ARIZONA
CENTER FOR
LAW IN THE
PUBLIC
INTEREST

202 E. MCDOWELL RD., SUITE 153
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004
(602) 258-8850
(602) 258-8757 (FAX)
WWW.ACLPI.ORG

May 21, 2008

Mr. Kevin D. Ray
Arizona Attorney General's Office
1275 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2926

     Re: Settlement Agreement, Paragraph 55

Dear Kevin:

     When we met last week in Phoenix, Plaintiffs said they would identify by letter the issues to be addressed at our June 3, 2008 meeting which will focus on Paragraph 55 of the Agreement. We propose the meeting be a working meeting where we try to reach agreement on (a) whether and how the WAFAS process will be improved and (b) additional sources of information the State will use to measure "whether services to class members are consistent with and designed to achieve the Principles." We propose the meeting focus on the following matters:

- Collecting richer information on fidelity to the JK Principles. We think that refining the guidance given to interviewers and record reviewers would allow the State, without changing the questions asked, to collect richer information and provide more meaningful feedback to providers. This could be accomplished, for example, by ensuring that reviewers take full advantage of opportunities to explore the adequacy of the CFT's assessment and service planning. Reviewers could be asked to explore and perhaps determine whether the services in the plan are likely to be effective in meeting a child's needs.

- Integrating the information from the family interviews and the record review. We propose that the same individual score both the interviews

and the record review or that the family interviewer and the record reviewer jointly score both the WFI and the record review instrument.

- Ensure that reviewers are competent to make the judgments required by the WAFAS. We think the WAFAS would be a more effective vehicle for improving practice if the standards for reviewers were raised, and if the necessary infrastructure was in place at the RBHA and at the family organization to ensure proper training, oversight and competence.

- Ensure that systemic issues that emerge from the review process are identified and communicated, for example, issues of working with CPS.

- Ensure an appropriate number of cases from a provider are actually reviewed. In some cases there were as few as three cases in which the caregiver and the facilitator were interviewed.

- Ensure caregivers and family members are interviewed in person, and increase the number of other team members interviewed to gather a clear picture of the case.

Additional Measures

Attached for your review is a comparison of the JK Principles and the questions in the WAFAS. We welcome your comments on whether we have omitted relevant WAFAS questions and whether our comments in the third column are accurate.

The SOC Plan says that the State is using information from the WAFAS and other sources of information (referred to as children's performance measures) to evaluate fidelity to the Principles. We asked for a description of the additional sources of information. We propose that at the meeting the parties attempt to reach agreement on the additional measures that will be used, including:

- Measures of compliance with required practice protocols.

- Measures of whether services are designed and implemented to achieve the JK functional outcomes. These measures may include both outcome measures and measures that look at the adequacy of assessment and

service planning. The CASII may provide information relevant in this regard.

- Measures of whether services are provided in the most integrated setting.

- Measures of the sufficiency of interagency collaboration.

- Measures of stability and the sufficiency of efforts to achieve stability (e.g., minimize multiple placements, avoid removal in crises).

- Measures of the adequacy of the array of services offered by the RHBA, including direct supports, case management, and substance abuse services. We understand that the State can quantify these services and is developing methods for evaluating whether they are of acceptable quality.

Please let us know if you have questions concerning the above. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anne Ronan
Ira A. Burnim

cc: Dr. Laura Nelson
        Brian Lensink
        Michael Fronske
        Logan T. Johnston
        Leezie Kim

JK Principles & WAFAS Questions

Principle	Content	WFI interviews	File review	Comments
Collaboration with the child and family	* Parents treated as partners in assessment, planning, delivery and evaluation; * Parent preferences taken seriously	1.1, Y1.1 (family/youth given time to talk about strengths beliefs and traditions and for youth, things like and good at; shared with team) 1.2, Y1.2 (explaining wraparound process and family's choices) 1.3, Y1.3 (family/youth given opportunity to tell things have worked in past) 1.4, Y1.4 (family/youth select who on team) Y1.6 (youth happy with the members of the team) 2.1, Y2.1 (family/youth and team created plan describing how team will meet needs) 2.10 (family makes final decision in designing wraparound plan) 2.11, Y2.5 (team took time to understand family's/youth's values and beliefs and plan is in tune with them) Y2.3 (team knows what youth likes and things do	1 (family and youth's needs/concerns are documented) 2 (documentation that identifies and prioritizes needs for child and family) [scoring appears to give consideration to whether documentation reflects family's view] 6 (child and family team is doing the planning and implementation) 7 (service plan specifies family's goals/objectives) 8 (clearly articulated long range vision of the future for youth and family) [scoring indicates this should be family's articulation] 10 (goals and objectives of service plan relate to needs family has prioritized) 25 (evidence that family and/or youth making decisions about direction and method of team)	

well) 3.1, Y3.1 (important decisions made with child and family) 3.6, Y1.5 (friend or advocate of the family/youth actively participates on team) 3.10, Y3.8 (team uses language the family can understand) 3.12, Y3.10 (all team members, including friends, family and natural supports, participate in meetings) 3.14, Y3.12 (all members demonstrate respect for the family) 3.15 (youth has opportunity to communicate views when time to make decision) Y3.13 (youth has chance to give ideas during meetings) 4.5 (after formal wraparound has ended, there is a process to re-start it if youth/family needs it)	

