were jointly assessed by the resource worker and supervisor, and when the information was assessed to be below the threshold for a quality of care review, the underlying issues were addressed informally with the caregiver. In two files, the analysts found that the resource workers received information that was assessed to be below the threshold for a quality of care review and there was no indication that the underlying issues were addressed with the caregivers. In another file, the analysts found

that the resource worker received information that should have been assessed as a quality of care concern and was not.

The practice analysts also reviewed records related to quality of care reviews documented in 16 files as having been started or completed and found that the practice recorded in only one of these files met the standard for a quality of care review. The other 15 files lacked documentation related to a number of requirements outlined in the policy and standards. For example, all of these files lacked documentation confirming that the decision to conduct a quality of care review was made within 24 hours of receiving the information. Also, almost all of the reviews took longer than the expected 30-day timeframe to complete, and there was no indication that a manager had approved the extension or that the caregiver was notified of the extension.

2. ACTIONS TAKEN TO DATE

The results of this audit were reviewed with the SDA management team on October 29, 2020

3. ACTION PLAN

ACTION	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	INTENDED OUTCOME	DATE TO BE COMPLETED
1. RE 4: Renewal of CCRC and CRRA checks: a. A tracking system will be developed to ensure CCRC and CRRA are renewed within appropriate timeframes. b. All current RE files will be reviewed to ensure CCRC and CRRA checks are completed, current, and documented on file.	EDS	All current caregivers, care providers, as well as anyone 18 years or older living or who will be living in the home, and anyone 18 years or older who will have significant and unsupervised access to children in the home will be screened according to policy.	June 30, 2021
2. RE 5: Caregiver Continuing Learning and Education a. Review of files to ensure a learning plan with the caregiver has been developed and the mandatory training has been completed within 2 years. b. Establish process to track and monitor completion for the PRIDE training	EDS	Caregivers have the required knowledge and skills and are able to provide quality care	June 30, 2021

<p>3. RE 7 & 8: Ongoing Monitoring of Family Care Home and Annual Reviews</p> <p>a. Establish a Common tracking system to ensure that there is ongoing contact / monitoring (every 90 days) and completed annual review as outlined in policy 8.17.</p>	EDS	<p>Children are cared for in supported and monitored environments.</p> <p>Caregivers are supported in their care of children/youth and feedback/support is offered on a continuous basis.</p>	June 30, 2021
<p>4. RE 13: Conducting a Quality of Care Review</p> <p>a. The process, roles & responsibilities as well as documentation requirements will be reviewed with the Residential Resource Teams</p>	EDS	<p>Children and youth are cared for in safe, nurturing & supportive environments</p> <p>Caregivers are attending to the safety and well being of children/youth in their care.</p> <p>QOCR are completed in a fair and timely manner.</p>	June 30, 2021

APPENDIX

This appendix contains a description of the audit methodology and a detailed breakdown of the findings for each of the measures in the audit tool.

A. METHODOLOGY

This practice audit was based on a review of records in a representative sample of resource files obtained from the Okanagan Service Delivery Area (SDA). The audit included a review of records in the physical files and electronic records and attachments in the Ministry Information System (MIS) and Integrated Case Management (ICM) system.

The sample was selected from a list of resource files extracted from MIS at the SDA level.

The list of resource (RE) files extracted from MIS (i.e., the sampling frame) consisted of files pertaining to family care homes of the types Regular, Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, Restricted, and Client Service Agreement (where the provider was a unique family caregiver contracted directly by the Ministry) that met all of the following criteria:

- eligible for payment for at least 13 months between December 1, 2016 and November 30, 2019
- eligible for payment for at least 1 month since February 1, 2019
- eligible for payment for at least 1 month prior to December 1, 2017
- had a child or youth in care (CYIC) placement for at least 1 month between December 1, 2016 and November 30, 2019

The total number of files that met all of the criteria in the sampling frame was 164. From this total, a sample of 49 files was selected using the simple random sampling method. This sample size provides a 90% confidence level, with a 10% margin of error.

The sampling method and MIS extracts were developed and produced with the support of the Modelling, Analysis and Information Management (MAIM) Branch.

Eight additional files were included with those in the sample for which measure RE 12 (assessing quality of care concern) or measure RE 13 (conducting quality of care review) were applicable. These files were flagged in MIS as having at least one Quality of Care (QOC) concern or review but had not made it into the sample through the random sampling process. This brought the total number of files reviewed for RE 12 and RE 13 to 57.

