2019 REGION 1 ICW CASE REVIEW REPORT

Washington State Department of
CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES

Original Date: August 26, 2019 | Revised Date: September 23, 2019
Administrative Services | Approved for distribution by Doug Savelesky, QA/CQI Administrator

Washington State Department of CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES

Contents

Original Date: August 26, 2019 | Revised Date: September 23, 2019
Administrative Services | Approved for distribution by Doug Savelesky, QA/CQI Administrator

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.*

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 1 ICW Overview

The Region 1 ICW Case Review was conducted July 15-19, 2019 at the Spokane Valley field office.

Context: Indian Child Welfare in Region 1

There are three federally recognized Tribes in Region 1: The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, the Kalispel Tribe of Indians and the Spokane Tribe of Indians. Within Region 1 there are two RAIOs: NATIVE Project and the American Indian Community Center, both located in the city of Spokane.

The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation has a Tribal Court and a social service agency. The Tribe investigates reports of child abuse and neglect that occur on the reservation. Occasionally, the Tribe contacts the local DCYF office to request assistance with an investigation on the reservation primarily when an investigation by the Tribal social worker poses a conflict of interest. Some Child Protective Service (CPS) investigations and CPS-Family Assessment Response (CPS-FAR) interventions regarding Colville Tribal children who reside off the reservation are co-managed by DCYF and the Tribe. Dependency petitions for Colville Tribal children are filed in Tribal Court.

The Kalispel Tribe of Indians has a Tribal Court and a social service agency. The Tribe investigates reports of child abuse and neglect that occur on the reservation. Occasionally, the Tribe contacts the local DCYF office to request assistance with an investigation on the reservation when an investigation by the Tribal social worker poses a conflict of interest. Dependency petitions for Kalispel Tribal children who reside on the reservation are filed in Tribal Court. DCYF and the Tribe have a detailed working agreement regarding CPS investigations and CPS-FAR interventions off the reservation as well as cases that are open to DCYF for payment only.

The Spokane Tribe of Indians investigates reports of child abuse and neglect for all children who reside on the Spokane Reservation regardless of Tribal affiliation. Some CPS investigations and CPS-FAR interventions regarding Spokane Tribal children who reside off the reservation are co-managed by DCYF and the Tribe. The Tribe files Youth in Need of Care petitions in Tribal Court for children who reside on the reservation.

All three Tribes provide social services including Indian Health Services, mental health counseling, chemical dependency treatment and Head Start services for children. Additionally, the Spokane Tribe and the Colville Tribe operate Tribal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) programs. All three Tribes are licensed Child Placing Agencies (CPA) and license foster homes on and off the reservation. The Colville Tribe operates the Paschal Sherman Indian School (kindergarten through ninth grade) in Omak, Washington.

The two RAIOs in the region provide numerous services to the community. NATIVE Project provides comprehensive health care to the greater Spokane community, a diabetes management program, mental health counseling, chemical dependency assessments and treatment and youth services. The American Indian Community Center provides family services including crisis intervention, a food bank, adult education services, visitation and transportation.

Additional services for Indian families in Region 1 North include the Healing Lodge of the Seven Nations and Camas Path. The Healing Lodge of the Seven Nations provides residential chemical dependency treatment for Native youth, ages 13-17. It is a collaboration among the three Tribes in Region 1 North and the Nez Perce Tribe and the Coeur D'Alene Tribe (Idaho), the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Oregon). Camas Path provides independent living skills to youth and Tribal foster care licensing.

Region 1 encompasses a large geographical area that includes 11 DCYF field offices. Spokane County has the only office in the region with a specialized ICW section serving all of Spokane County. The Spokane ICW section includes a worker who manages all of the Tribal payment only cases. One unit investigates CPS reports and provides Family Voluntary Services (FVS) for Indian families. There are two units which provide ICW Child and Family Welfare Services (CFWS). ICW dependency cases are heard in Spokane County Dependency court. Caseworkers are responsible for providing legal notice to the Tribes.