Functional outcomes	Services designed and implemented to achieve: * Success in school * Children live with families * Avoid delinquency * Become stable and productive adults * Stabilize child's condition * Minimize safety risks	1.6 (process of identifying what leads to crises/dangerous situations) 2.8, Y2.7 (crisis/safety plan specifies what everyone must do to respond to crises and how to prevent crises) 2.9 (confidence that team can keep child in community in event of crisis)	16 (service plan developed in the LRE and if in a more restrictive environment includes strategies to move to a LRE) 21 (crisis plan based on comprehensive functional assessment on predicted crises and includes strategies to prevent crises) 22 (crisis plan identifies signs/behaviors of impending crisis and ways to deescalate crises) 23 (crisis plan includes specific steps to be taken if crisis occurs and assigns responsibilities for steps)	* There are questions (not catalogued here) that look at whether the team has set goals and whether progress is being made toward goals. However, the questions do not look at whether services are designed and implemented to achieve the outcomes specified in JK * Information relevant to whether services are designed and implemented to achieve the outcomes specified in JK may be available via CASII * Some information relevant to whether services are designed and implemented to achieve JK outcomes may be available from questions on LRE and crisis planning
Collaboration with others	* Joint assessment, joint plan, and joint implementation for multi-system involved kids	1.5 (if difficult to get members to attend team meetings) [reviewer probes issues related to getting participation by others including other agencies]	11 (services/activities coordinated through integrated service plan) [grading tool says reviewer is looking for collaboration between system partners in	* No question directly asks whether there is a joint assessment or plan for multi-system kids * No question on whether team includes representa-

	* Team includes representatives from other agencies needed to develop an effective plan including teacher, Child Protective Service and/or Division of Developmental Disabilities case worker, and probation office * Team includes any foster parents	2.6 (whether member of team do not have a role in implementing the plan) 27 (evidence that individuals on CFT working together to provide coordinated services/supports) 3.12, Y3.10 (all team members, including friends, family and natural supports, participate in meetings)	the development of service tives from other systems (e.g., education, child welfare, juvenile probation, DD) when needed to develop an effective plan * No question on whether teacher included if needed to develop an effective plan * No question on whether foster parent is on team *How is the concept of wraparound ending or finishing (see 4.5, 4.8) harmonized with the idea that all children have CFTs?
Accessible services	* Comprehensive array of behavioral health services, sufficient to ensure children receive the treatment they need * Case management as	13 (services/supports based on needs, not on availability of services/supports) 3.2, Y3.2 (when team has good idea for support/service, it finds the resources/figures out some way to make it happen) 3.8, Y3.7 (whether services/supports are hard to access b/c they are far away or b/c transportation issues)	* No question on whether services on plan are likely to be effective in meeting child's needs * No questions about case management * No question on whether plan identifies and addresses transportation needs

	needed * Plans identify transportation needs to access services * Services adapted/created when needed but not available		
Best practices	* Services provided by competent individuals who are adequately trained * Services delivered in accordance with ADHS guidelines that incorporate evidence-based Abest practice@ * Plans identify and appropriately address behavioral symptoms that are reactions to death, abuse/neglect, LDs, trauma,	3.7, Y3.6 (team comes up with new idea for plan when family's needs change or something isn't working)	28 (documentation that progress towards goals and action steps has been monitored) 29 (child and family are making progress towards their goals)	* No questions looking at competence of individuals providing service * No questions re: whether services incorporate evidence-based practice * No questions on whether teams/plans identify and address behavioral symptoms that are reactions to death, abuse, neglect, substance abuse, DD, maladaptive sexual behavior, etc. * Questions on service modification do not reference JK functional outcomes

	substance abuse, DD, maladaptive sexual behavior, and need for stability and permanency (esp for kids in foster care) * Services continuously evaluated and modified if not meeting desired outcomes			
Most appropriate setting	* Services in child's home and community to extent possible * Services in most integrated setting * If residential appropriate setting * If residential necessary, most integrated and home-like setting	2.5, Y2.4 (plan includes strategies to get youth involved in community activities)	16 (service plan developed in the LRE and if in a more restrictive environment includes strategies to move to a LRE) 19 (service plan includes opportunities for youth to engage in community activities)	* There does not appear to be a direct look at whether child is being served in most integrated setting. The focus is on "LRE," which while related to integration, is different. * Interview does not include questions on LRE. * No inquiry into whether residential program is most integrated and home-like residential program possible