The records in all of these files were reviewed by practice analysts on the Audit Team, in the Quality Assurance Branch. The analysts used the RE audit tool to assess the records in the files,

record a rating for each measure, and collect categorical and qualitative data and information, as observed in the records.

The RE audit tool contains 13 measures designed to assess compliance with key components of the Caregiver Support Service Standards (CSSS) and the Resource Work Policies, which replaced the CSSS in 2017.

Each measure contains a scale with “Achieved” and “Not achieved” as rating options, as well as ancillary questions designed to assist the analysts in collecting categorical and qualitative data that explain or provide context for the ratings.

In reviewing the records, the analysts focused on practice that occurred during a 36-month period (December 1, 2016 – November 30, 2019) referred to in the report as the audit timeframe.

The audit tool is a SharePoint form that was developed and produced with the support of data specialists on the Monitoring Team, in the Child Welfare Branch.

Quality assurance policy and procedures require that practice analysts identify for action any record that suggests a child or youth may need protection under section 13 of the *Child, Family and Community Service Act*. During the audit process, the analysts watch for situations in which the information in the record suggests that a child or youth may have been left in need of protection. When identified, the record is brought to the attention of the responsible team leader (TL) and director of operations (DOO), as well as the executive director of service (EDS), for follow up, as deemed appropriate.

B. DETAILED FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

In this section of the report, findings are presented in tables that contain counts and percentages of ratings of achieved and not achieved for all of the measures in the resource audit tool (RE 1 to RE 13). Each table is followed by an analysis of the findings, including a breakdown of the reasons why a measure was rated achieved or not achieved. It is important to note that some measures can result in a rating of not achieved for more than one reason.

There were 49 files in the sample for measures RE 1 to RE 11 and 57 files for RE 12 and RE 13. However, not all of the measures in the audit tool were applicable to records in all of these files. The “Total Applicable” column in the tables contains the total number of files in which each measure was applied to the records and notes below some of the tables explain why some of the measures were not applicable to records in some of the files.

The overall compliance rate for this SDA was **42%**.

b.1 Screening and Assessing Prospective Caregivers and Family Care Homes

Table 1 provides compliance rates for measures RE 1, RE 2, RE3 and RE 4, which have to do with screening and assessing each caregiver and any other adult who is living in the family care home or who has significant and unsupervised time with a child placed in the home. The compliance rate is the percentage of the files in which each measure was applied to the records and rated achieved. The note below the table provides the number of files in which the measure was not applicable and explains why.

Table 1: Screening and Assessment of Caregivers and Other Adults in the Family Care Home

Measure	Total Applicable	# Achieved	% Achieved	# Not Achieved	% Not Achieved
RE 1: Initial screening of prospective caregivers and other adults in family care home	49	26	53%	23	47%
RE 2: Assessment of prospective caregivers and family care home	49	28	57%	21	43%
RE 3: Screening and assessment of relief caregivers*	33	24	73%	9	27%
RE 4: Renewal of CCRC and CRRA checks	49	28	57%	21	43%

*This measure was not applicable to 16 files in which relief caregivers were not identified.

RE 1: Initial Screening of Prospective Caregivers and Other Adults in the Home

The compliance rate for this measure was 53%. The measure was applied to records in all 49 files in the sample; 26 of the 49 files were rated achieved and 23 were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of achieved, the file contained documentation confirming that the following activities were completed before a child was placed in the home:

- confirmation that each prospective caregiver was 19 years of age or older
- a prior contact check (PCC) or initial records review (IRR) and detailed records review (DRR) for each prospective caregiver and anyone 18 years of age or older who was residing in the home or had significant unsupervised time with a child placed in the home
- a consolidated criminal record check (CCRC) for each prospective caregiver and anyone 18 years of age or older who was residing in the home or had significant unsupervised time with a child placed in the home
- a medical assessment for each prospective caregiver, and
- three reference checks for each prospective caregiver.

Of the 23 files rated not achieved, 13 were missing documentation related to one screening activity and 10 were missing documentation related to two or more screening activities.

Prior contact checks (missing in 15 files) and placement of a child in the home prior to completion of all screening activities (observed in 8 files as having occurred) were the most frequently missed

activities, followed by the medical assessment (missing in 6 files), the required number of reference checks (missing in 6 files) and the consolidated criminal record check for a caregiver (missing in 5 files).

