

*Prevention*

<i>AS IS</i>	<i>CHILD FIRST</i>
<p><i>Lack of adequate and accurate assessment of child well-being</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Current assessments do not consider intergenerational poverty, trauma, and addiction</i></li> <li>• <i>System is not designed to identify and address resource needs</i></li> <li>• <i>Specialization is needed to accurately assess needs</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Lack of resources</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Mental health</i></li> <li>• <i>Substance abuse</i></li> <li>• <i>Physical health</i></li> <li>• <i>Childcare and respite care</i></li> <li>• <i>Education supports; i.e., tutoring, school supplies, post-secondary</i></li> <li>• <i>Housing</i></li> <li>• <i>Food</i></li> <li>• <i>Employment</i></li> <li>• <i>Financial services and literacy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Government benefits enrollment</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Achieving a child's well-being in the family is the goal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Assessing how we might maintain child well-being in the family environment</i></li> </ul> <p>Immediate, ongoing access to supportive services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Wraparound, respite, SNAP, etc., so we can easily identify if a child can remain in their home (i.e., if children are still unfed)</i></li> <li>• <i>Community and network support</i></li> </ul>
<p><i>Lack of support for parenting skills development</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No parental advocacy</i></li> <li>• <i>Parents are not ready or able to be parents, no solutions to support them</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Individual versus intergenerational issues, poverty, trauma</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Parents not motivated or wanting to be parents</i></li> </ul>	<p>Expectations and standards for parents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Parental engagement: parent classes, clear standards to meet</i></li> <li>• <i>Frequent check-ins and assessment and reassessment</i></li> <li>• <i>Parents achieving standards of care for their child(ren)</i></li> </ul>
<p><i>Lack of an integrated, inclusive approach to prevention</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No cross-partner or agency collaboration for all agencies involved in the family and child's life (school, doctor, etc.)</i></li> <li>• <i>The approach is punitive, adversarial</i></li> <li>• <i>Lack of cultural competence, inclusion</i></li> </ul>	<p>Team approach to decision making focused on child well-being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Start of the Child Well-Being Team as subsequently described</i></li> <li>• <i>Child welfare is responsible for assessing and monitoring a child's well-being</i></li> </ul>

*In Care*

<i>AS IS</i>	<i>CHILD FIRST</i>
<p><i>Reunification is the goal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Lack of measurement of child well-being and progress</i></li> <li>• <i>Well-being of caregiver and youth not addressed</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Lack of normalcy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Isolation of youth and caregivers</i></li> <li>• <i>Lack of peer networks</i></li> <li>• <i>Lack of connection to family</i></li> </ul>	<p>Child well-being is the goal, not a prescribed outcome such as reunification currently</p> <p>Normalcy for children and caregivers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>People working in the system who have empathy (versus sympathy), lived experience</i></li> <li>• <i>Youth able to do what other children do</i></li> <li>• <i>Caregivers able to act like normal caregivers</i></li> <li>• <i>Reduced isolation of all parties</i></li> </ul>

- Youth not treated like nonfoster care among peers or biological children in placement
  - Lack of safety, nurturing, love, family environment
- Absence of collaborative team approach and youth and caregiver involvement in decision making*
- Youth not involved in caregiver recruitment or placement decisions
  - Caregivers not involved in placement decisions and no matching or assessment
  - System inefficiencies and red tape hinder permanency on child welfare side and court side
  - Lack of ability for caregivers and youth to provide feedback to evaluate agency performance or if there is, actions are invisible
  - Caregivers not treated with respect, not treated as valued member
  - Lack of contact and communication among caregivers, workers, youth
  - Worker caseload too high

- Respite
- Community and network support

The Child Well-Being Team is driven by unique child needs (hyper personalized), individuality

- Driven by unique child needs and hyper-personalization
- Inclusive of all influential people in the child's life
- Matching child to a team of people and workers
- Youth and caregivers have a seat at the table, treated as professionals
- Emphasis on cultural competence and youth voice
- Consideration of the environment and potential changes to the court experience
- Judge serves as a mediator
- Effective communication and transparency
- Ensuring child safety and well-being through ongoing monitoring and adjustment
- Emphasis on cognitive flexibility and team growth with the youth