Timeliness	* Children assessed and served promptly		*Measures other than WAFAS address timeliness. Do these other measures look at whether (a) urgent matters are appropriately identified and (b) if identified, get immediate attention?
Services tailored to child and family	* Strength and needs dictate type, mix and intensity of services * Parents and children encouraged and assisted to articulate own strength and needs, goals, and service preferences	1.1, Y1.1 (family/youth given time to talk about strengths beliefs and traditions and for youth, things like and good at; shared with team) 1.2, Y1.2 (explaining wraparound process and family's choices) 1.3, Y1.3 (family/youth given opportunity to tell things have worked in past) 2.1, Y2.1 (family/youth and team created plan describing how team will meet needs) 2.4 (supports/services in plan connected to strengths and abilities of child and family) 2.10 (family makes final decision in designing wraparound plan) 2.11, Y.2.5 (team took time to understand	1 (family and youth's needs/concerns are documented) 3 (examples of strengths, assets, resources and cultural considerations are included for areas of priority need) 7 (service plan specifies family's goals/objectives) 13 (services/supports based on needs, not on availability of services/supports) 16 (services/supports based on strength of youth/family) 25 (evidence that family and/or youth making decisions about direction and method of team)

7

Stability		family's/youth's values and beliefs and plan is in tune with them) Y2.3 (team knows what youth likes and things do well) Y2.8 (youth feels like he and his family gets the help they need) 3.3, Y3.3 (youth involved in activities that builds on strengths)		
	* Plans strive to minimize multiple placements * Plans identify if child at risk of placement disruption and steps to take to minimize/eliminate the risk * Plan anticipate and plan for crisis * In responding to crisis, use all service possible to help child	1.6 (process of identifying what leads to crises/dangerous situations) 2.8, Y2.7 (crisis/safety plan specifies what everyone must do to respond to crises and how to prevent crises) 2.9 (confidence that team can keep child in community in event of crisis) 4.4, Y4.4 (team helped child prepare for major transitions through planning) 4.6, Y4.2 (wraparound has helped the family develop/strengthen relationships that will support them when	20 (transition planning documentation identifies needs, services and supports that will continue to need attention after formal supports discontinued or when transitioning to adult service system) 21 (crisis plan based on comprehensive functional assessment on predicted crises and includes strategies to prevent crises) 22 (crisis plan identifies signs/behaviors of impending crisis and ways to deescalate crises)	* Questions don't examine efforts to minimize multiple placements, minimize placement disruptions * Questions don't examine efforts, in crises, to avoid removal from home and inappropriate use of police/criminal justice system

remain at home, minimize placement disruptions, and avoid inappropriate use of police/crim justice system * Service plans anticipate and appropriately plan for transitions in children's lives, including transitions to new schools and new placements, and transitions to adult services	wraparound finished)	23 (crisis plan includes specific steps to be taken if crisis occurs and assigns responsibilities for steps)

Respect for child and family's cultural heritage	* Services provided in manner that respects cultural traditions and heritage * Services provided in Spanish when that is family's primary language	1.1 (family given time to talk about strengths beliefs and traditions; shared with team) 2.11, Y2.5 (team took time to understand family's/youth's values and beliefs and plan is in tune with them) 3.10, Y3.8 (team uses language the family can understand) [scoring refers to 18 needing to address language barriers for non-English speakers] 3,14, Y3.12 (members show respect for youth and family)	3 (examples of strengths, assets, resources and cultural considerations are included for areas of priority need) 4 (examples of family and youth culture, values and beliefs are included for areas of priority need) 18 (services/supports based on culture of youth/family)	* No inquiry into whether services delivered in Spanish as required
Independence	* Services include support and training to parents to meet child's need * Services include support and training for children in self-management * Plan identify and provide training and support to parents and children to	1.2 (explaining wraparound process and family's choices) 4.3 (wraparound has helped child solve own problems)		* No questions on whether parents are given training and support to meet their child's needs themselves * No questions on whether child is given training and support in self-management (although is question on whether wraparound has helped the child solve his own problems) * No inquiry into supportive services to

	help them participate as partners (including transportation assistance, advance discussions, and help with understanding written materials)	parents and children to help them participate in process
Connection to natural supports	* System identifies and appropriately utilizes natural supports	1.5 (if difficult to get natural supports to attend team meetings, reviewer explores issue) 2.3, Y2.6 (services, supports, and strategies in family's plan) [more informal/natural supports, higher score] 2.5, Y2.4 (plan includes strategies to get youth involved in community activities) 3.4, Y3.4 (team finds ways to increase natural supports) 3.6, Y1.5 (friend or advocate of the family/youth actively participates on team) 3.12, Y3.10 (all team members, including friends, family and natural supports,	5 (documentation of natural supports) 8 (natural support actively involved or ongoing efforts to identify and engage natural supports) 19 (service plan includes opportunities for youth to engage in community activities) 25 (service plan at least partially implemented by natural supports)

participate in meetings) Y3.5 (team helps youth talk with friends and other natural supports when things aren't going right) 4.2, Y4.3 (wraparound has helped child develop friendships with other positive youth) 4.6, Y4.2 (wraparound has helped family develop/strengthen relationships that will support them when wraparound finished) 4.7 (family can succeed on own with help from natural supports)	

The WFI interview questions in the chart with no lettered prefixes are from the Caregiver, Facilitator and Team Member Forms. The questions on these forms are identical. Questions from the youth form contain the prefix Y and then the question number.