



2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT



Washington State Department of
CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES



Washington State Department of
CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES

Contents

Vision	1
Washington State Department of Children, Youth & Families Commitment	1
Background and Purpose	1
Washington State Indian Child Welfare (ICW) Case Review	1
Goals of ICW Case Review	2
Components of ICW Case Review	2
ICW Case Review Design	2
Region 6 ICW Overview	4
Context: Indian Child Welfare in Region 6	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Region 6 ICW Case Review Sample	4
Tribal Affiliation of the Children Included in the Region 6 Review	8
Children with Washington State Tribal Affiliation	9
Region 6 ICW Case Review Results	9
Comparison of 2015 ICW Case Review Results with 2019 Case Review Results	10
Regional Practice Themes	10
Region 6 and Statewide Results for Each Case Review Question	13
Average Length of Stay for ICWA Children included in the Region 6 ICW Case Review	39
Appendix A.....	40
Non-ICWA Culturally Competent Case Management	40

Vision

Washington State Department of Children, Youth & Families Commitment

The Washington State Department of Children, Youth & Families (DCYF) commitment to the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA)¹ requires:

- Protecting the essential tribal relations and best interests of Indian children by promoting practices designed to prevent out-of-home placement of Indian children that is inconsistent with the rights of the parents, the health, safety or welfare of the children, or the interests of their tribe.
- When placement away from the parent or Indian custodian is necessary, the placement reflects and honors the unique values of the child's tribal culture and is best able to assist the Indian child in establishing, developing and maintaining a political, cultural, social and spiritual relationship with the tribe and tribal community.

Background and Purpose

Washington State Indian Child Welfare (ICW) Case Review

DCYF follows a government-to-government approach to seek consultation and participation by representatives of tribal governments in policy development and service program activities. DCYF is committed to a government-to-government approach through consultation with Federally Recognized Tribes of Washington State, and to work in collaboration with Recognized American Indian Organizations (RAIOs) and individual American Indians and Alaska Natives to ensure quality and comprehensive service delivery to all Indian children and families served.

To fulfill this commitment, in 2003 the Washington State Indian Child Welfare (ICW) Case Review was developed in collaboration with Washington State Tribes and the former Children's Administration – now DCYF's child welfare services. The ICW Case Review is the result of ongoing collaboration between Washington State Tribes, RAIOs, the Tribal Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) and DCYF. The first ICW Case Review was conducted in 2007. Subsequent reviews have occurred in 2009, 2012 and 2015. The ICW Case Review Tool was developed to evaluate ICWA compliance and the quality of ICW social work practice in all areas of the state through assessing compliance in meeting:

- The requirements of the Federal Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA);
- The Washington Indian Child Welfare Act (WICWA);
- DCYF Indian Child Welfare Policies and Procedures; and
- Memoranda of Agreement between Washington State Tribes and DCYF.

¹ Based on the legislative findings of the Washington State Indian Child Welfare Act, Laws of 2011, ch. 309 § 3.

Original Date: August 26, 2019 | Revised Date: September 24, 2019

Administrative Services | Approved for distribution by Doug Savelesky, QA/CQI Administrator

Goals of ICW Case Review

- Evaluating compliance with Washington State and federal ICWA. The state and federal ICWA apply to Indian children who are (1) members of tribes or (2) eligible for membership and the biological child of a member. The tribe must be a federally recognized tribe(s) including recognized Alaska Native regional corporations and Alaska Native villages.
- Evaluating the quality of culturally competent case management for all Indian families. This includes families where the child meets ICWA's definition of an Indian child.
- Enhancing staff development and understanding of ICW practice by utilizing the ICW Case Review for training and skill building. The ICW Case Review identifies ICWA requirements and the elements of sound culturally competent case management with references to the WICWA and DCYF ICW Policies and Procedures.
- The ICW Case Review results lay the groundwork for improving the quality of ICW social work at the regional and statewide level. Specific practice areas include:
 - Early identification of Indian children
 - Early engagement and ongoing collaboration with Tribes
 - Active efforts to provide services to parents and families to prevent the removal of the child, or to safely return the child home
 - Timely legal notice to Tribes of dependency actions

Components of ICW Case Review

Cases included in the review are from all program areas served by DCYF which include:

- Child Protective Services (CPS) Investigations
- Family Assessment Response (FAR) Interventions
- Family Voluntary Services (FVS)
- Child and Family Welfare Services (CFWS)
- Family Reconciliation Services (FRS)

ICW Case Review Design

The 2019 ICW Case Review Tool was comprised of 43 questions that are divided into eight practice areas. Five sections are devoted to ICW compliance and quality of practice, and the last three sections focus on child safety, well-being and permanency. All ICW compliance questions reference ICWA, DCYF policy, the WICWA or the Washington State Tribal/State Agreement. The ICW Case Review Tool is designed to be used for multiple purposes:

- Systematic statewide ICW Case Reviews
- Training tool for DCYF caseworkers and managers on the requirements of ICWA and DCYF ICW policy
- Local regional and/or office reviews of ICW cases to be conducted by DCYF staff and Tribes

The 2019 ICW Case Review was facilitated by the Office of Tribal Relations in collaboration with the Central Case Review Team (CCRT) and conducted by a team of reviewers, comprised of:

- Tribal representatives
- RAIO representatives
- Casey Family Programs
- Court Partners
- Alliance Trainers
- DCYF caseworkers and managers

All DCYF reviewers were identified by the region to participate in the review process.

Reviews occurred in six locations across the state. The Office of Tribal Relations developed a random sample, coordinated logistical arrangements of the review and hosted each of the six reviews. The CCRT facilitated consensus building and assisted reviewers to ensure inter-rater reliability. There were different Tribal, RAIO and review participants at each of the six locations. All participants attended training on the ICW Case Review process and tool. The ICW Case Review design includes:

- Four-day reviews that begin on Tuesday and end on Friday
- Review of each case by at least two team members
- Feedback sheets completed on each case reviewed identifying strengths and areas needing improvement. The feedback sheets are provided to the caseworker, supervisor and administrators at the end of the review
- A review team debrief at the end of the third day to discuss the regional results. During the debrief, the team identifies practice themes, strengths, areas needing improvement and systemic issues
- An exit meeting on the fourth day with local administrators, supervisors and caseworkers. The review team provides feedback on the regional ICW practice themes.

