



Performance and Quality Improvement (PA-PQI)

2026 Updates for Public Agencies

Purpose

An inclusive, agency-wide performance and quality improvement system increases agency capacity to make data-informed decisions that support the achievement of performance targets, program goals, individual and family outcomes, and staff and consumer satisfaction, effectively engages staff, persons served, and other stakeholders in advancing the agency's mission and achieving strategic goals through continuous, integrated, data-driven efforts to improve service delivery and administrative practice.

Introduction

COA's Performance and Quality Improvement (PA-PQI) Standards provide the framework for an agency-wide PQI system that effectively engages staff, persons served, and other stakeholders in advancing the agency's mission and achieving strategic goals through continuous, integrated, data-driven efforts to improve service delivery and administrative practice, increases agency capacity to make data-informed decisions that support the achievement of performance targets, program goals, individual and family outcomes, and staff and consumer satisfaction. Building and sustaining a comprehensive, mission-driven PQI system is dependent upon the active engagement of staff at all levels, persons served, and other stakeholders throughout the improvement cycle.

Note: Please see the [PA-PQI Reference List](#) for the research that informed the development of these standards.

Note: Please see the [PQI Toolkit](#) for additional guidance on these standards.

Note: ~~For information about changes made in the 2020 Edition, please see [PQI Crosswalk](#).~~

PA-PQI 1: PQI Infrastructure

The agency's PQI system has an infrastructure has that gives the agency capacity to:

- a. ensure the integrity of measurement practices, including data collection and analysis;
- b. identify agency-wide and region- and program-specific areas of strength and areas for improvement; and

c. identify, implement, and monitor improvement strategies.

Interpretation: *Agencies should demonstrate consistent, reliable practices for gathering and using data to inform quality improvement, commensurate with their size, resources, and governance structure. Agencies with limited data infrastructure should apply these standards using available tools and qualitative methods, ensuring data are consistently collected and used for improvement at a level appropriate to their agency.*

Examples: *Agencies may rely on a range of tools and systems to support their PQI activities depending on their resources and infrastructure. These can include:*

- a. spreadsheets for tracking and analysis;*
- b. survey tools for gathering feedback;*
- c. state or jurisdiction-provided case management systems;*
- d. databases or dashboards developed in-house; and/or*
- e. qualitative sources such as staff or client focus groups, exit and stay interviews, and committee meeting notes.*

Table of Evidence		
Standard Code	Evidence Type	Description
PA-PQI 1	On-Site Activities	<p>County/Municipality Administered Agency, State Administered Agency (Central Office), or other Public Entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews may include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agency leadership 2. Program field<u>Direct service staff</u>personnel 3. Community stakeholders 4. PQI Director 5. ITM/data analysis manager 6. Contracted providers 7. Persons served <p>State Administered Agency (Regional Office)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews may include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regional Director 2. Program field<u>Direct service staff</u>personnel

Table of Evidence

Standard Code	Evidence Type	Description
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Administrative personnel <u>staff</u> (HR, Training, PQI, ITM) 4. Community stakeholders 5. Contracted providers 6. Persons served
PA-PQI 1	Self-Study	<p>County/Municipality Administered Agency, State Administered Agency (Central Office), or other Public Entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PQI Plan • PQI operational procedures • PQI meeting/activity schedule for the next 12 months • Document or chart detailing the agency's PQI structure including committees and work groups with member lists, as appropriate <p>State Administered Agency (Regional Office)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional PQI plan • Regional PQI operational procedures • Regional PQI meeting/activity schedule for the next 12 months • Document or chart detailing the region's PQI structure including committees and work groups with member lists, as appropriate