RE 2: Assessment of Prospective Caregivers and the Family Care Home

The compliance rate for this measure was 57%. The measure was applied to records in all 49 files in the sample; 28 of the 49 files were rated achieved and 21 were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of achieved, the file contained documentation confirming that the following activities were completed before a child was placed in the home:

- a participatory assessment of each prospective caregiver to verify their ability to care for children
- an environment of care checklist (applies after March 2017)
- a home study report or updated home study report
- supervisory approval of the home study report or updated home study report, and
- a Criminal Records Review Act (CRRA) check for each prospective caregiver.

Of the 21 files rated not achieved, 14 were missing documentation related to one assessment activity and 7 were missing documentation related to two or more assessment activities. Placement of a child in the home prior to completion of all assessment activities (observed in 11 files as having occurred), the CRRA check for a caregiver (missing in 9 files) and the home study (missing in 5 files) were the most frequently missed activities, followed by the participatory assessment of a caregiver (missing in 2 files), a home study update following significant changes in the caregiver's own situation (missing in 2 files) and supervisor approval of the home study report (missing in 2 files).

RE 3: Screening and Assessment of Relief Caregivers

The compliance rate for this measure was 73%. The measure was applied to records in 33 of the 49 files in the sample; 24 of the 33 files were rated achieved and 9 were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of achieved, the file contained documentation confirming that the following activities were completed before a child was placed in the care of a relief caregiver, either in the primary caregiver's home or in the relief caregiver's home:

- confirmation that each relief caregiver was 19 years of age or older
- prior contact check (PCC) or initial records review (IRR) and detailed records review (DRR) for each relief caregiver
- consolidated criminal record check (CCRC) for each relief caregiver
- joint assessment and approval of each relief caregiver by the primary caregiver and resource worker (applies before March 2017)
- relief caregiver screening checklist completed and signed (applies after March 2017).

Of the 9 files rated not achieved, 7 were missing documentation related to one activity and 2 were missing documentation related to two activities. Joint assessment and approval (missing in 6 files for at least one relief caregiver) was the most frequently missed activity, followed by the PCC or IRR/DRR (missing in 3 files for at least one relief caregiver), the consolidated criminal record check (missing in 1 file for at least one relief caregiver) and the screening checklist (missing in 1 file).

RE 4: Renewal of CCRC and CRRA Checks

The compliance rate for this measure was 57%. The measure was applied to records in all 49 files in the sample; 28 of the 49 files were rated achieved and 21 were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of achieved, the file contained documentation confirming that the following activities were completed:

- a current (valid) CCRC for each caregiver and anyone 18 years of age or older who was residing in the home or who had significant and unsupervised time with a child placed in the home
- a current (valid) CRRA check for each caregiver in the home.

Of the 21 files rated not achieved, 19 were missing documentation related to one activity and 2 were missing documentation related to two activities. The CRRA check for a caregiver (missing or expired in 18 files) was the most frequently missed activity, followed by the CCRC for a caregiver (expired in 4 files) and the CCRC for an individual 18 years of age or older who was residing in the home and or who had significant and unsupervised time with a child placed in the home (did not meet policy requirements in 1 file).

Two of the CCRC's in the sample were completed through the Centralized Services Hub.

b.2 Providing Training, Ongoing Learning, and Placement Information for Caregivers

Table 2 provides compliance rates for measures RE 5 and RE 6, which have to do with supporting caregiver ongoing learning and education and providing written referral information about a child to the caregiver when the child is placed in the caregiver's home. The compliance rate is the percentage of the files in which each measure was applied to the records and rated achieved.

Table 2: Caregiver Continuing Learning and Sharing Placement Information with Caregiver

Measure	Total Applicable	# Achieved	% Achieved	# Not Achieved	% Not Achieved
RE 5: Caregiver continuing learning and education including mandatory training	49	11	22%	38	78%
RE 6: Sharing Placement Information with Caregiver	49	1	2%	48	98%

RE 5: Caregiver Continuing Learning and Education

The compliance rate for this measure was 22%. The measure was applied to records in all 49 files in the sample; 11 of the 49 files were rated achieved and 38 were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of achieved, the file contained a learning plan for the caregiver and documentation indicating that the caregiver had been provided with information or education on relevant topics and had completed mandatory training within two years of the date on which the caregiver was approved. If it had not been two years since the caregiver was approved, the file contained a learning plan and documentation indicating that the caregiver was in the process of completing the mandatory training.

Of the 38 files rated not achieved, 17 were missing documentation related to one activity and 21 were missing documentation related to two or more activities. Confirmation that mandatory training was completed within the required timeframe (missing in 30 files) and the learning plan (missing in 25 files) were the most frequently missed activities, followed by confirmation that the caregiver was provided information or education on relevant topics (missing in 8 files).

