From:	Harvey, Brian
To:	O"Toole, Maggie
Subject:	FW:
Date:	Monday, July 30, 2012 10:25:00 AM
Attachments:	brmh comments - Labrador Service Delivery Model Working Group Discussion Guide Nov 7th 8th revised 2.doc

FYI and TRIM

Brian RM. Harvey
Director, Policy & Planning - Aboriginal Affairs
Intergovernmental & Aboriginal Affairs Secretariat
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
(709) 729-1487 (w)
(709) 693-1612 (c)

From: Harvey, Brian
Sent: 03 November 2011 13:15
To: MacDonald, Sheree P.
Cc: Lundrigan, Wanda; Gover, Aubrey; Dutton, Sean
Subject: RE:

Hi Sheree

I have reviewed and suggest a few changes (tracked in the attached for ease of reference) for your consideration. These suggested changes are not substantive.

I also posed a few questions; I will leave it to your discretion whether the answers would add clarity to the document.

On the whole, I do not have any concerns; the draft Guide is well-prepared and I look forward to next week's meetings.

Best,

Brian

Brian RM. Harvey
Director, Policy & Planning (A) - Aboriginal Affairs
Intergovernmental & Aboriginal Affairs Secretariat
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
(709) 729-1487 (w)

(709) 693-1612 (c)

_____

From: MacDonald, Sheree P.
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 4:54 PM
To: Harvey, Brian
Cc: Lundrigan, Wanda
Subject:

Brian,

We are trying to finalize this draft so I can circulate it late tomorrow or Friday to working group members.any comments welcome

sheree

**CYFS Labrador Service Delivery Model
Working Group**

Identifying Service Delivery Issues in Labrador

Working Group Discussion Guide

Meeting November 7th and 8th, 2011

Table of Contents

Background

The Department of Child, Youth and Family Services is committed to building a revitalized child protection system, and providing more targeted attention to children, youth and their families. The Department is developing a new organizational model to address systemic issues, improve service delivery for children, youth and families and better support frontline staff throughout the province.

The legislative authority for the Department's programs and services is provided by:

☐ *Children and Youth Care and Protection Act;*
☐ *Adoption Act;*
☐ *Child Care Services Act;*
☐ *Youth Criminal Justice Act; and*
☐ *Young Person's Offences Act.*

The Department's key lines of business include:
- Protective Intervention Services
- Youth Services
- Community Youth Corrections
- Adoption Services
- Child Care Services
- Family Resource Centres

The delivery of services in these areas is conducted with the cooperation of numerous individuals and organizations. This includes:
- over 533 foster parents who open their homes to children and youth with 120 in Labrador;
- 27 Family Resource Centres with seven in Labrador (one of these is primarily a Healthy Baby Club)
- John Howard Society which operates two open custody group homes on the island;
- Volunteer Community Boards who operate group homes in various sites throughout the Province, including Nain and Happy Valley-Goose Bay;
- Sheshatshiu Band Council who operate a group home in that community;
- Choices for Youth, an organization which delivers services to youth aged 16 to 18 in the St. John's area;
- 35 Youth Justice Committees for Extra Judicial Sanctions with committees in Labrador West, Happy Valley-Goose Bay and Nain;
- 183 child care centres with nine in Labrador;
- 84 family child care homes with two in Labrador; and
- two approved family child care agencies licensed by the Department to oversee family child care homes on the island.

Two associations provide important input into the Department's policies, programs and services. The Newfoundland and Labrador Foster Families Association represents the

Province's foster parents and provides a voice for their membership, as well as supportive services for foster parents, including training. The Association of Early Childhood Educators – Newfoundland and Labrador represents the men and women who provide care for children in regulated child care and are a critical point of contact between the Department and these professionals.

Aboriginal organizations/governments have been engaged with CYFS on specific policy issues and also work with CYFS offices directly in communities. The Department hopes to strengthen that partnership by seeking input on the development of a service delivery model that is culturally appropriate to meet the needs of Aboriginal children, youth and families.

The need for culturally appropriate policies, programs and service delivery systems for Aboriginal people in Newfoundland and Labrador has been raised on many occasions. In recognition of Labrador's unique circumstances, a Steering Committee comprised of Ministers of the provincial Government and leaders from Innu Nation, the Innu First Nations, Nunatsiavut Government and the NunatuKavut Community Council was formed to ensure that the new structure considers all cultural and geographic aspects of Labrador. The Steering Committee will be supported by a Working Group comprised of individuals representing their members.

The Steering Committee met on November 10, 2010 and identified the following key points for further exploration and consideration by the Working Group:
- A model for Aboriginal service delivery is required to meet the needs of Aboriginal people in Labrador, as many face issues that are distinct from mainstream delivery.
- Need to explore Aboriginal historical customs and practices – in terms of the strengths in Aboriginal families, communities and culture – to find solutions.
- It is important to base the model on listening and learning from experiences as well as Aboriginal evidence-informed practice.
- The extent to which basic needs can be met in communities has an impact on the success of the programs mandated under the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services and the service delivery model being developed.
- The geography of Labrador presents unique challenges for many areas which must be considered in the design.

