

FEDERAL REVIEW WORK PLAN

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE REVIEW

OCTOBER 1, 1998 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 1999

ACTIVITIES	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
Develop, manage and monitor the contract for the Project Director. Develop and finalize the work plan with Social Service and Division Directors.	Doris Walker Jayne Bachman Kaye Thomas
Manage all aspects of the work plan and the review process. Prepare monthly progress reports for all participants.	Project Director
Provide consultation and technical assistance to the Social Service and Division, Project Directors, state and county staff.	Bessie Barnett
Lead the data correction, collection and submission to the Children's Bureau during the preparation and self-assessment period. Monitor corrective action in Fulton and 2 other counties.	Evaluation and Reporting Section (Judy Fuller)
Assist Regional Office in providing training to state and county level stakeholder reviewers. Respond to Staff Training Self Assessment	Training Unit
All consultants to assist staff in reviewing and correcting data for report period. Assigned consultants to work with the 2 on-site review counties during all phases of the review. Monitor corrective action after CWP/PG review.	Consultation and Support Unit
Project Director, Ruth Walker, staff member from each Social Service Unit, Evaluation and Reporting Unit and 3 on-site county representatives	Review Team Division and Social Service Directors

STATE PREPARATION

FOCUS	TIMEFRAAME
State Preparation - This period will be an opportunity for the state to prepare for the self-assessment and the on-site reviews. During this period, Georgia will have an opportunity to correct and submit data, prepare Fulton and the 2 other counties' records/staff/stakeholders, select the 2 additional on-site review counties, select the state and county level reviewers.	December 1 - December 30, 2000 Project Director

ACTIVITIES	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	TIMEFRAAME
Selection of private contractor Project Director to implement, monitor the work plan, the review process and evaluate the state's performance during the review.	Juanita Blount-Clark Doris Walker Bessie Barnett	December 1 TO 12-15, 2000
Selection and notification of state level stakeholders, reviewers and interviewees to assist with self-assessment (Review Team).	Wilfred Hamm Project Director	December 30, 2000
Notify other stakeholders who will be involved in or affected by the review, i.e. judges, foster parents, child advocate, and providers.	Juanita Blount-Clark	
State provides lists of State Review Team who will participate in the Self Assessment to Regional Office.		
Training provided to state level reviewers/interviewees.	Project Director Training Unit Bessie Barnett Ruth Walker	January 5 - 10, 2001

Assessment of state data - Print data for report period and send to each county. Counties make corrections and resubmit to state office by JANUARY 10, 2001. Consultation and support staff to assist counties in correcting data by JANUARY 10, 2001.	Ed Fuller	January 10, 2001
Contact National Resource Center for technology, resubmit state data for report period.		
Assign 2 Evaluation and Reporting staff to lead the Fulton Review Team.	Evaluation and Reporting Section	January 1, 2001 To February 15, 2001
Fulton to select a CPS supervisor and placement supervisor as contact persons to serve on the Fulton Review Team with the Evaluation and Reporting staff. Fulton Team to assure that case files are set up for review based on policy in Chapter 70. Assure that IDS data is accurate. Select 15 random CPS cases and 15 placement cases for review using the federal on-site review protocol.		
Paul Vincent, Linda Bayless and Child Welfare Policy and Practice Group (CWPPG) to assist in conducting the interviews with children, families and stakeholders. CWPPG to submit written findings and corrective action plan to County and Division Director.	Project Director, Bessie Barnett	March 1 - July 1, 2001
Fulton corrective action plans to be implemented from March 1 through July 1, 2001. Fulton Team to monitor progress and submit monthly reports to County Director and Division Director.		

Select 2 additional counties for the on-site reviews based on corrected data. Follow same procedures as for Fulton. Assign 1-2 Evaluation and Reporting staff as team leaders.	Project Director, Bessie Barnett	March 1 - July 1, 2001
CWPPG to review 5 CPS cases and 5 placement cases in each county and develop a corrective action plan. Corrective action plan to be implemented from March 1 through July 1, 2001.		