There were five non-ICWA questions within the Culturally Competent Case Management section which were developed to be companion questions to the ICWA case management questions. These five questions are not included within the main body of the report, but are included as Appendix A at the end of this report.

Washington Statewide 2019 ICW Report Overview

The Washington Statewide Report includes state and regional results as well as statewide recommendations for quality assurance and improvement plans. The statewide recommendations are designed to be included in future quality assurance and improvement plans in collaboration with Washington State Tribes to increase compliance with ICWA and DCYF ICW policy, and reduce disproportionality. The 2019 Statewide Report includes the following recommendations:

- Improve early engagement of Tribes
- Specialization of ICW offices, units, designated caseworkers
- Utilization of Verified Sources for Ancestry Charts
- Improved Documentation
- Locating Absent Parents and Providing Active Efforts
- Assist with Completion of Paperwork
- Increase Shared Planning Meetings

The Washington Statewide 2019 ICW Report also includes systemic issues that were identified by ICW review teams as barriers to completing ICW requirements. The systemic issues include:

- Native American Evidence Based Providers
- ICWA Case Identification
- ICWA Training
- Documentation of Tribal Legal Notice
- Utilization of a Qualified Expert Witness
- Utilization of ICW Workload Ratios'
- Worker Retention
- File Upload Documentation

Region 6 ICW Overview

The Region 6 ICW Case Review was conducted Aug. 12-16, 2019 at the Tumwater DCYF field office.

Context: Indian Child Welfare in Region 6

Region 6 is comprised of 12 federally recognized Tribes: Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation, Cowlitz Indian Tribe, Hoh Indian Tribe, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe, Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe, Makah Tribe, Nisqually Indian Tribe, Quileute Tribe, Quinault Indian Nation, Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe, Skokomish Indian Tribe, and Squaxin Island Tribe.

There are 13 DCYF field offices located in Region 6: Forks, Port Angeles, Port Townsend, Aberdeen, Centralia, Kelso, Long Beach, Shelton, South Bend, Stevenson, Tumwater, Vancouver-Columbia, and Vancouver-Cascade. The region does not have specialized ICW units in these offices; however, there are designated Indian Child Welfare social workers in the Aberdeen, Centralia, Kelso, Shelton, Vancouver Cascade, and Vancouver Columbia offices. For the majority of the period under review there were 6 Local Indian Child Welfare Advisory Committees (LICWAC), Aberdeen/South Bend/Long Beach, Centralia/Kelso, Forks/Port Angeles/Port

Townsend, Shelton, Tumwater, and Vancouver. In April of 2019, Centralia and Kelso started meeting separately. On average, the LICWACs meet once a month.

The Chehalis Tribe borders Grays Harbor, Lewis, and Thurston counties. The Tribe has a Tribal Court. When a family lives on the reservation, the Tribe takes responsibility for the case. DCYF takes the lead and coordinates CPS investigations or CPS-FAR interventions with the Tribe for children and families living off the reservation. The Tribe's resources include foster care, chemical dependency treatment, behavioral health, medical and dental services, Early Head Start, Head Start, and K-12 education.

The Quinault Indian Nation headquarters and sub headquarters are located in Grays Harbor and Jefferson counties in both Taholah and Queets. The Quinault reservation lies within the Aberdeen and Forks catchment areas. The Quinault Indian Nation investigates reports of abuse and neglect when the family lives on the reservation. DCYF takes the lead and coordinates CPS investigations or CPS-FAR interventions with the Tribe for children and families living off the reservation. The Tribe has an adjudicated Tribal Court located on the reservation in Taholah, WA. The Tribe will intervene on all cases or take jurisdiction when their children live off of the reservation. The Tribe's resources include foster care, chemical dependency treatment, behavioral health, a health and wellness center that provides medical care, and Quinault TANF.

The Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe is located in Pacific County. The Tribe has a Tribal Court and social service agency. Shoalwater Bay tribal social workers investigate reports of abuse and neglect of children residing on the reservation. DCYF takes the lead and coordinates CPS investigations and CPS-FAR interventions with the Tribe for children and families living off the reservation. The Tribe takes jurisdiction in Tribal Court in dependency cases. The Tribe works in coordination with DCYF for case planning and may elect to intervene in the case when their children live off of the reservation. The Tribe's resources include housing, medical and dental services, chemical dependency treatment, and mental health.

The Cowlitz Indian Tribe has a Tribal Court that hears civil cases and social service agency cases that include providing case management for their children. DCYF takes the lead and coordinates CPS investigations and CPS-FAR interventions with the Tribe for children and families living on and off the reservation. The Cowlitz Tribe's resources include housing, medical services, chemical dependency treatment, mental health, parenting classes, childcare, and educational and vocational programs.

The Nisqually Indian Tribe has a Tribal Court and a social service agency. When an intake is received relating to a family residing on the reservation, the Tribe takes responsibility for the case. DCYF takes the lead and coordinates CPS investigations and CPS-FAR interventions with the Tribe for children and families living off the reservation. The Nisqually Tribe's resources include Tribal TANF, housing, behavioral health, medical and dental services, and substance abuse services. The Nisqually Tribe offers K-12 educational programs as well as early intervention services through Head Start and the Early Childhood Disability Program.

The Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe and the Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe are within the Port Angeles office catchment area. The Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe is in the process of establishing a Tribal Court and has a social service agency that provides case management. DCYF takes the lead and coordinates CPS investigations and CPS-FAR interventions with the Tribe. The Tribe's resources include, behavioral health, educational programs, dental and health care, and economic supports.

The Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe has a Tribal Court. DCYF takes the lead and coordinates CPS investigations and CPS-FAR interventions with the Tribe for children and families living on and off the reservation. The Tribe provides case management for their families. Tribal resources include mental health counseling, chemical dependency services, Head Start and Early Head Start, housing, Tribal TANF, and medical and dental services.