The Working Group will assist the Department in developing recommendations for a service delivery model that takes into account core issues unique to Child, Youth and Family Services program and service delivery in Labrador and for Aboriginal children, youth and families with the goal of improving accessibility and effectiveness. These recommendations will be referred to the Steering Committee for discussion.

Introduction

The purpose of this Discussion Guide is to help initiate discussion on the issues impacting Child, Youth and Family Services delivery in Labrador and for Aboriginal children, youth and families in Labrador.

The Discussion Guide is intended to be used as a tool to help identify priority service delivery and structural issues. The Guide identifies five issues for consideration and poses several questions on each issue to facilitate **but not limit** discussion. The format is designed to ensure the "problem or issue" is clearly understood by examining the impacts observed on children, families and communities, as well as identifying the possible root causes or why the problem or issue exists. Recognizing that these issues have been assessed previously by others, the discussion document asks participants to identify other relevant sources of information on each topic which the Group may wish to consider. Finally, the document puts forward questions to stimulate ideas for possible solutions.

The results of these discussions will inform recommendations developed by the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services for a service delivery model for Labrador and Aboriginal people, for consideration by the Steering Committee.

ISSUES:

1. RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

Status:

Q What is the current status of this issue?

Recruitment and retention issues vary significantly throughout the Labrador region. Assessment of vacancies (See Appendix 1) in Labrador's regional directors, program managers, social workers, social worker assistants, community service workers, behavioral management specialists and clerical positions over the period of January 2008 - December 2010, identifies that Sheshatshiu and the North Coast of Labrador have experienced significant challenges in recruiting and retaining workers.

Impacts:

Q How does current staffing retention impact service delivery in Labrador and to Aboriginal children, youth and families?

Root Causes:

Q What are some of the barriers to recruitment and retention? What are the top three?
Q What research, information sources or key contacts should be pursued to inform the Working Group further on this issue?

Possible Solutions:

Q What are the priority strategies for recruitment?
Q What are the priority strategies for retention?

2. ORGANIZATION OF CYFS SERVICES

Status:

Q What is the current status of this issue?

As the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services develops a new CYFS service delivery structure for Labrador, staffing models that support effective and culturally relevant CYFS service delivery to Aboriginal children, youth and families in the diverse settings throughout Labrador are imperative. Currently the model includes a Director in Region with authority under the various Acts mandated to this department, for the Innu Communities and one for the remainder of Labrador. The new model will have three Zone Managers with this authority: one for the Innu Zone, one for the Inuit Zone and one for the rest of Labrador. Labrador will also be a dedicated region with the Northern

Peninsula going to the Western Region. The current model also includes a mix of social workers, social worker assistants, community service workers and behaviour management specialists to deliver front-line services.

Specific training on Aboriginal culture and issues is limited. In September 2008, through a partnership between the Labrador-Grenfell RHA, St. Thomas University of New Brunswick, the Nunatsiavut Government and the Department of Health and Community Services, the first courses in the Labrador Bachelor of Social Work Post Degree Program (LBSW) were offered. The Nunatsiavut Government also revised the PRIDE program to make it culturally relevant and the Department piloted this new program in Hopedale in June 2011, and another session is planned this year. Under the Department's Early Learning and Child Care (ELCC) Plan, CYFS is exploring a number of projects with Aboriginal and community organizations and the Nunatsiavut Government to increase child care space appropriate to the needs of communities.

The distribution of workers is identified in Appendix 1. Caseload distribution is shown in Appendix 2 and indicates significant inequities with caseloads from two to 107. Some of the current positions are shared with the health sector to perform work in both CYFS and FRS. This will not be the case when the Labrador region transfers to the new department.

Impacts:

Q What are the specific impacts on service delivery from the current level of training specific to Aboriginal culture and issues?
Q What impacts are the Community Support Worker positions having on service?
Q What are the positive or negative results of the current locations of CYFS offices?
Q What do the caseload numbers indicate?

Root Causes:

Q What research, information sources or key contacts should be pursued to inform the Working Group further on this issue?

Possible Solutions:

Q What is the appropriate mix and types of positions to deliver this service on the front-line?
Q What type of training should be provided to professionals delivering services to Aboriginal peoples and communities in Labrador?
Q. What supervisory, technical and administrative supports are required for the front line?
Q Where should all levels of program staff be located to provide the most effective services to both high and low volume caseloads?
Q How should CYFS services work in partnership with Aboriginal organizations and communities? What are the specific processes which should be put in place?

3. DATA COLLECTION AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Status:

Q What is the current status of this issue?