RE 6: Sharing Placement Information with Caregiver

The compliance rate for this measure was 2%. The measure was applied to records in all 49 files in the sample; 1 of the 49 files was rated achieved and 48 were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of achieved, the file contained documentation confirming that the caregiver had received written child referral information and written information about the caregiver's responsibilities (arising from the child's care plan) for each child placed in the caregiver's home during the audit timeframe.

All of the 48 files rated not achieved lacked documentation confirming that the caregiver had received both child referral information and information about the caregiver's responsibilities for each child placed in the caregiver's home during the audit timeframe.

Only two of the 49 files in the sample contained documentation confirming that the caregiver had received both child referral information and information about their responsibilities for at least one child placed in their care, and this occurred for only 3 of the 244 children placed in the 49 family care homes in the sample during the audit timeframe.

b.3 Ongoing Monitoring of Caregivers and Family Care Homes

Table 3 provides compliance rates for measures RE 7 and RE 8, which have to do with the requirement that resource workers maintain ongoing in-person contact with the caregiver, in the caregiver's home, at least once every 90 days, and that they complete annual reviews of the family care home within 30 working days of the anniversary date of the initial approval of the home, or within 30 days of the date of the previous annual review.

Table 3: Ongoing Monitoring and Annual Reviews of Family Care Homes

Measure	Total Applicable	# Achieved	% Achieved	# Not Achieved	% Not Achieved
RE 7: Ongoing monitoring of family care home	49	0	0%	49	100%
RE 8: Annual reviews of family care home	49	4	8%	45	92%

RE 7: Ongoing Monitoring of Family Care Home

The compliance rate for this measure was 0%. The measure was applied to records in all 49 files in the sample and all were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of achieved, the file contained documentation confirming that in-person contact with the caregiver in the caregiver's home had occurred at least once every 90 days.

Of the 49 files rated not achieved, 47 had documentation indicating that in-person visits in the caregiver's home had occurred, but not within 90 days of the previous visit; and 2 had no documentation indicating that in-person visits in the caregiver's home had ever occurred during the three-year audit timeframe. Based on the documentation, 264 in-person visits occurred during the audit timeframe, which averaged 5 visits per family care home within the 3 years.

RE 8: Annual Reviews of Family Care Home

The compliance rate for this measure was 8%. The measure was applied to records in all 49 files in the sample; 4 of the 49 files were rated achieved and 45 were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of achieved, each annual review was completed within 30 working days of the anniversary date of the signing of the first contract with the caregiver or within 30 working days of the date of the previous annual review, and documented in the file; and the required number of annual reviews were completed during the three-year audit timeframe.

Of the 45 files rated not achieved, 27 did not contain all of the annual reviews that should been completed during the audit timeframe; 8 had the expected number of annual reviews but not all were completed within the required timeframe; 5 did not contain any annual reviews; 1 had the expected number of annual reviews but none were completed within the required timeframe; and 4 had a combination of missing annual reviews and annual reviews that were not completed within the required timeframe.

b.4 Supportive Practice with Caregivers

Table 4 provides compliance rates for measures RE 9, RE 10 and RE 11, which have to do with reportable incidences, the allowable number of children in the family care home, and supportive practice. The compliance rate is the percentage of the files in which each measure was applied to the records and rated achieved.

Table 4: Reportable Incidences, Allowable Number of Children and Supportive Practice

Measure	Total Applicable	# Achieved	% Achieved	# Not Achieved	% Not Achieved
RE 9: Reportable incidences	49	17	35%	32	65%
RE 10: Allowable number of children in a caregiving home	49	43	88%	6	12%
RE 11: Supportive practice	49	37	76%	12	24%

RE 9: Reportable Incidences

The compliance rate for this measure was 35%. The measure was applied to records in all 49 files in the sample; 17 of the 49 files were rated achieved and 32 were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of achieved, the file contained documentation confirming that the caregiver was informed of the obligation to report to the appropriate delegated social worker all information of significance to the safety and well-being of a child placed in the caregiver's home and any significant changes in the caregiver's own situation, and the file contained documentation confirming that the caregiver had been reminded on an annual basis of the obligation to report.

Of the 32 files rated not achieved, 27 contained documentation indicating that the caregiver was informed of the obligation to report but not on an annual basis; and 5 contained no documentation indicating that the caregiver had ever been informed of the obligation to report.