There are four federally recognized Tribes within the Forks office catchment area: Hoh Tribe, Makah Tribe, Quileute Tribe, and Quinault Indian Nation. The Hoh Tribe has a social service agency and a Tribal Court. DCYF takes the lead and coordinates CPS investigations and CPS-FAR interventions with the Tribe for children and families living on and off the reservation. The Hoh Tribe's resources include medical services, substance abuse services, community health resources, and youth programs through the Chief Klia Wellness Center. The Hoh Tribe also offers housing assistance, and a Tribal Library/Early Literacy program.

The Makah Tribe has a Tribal Court and a social service agency. When an intake is received relating to a family residing on the reservation, the Tribe takes responsibility for the case. DCYF takes the lead and coordinates CPS investigations and CPS-FAR interventions with the Tribe for children and families living off the reservation. The Tribe takes jurisdiction of some of the dependency actions when their children live off of the reservation. The Makah Tribe's resources include substance abuse services, mental health counseling, health care, Early Childhood Education, Head Start and Early Head Start, and financial supports.

The Quileute Tribe has a social services agency and Tribal Court. DCYF takes the lead and coordinates CPS investigations and CPS-FAR interventions with the Tribe for children and families living off the reservation and for much of this review period DCYF also conducted investigations and interventions on the reservation at the Tribe's request. The Tribe takes jurisdiction of some of the dependency actions when their children live off of the reservation. The Tribe's resources include chemical dependency services, mental health, parenting classes, dental and medical, housing, and financial supports. The Tribe has educational services including Birth to 5 Early Intervention, Head Start, and a Tribal school for kindergarten through 12th grade.

The Skokomish Indian Tribe is located in Mason County within the Shelton office catchment area. The Tribe has a Tribal Court and a social service agency. DCYF takes the lead and coordinates CPS investigations and CPS-FAR interventions with the Tribe for children and families living on and off the reservation. The Tribe's resources include Tribal TANF, housing, substance abuse treatment, medical and dental services, and mental health counseling services. The Skokomish Tribe offers educational programs and early intervention services to its youngest members through Head Start and childcare programs.

The Squaxin Island Tribe is also located in Mason County within the Shelton office catchment area. The Tribe has a Tribal Court and a social service agency. DCYF takes the lead and coordinates CPS investigations and CPS-FAR interventions with the Tribe for children and families living on and off the reservation. The Tribe's resources include TANF, dental and medical, mental health counseling, and substance abuse services. The Tribe's educational services include a child care program and Healthy Families.

Region 6 ICW Case Review Sample

A random sample of 24 cases was reviewed. The sample was stratified to be representative of the proportion of ICW cases served by each office within the region. The sample included cases of children or parents

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

identified as Native American in FamLink, the DCYF State Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS). For out-of-home cases when there were multiple children in the family, the case was evaluated regarding one randomly selected child. Cases were open in one or more of the months from July 2018 to December 2018. The case sample was designed so that approximately 50% of families were affiliated with a Washington State Tribe.

Cases were classified as either an in-home case or an out-of-home case according to the Children's Bureau federal review definition.

- **In-home service cases:** The case remained open 45 consecutive days or more to provide in-home services and/or to monitor child safety. All children remained in the home during the last 12 months.
- **Out-of-home care cases:** The identified child was in out-of-home care 24 hours or more through court action or a Voluntary Placement Agreement (VPA) during the last 12 months. The child may have returned home within the last year or had siblings who remained in the home.

In-Home Cases	Out-Of-Home Cases	Total Cases
6	18	24

The cases reviewed were classified as ICWA or Non-ICWA. In-home cases were classified as "ICWA Eligible" if one of the children in the family home was either a member or the child of a member and eligible for membership with a federally recognized tribe. It is recognized that ICWA does not apply to in-home cases and the ICWA specific questions were not applicable to in-home cases. The designation of "ICWA Eligible" was for classification purposes only. The number of cases reviewed for each classification is as follows:

Out-Of-Home ICWA	In-Home ICWA Eligible	Out-Of-Home Non-ICWA	In-Home Non-ICWA Eligible
14	2	4	4

The number of cases reviewed from each field office in the region was as follows:

Region 6 Offices	Number of Cases
Aberdeen	3
Centralia	2
Forks	1
Kelso	4
Long Beach	0
Port Angeles	1
Port Townsend	0

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Shelton	1
South Bend	0
Stevenson	0
Tumwater	4
Vancouver Cascade	4
Vancouver Columbia	4

Tribal Affiliation of the Children Included in the Region 6 Review

Tribal affiliation included all Tribes identified by a parent or family member including:

- Tribes that have determined the child's Indian status as a member, eligible for membership or non-member
- Tribes whose determination of the child's Indian status was still pending
- Tribes identified by a parent or family member, with whom inquiry of Indian status was not completed with the identified Tribe

Some children were affiliated with more than one Tribe, including Washington State Tribes and Tribes outside of Washington State. The Tribes and the number of children affiliated with them are listed below.

Tribe	Number of Children
Aleut (Egegik Village)	1
Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians	1
Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska	3
Cherokee (Unspecified)	2
Cherokee Nation	1
Chickasaw Nation	1
Citizen Potawatomi Nation, Oklahoma	1
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	1
Cowlitz Indian Tribe	2
Hoh Tribe	1
Hoonah Indian Association, Tlingit and Haida	1
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe	1

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of Stewarts Point	1
Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe	1
Makah Tribe	3
Metlakatla Indian Community	1
Muckleshoot Indian Tribe	1
Native Village of Afognak	1
Nisqually Indian Tribe	1
Puyallup Tribe of Indians	1
Quileute Nation	2
Quinault Indian Nation	4
Sioux (Unspecified)	1
Sitka Tribe of Alaska	1
Skokomish Indian Tribe	1
Tangirnaq Native Village	1

Children with Washington State Tribal Affiliation

Children were identified by Tribal affiliation in an effort to assess if there were practice differences when serving families from federally recognized Washington State Tribes versus out-of-state federally recognized Tribes and non-federally recognized tribes or Canadian First Nations.