STATEWIDE SELF ASSESSMENT PHASE ONE

ACTIVITIES	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	TIMEFRAME
Project Director will gather policies, documentation from each unit and the Office of Adoption, i.e. CPS Task Force Report, Foster Care Workload Study, etc.	Project Director	December 30, 2000
Each unit to assign a contact person to work with the Project Director on the Review Team. Note: Units should submit documentation to the Project Director by December 30, 2000.	Unit Managers	
Regional Office transmits date profiles and Statewide assessment form to State for completion	Region 4 Office	January 16, 2001

State begins Self-Assessment - Evaluation and Reporting Section will take the lead on data assessment and complete Safety and Permanency Data and Point-in-time Profile.	Ed Fuller Project Director	January 16 - May 16, 2001
State returns completed statewide assessment to Regional Office for approval. Note: This is due 2 months prior to the On site Review.		May 16, 2001
Regional Office and State determine composition of sample cases.		May 16-2001
State provides listing of CPS cases for selecting sample to Regional Office		May 16, 2001
Regional Office transmits State's listing of CPS cases to Children's Bureau (CB) staff and advises CB staff on location from which sample is to be selected.		May 16, 2001
State Completes identification of state members of Review Team.		
State provides copies of the States policies relevant to the review for inclusion in packages to Review Team Members.		
CB staff selects sample 150 cases from the State's AFCARS data for the period under review and 150 CPS cases from list provided by the State.	Project Director	June 1-15, 2001
Fulton and 2 other counties prepare staff, families and children for review.	Consultants and Evaluation and Reporting staff assigned to counties	

Train county reviewers	Project Director Training Unit Bessie Barnett Ruth Walker	June 15 - July 1, 2001
------------------------	--	------------------------

ACTIVITIES/SYSTEMIC FACTORS	STATE LEAD PERSON (S)	METHOD OF ASSESSING	STAKEHOLDER (S)	TIME/FRA
A. Statewide Information System Capacity 1. Discuss how effectively the State is able to meet the State plan requirement that it operates a Statewide information system that can determine the status, demographics, location, and goals for all children in foster care in the State. In responding, consider the accessibility of this information to State managers and local staff and the usefulness of the information in carrying out the agency's responsibilities.	Ed Fuller Evaluation and Reporting (E & R) Project Director	AFCARS		Jan 16 To N 16, 2001
B. Case Review System 1. How effectively is the State able to meet the requirement that each child in foster care under the State's placement and care responsibility have a written case plan with all the required elements?	Doris Walker Ed Fuller	Evaluation and Reporting Reviews		

2. How effectively is the State able to meet the case review system requirement that parents of children in foster care participate in developing the child's case plan? In responding, consider their participation in activities such as identifying strengths and needs, determining goals, requesting specific services and evaluating progress related to their children.	Doris Walker	Focus Group Surveys	Judges Citizen Panels	
In completing the statewide assessment, States have the option of gathering information through focus groups with stakeholders or consumer groups, surveys, joint planning forums within the State, or otherwise connecting the statewide assessment with ongoing consultation through their Title IV-B planning process.				
3. Citing any data available to the State, discuss how effectively the State is meeting the requirement that the status of each child in foster care be reviewed periodically, i.e., at least every 6 months, by a court or by administrative review.	Doris Walker Ed Fuller	Evaluation and Reporting Reviews		

4. Citing any data available to the State, discuss how the State meets the requirement that permanency hearings for children in foster care occur within prescribed timeframes. Discuss the effectiveness of these hearings in promoting the timely and appropriate achievement of permanency goals for children.	Doris Walker	Focus Group Surveys	Child Placement Project, Council of Juvenile Court/Judges SAAGS	
ACTIVITIES/SYSTEMIC FACTORS	STATE LEAD PERSON (S)	METHOD OF ASSESSING	STAKEHOLDER (S)	TIME/ERA
5. Citing any data available to the State, discuss how the State meets the requirement to provide foster parents, preadoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care with notice of and an opportunity to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child in their care.	Doris Walker Ed Fuller	Focus Group Surveys	AFPAAG	
C. Quality Assurance System	Doris Walker Ed Fuller	Evaluation and Reporting Reviews	CASA's Citizen Panels	
1. Discuss how the State has complied with the requirement at section 471 (a)(22) of the Social Security Act to develop and implement standards to ensure that children in foster care placements are provided quality services that protect their health and safety, and any effects of implementing the standards to date.				