*Lack of access to appropriate supportive services for both caregivers and youth*

- Lack of auto enrollment
- Matching of quality and intensity of services
- Lack of training and support for foster and kinship families
- Financial burden on foster and kinship families
- Lack of respite care
- Youth aren't prepared with life skills for self-sufficiency

Access to resources and supportive services

- Services follow the child; not start and stop
- The Child Well-Being Team can fast-track access
- Integrated community and network support

*Suboptimal caregivers*

- Barriers exclude good families and include suboptimal families
- Ineffective recruitment, stigma, misinformation about being a foster parent
- Lack of transparency and honesty, red tape related to becoming a foster parent
- Lack of appropriate standards for caregiving and caregivers
- Lack of ongoing evaluation regarding placement fit between youth and caregivers
- No or limited nontraditional family placement options
- Lack of safety; need for safe, nurturing, loving foster homes

Needs-specific and optimized caregivers

- Matching based on need, cultural competence, caregiving skills, etc.
- Changing who can be a caregiver; broad spectrum of caregivers, and the solution that works best depends on the child (kinship is not always best); many models can work (i.e., during the week they are with one family, weekends another, group home sometimes, biological family sometimes); doesn't have to be so binary (all or nothing), i.e., shared custody
- It doesn't have to be a family placement, but could be institutional, boarding school, hybrid, etc.
- How to assess a good caregiving relationship

- *Biological family leniency negatively affects permanency*
- *Lack of resources for biological families negatively affects permanency*
- *Lack of resources and supportive services for caregivers*
- *Lack of training for caregivers*

- How to recruit and retain good caregivers
- Respite
- Transition support, grieving support for both child and caregiver

*Exit from Care*

AS IS	CHILD FIRST
<p><i>Lack of youth involvement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Lack of youth choice regarding exit path to permanency or self sufficiency</i></li> <li>• <i>Lack of youth involvement in transition to permanency or reunification</i></li> </ul>	<p>Focus on youth preference and well-being regarding path choice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-sufficiency regardless of path</li> <li>• Youth choice is factored into exit decision making</li> </ul>
<p><i>Absence of an extended and intensified transitional phase for children; lack of or inconsistent slow, measured, gentle transition, regardless of type</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>For example, visitation with biological families may happen too soon or be forced; vital documents are not provided timely or at all; transition to adulthood is not measured nor do youth feel prepared</i></li> <li>• <i>Youth perceive a deficiency in financial independence and literacy</i></li> <li>• <i>Youth lack access to services and supports to learn skills of self-sufficiency</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Services include housing, postsecondary education employment, enrollment in government benefits and other social supports</i></li> <li>○ <i>Lack of peer support, mentorship, and other social support networks</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Lack of continuity of supportive services after transition and case closure</i></li> <li>• <i>Lack of mental health and emotional support during transition, lack of family therapy</i></li> <li>• <i>Lack of community for similar youth and families</i></li> </ul>	<p>Smooth transition to maintain well-being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Readiness assessment for transition</li> <li>• Structured step-down approach determined by the Child Well-Being Team</li> <li>• Immediate and ongoing access to services such as mental health support, government benefits, substance abuse assistance, respite care, education, and employment</li> <li>• Community and network of support</li> <li>• Support for transition to adulthood and permanency pathway for older youth</li> <li>• Assessment based on demonstration of skills or knowledge attainment</li> <li>• Connection to support pathway for youth unable to achieve readiness threshold, such as commercially sexually exploited children or those with felony charges impacting housing and financial stability</li> </ul>
<p><i>Lack of oversight, evaluation and vigilance after exit</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Lack of safety net, e.g., check-in, ability to call for help, continued contact with social worker or foster family</i></li> <li>• <i>Lack of ensuring basic needs are met after case closure</i></li> </ul>	<p>Oversight, check-ins, measuring progress (as needed, and cycles back to top); this determines milestones for stepping down to the next step</p>