One Local Indian Child Welfare Advisory Committee (LICWAC) team supports the Spokane, Colville, Republic, Newport and Lincoln County offices. LICWAC meetings are conducted once per week. A second LICWAC team supports the Omak, Wenatchee and Moses Lake offices and staffing's occur once per week. Cases requiring a LICWAC staffing in the Clarkston and Colfax offices are frequently staffed with the Nez Perce Tribe, located across the Idaho/Washington border.

Region 1 ICW Case Review Sample

A random sample of 25 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 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
5	20	25

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
15	1	5	3

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

Region 1 Offices	Number of Cases
Clarkston	1
Colfax	1
Colville	1
Moses Lake	3

Newport	1
Omak	1
Spokane Central	6
Spokane ICW	4
Spokane North	3
Spokane Valley	2
Wenatchee	2

Tribal Affiliation of the Children Included in the Region 1 Review

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

- Tribes that have determined the child's Indian status as 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

The following chart identifies the number of children included in the review from out-of-state federally recognized Tribes. Many children had multiple Tribal affiliations.

Tribe	Number of Children
Apache (unspecified)	1
Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation of Montana	1
Cherokee (unspecified)	2
Cherokee Nation	1
Choctaw (unspecified)	1
Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation	4
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	4
Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation	1
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon	1

Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	1
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	1
Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon	1
Klamath Tribes	1
Lummi Nation	1
Muckleshoot Indian Tribe	1
Nez Perce Tribe	1
Quileute Nation	1
Quinault Indian Nation	1
Sioux (unspecified)	2
Skokomish Indian Tribe	1
Snoqualmie Tribe	2
Spokane Tribe of Indians	2

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	11
Out-Of-State Tribe	14
Non-Federally Recognized Tribe or Canadian First Nation	0

Region 1 ICW Case Review Results

Comparison of Results to Standard 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 was 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. **Asking the Mother or Maternal Relatives if the Child Had American Indian/Alaska Native Ancestry**
    - In 100% (18) of the cases, the mother or maternal relatives were asked if the child had American Indian/Alaska Native ancestry. Cases were applicable when the mother or maternal relatives were identified and available.
2. **Comprehensive Ancestry Charts**
    - In 81% (13 of 16) 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. **Second inquiry with federally recognized Tribes to determine Indian status**
    - In 83% (5 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).
    - In 80% (4 of 5) of the cases, the second inquiry was made to a federally recognized tribe within 60 days of the first inquiry.

4. **LICWAC Staffing**
    - In 80% (4 of 5) of the cases in which a LICWAC occurred, while inquiry with a federally recognized tribe was pending, the LICWAC staffing was held or attempts were made to schedule the staffing within 60 days of learning the child may be Indian.
5. **FTDM Staffing**
    - In 100% (11) of the cases, an FTDM staffing occurred when a child was placed into out-of-home care or a placement move was being considered.
6. **Family Contact**
    - In 80% (12 of 15) 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 their parents and extended family members.
7. **Qualified Expert Witness**
    - In 86% (6 of 7) 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.
8. **Placement Preference**
    - In 100% (7) 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.
9. **Child Safety in Out-of-Home Care**
    - In 90% (18 of 20) 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.
10. **Meeting the Educational Needs of the Children**
    - In 90% (9 of 10) 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. **Asking the Father or Paternal Relatives if the Child Had American Indian/Alaska Native Ancestry**
    - In 63% (10 of 16) of the cases, the father or paternal relatives were asked if the child had American Indian/Alaska Native ancestry.

- In 55% (6 of 11) of the cases, the father was asked timely if the child had American Indian/Alaska Native ancestry. This applied to cases opened within the past two years.