RE 10: Allowable Number of Children in Family Care Home

The compliance rate for this measure was 88%. The measure was applied to records in all 49 files in the sample; 43 of the 49 files were rated achieved and 6 were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of achieved, the following criteria were met:

- The number of all children living in the family care home and the number of children in care placed in the family care home did not exceed the maximum allowable numbers based on the level of the home, or
- The maximum allowable numbers were exceeded with a manager's approval, and
- The family care home that was approved to exceed the maximum allowable numbers was reviewed every 90 days for the first year and every 6 months thereafter, as required.

Of the 6 files rated not achieved, 2 were missing confirmation that the home approved to exceed the maximum allowable numbers of children was reviewed every 6 months; 2 were missing confirmation that the home approved to exceed the maximum allowable numbers of children was reviewed every 90 days; and 2 were missing documentation related to more than one activity, including home approved to exceed maximum allowable numbers reviewed every 90 days (required but missing in both of these 2 files); home reviewed every 6 months (required but

missing in 1 of these 2 files); and manager's approval to exceed maximum allowable numbers (missing in 1 of these 2 files).

RE 11: Supportive Practice

The compliance rate for this measure was 76%. The measure was applied to records in all 49 files in the sample; 37 of the 49 files were rated achieved and 12 were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of achieved, the file contained documentation confirming that the resource worker used supportive practices with the caregiver, similar to those listed in the procedures associated with Standard 8.15(1) in the Resource Work Policies.

Of the 12 files rated not achieved, 10 contained insufficient confirmation of supportive practice to meet the standard; and 2 lacked confirmation of supportive practice altogether.

b.5 Assessing and Reviewing Quality of Care Concerns in Family Care Homes

Table 5 provides compliance rates for measures RE 12 and RE 13 which have to do with assessing quality of care concerns and conducting quality of care reviews. For these two measures, 8 additional files were reviewed. These additional files were in the population of files from which the original sample was selected but had not made it into the sample through random selection. They were purposefully added to the sample for measures RE 12 and RE 13 because they had a quality of care concern (QCC) or quality of care review (QCR) flag in MIS.

As a result, there were 57 files in the sample for measures RE 12 and RE 13.

The compliance rate is the percentage of the files in which each measure was applied to the records and rated achieved. The notes below the table provide the number of files in which each of the measures was not applicable and explain why.

Table 5: Quality of Care Concerns and Reviews

Measure	Total Applicable	# Achieved	% Achieved	# Not Achieved	% Not Achieved
RE 12: Assessing quality of care concern*	19	16	84%	3	16%
RE 13: Conducting quality of care review**	16	1	6%	15	94%

*Measure RE 12 was not applicable to 38 files in the sample because a quality of care concern was not identified when the records in those files were reviewed by the practice analysts.

**Measure RE 13 was not applicable to 41 files in the sample because a quality of care review had not been started or completed in those files.

RE 12: Assessing a Quality of Care Concern

The compliance rate for this measure was 84%. The measure was applied to records in 19 files; 16 of the 19 files were rated achieved and 3 were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of

achieved, the file contained documentation confirming that the following activities were completed:

- Concerns about the quality of a child's care in the home were jointly assessed by the resource worker and a supervisor to determine whether a quality of care review should be completed, or
- Concerns about the quality of a child's care in the home were assessed to be below the threshold for a quality of care review, and the underlying issues were addressed with the caregiver.

Of the 3 files rated not achieved, 2 contained information indicating that quality of care concerns were assessed to be below the threshold for a quality of care review, but there was no indication that the underlying issues were addressed with the caregiver; and 1 contained information indicating that there were concerns about the quality of a child's care in the home and the information was not assessed.

RE 13: Conducting a Quality of Care Review

The compliance rate for this measure was 6%. The measure was applied to records in 16 files; 1 of the 16 files was rated achieved and 15 were rated not achieved. To receive a rating of achieved, the file contained documentation confirming that the following activities were completed:

- The decision to conduct a quality of care review was made within 24 hours of receiving information about a quality of care concern
- The quality of care review was started within 5 days
- The quality of care review was completed within 30 days, or
- The quality of care review was completed within an extended timeframe as approved by the responsible manager, and
- The caregiver was notified of the extension, and
- If a serious sanction was applied, the caregiver was informed of the right to request an administrative review of the decision to apply a sanction.

All of the 15 files rated not achieved lacked information confirming that two or more activities had been completed. Decision to conduct a quality of care review made within 24 hours (missing in all 15 files); quality of care review completed within 30 days unless extension approved by manager (missing in 13 files); caregiver notified of extension of timeframe (missing in 13 files); and quality of care review started within 5 days (missing in 11 files) were the most frequently missed activities, followed by decision to conduct quality of care review approved by responsible manager (missing in 3 files).