The June 23, 2010 Canadian Council of Provincial Child and Youth Advocates position paper *Aboriginal Children and Youth in Canada: Canada Must Do Better,* recommended a national data management system reporting Aboriginal child welfare outcomes. While data is currently available by community for both the Innu and Inuit Zones, information is specific to the community and does not identify Aboriginal children either within these communities or in other areas of the province. Also the information in the Client Referral Management System (CRMS) is often not complete making tabulation more difficult.

Identifying indicators that can be tracked to assess outcomes is a challenge for CYFS in this province and across Canada, particularly in the area of child protection. Provincial departments responsible for child protection throughout the country are partnering on a project to identify indicators. The department will use this information to inform the development of outcomes specific to its intervention with children and youth.

As a first phrase in monitoring outcomes, the Department has identified a series of indicators to track whether CYFS is meeting its legislative and policy requirements (See Appendix III). One of these requirements is ensuring a plan is in place for the child or youth. The department is also tracking placement information for Labrador (also included in Appendix III).

Complete and reliable data is required to understand the true scope of the issues and possible solutions as well as outcomes.

Impacts:

Q How important is this type of data?

Root Causes:

Q How is the data on Aboriginal children, youth and families currently collected, interpreted, reported and used?
Q How and for what purposes is data shared between agencies?
Q What research, information sources or key contacts should be pursued to inform the Working Group further on this issue?

Possible Solutions:

Q How can data collection, management and sharing be improved to assist with the development and delivery of the services under the mandate of the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services for Labrador and Aboriginal people?
Q What are the key outcome indicators CYFS needs to track related to its interventions in addition to those attached in Appendix III related to requirements?
Q Would it be beneficial for communities or Aboriginal governments / organizations to also set outcome indicators for children generally that they could plan and measure their own intervention against?

4. POLICY ISSUES

Status:

Q What is the current status of this issue?

There are specific minimum standards (reflected in policy and procedures) that are required for programs administered by the Department. These may be based on clinical best practice, legislative requirements and/or government's framework for human resources, financial and records management. Within this context the challenge is to find where flexibility is possible to ensure program objectives can be achieved without lowering the standard or creating inequities in system delivery. This requires a clear understanding of what the standards are and why they are in place, as well as an understanding of community norms in order to identify ways to make services culturally reflective as well as responsive to the current realities in specific communities.

Impacts:

Q What are some of the key policies or procedures impacting the success of service delivery for Aboriginal children, youth, families and communities? What are the top three?

Root Causes:
Q What is the rationale for these policies or procedures?
Q What community norms, cultural aspects and historical customs and practices need to be considered in respect of these policies or procedures?
Q What research, information sources or key contacts should be pursued to inform the Working Group further on this issue?

Possible Solutions:

Q Where might variation, flexibility or a different approach be needed and possible?

5. SERVICE COORDINATION

Status:

Q What is the current status of this issue?

In order to improve the service delivery capacity of CYFS, the availability, gaps and cross-over of critical priority services and programming provided by other Provincial Government and Aboriginal governments / organizations which affect CYFS outcomes must be considered. Key areas include housing and medical services, such as mental health and addictions counseling, as well as strategies/programs to facilitate community healing and strengthen Aboriginal traditions and knowledge.

Impacts:

Q What are the impacts to CYFS objectives in terms of the availability, gaps or cross-overs of these service areas? Are there other critical priority services impacting CYFS results?

Root Causes:

Q Who has primary responsibility for these services and what strategies are in place to address gaps in these areas?
Q What research information sources or key contacts should be pursued to inform the working Group further on this issue?

Possible Solutions:

Q What role should CYFS play, or actions can it take, in respect to these gaps or cross-overs?