2. **Completing the Indian Identity Request Form at the Initial Visit and Uploading the Form**
   - In 44% (8 of 18) of the cases, the mother or maternal relatives were asked to complete the Indian Identity Request form at the initial visit.
   - In 29% (4 of 14) of the cases, the father or paternal relatives were asked to complete the Indian Identity Request from at the initial visit.
   - In 47% (8 of 17) of the cases, the Indian Identity Request form was uploaded into FamLink.
3. **Referral to the Native American inquiry (NAIR) Unit and Initial Inquiry**
   - In 47% (7 of 15) of the cases, when Indian ancestry was identified with a federally recognized tribe the social worker provided a complete referral to the NAIR unit within 10 working days of learning the information.
   - In 50% (8 of 16) of the cases, the initial inquiry to federally recognized tribes was completed within 30 days from the time Indian ancestry was identified.
4. **LICWAC Staffing**
   - In 63% (5 of 8) of the cases, the case was staffed with LICWAC when inquiry was pending with a federally recognized tribe.
   - In 50% (2 of 4) of the cases, the case was staffed with LICWAC for guidance when the child's Tribe(s) was unavailable or the tribe was in agreement with guidance from the LICWAC occurring.
5. **Ongoing Active Efforts to Provide and Engage the Mother and Father in Services**
   - In 50% (6 of 12) 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 58% (7 of 12) 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 42% (5 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.
6. **Collaboration with Tribe(s) in Case Planning**
   - In 60% (3 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.
   - In 43% (6 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 38% (3 of 8) 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 a FTDM staffing when placement of the child or a placement move was being considered.

7. **Case Planning with and Cultural Support of the Child**
    - In 60% (3 of 5) 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.
    - In 21% (3 of 14) of the cases of children placed in out-of-home care who were 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.
8. **Court Requirements**
    - In 44% (4 of 9) 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 60% (9 of 15) of the cases of children where ICWA applied, the federally recognized tribe was notified prior to all dependency review hearings within the last year.
9. **Placement Preference**
    - In 58% (7 of 12) 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 to identifying specifically the tribe's placement preference.
10. **Assessing and Addressing Child Safety in the Family Home**
    - In 47% (7 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.
11. **Meeting the Physical and Mental/Behavioral Health Needs of Children**
    - In 67% (10 of 15) 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 44% (4 of 9) 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.
12. **Actions to achieve permanency**
    - In 60% (9 of 15) 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 1 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.)

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

Region 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
63% (10 of 16)	61% (62 of 101)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	0% (0 of 1)
Moses Lake	100% (2)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	67% (2 of 3)
Spokane ICW	100% (3)
Spokane North	0% (0 of 2)
Spokane Valley	50% (1 of 2)
Wenatchee	100% (1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	50% (2 of 4)
Out-Of-Home Cases	67% (8 of 12)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
86% (6 of 7)

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

Region 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
100% (18)	79% (84 of 106)

Region 1 Office Results	
Clarkston	100% (1)
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	100% (2)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	100% (3)
Spokane ICW	100% (4)
Spokane North	100% (2)
Spokane Valley	100% (2)
Wenatchee	100% (1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	100% (4)
Out-Of-Home Cases	100% (14)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
100% (8)

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

Region 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
72% (13 of 18)	74% (59 of 80)

Region 1 Office Results	
Clarkston	100% (1)
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	0% (0 of 2)
Newport	0% (0 of 1)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	67% (2 of 3)
Spokane ICW	75% (3 of 4)
Spokane North	100% (2)
Spokane Valley	100% (2)
Wenatchee	100% (1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	75% (3 of 4)
Out-Of-Home Cases	71% (10 of 14)

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

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

Region 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
55% (6 of 11)	64% (38 of 59)

Region 1 Office Results

Moses Lake	0% (0 of 2)
Newport	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	50% (1 of 2)
Spokane ICW	67% (2 of 3)
Spokane Valley	100% (2)
Wenatchee	100% (1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	67% (2 of 3)
Out-Of-Home Cases	50% (4 of 8)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
50% (3 of 6)