<p>2. Discuss the effectiveness of the agency's quality assurance system in helping to ensure safety, permanency, and well-being for children served by the agency and their families in all jurisdictions of the State. In responding, discuss the jurisdictions in the State covered by the quality assurance procedures, the capacity of the system to evaluate the adequacy and quality of the State's child and family services system, and its capacity to produce information leading to program improvements.</p>	Ed Fuller			
---	-----------	--	--	--

D. Staff and Provider Training

<p>1. Citing any data available to the State on the numbers and timeframes of staff trained, discuss the effectiveness of the State's initial and ongoing training for all child welfare staff employed by the agency that includes the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions.</p>	Sonia Johnson			
--	---------------	--	--	--

<p>2. Citing any data available to the State, discuss the effectiveness of the State's training of current and prospective foster and adoptive families and the staff of State-licensed or approved child care institutions that care for children in the State's care or responsibility that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties.</p>	Liz Bryant Doris Walker Jo Cato Dianne Sacks	Surveys	GAHSC APPAG	
---	---	---------	----------------	--

ACTIVITIES/SYSTEMIC FACTORS	STATE LEAD PERSON (S)	METHOD OF ASSESSING	STAKEHOLDER (S)	TIME/ERA
-----------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-----------------	----------

E. Service Array and Resource Development

<p>1. Discuss how effective the State has been in meeting the Title IV-B State plan requirement to provide services designed to help children safely and appropriately return to families from which they have been removed.</p>	Doris Walker	Surveys	PUP Homestead Providers Family Connection	
--	--------------	---------	--	--

<p>2. Discuss how effective the State has been in meeting the Title IV-B State plan requirement to provide preplacement preventive services designed to help children at risk of foster care placement remain safely with their families.</p>	David Helwig			
---	--------------	--	--	--

<p>3. Discuss how effective the State has been in meeting the Title IV-B State plan requirement to provide services designed to help children be placed for adoption, with a legal guardian, or if adoption or legal guardianship are determined not to be appropriate for a child, in some other planned, permanent living arrangement.</p>	Doris Walker Liz Bryant Velna McCray-Duncan	Surveys	APPAG	
--	---	---------	-------	--

<p>4. Describe the extent to which all the services in items 1-3 above are accessible to families and children on a statewide basis.</p>	Doris Walker Liz Bryant Velna McCray-Duncan	Surveys	APPAG	
--	---	---------	-------	--

1. Agency Responsiveness to Community	Doris Walker Sarah Brownlee	Focus Group	Child First Collaboration Committee/Children's Justice Committee	
1. Discuss how effective the State has been in meeting the requirement to consult and coordinate with external community stakeholders in the development of the State's Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP). In responding, discuss how the concerns of stakeholders are addressed in the agency's planning and operations and their involvement in evaluating and reporting progress on the agency's goals.				
2. Discuss how effective the State has been in meeting the State plan requirement to coordinate its services with the services and benefits of other public and private agencies serving the same general populations of children and families	All Social Service	Surveys	Family Connection Private Providers CASA's	
3. Does the agency have any agreements in place with other public or private agencies or contractors, such as juvenile justice or managed care agencies, to perform Title IV-E or IV-B functions? If so, how are services provided under the agreements or contracts monitored for compliance with State plan requirements or other program requirements and accurate eligibility determinations made, where applicable?	All Social Service	Review Agreements Surveys Reports		
ACTIVITIES/SYSTEMIC FACTORS	STATE LEAD PERSON (S)	METHOD OF ASSESSING	STAKEHOLDER (S)	TIMEFRA

4. Citing any data available, discuss how effective the State has been in meeting State plan requirements for determining whether children are American Indian and ensuring compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act.	NOT APPLICABLE THERE ARE NO RECOGNIZED TRIBES IN GEORGIA	N/A	N/A	N/A
1. Foster and Adoptive Home Licensing, Approval, and Recruitment	Liz Bryant Dianne Sacks Jo Cato	Focus Group ORS Reports	GAHSC AFPAG	
1. Discuss how effective the State has been in meeting the requirement to establish and maintain standards for foster family homes, adoptive homes, and child care institutions in which children served by the agency are placed.				
2. Citing any data available to the State, discuss how effective the State has been in meeting the State plan requirement to ensure that the State's licensure standards are applied equally to all foster and adoptive homes and child care institutions that serve children in the State's care or custody.	All Social Service Project Director	Surveys	GAHSC AFPAG	