Primary Tribal Affiliation of the Child	Number of Cases
Washington State Tribe	13
Out-Of-State Tribe	11
Non-Federally Recognized Tribe or Canadian First Nation	0

Region 6 ICW Case Review Results

Comparison of Results to Traditional Field Office Reviews and Past ICW Reviews

It is important to note that the results of this review **cannot** be compared to the results of field office review completed by the Central Case Review Team. The statewide ICWA review was completed with a review tool

utilizing questions and rating criteria developed by the statewide Tribal Relations team, which are not comparable to the questions and rating criteria utilized within the Children's Bureau Onsite Review Instrument. While some of the questions are similar in structure, the case sampling and rating criteria are not comparable.

Comparison of 2015 ICW Case Review Results with 2019 Case Review Results

As noted above, a note of caution regarding the comparison of previous ICW reviews to the 2019 ICW case review. Previous ICW reviews included case sampling of CPS investigation only cases and CPS-FAR intervention cases. These cases are often short in duration (under 45 days) and do not include services to the family. The purpose of including these cases in the past was to assure the department met policy requirements of inquiry to identify Native American families involved with the department from the inception of the case. During the 2019 ICW review, case sampling criteria utilized the federal definition of a case as an in-home case or an out-of-home case. In addition, since the previous ICW review in 2015, there have been updates to policy expectations and practice clarification which have occurred. Based on these policy updates and practice expectations, individual question wording and rating criteria were adjusted to match these requirements.

Regional Practice Themes

Strengths:

The practice areas below are identified as strengths with a review rating result of 80% or higher.

1. Initial Inquiry with The Father in A Timely Manner

- In 80% (8 of 10) of the cases, the father or paternal relatives were asked if the child had American Indian/Alaska Native ancestry.

2. Comprehensive Ancestry Charts

- In 89% (17 of 19) of the cases that required an ancestry chart for the purposes of inquiry, comprehensive genealogical information was gathered from the parents or relatives which included the child's, parents' and grandparents' full name, date and place of birth and tribal affiliation.

3. Timely Second Inquiry with Federally Recognized Tribes to Determine Indian Status

- In 100% (4) of the cases, the second inquiry was made to a federally recognized tribe within 60 days of the first inquiry.

4. LICWAC Staffing

- In 83% (5 of 6) of the cases, the case was staffed with LICWAC for guidance when the child's identified Tribe(s) was unavailable or the tribe was in agreement with guidance from the LICWAC occurring.

5. Ongoing Case Planning with The Child

- In 86% (6 of 7) of the cases of children placed in out-of-home care who were ICWA eligible, there were ongoing efforts made to engage the child in the case planning process on an age-appropriate level.

6. Following Tribal Placement Preference

- In 100% (4) of the cases in which the tribes placement preference was identified, the placement preference was assessed for suitability and the child was placed with the Tribe's preferred placement; or, the Tribe's placement preference was assessed for suitability and was not followed due to safety or well-being concerns for the child and there were follow-up efforts to resolve the differences with the Tribe(s) in a timely and collaborative manner and a resolution was reached; or, a resolution was unable to be reached and the court found good cause not to follow the placement preference of the Tribe(s) by clear and convincing evidence.

7. Child Safety in Out-Of-Home Care

- In 83% (15 of 18) of the cases of children placed in out-of-home care, risk and safety threats were adequately identified, assessed and addressed. Children were placed with a safe relative, other suitable person or foster home and if safety threats were identified regarding the child's out-of-home caregiver, all threats were assessed and addressed.

8. Meeting The Educational Needs of the Children

- In 91% (10 of 11) of the cases that remained open for services or safety monitoring, the child's educational needs were adequately assessed and appropriate services were provided when needs were identified. When the child's Tribe had educational resources there was ongoing collaboration with the Tribe regarding meeting the child's educational needs.

Areas Needing Improvement:

The practice areas below are identified as areas needing improvement with a review rating result lower than 70%.

1. Initial Inquiry with The Mother and The Father

- In 62% (13 of 21) of the cases, the father or paternal relatives were asked if the child had American Indian/Alaska Native ancestry.
- In 65% (13 of 20) of the cases, the mother or maternal relatives were asked if the child had American Indian/Alaska Native ancestry.

2. Initial Contact with A Federally Recognized Tribe

- In 50% (4 of 8) of the cases, when it was known at case opening that the child was a member or eligible for membership with a federally recognized Tribe, the Tribe was contacted within 24 hours of being assigned the case as per policy.
- In 0% (0 of 5) of the cases, when the child was a member or eligible for membership with a Washington State federally recognized Tribe(s), the Tribe was contacted within one working day to discuss case planning when the case was opened in-home services, out-of-home services or when there was an emergency removal of a child in the last year.

3. Completing The Indian Identity Request Form at The Initial Visit and Uploading the Form

- In 33% (5 of 15) of the cases, the mother or maternal relatives were asked to complete the Indian Identity Request form at the initial visit.
- In 29% (5 of 17) of the cases, the father or paternal relatives were asked to complete the Indian Identity Request form at the initial visit.
- In 67% (6 of 9) of the cases, the Indian Identity Request form was uploaded into FamLink.

4. Referral to The Native American Inquiry (NAIR) Unit and Initial Inquiry

- In 42% (8 of 19) of the cases, when Indian ancestry was identified with a federally recognized tribe the caseworker provided a complete referral to the NAIR unit within 10 working days of learning the information.
- In 41% (7 of 17) of the cases, the initial inquiry to federally recognized tribes was completed within 30 days from the time Indian ancestry was identified.

5. Second Inquiry with Federally Recognized Tribes to Determine Indian Status

- In 67% (4 of 6) of the cases, when the federally recognized Tribe(s) did not respond to the initial inquiry to determine Indian status, a second inquiry was made to the Tribe(s).