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
75% (6 of 8)	57% (24 of 42)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	0% (0 of 1)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane ICW	67% (2 of 3)
Wenatchee	100% (1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	0% (0 of 1)
Out-Of-Home Cases	86% (6 of 7)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
83% (5 of 6)

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
44% (8 of 18)	36% (36 of 101)

Region 1 Office Results	
Clarkston	100% (1 of 1)
Colville	100% (1 of 1)
Moses Lake	50% (1 of 2)
Newport	0% (0 of 1)
Omak	100% (1 of 1)
Spokane Central	33% (1 of 3)
Spokane ICW	25% (1 of 4)
Spokane North	50% (1 of 2)
Spokane Valley	50% (1 of 2)
Wenatchee	0% (0 of 1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	25% (1 of 4)
Out-Of-Home Cases	50% (7 of 14)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
38% (3 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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
29% (4 of 14)	26% (23 of 89)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	0% (0 of 1)
Moses Lake	50% (1 of 2)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	33% (1 of 3)
Spokane ICW	0% (0 of 3)
Spokane Valley	50% (1 of 2)
Wenatchee	0% (0 of 1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	33% (1 of 3)
Out-Of-Home Cases	27% (3 of 11)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
29% (2 of 7)

8. Was the Indian Identity Request form(s) uploaded into FamLink (#09-761)?	
Region 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
47% (8 of 17)	63% (49 of 78)

Region 1 Office Results	
Clarkston	100% (1)
Colville	0% (0 of 1)
Moses Lake	0% (0 of 2)
Newport	0% (0 of 1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	67% (2 of 3)
Spokane ICW	33% (1 of 3)
Spokane North	100% (2)
Spokane Valley	100% (2)
Wenatchee	0% (0 of 1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	50% (2 of 4)
Out-Of-Home Cases	46% (6 of 13)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
29% (2 of 7)

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 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
47% (7 of 15)	48% (47 of 97)

Region 1 Office Results	
Clarkston	0% (0 of 1)
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	0% (0 of 1)
Newport	0% (0 of 1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	33% (1 of 3)
Spokane ICW	67% (2 of 3)
Spokane North	100% (2)
Spokane Valley	100% (1)
Wenatchee	0% (0 of 1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	100% (1)
Out-Of-Home Cases	43% (6 of 14)

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

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

Region 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
50% (8 of 16)	44% (43 of 97)

Region 1 Office Results	
Clarkston	0% (0 of 1)
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	0% (0 of 1)
Newport	0% (0 of 1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	33% (1 of 3)
Spokane ICW	75% (3 of 4)
Spokane North	100% (2)
Spokane Valley	100% (1)
Wenatchee	0% (0 of 1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	100% (2)
Out-Of-Home Cases	43% (6 of 14)

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

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

Region 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
81% (13 of 16)	85% (83 of 98)

Region 1 Office Results	
Clarkston	100% (1)
Colville	0% (0 of 1)

Moses Lake	100% (1)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	67% (2 of 3)
Spokane ICW	75% (3 of 4)
Spokane North	100% (2)
Spokane Valley	100% (1)
Wenatchee	100% (1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	50% (1 of 2)
Out-Of-Home Cases	86% (12 of 14)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
100% (7)

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
83% (5 of 6)	83% (34 of 41)

Region 1 Office Results	
Moses Lake	100% (1)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	100% (1)
Spokane North	50% (1 of 2)
Wenatchee	100% (1)

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

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

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

Region 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
80% (4 of 5)	91% (31 of 34)

Region 1 Office Results	
Moses Lake	0% (0 of 1)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	100% (1)
Spokane North	100% (1)
Wenatchee	100% (1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	NA
Out-Of-Home Cases	80% (4 of 5)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
67% (2 of 3)

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

Region 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
63% (5 of 8)	29% (12 of 41)