Rating Indicators

Rating	
1	<p>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity, <u>as indicated by full implementation of the practices outlined in the PQI 1 Practice standards.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All elements or requirements outlined in the standard are evident in practice, with rare or no exceptions; exceptions do not impact service quality or agency performance.
2	<p>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 1 Practice standards.</u> The majority of the standards requirements have been met and the basic framework required by the standard has been implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor inconsistencies and not yet fully developed practices are noted; however, these do not significantly impact service quality or agency performance.
3	<p>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 1 Practice standards.</u> The agency has not implemented the basic framework of the standard but instead has in place only part of this framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Omissions or exceptions to the practices outlined in the standard occur regularly, or practices are implemented in a cursory or haphazard manner. Service quality or agency functioning may be compromised. Capacity is at a basic level.
4	<p>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 1 Practice standards.</u> The agency's observed administration and management infrastructure and practices are weak or non-existent; or show signs of neglect, stagnation, or deterioration.</p>

PA-PQI 1.01

The PQI plan and procedures:

- a. cover every program or service area within each of the agency's regions or sites;
- b. articulate the agency's approach to quality improvement including specific models and methodologies it employs;
- c. describe the PQI system's structure and outline all major PQI activities;
- d. define staff roles and assigns responsibility for implementing and coordinating the PQI process;
- e. identify the core areas of performance being measured and the purpose or goals for measuring these areas;
- f. define measurement practices including data collection and analysis methods, process, and applicable timeframes; ~~and~~
- g. reflect how the PQI system is evaluated; and
- g-h. demonstrate alignment with agency-wide strategic, annual, human resources, and financial planning processes.

CFS Interpretation: *For child and family services agencies, the PQI system must include all the jurisdictions in which the services included in the Child and Family Services Plan are provided.*

Interpretation: *For state-administered agencies, regional PQI plans should directly correlate with the agency-wide plan while also being responsive to the region's specific needs. The regional plan and accompanying procedures explain the structure for carrying out PQI activities in the region, including any region-specific committees, processes, and performance measures. Additionally, if the region contains any unique programs, the regional PQI plan should address the PQI activities and measures for those programs.*

Interpretation: *The agency's PQI plan, as the guiding document for implementing and refining the PQI system, is distinct from time-sensitive, actionable plans that the agency develops to target improvement activities such as the Child and Family Services Review Program Improvement Plans.*

Note: *Regarding element (e), please see the Person-Centered Logic Model Core Concept in each assigned Service Standard for additional information on program outputs and individual outcomes to be included in the PQI plan.*

Examples: *Among other things, evaluation of the PQI system can include assessing how well PQI activities align with best practices in measurement including: (1) is the agency asking the right performance questions, (2) how well do chosen metrics answer the performance questions being asked, and (3) is the agency accurately measuring change over time.*

Rating Indicators

<u>Rating</u>	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• One of the standard's elements is not fully implemented (e.g., it lacks sufficient detail about how the PQI system is evaluated or some programs are less well addressed in the plan); or</u><u>• Regional or site-level PQI plans are in place but not fully aligned with the agency-wide plan; or</u><u>• Linkages between PQI and core planning functions are laid out, but one core planning function is not adequately covered.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• One of the standard's elements is not addressed at all (e.g., the plan does not include clear staff roles or defined measurement practices); or</u><u>• Some programs, service areas, or regions are not covered in the plan; or</u><u>• Alignment with planning functions is minimal.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• No comprehensive PQI plan is in place; or</u><u>• The plan fails to provide basic structure, scope, and responsibilities for PQI; or</u><u>• PQI activities are ad hoc, undocumented, or limited to compliance-driven processes without a system-wide framework.</u>

PA-PQI 1.02

The PQI plan:

- a. defines a broad range of internal and external stakeholder groups; and
- b. specifies how these stakeholder groups will ~~be~~ participate meaningfully ~~involved~~ in the PQI process, including how their input is gathered, considered, and used to inform improvements.

Examples: ~~Interpretation: Stakeholder involvement is fundamental to any well-designed PQI system and is crucial to a public agency's ability to achieve its mission and elicit public trust. Stakeholders are often thought of in terms of categories or groups of people—sometimes referred to as communities of interest.~~

Common stakeholder categories include:

- a. persons served, including children and youth when applicable;
- b. community-based organizations and neighborhood associations;
- c. service providers, particularly contracted providers;
- d. community-based business entities;
- e. public agency partners including other social service agencies and the court system;
- f. statewide or national advocacy organizations; and
- g. academic, learning, and research institutions.