6. LICWAC Staffing While Inquiry Is Pending

- In 57% (4 of 7) of the cases, the case was staffed with LICWAC when an inquiry was pending with a federally recognized tribe.

7. Ongoing Active Efforts and Engagement of the Mother and The Father

- In 23% (3 of 13) of the cases that remained open for in-home or out-of-home services, there were ongoing active efforts to provide services to the father including engaging and actively working with the father to complete services.
- In 60% (9 of 15) of the cases that remained open for in-home or out-of-home services, there were ongoing active efforts to provide services to the mother including engaging and actively working with the mother to complete services.
- In 33% (4 of 12) of the cases that remained open for in-home or out-of-home services, there were timely and diligent efforts to engage the parent in services, including services offered by tribes and Indian organizations when possible.

8. Collaboration with Tribe(s) In Case Planning

- In 21% (3 of 14) of the cases of children who were a member or eligible for membership with a federally recognized tribe, there were ongoing efforts to collaborate with the tribe in case planning.
- In 60% (6 of 10) of the cases of children who were a member or eligible for membership with a federally recognized Tribe, the Tribe was notified in a timely manner and encouraged to participate in FTDM staffing when placement of the child or a placement move was being considered.

9. Cultural and Family Support of the Child

- In 50% (7 of 14) of the cases of children placed in out-of-home care who was a member or eligible for membership with a federally recognized Tribe, ongoing efforts were made to encourage and support the child's participation in Tribal customs and activities specific to the child's Tribe.
- In 36% (5 of 14) of the cases of children placed in out-of-home care and ICWA applied, there were ongoing efforts to support the child's contact with his/her parents and extended family members.

10. Court Requirements

- In 50% (4 of 8) of the cases of children where ICWA applied, the federally recognized Tribe was provided legal notice prior to all dependency fact-finding, guardianship fact-finding and termination hearings.
- In 57% (8 of 14) of the cases of children where ICWA applied, there was a qualified expert witness for all dependency fact-finding, guardianship fact-finding and termination proceedings in the last two years.
- In 25% (2 of 8) of the cases of children where ICWA applied, there was a qualified expert witness for all dependency fact-finding, guardianship fact-finding and termination proceedings in the last two years.

11. Identification of The Tribe's Placement Preference

- In 29% (4 of 14) of the cases of children placed in out-of-home care where ICWA applied, efforts were made to identify the Tribe's placement preference. This included efforts to consult with the Tribe prior to making a non-emergent placement decision and efforts to consult with the Tribe in a timely manner after an emergency placement occurred. This measure goes beyond documenting that the tribe was in agreement with the placement, identifying specifically the tribe's placement preference.

12. Assessing and Addressing Child Safety in The Family Home

- In 53% (8 of 15) of the cases of children who resided in the family home during the last year, risk and safety threats were adequately identified, assessed and addressed.

13. Meeting The Physical and Mental/Behavioral Health Needs of Children

- In 43% (6 of 14) of the cases when ICWA applied, the child's physical health needs were adequately assessed and appropriate health services were provided when needs were identified; including routine well-child and dental exams. When the child's Tribe had health resources, there was ongoing collaboration with the Tribe regarding meeting the child's health needs.
- In 60% (6 of 10) of the cases when ICWA applied, the child's mental/behavioral health needs were adequately assessed and appropriate services were provided when needs were identified. When the child's Tribe had mental health resources, there was ongoing collaboration with the Tribe regarding meeting the child's mental health needs.

14. Actions to Achieve Permanency

- In 36% (5 of 14) of the cases of children who resided in out-of-home care during the last year, the child returned home during the last year or there were sufficient and timely efforts made to achieve permanency for the child in the last year.

Region 6 and Statewide Results for Each Case Review Question

Rating criteria for each question can be obtained through the *2019 Washington State Indian Child Welfare Case Review Tool*.

Inquiry of Indian Status

(The questions in this section were designed to measure compliance and quality of practice regarding inquiry and determination of Indian status per WICWA.)

Original Date: August 26, 2019 | Revised Date: September 24, 2019

Administrative Services | Approved for distribution by Doug Savelesky, QA/CQI Administrator

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

1. Was the father, Indian custodian or paternal relatives asked if the child had American Indian/Alaska Native ancestry?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
62% (13 of 21)	61% (62 of 101)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	100% (3)
Centralia	0% (0 of 2)
Kelso	25% (1 of 4)
Port Angeles	100% (1)
Shelton	100% (1)
Tumwater	75% (3 of 4)
Vancouver Cascade	50% (2 of 4)
Vancouver Columbia	100% (2)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	67% (4 of 6)
Out-Of-Home Cases	60% (9 of 15)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
83% (10 of 12)

2. Was the mother, Indian custodian or maternal relatives asked if the child had American Indian/Alaska Native ancestry?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
65% (13 of 20)	79% (84 of 106)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	100% (3)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Centralia	0% (0 of 2)
Kelso	100% (4)
Port Angeles	100 % (1)
Shelton	0% (0 of 1)
Tumwater	75% (3 of 4)
Vancouver Cascade	33% (1 of 3)
Vancouver Columbia	50% (1 of 2)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	67% (4 of 6)
Out-Of-Home Cases	64% (9 of 14)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
64% (7 of 11)

3. If the mother, Indian custodian, maternal relatives were asked regarding the child's Indian ancestry, were they asked timely?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
64% (7 of 11)	74% (59 of 80)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	100% (2)
Kelso	50% (2 of 4)
Tumwater	67% (2 of 3)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Vancouver Cascade	0% (0 of 1)
Vancouver Columbia	100% (1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	50% (2 of 4)
Out-Of-Home Cases	71% (5 of 7)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
80% (4 of 5)

4. If the father, Indian custodian, paternal relatives were asked regarding the child's Indian ancestry, were they asked timely?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
80% (8 of 10)	64% (38 of 59)

Region 6 Office Results	
Kelso	100% (2)
Tumwater	67% (2 of 3)
Vancouver Cascade	67% (2 of 3)
Vancouver Columbia	100% (2)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	67% (2 of 3)
Out-Of-Home Cases	86% (6 of 7)