Region 1 Office Results	
Clarkston	0% (0 of 1)
Moses Lake	100% (2)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	67% (2 of 3)
Spokane North	0% (0 of 1)

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

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
80% (4 of 5)	92% (11 of 12)

Region 1 Office Results	
Moses Lake	50% (1 of 2)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	100% (2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
67% (2 of 3)

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
50% (6 of 12)	44% (30 of 68)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	0% (0 of 1)
Moses Lake	50% (1 of 2)
Newport	0% (0 of 1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	67% (2 of 3)
Spokane ICW	100% (1)
Spokane Valley	100% (1)
Wenatchee	50% (1 of 2)

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

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

Region 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
58% (7 of 12)	64% (46 of 72)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	100% (1)

Moses Lake	50% (1 of 2)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	50% (1 of 2)
Spokane ICW	50% (1 of 2)
Spokane Valley	100% (1)
Wenatchee	50% (1 of 2)

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
60% (3 of 5)	79% (22 of 28)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	100% (1)
Newport	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	100% (2)
Spokane ICW	0% (0 of 1)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
33% (1 of 3)

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
60% (3 of 5)	54% (14 of 26)

Region 1 Office Results	
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane ICW	100% (1)
Spokane Valley	0% (0 of 1)
Wenatchee	100% (1)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	NA
Out-Of-Home Cases	60% (3 of 5)

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

Region 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
43% (6 of 14)	49% (37 of 75)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	50% (1 of 2)
Newport	100% (1)

Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	40% (2 of 5)
Spokane ICW	50% (1 of 2)
Spokane Valley	0% (0 of 1)
Wenatchee	0% (0 of 1)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
50% (5 of 10)

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 1 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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
100% (11)	79% (50 of 63)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	100% (1)
Newport	100% (1)
Spokane Central	100% (1)
Spokane ICW	100% (3)
Spokane North	100% (1)
Spokane Valley	100% (1)
Wenatchee	100% (2)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	NA
Out-Of-Home Cases	100% (11)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
100% (7)

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
38% (3 of 8)	60% (30 of 50)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	0% (0 of 1)
Moses Lake	0% (0 of 1)
Newport	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane ICW	100% (2)
Wenatchee	50% (1 of 2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
50% (3 of 6)

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
42% (5 of 12)	43% (30 of 69)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	0% (0 of 1)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	50% (2 of 4)

Spokane ICW	50% (1 of 2)
Wenatchee	0% (0 of 2)

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

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
80% (12 of 15)	67% (51 of 76)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	0% (0 of 1)
Moses Lake	100% (2)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	60% (3 of 5)
Spokane ICW	100% (1)
Spokane Valley	100% (1)
Wenatchee	100% (2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
100% (11)

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
21% (3 of 14)	38% (29 of 76)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	0% (0 of 1)
Moses Lake	0% (0 of 2)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	20% (1 of 5)
Spokane ICW	50% (1 of 2)
Wenatchee	0% (0 of 2)

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

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
50% (2 of 4)	56% (9 of 16)

Region 1 Office Results	
Moses Lake	100% (1)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	0% (0 of 2)

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

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 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
44% (4 of 9)	57% (25 of 44)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	0% (0 of 1)
Moses Lake	0% (0 of 1)
Newport	0% (0 of 1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	100% (2)
Spokane ICW	50% (1 of 2)
Wenatchee	100% (1)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
50% (4 of 8)

29. Was the child's Tribe(s) informed of all dependency reviews?	
Region 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
60% (9 of 15)	67% (51 of 76)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	50% (1 of 2)

Newport	100% (1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	60% (3 of 5)
Spokane ICW	100% (2)
Spokane Valley	0% (0 of 1)
Wenatchee	50% (1 of 2)

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

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

Region 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
86% (6 of 7)	58% (18 of 31)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	0% (0 of 1)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	100% (2)
Spokane ICW	100% (2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
83% (5 of 6)