Appendix 1: Staffing Information

Zone K (*) (& Present Office)	Catchment Communities	Position	# of FTEs	Monthly Occupancy by FTEs	% Occupancy over 3 Years	Comments
*Cartwright		Social Worker	1	36/36	100%	No Turnover (N/T)
*Forteau	L'Anse Au Clair Buckle's Point L'Anse Amour English Point Fox Cove L'Anse Au Loup Capstan Island West St. Modeste Pinware Red Bay	Social Worker	1	36/36	100%	N/T
*Happy Valley-Goose Bay District Office	North West River, Mud Lake, *Cartwright & *Black Tickle	Manager (Clinical & Administrative)	2	36/36	100%	N/T
		Social Worker	9	>9 FTEs-27 mo. (up to13FTEs/mo.) =9 FTEs- 6 mo. <9FTEs-3 mo. 33/36 months: 4 vacancies affected 3 months	At or above 100% for 92% of timeframe	At or above 9 FTEs for 27 months
		Social Worker Assistant	2	=2 FTEs-29 mo. =1 FTE-7 months	100% for 81% of timeframe	
		Family Intervention Worker	1	=1 FTE-13 mo. 13/14 months position filled	100% for 93% of timeframe	New Position Nov. 2009
		WPEO 1	1	36/36	100%	
*Happy Valley-Goose Bay Regional Office		Regional Director (Protective Intervention, Youth Services and Adoptions)	1	36/36	100%	N/T
		Social Worker	4	=4 FTEs-19 mo. =3FTEs-6 mo. =2FTEs-11 mo.	At 100% for 53% of timeframe	December 2010: 4FTEs
		Clinical Psychologist	1			N/T
		C/BMS	2	=2 FTEs-36mo.	100%	
		Clerk IV	1	=1 FTE-35 mo.	98%	
		File Disclosure Clerk	1	=1FTE-18 mo. 18/18 months filled	100%	New Position July 2009
Labrador Health Centre		Child Care Services Social Worker	2			1 position is Capacity Social Worker
Port Hope Simpson	Lodge Bay *Mary's Harbour	Social Worker	1	=1 FTE-32/32 mo. in Mary's Harbour =1 FTE-4/4 mo. in	100% in two towns	No SW in MH. SW position moved to PHS

*Mary's Harbour	St. Lewis William's Harbour Charlottetown Pinsent's Arm Norman Bay			Port Hope Simpson		Sept. 2010; Mary's Harbour shown as office location by Dept. of CYFS
*Wabush	Labrador City Churchill Falls	Regional Director (Community Youth Corrections, Community Agencies and Child Care Services)	1	36/36	100%	N/T
		Manager- (Clinical & Administrative)	2	36/36	100%	N/T
		Social Worker	3	=3 FTEs-33 months =2FTEs-3 months 1 vacancy affecting 3 months	At 100% occupancy for 92% of timeframe	
		Family Intervention Worker	1	=1 FTE months 11/12 months position filled	At 100% for 92% of timeframe	New Position Jan. 2010
		WPEO 1		=1 FTE-36 mo.	100%	N/T

Zone L Office "Innu Zone"	Catchment Communities	Position	# of FTEs	Monthly Occupancy by FTEs	% Occupancy over 3 Years	Comments
Natuashish		Social Worker	2	=2FTEs-0 mo. =1FTE-30 mo. =0FTE-6 mo.	50% FTE occupancy for 83% of timeframe ; 0% capacity for 17% of the timeframe	SSS managers supervise NSH staff; All SSS staff & resources support NSH
		Community Service Worker	4			Problem with L-GH data-wating for L-GH reply
Sheshatshiu		Regional Director-Innu Zone (Protective Intervention & Youth Services)	1	36/36	100%	
		Manager (Clinical & Administrative)	2	34/36	1FTE vacant for 2 months	Both FTEs do not have original staff
		Social Worker	6	>6FTEs-4 mo (7FTEs/mo.) <6FTEs-18 mo.: =5FTEs-9 mo. =4FTEs-8 mo. =3FTEs-1 mo.	50% of timeframe at less than full occupancy	FTEs include 1 dedicated YC SW for SSS/NSH; 3 steady SW staff from Jan/08-Sep/10; 18 months show vacancies

		Position	# of FTEs	Monthly Occupancy by FTEs	% Occupancy over 3 Years	Comments
				=6FTEs-14 mo.		
		Community Service Worker	4	=4FTEs-18 mo. >4FTEs-14 mo. =3FTEs-4 mo.	89% of time at or above FTE capacity	Includes Family Intervention Worker? Staff must speak Innu Aimun & English ; write in English
		Information Administrator	1	36/36	100%	N/T; Unique position
		Clerk IV	1	36/36	100%	Functions as FAO for both SSS & NSH
		Clerk 1	1	29/36	81% occupancy over 36 months High turnover	4 persons in position since 2008; Staff must speak Innu Aimun & English; write in English

Zone M (*) Office	Catchment Communities	Position	# of FTEs	Monthly Occupancy by FTEs	% Occupancy over 3 Years	Comments
*Hopedale		Manager (Clinical)	1	2/2	Manager (3rd FTE since position began) started position in October 2010	Manager resides in Hopedale.; Responsible for all offices & communities in Zone M
		Social Worker	2	=2FTEs-27mo. =1FTE-7 mo. =0FTE-2 mo.	2FTEs 75% of timeframe at 100% occupancy	
		Community Service Worker	2	=2FTEs-21 mo. =1FTE-15mo.	58% of timeframe	1CSW since Jan. 2008; one since June 2009; 3 CSWs Oct-Dec. 2010
*Nain		Manager (Administrative)	1	36/36	100%	Manager resides in Nain; Responsible for all offices & communities in Zone M.; Former District Manager
		Social Worker	3			Problem with L-GH data-wating for L-GH reply
		Social Worker Assistant	1	=1FTE-26mo.	72% of timeframe	Vacant March-December 2010
		Community Service Worker	2	=2FTE-36 mo.	100%	Same staff since January 2008
		WPEO1	1	36/36	100%	March-Dec/10 2 FTEs in position
*Makkovik	Postville & Rigolet	Social Worker	1	=0FTE-30 mo. =1FTE-6 mo.	0% capacity for 83% of the timeframe	1 CSW received RSW status April 2011
		Community Service Worker	2	=2FTEs-33mo. =1FTE-3mo.	92% of timeframe	Same two CSWs since March 2008