Original Date: August 26, 2019 | Revised Date: September 24, 2019
 Administrative Services | Approved for distribution by Doug Savelesky, QA/CQI Administrator

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe

80% (4 of 5)

5. If it was known at case opening that the child was either (1) a member of a federally recognized Tribe(s) or (2) eligible for membership and the biological child of a member of a federally recognized Tribe(s), was the Tribe(s) contacted within 24 hours of being assigned the case per policy?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
50% (4 of 8)	57% (24 of 42)

Region 6 Office Results

Aberdeen	33% (1 of 3)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Kelso	100% (1)
Port Angeles	0% (0 of 1)
Shelton	100% (1)
Tumwater	100% (1)

Regional Results by Case Type

In-Home Cases	50% (1 of 2)
Out-Of-Home Cases	50% (3 of 6)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe

43% (3 of 7)

6. Was the mother, Indian custodian or maternal relatives asked to complete the Indian Identity Request (IIR) form (#09-761) at the initial visit per policy?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
33% (5 of 15)	36% (36 of 101)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	33% (1 of 3)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Kelso	50% (2 of 4)
Port Angeles	0% (0 of 1)
Shelton	0% (0 of 1)
Tumwater	50% (1 of 2)
Vancouver Cascade	50% (1 of 2)
Vancouver Columbia	0% (0 of 1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	67% (2 of 3)
Out-Of-Home Cases	25% (3 of 12)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
25% (2 of 8)

7. Was the father, Indian custodian or paternal relatives asked to complete the Indian Identity Request (IIR) form (#09-761) at the initial visit per policy?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
29% (5 of 17)	26% (23 of 89)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 3)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Kelso	0% (0 of 3)
Port Angeles	0% (0 of 1)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Shelton	0% (0 of 1)
Tumwater	50% (1 of 2)
Vancouver Cascade	75% (3 of 4)
Vancouver Columbia	50% (1 of 2)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	33% (1 of 3)
Out-Of-Home Cases	29% (4 of 14)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
30% (3 of 10)

8. Was the Indian Identity Request form(s) uploaded into FamLink (#09-761)?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
67% (6 of 9)	63% (49 of 78)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	100% (1)
Kelso	67% (2 of 3)
Tumwater	0% (0 of 2)
Vancouver Cascade	100% (3)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	100% (3)
Out-Of-Home Cases	50% (3 of 6)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
50% (2 of 4)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

9. If Indian ancestry was identified with a federally recognized Tribe, did the worker provide a complete referral to the Native American Inquiry Referral (NAIR) Unit within 10 working days of learning this information?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
42% (8 of 19)	48% (47 of 97)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	33% (1 of 3)
Centralia	50% (1 of 2)
Kelso	67% (2 of 3)
Port Angeles	0% (0 of 1)
Shelton	0% (0 of 1)
Tumwater	50% (2 of 4)
Vancouver Cascade	67% (2 of 3)
Vancouver Columbia	0% (0 of 2)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	25% (1 of 4)
Out-Of-Home Cases	47% (7 of 15)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
42% (5 of 12)

10. Was the initial inquiry to the federally recognized Tribe(s) completed within 30 days from the time Indian ancestry was identified?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
41% (7 of 17)	44% (43 of 97)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	33% (1 of 3)
Centralia	100% (1)
Kelso	33% (1 of 3)
Port Angeles	0% (0 of 1)
Shelton	0% (0 of 1)
Tumwater	50% (2 of 4)
Vancouver Cascade	67% (2 of 3)
Vancouver Columbia	0% (0 of 1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	33% (1 of 3)
Out-Of-Home Cases	43% (6 of 14)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
45% (5 of 11)

11. Was comprehensive genealogical information gathered to complete the ancestry chart?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
89% (17 of 19)	85% (83 of 98)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	100% (3)
Centralia	50% (1 of 2)
Kelso	100% (3)
Port Angeles	100% (4)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Shelton	100% (1)
Tumwater	100% (1)
Vancouver Cascade	100% (3)
Vancouver Columbia	50% (1 of 2)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	75% (3 of 4)
Out-Of-Home Cases	93% (14 of 15)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
92% (11 of 12)

12. If a federally recognized Tribe(s) did not respond to the initial inquiry to determine Indian status, was a second inquiry made to the Tribe(s)?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
67% (4 of 6)	83% (34 of 41)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	50% (1 of 2)
Kelso	100% (2)
Vancouver Cascade	100% (1)
Vancouver Columbia	0% (0 of 1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	0% (0 of 2)
Out-Of-Home Cases	100% (4)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
50% (1 of 2)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

13. Was the second inquiry to the federally recognized Tribe(s) completed within 60 days of the first inquiry?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
100% (4)	91% (31 of 34)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	100% (1)
Kelso	100% (2)
Vancouver Cascade	100% (1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
Out-Of-Home Cases	100% (4)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
100% (1)

14. Was the case staffed with the Local Indian Child Welfare Advisory Committee (LICWAC) when inquiry was pending with a federally recognized Tribe?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
57% (4 of 7)	29% (12 of 41)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	100% (1)
Kelso	0% (1)
Tumwater	0% (2)
Vancouver Cascade	100% (3)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
50% (2 of 4)

15. If the case was staffed with a LICWAC during the time inquiry was pending with the Tribe, did the LICWAC staffing occur timely?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
100% (4)	92% (11 of 12)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	100% (1)
Vancouver Cascade	100% (3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
100% (2)

Active Efforts/Collaboration with Tribes

(The questions in this section were designed to measure compliance and quality of practice regarding Active Efforts and collaboration with Tribes per federal and state ICWA.)