3. Citing any licensure or safety data available to the State, discuss how effective the State has been in meeting the State plan requirements to conduct criminal background clearances on prospective foster and adoptive families, including those being licensed or approved by private agencies in the State. How does the State address safety considerations with respect to the staff of child care institutions and foster and adoptive families (if the agency has opted not to conduct criminal background clearances on foster care and adoptive families)?	Dianne Sacks Liz Bryant Jo Cato	Random Sample of Foster/Adoptive Records	GAHSC AFPAG	
4. Citing any data available to the State, discuss how effective the State has been in meeting the State plan requirement to recruit and retain foster and adoptive families that represent the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the State for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed, including the effectiveness of the State's official recruitment plan.	Liz Bryant Ellen Skinner Velma McCray-Duncan			
5. Citing any data available to the State, discuss how effective the State has been in meeting the State plan requirement to recruit and use adoptive families for waiting children across State or other jurisdictional boundaries. In responding, consider relevant agency policies, timeframes for initiating recruitment activities, and specific methods.	Velma McCray-Duncan			
ACTIVITIES/SYSTEMIC FACTORS	STATE LEAD PERSON (S)	METHOD OF ASSESSING	STAKEHOLDER (S)	TIME/ERA

SAFETY AND PERMANENCY DATA	David Hellwig Ed Fuller Project Director			
1. Safety				
Outcome S1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.				
Outcome S2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.				
Based on examination of the safety data elements on the safety data profile in section III, and the State Child and Family Services Plan (State IV-B plan), please respond to the following questions.				
1. Trends in Safety Data. Have there been notable changes in the individual data elements in the safety profile in Section III over the past 3 years in the State? Identify and discuss factors that have affected the changes noted and the effects on the safety of children in the State.	David Hellwig			
2. Child Maltreatment (Safety Data Elements I & II). Examine the data on reports of child maltreatment disposed during the year by disposition of the reports. Identify and discuss issues affecting the rate of substantiated vs. unsubstantiated reports and factors that influence decision-making regarding the disposition of incoming reports.	Ed Fuller			

<p>3. Cases Opened for Services (Safety Data Element III). Compare the cases opened for services following a report of maltreatment to the rates of substantiated reports received. Discuss the issues affecting opening cases following reports of maltreatment and reasons cases are or are not opened.</p>	David Hellwig			
<p>4. Children Entering Foster Care Based on Child Abuse and/or Neglect (C/A/N) Report (Safety Data Element IV). Identify and discuss issues affecting the provision of home-based services to protect children from maltreatment and whether or not there is a relationship between this data element and other issues in the State, such as availability of services to protect children, repeat maltreatment, or changes in the foster care population.</p>	David Hellwig			
<p>5. Child Fatalities (Safety Data Element V). Identify and discuss child protection issues affecting child deaths due to maltreatment in the State and how the State is addressing the issues.</p>	David Hellwig			

<p>6. Recurrence of Maltreatment (Safety Data Element VI). Discuss whether or not the State's recurrence of maltreatment conforms to the national standard for this indicator, the extent to which the State's rate of recurrence of child maltreatment is due to the same general circumstances or same perpetrator, and how the State is addressing repeat maltreatment.</p>	David Hellwig			
<p>7. Incidence of Child Abuse and/or Neglect in Foster Care (Safety Data Element VI). Discuss whether or not the State's incidence of child maltreatment by the foster care provider conforms to the national standard for this indicator. Discuss the ways in which the State is addressing this issue and whether or not there is a need for additional measures to ensure the safety of children who are in foster care or preadoptive placements.</p>	David Hellwig Liz Bryant			
<p>8. Other Safety Issues. Discuss any other issues of concern, not covered above or in the data profiles that affect the safety outcomes for children and families served by the agency.</p>	David Hellwig			

<p>1. Permanency</p> <p>Outcome P1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.</p> <p>Outcome P2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.</p> <p>Based on examination of the foster care data in the two foster care profiles in section III, and the State Child and Family Services Plan (State IV-B plan), please respond to the following questions.</p> <p>1. Trends in Permanency Data. Have there been notable changes in the individual data elements in the two permanency data profiles in section III over the past 3 years in the State? Identify and discuss any factors affecting the changes noted and the effects on permanency for children in foster care in the State.</p>	<p>Doris Walker Ed Fuller Project Director</p>			
<p>ACTIVITIES/SYSTEMIC FACTORS</p>	<p>STATE LEAD PERSON (S)</p>	<p>METHOD OF ASSESSING</p>	<p>STAKEHOLDER (S)</p>	<p>TIMEFRAME</p>