(Remote)		Manager (Clinical)	1	Vacant one month: Nov. 2009	#1 FTE: 22 mo. #2 FTE: 10 mo. #3 FTE: 3 mo.	FTE filled twice; neither resided in Labrador; #3 FTE Manager now living in Hopedale

Appendix II: Labrador Case Count

Data was extracted from CRMS on November 1, 2010 and the work count process
was completed on May 18, 2011. Therefore, the data is accurate for approximately
May 11, 2011

Complete Working – Includes all Intakes on Active & all Adoptions

Status	Total
Active	949
Closed	197
Not Active Needs Review (NANR)	53
Transferred	2
Grand Total	*1201*

> ➤ All files that were reported closed (with CRMS close date) and transferred files
>   were removed from further analysis.
> ➤ All intake on active PIP and FSP were removed from further analysis
> ➤ All inactive adoptions, either Approved or Reserve, were removed from further
>   analysis

All further Analysis on a total of 1002 Active and NANR files

Social Workers or Community Service Workers with Active Files

Position	Total Files	District	Workers Current Status
SW II	6	Cartwright	active
SW II	11	Forteau	active
SW I	11	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	active
SW I	37	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	active
SW I	1	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	active
SW I	6	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	active
SW I	15	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	active
SW I	15	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	Mat Leave - March
SW I	22	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	active
SW I	17	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	active
SW I	19	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	active
SW I	13	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	active
SW I	7	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	active
SW I	20	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	active
CSW	1	Hopedale	active ???Intake maybe
CSW	6	Hopedale	active
SW II	32	Hopedale	active
CSW	1	Makkovik	active - ??? Intake maybe
N/A	15	Happy Valley-Goose Bay	left CYFS
SW II	41	Hopedale	left CYFS - vacant
SW II	42	Makkovik	left CYFS
CSW	12	Nain	active
SW II	32	Nain	active
SW II	43	Nain	active
PM - SW	2	Nain	active
SW II	13	Nain	active
SW II	95	Natuashish	active
SW II	6	Port Hope Simpson	active
SW II	107	Sheshatshiu	active
SW II	72	Sheshatshiu	active
SW II	8	Sheshatshiu	active
PM - SW	27	Sheshatshiu	active
SW II	89	Sheshatshiu	active
SW II	1	Sheshatshiu	Left CYFS
SW II	64	Sheshatshiu	active
SW II	1	Sheshatshiu	??? - Intake maybe
SW I	31	Wabush	Mat Leave - Dec 2010
SW I	23	Wabush	active
SW I	38	Wabush	active

Labrador – Districts

District	Active	Not Active Needs Review	Total
Cartwright	6		6
Forteau	11		11
Happy Valley-Goose Bay	190	8	198
Hopedale	76	4	80
Makkovik	43		43
Nain	98	4	102
Port Hope Simpson	6		6
Sheshatshiu	429	35	464
Wabush	90	2	92
Grand Total	*949*	*53*	*1002*

Labrador – Services

Service	Active	Not Active Needs Review	Total
Adoptions - Caregiver Program	1		1
Adoptions - Intercountry Program	1		1
Adoptions - Regular Program	5		5
Adoptions Subsidy Program	24		24
Caregiver Home Administration Program	142	3	145
Child Welfare Allowance Program	52		52
Community Corrections	39	3	42
Extrajudicial Sanctions	1		1
Family Services Program	33	1	34
Group Administration	14		14
In Care/Custody Program	176	5	181
Intake	23		23
Protective Intervention Program	409	40	449
Youth Services - Non-Residential Program	2		2
Youth Services - Residential Program	27	1	28
Grand Total	*949*	*53*	*1002*

Cartwright

Services	Active		Not Active Needs Review		Grand Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Adoptions - Regular Program	1	16.7%			1	16.7%
Caregiver Home Administration Program	1	16.7%			1	16.7%
Child Welfare Allowance Program	1	16.7%			1	16.7%
Community Corrections	1	16.7%			1	16.7%
In Care/Custody Program	1	16.7%			1	16.7%
Protective Intervention Program	1	16.7%			1	16.7%
Total	*6*	*100.0%*			*6*	*100.0%*