16. Were ongoing active efforts made to provide services to the father or Indian custodian, including ongoing engagement to complete services?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
30% (3 of 13)	44% (30 of 68)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 2)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Forks	0% (0 of 1)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Kelso	0% (0 of 2)
Port Angeles	100% (1)
Tumwater	0% (0 of 1)
Vancouver Cascade	0% (0 of 2)
Vancouver Columbia	67% (2 of 3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
25% (2 of 8)

17. Were ongoing active efforts made to provide services to the mother or Indian custodian including ongoing engagement to complete services?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
60% (9 of 15)	64% (46 of 72)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 2)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Forks	100% (1)
Kelso	33% (1 of 3)
Port Angeles	100% (1)
Tumwater	100% (2)
Vancouver Cascade	50% (1 of 2)
Vancouver Columbia	100% (3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
56% (5 of 9)

18. Were ongoing efforts made to engage the child in case planning on an ongoing basis?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
86% (6 of 7)	79% (22 of 28)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 1)
Port Angeles	100% (1)
Tumwater	100% (2)
Vancouver Columbia	100% (3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
80% (4 of 5)

19. If the child was a member or the biological child of a member and eligible for membership with a Washington State federally recognized Tribe, was the Tribe(s) contacted within 24 hours of case assignment to discuss jurisdiction?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
0% (0 of 5)	54% (14 of 26)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 3)
Port Angeles	0% (0 of 1)
Tumwater	0% (0 of 1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	0% (0 of 1)
Out-Of-Home Cases	0% (0 of 4)

20. Were there ongoing efforts to consult and collaborate with the Indian child's federally recognized Tribe(s) in case planning?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
21% (3 of 14)	49% (37 of 75)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 2)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Forks	100% (1)
Kelso	0% (0 of 2)
Port Angeles	0% (0 of 1)
Tumwater	50% (1 of 2)
Vancouver Cascade	0% (0 of 2)
Vancouver Columbia	33% (1 of 3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
22% (2 of 9)

21. If the Tribe or LICWAC did not concur with the child's case plan and notified DCYF that an impasse existed, were the impasse procedures followed?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
NA	NA

An impasse is defined as a deadlock between DCYF, the LICWAC or the child's Tribe regarding the child's case plan. There were no applicable cases to this question in 2012, 2015 or 2019. This question remains in the ICW case review to serve as a reminder to Tribes and LICWACs that DCYF strongly encourages the use of these procedures as steps to resolve issues at the lowest possible level within the DCYF organizational structure recognizing that DCYF cannot impose these requirements on Tribes as Sovereign nations.

Culturally Competent Case Management

(The questions in this section were designed to measure compliance and quality of practice regarding providing culturally competent case management.)

22. Did a Family Team Decision Making (FTDM) staffing occur when placement of the child or a placement move was being considered?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
64% (7 of 11)	79% (50 of 63)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	100% (2)
Forks	100% (1)
Kelso	100% (1)
Tumwater	33% (1 of 3)
Vancouver Cascade	50% (1 of 2)
Vancouver Columbia	50% (1 of 2)

Regional Results by Case Type	
Out-Of-Home Cases	64% (7 of 11)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
75% (6 of 8)

23. If a FTDM staffing occurred, was the child's federally recognized Tribe(s) notified and encouraged to participate in the staffing in a timely manner?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
60% (6 of 10)	60% (30 of 50)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	50% (1 of 2)
Forks	100% (1)
Tumwater	67% (2 of 3)
Vancouver Cascade	50% (1 of 2)
Vancouver Columbia	50% (1 of 2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
63% (5 of 8)

24. Were timely and diligent efforts made to engage the parent or Indian custodian in reasonably available and culturally appropriate preventive, remedial, or rehabilitative services, including services offered by tribes and Indian organizations if possible?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
33% (4 of 12)	43% (30 of 69)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	50% (1 of 2)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Kelso	0% (0 of 2)
Port Angeles	0% (0 of 1)
Tumwater	0% (0 of 2)
Vancouver Cascade	50% (1 of 2)
Vancouver Columbia	100% (2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
38% (3 of 8)

25. When the child was placed in out-of-home care, were there ongoing efforts to support the child's contact with his/her parents and extended family members?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
50% (7 of 14)	67% (51 of 76)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	50% (1 of 2)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Forks	0% (0 of 1)
Kelso	50% (1 of 2)
Port Angeles	0% (0 of 1)
Tumwater	50% (1 of 2)
Vancouver Cascade	50% (1 of 2)
Vancouver Columbia	100% (3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
44% (4 of 9)

26. When the child was placed in out-of-home care, were ongoing efforts made to encourage and support the child's participation in Tribal customs and activities specific to the child's Tribe?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
36% (5 of 14)	38% (29 of 76)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	50% (1 of 2)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Forks	100% (1)
Kelso	50% (1 of 2)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Port Angeles	100% (1)
Tumwater	0% (0 of 2)
Vancouver Cascade	0% (0 of 2)
Vancouver Columbia	33% (1 of 3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
33% (3 of 9)

27. Was the case staffed with LICWAC for consultation when the child's Tribe(s) was unavailable, or the Tribe was in agreement with consultation with the LICWAC?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
83% (5 of 6)	56% (9 of 16)

Region 6 Office Results	
Kelso	100% (1)
Vancouver Cascade	67% (2 of 3)
Vancouver Columbia	100% (2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
100% (1)

Court Requirements

(The questions in this section were designed to measure compliance and quality of practice regarding notification to Tribes of court proceedings and providing an expert witness per federal and/or state ICWA.)

28. Was the child's Tribe(s) given legal notice prior to dependency fact findings, Title 13 guardianship fact findings, and termination fact findings?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
50% (4 of 8)	57% (25 of 44)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 2)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Kelso	100% (2)
Port Angeles	100% (1)
Vancouver Cascade	50% (1 of 2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
20% (1 of 5)

29. Was the child's Tribe(s) informed of all dependency reviews?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
57% (8 of 14)	67% (51 of 76)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 2)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Forks	0% (0 of 1)
Kelso	0% (0 of 2)
Port Angeles	100% (1)
Tumwater	100% (2)
Vancouver Cascade	100% (2)
Vancouver Columbia	100% (3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
56% (5 of 9)

30. Was there a qualified Indian expert witness for all dependency fact finding, Title 13 guardianship fact finding, and termination fact finding hearings?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
25% (2 of 8)	58% (18 of 31)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 2)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Kelso	50% (1 of 2)
Port Angeles	0% (0 of 1)
Vancouver Cascade	50% (1 of 2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
0% (0 of 5)

Placement Preference

(The questions in this section were designed to measure compliance and quality of practice regarding obtaining and following the placement preference of the Tribe.)