<p>2. Foster Care Population Flow (Point-in-Time Data Element I & Cohort Data Element D). Identify and discuss any issues raised by the data regarding the composition of the State's foster care population, rates of admissions and discharges, and changes in this area. Discuss the State's ability to ensure that the children who enter foster care in the State are only those children whose needs for protection and care cannot be met in their own homes.</p>	<p>David Hellwig, Project Director</p>			
<p>3. Placement Types for Children in Foster Care (Point-in-Time Data Element II or Cohort Data Element II). How well is the State able to ensure that children are placed in the types of placements that are the most family-like and most appropriate for their individual needs, both at the time of initial entry into foster care and throughout their stay in foster care?</p>	<p>Doris Walker Dianne Sacks Ed Fuller</p>			
<p>4. Permanency Goals for Children in Foster Care (Point-in-Time Data Elements III or VIII and Cohort Data Elements III & V). Discuss the extent to which children in care are moving safely into permanent living arrangements on a timely basis and issues affecting the safe, timely achievement of permanency for children in the State.</p>	<p>Doris Walker Liz Bryant Velma McCray-Duncan</p>		<p>SAAG's</p>	

<p>5. Achievement of Reunification (Point-in-Time Data Element IX). Discuss whether the State's data regarding achievement of reunification within 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home conform with the national standards for this indicator. Identify and discuss issues affecting conformity and how the State is addressing the issues.</p>	Doris Walker Ed Fuller	Judges Citizen Panels CASA's	
<p>6. Achievement of Adoption (Point-in-Time Data Element X). Discuss whether the State's data on children exiting foster care to a finalized adoption within less than 24 months from the latest removal from home conform to the national standard for this indicator. Identify and discuss issues affecting the number of children placed for adoption in the State and how the State is addressing the issues.</p>	Velma McCray-Duncan Ed Fuller, Project Director		
<p>7. Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) (Point-in-Time Data Element VI). Discuss the extent to which the State complies with the requirement at section 475 (5)(E) of the act regarding termination of parental rights for children who have been in foster care 15 of the most recent 22 months, for abandoned infants, and for children whose parents have been convicted of the listed felonies. Identify and discuss the issues that affect timely termination of parental rights, where appropriate, including the use of the exceptions to the TPR provisions.</p>	Velma McCray-Duncan Doris Walker Ed Fuller		

ACTIVITIES/SYSTEMIC FACTORS	STATE LEAD PERSON (S)	METHOD OF ASSESSING	STAKEHOLDER (S)	TIME/ERA
<p>8. Stability of Foster Care Placements (Point-in-Time Data Elements IV & XI and Cohort Data Element IV). Using data element XI on the point-in-time permanency profile, discuss whether the percentage of children in the State who have been in foster care less than 12 months and have had more than two placement settings conforms to the national standard for this indicator. Using all three data elements noted above, identify and discuss the reasons for the movement of children in foster care in the State. If there are differences in placement stability for children newly entering the system (cohort data) compared with the total population of children in care (permanency data), identify and discuss those issues.</p>	Doris Walker Ed Fuller			
<p>9. Foster Care Re-Entries (Point-in-Time Data Elements V & XII). Using data element XII, discuss whether the percentage of children who entered foster care during the period under review who had a prior entry into foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode conforms to the national standard for this indicator. Using both data elements, discuss the extent of foster care re-entries for all children in the State's placement and care responsibility, the issues affecting re-entries, and how the State is addressing the issues.</p>	Doris Walker Ed Fuller			

<p>10. Length of Stay in Foster Care (Point-in-Time Data Element VII & Cohort Data Element VI). Using data element VI in the cohort data profile, discuss how length of stay in foster care for first-time foster care entries in the State compares with the national standard for this indicator (although this indicator is not used to determine substantial conformity). Examining the data on length of stay in both profiles, identify and discuss factors affecting length of stay in foster care and how the State is addressing the issues. If there are differences in the length of stay between children newly entering foster care in the State (cohort data) and the total population of children in care (permanency data), identify and discuss the reasons.</p>	Doris Walker Ed Fuller			
<p>11. Other Permanency Issues. Discuss any other issues of concern, not covered above or in the data, that affect the permanency outcomes for children and families served by the agency.</p>				
<p>ACTIVITIES/SYSTEMIC FACTORS</p>	<p>STATE LEAD PERSON (S)</p>	<p>METHOD OF ASSESSING</p>	<p>STAKEHOLDER (S)</p>	<p>TIME/ERA</p>