Forteau

Services	Active		Not Active Needs Review		Grand Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Caregiver Home Administration Program	4	36.4%			4	36.4%
Family Services Program	2	18.2%			2	18.2%
In Care/Custody Program	5	45.5%			5	45.5%
Total	*11*	*100.0%*			*11*	*100.0%*

Happy Valley – Goose Bay

Services	Active		Not Active Needs Review		Grand Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Adoptions - Intercountry Program	1	0.5%			1	0.5%
Adoptions - Regular Program	2	1.0%			2	1.0%
Adoptions Subsidy Program	12	6.1%			12	6.1%
Caregiver Home Administration Program	34	17.2%			34	17.2%
Child Welfare Allowance Program	3	1.5%			3	1.5%
Community Corrections	8	4.0%	1	0.5%	9	4.5%
Family Services Program	9	4.5%			9	4.5%
Group Administration	9	4.5%			9	4.5%
In Care/Custody Program	34	17.2%	2	1.0%	36	18.2%

Services	Active #	Active %	Not Active Needs Review #	Not Active Needs Review %	Grand Total #	Grand Total %
Intake	3	1.5%			3	1.5%
Protective Intervention Program	65	32.8%	4	2.0%	69	34.8%
Youth Services - Residential Program	10	5.1%	1	0.5%	11	5.6%
Total	*190*	*96.0%*	*8*	*4.0%*	*198*	*100.0%*

Hopedale

Services	Active		Not Active Needs Review		Grand Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Adoptions - Caregiver Program	1	1.3%			1	1.3%
Adoptions Subsidy Program	4	5.0%			4	5.0%
Caregiver Home Administration Program	15	18.8%	3	3.8%	18	22.5%
Community Corrections	7	8.8%			7	8.8%
Family Services Program	2	2.5%			2	2.5%
In Care/Custody Program	16	20.0%	1	1.3%	17	21.3%
Intake	3	3.8%			3	3.8%
Protective Intervention Program	26	32.5%			26	32.5%
Youth Services - Non-Residential Program	1	1.3%			1	1.3%
Youth Services - Residential Program	1	1.3%			1	1.3%
Total	*76*	*95.0%*	*4*	*5.0%*	*80*	*100.0%*

Makkovik

Services	Active		Not Active Needs Review		Grand Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Caregiver Home Administration Program	9	20.9%			9	20.9%
Child Welfare Allowance Program	4	9.3%			4	9.3%
Family Services Program	2	4.7%			2	4.7%
In Care/Custody Program	7	16.3%			7	16.3%
Protective Intervention Program	18	41.9%			18	41.9%
Youth Services - Non-Residential Program	1	2.3%			1	2.3%
Youth Services - Residential Program	2	4.7%			2	4.7%
Total	*43*	*100.0%*			*43*	*100.0%*

Nain

Services	Active		Not Active Needs Review		Grand Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Adoptions Subsidy Program	1	1.0%			1	1.0%
Caregiver Home Administration Program	4	3.9%			4	3.9%
Child Welfare Allowance Program	3	2.9%			3	2.9%
Community Corrections	4	3.9%			4	3.9%
Family Services Program	6	5.9%			6	5.9%
Group Administration	3	2.9%			3	2.9%
In Care/Custody Program	20	19.6%			20	19.6%
Intake	5	4.9%			5	4.9%
Protective Intervention Program	46	45.1%	4	3.9%	50	49.0%
Youth Services - Residential Program	6	5.9%			6	5.9%
Total	*98*	*96.1%*	*4*	*3.9%*	*102*	*100.0%*

Port Hope Simpson

Services	Active		Not Active Needs Review		Grand Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Adoptions - Regular Program	1	16.7%			1	16.7%
Family Services Program	1	16.7%			1	16.7%
Protective Intervention Program	4	66.7%			4	66.7%
Total	*6*	*100.0%*			*6*	*100.0%*

Sheshatshiu & Natuashish

Services	Active		Not Active Needs Review		Grand Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Caregiver Home Administration Program	71	15.3%			71	15.3%
Child Welfare Allowance Program	46	9.9%			46	9.9%
Community Corrections	6	1.3%	2	0.4%	8	1.7%
Family Services Program	10	2.2%	1	0.2%	11	2.4%
In Care/Custody Program	90	19.4%			90	19.4%
Intake	2	0.4%			2	0.4%
Protective Intervention Program	196	42.2%	32	6.9%	228	49.1%

Youth Services - Residential Program	8	1.7%			8	1.7%
Total	*429*	*92.5%*	*35*	*7.5%*	*464*	*100.0%*