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 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
58% (7 of 12)	46% (33 of 72)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	0% (0 of 1)
Moses Lake	100% (1)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	75% (3 of 4)
Spokane ICW	100% (2)
Wenatchee	0% (0 of 2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
67% (6 of 9)

32. Was the Tribe's placement preference followed?	
Region 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
100% (7)	94% (31 of 33)

Region 1 Office Results	
Moses Lake	100% (1)
Newport	100% (1)
Spokane Central	100% (3)
Spokane ICW	100% (2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
100% (6)

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
47% (7 of 15)	51% (37 of 72)

Region 1 Office Results	
Clarkston	100% (1)
Colville	0% (0 of 1)
Moses Lake	50% (1 of 2)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	50% (1 of 2)
Spokane ICW	0% (0 of 3)
Spokane North	100% (2)
Spokane Valley	0% (0 of 2)

Regional Results by Case Type	
In-Home Cases	25% (1 of 4)
Out-Of-Home Cases	55% (6 of 11)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
50% (3 of 6)

34. During the time the child was placed in out-of-home care, were risk and safety threats adequately identified, assessed and addressed?	
Region 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
90% (18 of 20)	89% (99 of 111)

Region 1 Office Results	
Clarkston	100% (1)
Colfax	100% (1)
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	100% (1)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	100% (6)
Spokane ICW	67% (2 of 3)
Spokane North	50% (1 of 2)
Spokane Valley	100% (1)
Wenatchee	100% (2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
100% (10)

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 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
90% (9 of 10)	95% (55 of 58)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	100% (1)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	100% (1)
Spokane Central	75% (3 of 4)
Spokane ICW	100% (1)
Wenatchee	100% (1)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
86% (6 of 7)

36. Were actions taken to assess and address the child(ren)'s physical health needs?	
Region 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
67% (10 of 15)	61% (47 of 77)

Region 1 Office Results

Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	100% (2)
Newport	0% (0 of 1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	60% (3 of 5)
Spokane ICW	100% (2)
Spokane Valley	100% (1)
Wenatchee	50% (1 of 2)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
73% (8 of 11)

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

Region 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
44% (4 of 9)	57% (25 of 44)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	0% (0 of 1)
Moses Lake	100% (1)
Newport	100% (1)
Spokane Central	25% (1 of 4)
Spokane ICW	100% (1)
Wenatchee	0% (0 of 1)

Primary Affiliation with a Washington State Tribe
50% (3 of 6)

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 1 Results	2019 Statewide Results
60% (9 of 15)	38% (29 of 77)

Region 1 Office Results	
Colville	100% (1)
Moses Lake	100% (2)
Newport	100% (1)
Omak	0% (0 of 1)
Spokane Central	20% (1 of 5)
Spokane ICW	100% (2)
Spokane Valley	100% (1)
Wenatchee	50% (1 of 2)

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

Average Length of Stay for ICWA Children included in the Region 1 ICW Case Review

Of the children included in the review, 11 remained in out-of-home placement at the time of the Region 1 ICW Case Review.

Number of Children	Average Length of Stay
11	26.2 Months

Of the children included in the review, two children completed a trial return home and had their dependency dismissed prior to the Region 1 ICW Case Review.

Length of Stay in Out-of-Home Care	Length of Trial Return Home Prior to Dismissal of Dependency	Total Length of Stay
2 Months	8 Months	10 Months
4 Months	6 Months	10 Months

Of the children included in the review, two children were on a trial return home at the time of the Region 1 ICW Case Review.

Length of Stay in Out-of-Home Care	Length of Trial Return Home	Total Length of Stay
8 Months	0 Months	8 Months
13 Months	7 Months	20 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	9	16.8 Months
5 - 10	4	24.3 Months
11 - 18	2	39.5 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 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
0% (1)	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 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
0% (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 1 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 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
0% (1)	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 1 Results	**2019 Statewide Results**
100% (1)	23% (3 of 13)