31. Were efforts made to identify the Tribe's placement preference?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
29% (4 of 14)	46% (33 of 72)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 2)
Centralia	100% (1)
Forks	100% (1)
Kelso	0% (0 of 2)
Port Angeles	0% (0 of 1)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Tumwater	0% (0 of 2)
Vancouver Cascade	0% (0 of 2)
Vancouver Columbia	67% (2 of 3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
33% (3 of 9)

32. Was the Tribe's placement preference followed?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
100% (4)	94% (31 of 33)

Region 6 Office Results	
Centralia	100% (1)
Forks	100% (1)
Vancouver Columbia	100% (2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
100% (3)

Safety

(The questions in this section were designed to measure quality of practice regarding identifying, assessing and addressing risk safety threats for children.)

33. During the time the child(ren) was living in the family home, were risk and safety threats adequately identified, assessed and addressed?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
53% (8 of 15)	51% (37 of 72)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	50% (1 of 2)
Centralia	50% (1 of 2)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Kelso	0% (0 of 3)
Tumwater	33% (1 of 3)
Vancouver Cascade	100% (3)
Vancouver Columbia	100% (2)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	83% (5 of 6)
Out-Of-Home Cases	33% (3 of 9)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
43% (3 of 7)

34. During the time the child was placed in out-of-home care, were risk and safety threats adequately identified, assessed and addressed?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
83% (15 of 18)	89% (99 of 111)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	50% (1 of 2)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Forks	100% (1)
Kelso	67% (2 of 3)
Port Angeles	100% (1)
Shelton	100% (1)
Tumwater	100% (3)
Vancouver Cascade	100% (3)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Vancouver Columbia	100% (3)
--------------------	----------

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
82% (9 of 11)

Well-Being

(The questions in this section were designed to measure quality of practice regarding assessing and addressing the well-being needs of children.)

35. Were actions taken to assess and address the child(ren)'s educational/developmental needs?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
91% (10 of 11)	95% (55 of 58)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	100% (1)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Forks	100% (1)
Kelso	100% (1)
Port Angeles	100% (1)
Tumwater	100% (2)
Vancouver Cascade	100% (1)
Vancouver Columbia	100% (3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
88% (7 of 8)

36. Were actions taken to assess and address the child(ren)'s physical health needs?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
43% (6 of 14)	61% (47 of 77)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 2)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Forks	0% (0 of 1)
Kelso	100% (2)
Port Angeles	100% (1)
Tumwater	0% (0 of 2)
Vancouver Cascade	100% (2)
Vancouver Columbia	33% (1 of 3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
22% (2 of 9)

37. Were actions taken to assess the child(ren)'s mental/behavioral health needs and offer culturally appropriate services when needs were identified?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
60% (6 of 10)	57% (25 of 44)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 1)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Forks	100% (1)
Kelso	100% (1)

2019 REGION 6 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Port Angeles	100% (1)
Tumwater	50% (1 of 2)
Vancouver Columbia	67% (2 of 3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
57% (4 of 7)

Permanency

(The questions in this section were designed to measure quality of practice regarding achieving permanency for children placed in out-of-home care.)

38. If the child was placed in out-of-home care, were there sufficient and timely actions per policy, federal and state law, including active efforts when ICWA applies taken to complete the permanent plan?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
36% (5 of 14)	38% (29 of 77)

Region 6 Office Results	
Aberdeen	0% (0 of 2)
Centralia	0% (0 of 1)
Forks	0% (0 of 1)
Kelso	50% (1 of 2)
Port Angeles	100% (1)
Tumwater	50% (1 of 2)
Vancouver Cascade	0% (0 of 2)
Vancouver Columbia	67% (2 of 3)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
33% (3 of 9)

Average Length of Stay for ICWA Children included in the Region 6 ICW Case Review

Of the children included in the review, 12 remained in placement at the time of the Region 6 ICW Case Review.

Number of Children	Average Length of Stay
12	20.4 Months

Of the children included in the review, 2 children were on a trial return home at the time of the Region 6 ICW Case Review.

Length of Stay in Out-of-Home Care	Length of Trial Return Home	Total Length of Stay
10 Months	3 Months	13 Months
21 Months	5 Months	26 Months

Length of stay by age group for ICWA children included in the review:

Age Group	Number of Children	Average Length of Stay
Birth - 4	6	18.8 Months
5 - 10	6	19.8 Months
11 - 18	2	26 Months

Appendix A

Non-ICWA Culturally Competent Case Management

The child was not a member or the biological child of a member and eligible for membership with a federally recognized Tribe and the court did not determine there was reason to know the child was an Indian child; however, the family self-identified as having Indian cultural heritage, e.g., Indian ancestry with a non-federally recognized Tribe, Canadian First Nation or a descendant of a federally recognized tribe but not eligible for membership.

When ICWA did not apply, but the father self-identified Indian cultural heritage, was there ongoing engagement with the father in culturally competent case planning?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
50% (1 of 2)	20% (1 of 5)

When ICWA did not apply, but the mother self-identified Indian cultural heritage, was there ongoing engagement with the mother in culturally competent case planning?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
100% (1)	11% (1 of 9)

When ICWA did not apply, but the child/youth self-identified Indian cultural heritage, was there ongoing engagement with the child in culturally competent case planning?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
0% (1)	50% (3 of 6)

When ICWA did not apply, but the family self-identified Indian cultural heritage, were efforts made to identify and encourage involvement in community services and resources specifically for Indian families?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
33% (1 of 3)	14% (2 of 14)

When ICWA did not apply, but the family self-identified Indian cultural heritage and the child was placed in out-of-home care, were ongoing efforts made to encourage and support the child's participation in Tribal customs and activities?

Region 6 Results	2019 Statewide Results
0% (2)	23% (3 of 13)