Wabush

Services	Active		Not Active Needs Review		Grand Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Adoptions - Regular Program	1	1.1%			1	1.1%
Adoptions Subsidy Program	7	7.6%			7	7.6%
Caregiver Home Administration Program	4	4.3%			4	4.3%
Child Welfare Allowance Program	2	2.2%			2	2.2%
Community Corrections	6	6.5%			6	6.5%
Extrajudicial Sanctions	1	1.1%			1	1.1%
Family Services Program	1	1.1%			1	1.1%
Group Administration	2	2.2%			2	2.2%
In Care/Custody Program	3	3.3%	2	2.2%	5	5.4%
Intake	10	10.9%			10	10.9%
Protective Intervention Program	53	57.6%			53	57.6%
Total	*90*	*97.8%*	*2*	*2.2%*	*92*	*100.0%*

Aboriginal Children in Care - NL

Provincial Overview: Children in Care
- July 2011 there were 734 children in care in NL
- 31% of these children in care in NL are Aboriginal

Labrador-Grenfell: Regional Overview
- 250 children in care in Labrador/Grenfell Region and 231 are Aboriginal.
- 92% of the total number of children in care are Aboriginal
- 65% of Aboriginal children reside in their community
- 35% of Aboriginal children reside outside their community

Labrador Grenfell (All areas except Innu Zone)
- **1**21 children in care: 102 children (85%) are Aboriginal
- 59 Aboriginal children in care (58%) are living in their community (10 in Hopedale, 18 Nain, 5 Makkovik, 26 HVGB)
- 43 Aboriginal children (42%) reside outside their community (3 in OPP, 29 Roddicton, 2 HVGB, 5 North West River, 1 Nain, 2 Postville, 1 Cartwright)
- Placement Resources:
    - 106 Foster Homes: 79 regular and 27 relative/significant other
    - 2 Group Homes: Nain and HVGB
    - 1 Emergency Placement Unit (EPU): HVGB
    - 1 Individualized Living Arrangement (ILA): HVGB

Community Profiles for this part of the region:
- **Hopedale**
    - 20 Aboriginal children in care
        - 10 placed in Hopedale
        - 10 placed outside community
            - 1 in an OPP
            - 1 in Nain
            - 1 in HVGB
            - 7 living in Roddicton

- Resources: 13 Foster homes:10 regular and 3 significant other
  - **Nain**
    - 37 Aboriginal children in care
      - 18 placed in Nain
      - 19 placed outside community
        - 18 in Roddicton
        - 1 in OPP
    - Resources: 12 Foster Homes: 7 regular and 5 significant other and 1 Group Home

  - **Makkovik**
    - 8 Aboriginal children in care
      - 5 placed in Makkovik
      - 3 outside community
        - 1 in HVGB
        - 2 in Postville
    - Resources: 10 foster homes: 5 regular and 5 significant other
  - **HVGB**
    - 37 Aboriginal children in care
      - 26 residing in community (where parents reside)
      - 11 residing outside their community
        - 1 in OPP
        - 5 North West river
        - 1 Cartwright
        - 4 in Roddicton
    - Resources:
      - 26 Foster Homes: 20 regular and 6 significant other
      - 1 group Home
      - 1 Emergency Placement Unit (EPU)
      - 1 Individualized Living Arrangement (ILA)

<u>Innu Zone</u>

- The Innu zone has 129 children in care and custody: all of whom are Innu

- 90 children (70%)are placed in Sheshatshiu & Natuashish
- 39 children (30%) are placed outside their community
    - 11children are placed in 7 homes in HVGB and 2 are placed in the home in NWR
    - 25 are in OPP placements (22 in Ont. , 2 in Alberta and 1 in Saskatchewan)
    - 3 children are in long term stable placements on the island

- Placement Resources: 51 relative/significant other foster homes: 14 in Natuashish and 37 in Sheshatshiu and 1 group home in Sheshatshiu.

Appendix III: Key Indicators

The following tables outline those indicators for each program area that shall be monitored as part of the Department's inaugural Quality Assurance Framework. It is important to note that these indicators are divided into two phases – *1) Immediate* – which includes those indicators where monitoring and reporting processes shall commence during the first six months immediately following the regions transition to the Department; *2) Short Term Priority* – which includes those indicators where the Quality Assurance Division shall work in consultation with Program Directors to identify and develop measurement tools and reporting processes during the Winter of 2012 with implementation to occur prior to the end of this fiscal year for regions that have already transitioned and during the 2012-13 fiscal year for those regions that are not currently transitioned.