<p>1. Child and Family Well-Being</p> <p>Outcome WB1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.</p> <p>Outcome WB2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.</p> <p>Outcome WB3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.</p> <p>Based on any data the agency has available, please respond to the following questions.</p>	Review Team All Social Service, Project Director			
<p>1. Frequency of Contact Between Caseworkers and Children and their Families. Examine any data the State has available about the frequency of contacts between caseworkers and the children and families in their caseloads. Identify and discuss issues that affect the frequency of contacts and how the frequency of contacts affects the outcomes for children and families served by the State.</p>	Review Team			
<p>2. Educational Status of Children. Examine any data the State has available regarding the educational status of children in its care and placement responsibility. How does the State ensure that the educational needs of children are identified in assessments and case planning and that those needs are addressed through services?</p>	All Social Service			

<p>3. Health Care for Children. Examine any data the State has available regarding the provision of health care, including Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT), to children in its care and placement responsibility. How does the State ensure that the physical health and medical needs of children are identified in assessments and case planning activities and that those needs are addressed through services?</p>	Review Team All Social Service			
<p>4. Mental Health Care for Children. Examine any data the State has available regarding the mental health needs and status of children in its care and custody. How does the State ensure that the mental health needs of children are identified in assessments and case planning activities and that those needs are addressed through services?</p>	Review Team All Social Service			
<p>4. Other Well-Being Issues: Discuss any other issues of concern, not covered above or in the data, that impact on the well-being outcomes for children and families served by the agency.</p>	All Social Service Review Team			
<p>ACTIVITIES/SYSTEMIC FACTORS</p>	<p>STATE LEAD PERSON (S)</p>	<p>METHOD OF ASSESSING</p>	<p>STAKEHOLDER (S)</p>	<p>TIME/ERA</p>

<p>State Assessment of Strengths and Needs</p> <p>Based on examination of the data in section III and the narrative responses in sections II & IV, the State review team should respond to the following questions.</p>	All Social Service Review Team			
<p>1. What specific strengths of the agency's programs has the team identified?</p>	All Social Service			
<p>2. What specific needs has the team identified that warrant further examination in the onsite review? Note which of these needs are the most critical to the outcomes under safety, permanency, and well-being for children and families in the State.</p>	Review Team			
<p>3. Which three locations, e.g., counties or regions, in the State are most appropriate for examining the strengths and concerns noted above in the onsite review?</p>	All Social Service Review Team			
<p>4. Comment on the statewide assessment process in terms of its usefulness to the State, involvement of the entire review team membership, and recommendations for revision</p>	All Social Service Review Team			
<p>5. List the names and affiliations of the individuals who participated in the development of the statewide assessment (please specify their role).</p>	All Social Service Review Team			

(See State Assessment Instrument Attached)

ON-SITE REVIEWS- PHASE TWO

ACTIVITIES	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	TIMEFRAME
CB staff transmits sample listing to Regional Office.	Children's Bureau	June 1, 2001
Regional Office transmits sample listing to State	Regional Office	June 1 2001
State identifies sample of 30-50 cases from total sample listing of 150 foster care cases and 150 CPS cases listing and begins to set up case specific interviews and stakeholder interviews.	Regional Office	July 1 - 15, 2001
Regional Office completes preliminary assessment based on Statewide Assessment.	Evaluation and Reporting Section Assigned Consultants	
On-site review - Visit and discuss, review with staff/stakeholders, Project Director, Bessie Barnett and County Review Team	Designated CPS Supervisor Placement Supervisor from each county	
State finalizes reviewer schedules that include case reviews, case specific interviews, stakeholder interviews, entrance and exit conferences and other scheduled meetings or activities.		

Conduct on-site reviews in Fulton and 2 other counties.	Project Director County Review Teams	July 16 - 23, 2001
(See Review Instrument and Instructions Attached)	Stakeholders Region 4 Staff	August 16, 2001
30 days following onsite review, Regional Office transmits final report to State	Region 4 Staff	November 16 2001
90 Days following written receipt of notification of nonconformity by State:	Project Director	
State submits completed Program improvement Plan (PIP) to Regional Office		December 16, 2001
Regional Office reviews completed PIP for approval or disapproval	Project Director	
Regional Office notifies State of approval or disapproval of PIP		
30 days following notification of disapproval of PIP by Regional Office:		
State submits revised PIP to Regional Office		