Immediate - All Programs*			
Program Report/ Indicator	**Information**	**Time Interval**	**Process/Responsibility**
Caseload Management Statistics (CLMS) Report (Appendix B) *Protective Intervention, In Care, Child Welfare Allowance, Caregiver Homes, Community Youth Corrections and Adoptions*	• All active files need to be assigned to active workers. • Coverage must be arranged for all cases during periods of leave. • Demographic information is complete and accurate for each file assigned: client's name, CRMS ID, address, program (service) type and start date, file number involvement roles and custody status (type and effective date).	Monthly; first of each month	• Frontline social workers shall run CLMS report for their current caseload and bring this report to clinical supervision meetings. • Supervisors must ensure all cases are reassigned during periods of leave. Supervisors will run CLMS on a monthly basis and have staff sign off on case assignment. CLMS will be discussed at each supervisory session. • Quality Assurance Division shall on a quarterly basis run CLMS reports at the regional level and compare against current staff complement and team structures. Report to be provided to Regional Director and updates to CYFS Executive. Regional Director will develop plans to address variances
Clinical Supervision Monitoring Form (Appendix C)	• Assist frontline supervisors to track supervisory sessions with staff and progress of files.	Commence October; use at each supervisory session	• It is the expectation that all CYFS supervisors will utilize same in clinical consultation with staff.
Immediate - Community Youth Corrections			
Program Report/ Indicator	**Information**	**Time Interval**	**Process/Responsibility**
Month End Community	• Provides caseload	Monthly: first	• Frontline social workers shall complete

Corrections Caseload Report (Appendix D)	performance information for Community Youth Corrections.	of each month	this report and forward information to supervisor & zone manager. Regional Director to forward to Quality Assurance Division

Immediate - Child Care Services			
Program Report/ Indicator	**Information**	**Time Interval**	**Process/Responsibility**
Month End Child Care Centre and Family Child Care Home Form (Appendix E)	• Monthly/Annual inspections • Compliance with licensing requirements. • Number of centres, family homes. • Violations	Monthly: first of each month	• Data is collected regionally by Child Care Services Social Worker / Consultant and forwarded to Quality Assurance Division via Regional Director.

Immediate – Family Resource Centres			
Program Report/ Indicator	**Information**	**Time Interval**	**Process/Responsibility**
Month End Family Resource Centre Reporting Form (Appendix F)	• Number of FRP's • Contribution agreements, quarterly cash flow and annual reports.	Monthly: first of each month	• Data is collected regionally and forwarded to Regional director who will forward to Provincial office.

Immediate – Protective Intervention Program and In Care			
Program Report/ Indicator	**Information**	**Time Interval**	**Process/Responsibility**
Completion of Risk Assessment Instruments (RAI), Family Centred Action Plans (FCAP) and other risk management requirements such as safety assessment, assessment investigation summaries and referral verifications (Appendix G)	• Report will track the presence of noted indicators on worker's caseload.	Monthly: first of each month	• Quality Assurance staff will provide the data from report to the Regional Director who will disseminate to management group for follow up with their frontline staff. • It is the expectation that this report in conjunction with the CLMS will be the basis of regular supervisory sessions with staff.
Month End Foster Home Reporting Form (Appendix H)	• Report will track the process from application to approval	Monthly: first of each month	• Frontline social workers shall complete this report and forward information to supervisor and zone manager. Regional Director to forward to Quality Assurance Division
Immediate – Adoptions			
Program Report/ Indicator	**Information**	**Time Interval**	**Process/Responsibility**
Month End Adoptions Reporting Form (Appendix I)	• Data will be collected regarding: applications received requests for processing, number closed or on hold, pre-assessments completed and number of PRIDE starts and completions. • Number in progress, completed, placed and finalized.	Monthly: first of each month	• Frontline social workers shall complete this report and forward information to supervisor and zone manager. Regional Director to forward to Quality Assurance Division

Priority Monitoring Processes for Development (Winter 2012)

Report/Indicator/Program	Current Availability	Proposed Implementation Date
Adoptions		
Children identified for adoption data collection (children available, presented, accepted, declined)	This report must be developed by the Quality Division in consultation with Adoptions program.	January 2012
Caregiver Home Program and the In Care Program		
Continuous Custody Reporting Form (will contain date child first entered care, CRMS ID, age, date of order, monthly visits, date of last plan of care/progress report, permanent plan)	This report must be developed by the Quality Division in consultation with In Care program.	January 2012
The current number and type of foster home as well as demographics The number of emergency approvals	This report must be developed by the Quality Division in consultation with In Care program.	January 2012
Caregiver Home Program, In Care Program		
Report of monthly visits, annual reviews and competed social medical histories	This report must be developed by the Quality Division in consultation with Adoptions and In Care program.	March 2012
Number, Age, and Custody Status of children in care	Report developed in CRMS however it is not currently available for use. Dependent on accuracy of CLMS report.	March 2012
Community Youth Corrections		
Discharge Planning	This must be developed by the Quality Division in consultation with Community Corrections	March 2012
Protective Intervention, In Care		
The number of youth who enter the Youth Services program by transitioning from the In Care program and those that enter from the Protective Intervention Program	This report must be developed by the Quality Division in consultation with In Care and Caregiver Home program representatives.	March 2012
Adoptions and In Care Program		
Pre and Post Placement reports completed for Children in Care and Adopted Children	This report must be developed by the Quality Division in consultation with Adoptions, In Care and Caregiver Home program representatives.	March 2012