Interpretation: Stakeholders should participate in a broad range of activities including involvement in PQI planning activities; activities that gather qualitative data on the experience of receiving services or providing services as a contracted provider; reviewing and interpreting summary data information; and identifying, implementing, and monitoring solutions. Agencies should ensure stakeholder engagement is reciprocal and influences decision-making.

Note: Throughout the PA-PQI standards, staff are intentionally differentiated from other stakeholders to highlight their unique involvement in the PQI process.

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
1	<u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u>

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The plan limits meaningful involvement of stakeholders to certain service areas or regions; or</u> <u>The plan describes how input is sought and documented, but the link to decision-making is limited or unclear.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Key groups of stakeholders (e.g., persons served, contracted providers, etc.) are omitted; or</u> <u>Stakeholder involvement is limited to symbolic or one-time activities; or</u> <u>Processes for gathering and using stakeholder input are poorly defined.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all, e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Stakeholder groups are not defined in the plan; or</u> <u>There is no clear process for involving stakeholders in PQI planning or activities; or</u> <u>Stakeholder participation is either absent or so minimal that it does not influence quality improvement or decision-making.</u>

PA-PQI 1.03

The PQI plan outlines the flow of information between frontline workers and those responsible for implementing and coordinating the agency's PQI process to ensure:

- staff at all levels of the agency receive information on PQI evidence and findings;
- frontline staff and their supervisors have timely access to the information they need to clarify expectations and implement practice improvements; and
- timely, effective delivery of data and feedback to PQI system administrators.

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The plan outlines communication processes but lacks detail in some areas (e.g., staff access to PQI findings is described, but details on timeliness or feedback loops is limited).</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The plan mentions communication but provides minimal detail (e.g., it is unclear how frontline staff receive findings or provide input).</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The plan does not address information flow between PQI administrators and frontline staff.</u>

PA-PQI 2: Roles and Responsibilities

Staff at all levels of the agency are prepared to participate in, conduct, and sustain performance and quality improvement activities.

Table of Evidence		
Standard Code	Evidence Type	Description
PA-PQI 2	On-Site Activities	<p>All Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews may include:

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PQI staff 2. Managers and program directors 3. <u>Staff at all levels Agency personnel Staff at various levels, including both direct service and administrative or support personnel</u>
PA-PQI 2	On-Site Evidence	<p>All Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training curricula and materials • Documentation tracking staff completion of required PQI trainings
PA-PQI 2	Self-Study	<p>All Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PQI training curricula table(s) of contents broken down by job category including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. staff coordinating the agency's PQI system <u>2.</u> supervisors, program directors, and senior managers <u>2-3.</u> <u>non-supervisory staff</u>

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
1	<p>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</p> <p>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity, <u>as indicated by full implementation of the practices outlined in PA-PQI 2 Practice standards.</u> All elements or requirements outlined in the standard are evident in practice, with rare or no exceptions: exceptions do not impact service quality or agency performance.</p>
2	<p>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</p> <p>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 2 Practice standards.</u> The majority of the standards requirements have been met and the basic framework required by the standard has been implemented.</p>

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor inconsistencies and not yet fully developed practices are noted; however, these do not significantly impact service quality or agency performance.
3	<p>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</p> <p>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 2 Practice standards</u>. The agency has not implemented the basic framework of the standard but instead has in place only part of this framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omissions or exceptions to the practices outlined in the standard occur regularly, or practices are implemented in a cursory or haphazard manner. • Service quality or agency functioning may be compromised. • Capacity is at a basic level.
4	<p>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</p> <p>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 2 Practice standards</u>. The agency's observed administration and management infrastructure and practices are weak or non-existent; or show signs of neglect, stagnation, or deterioration.</p>

PA-PQI 2.01

Staff responsible for implementing and coordinating the agency's PQI process are trained on, or demonstrate competency in, sound measurement practices including:

- a. identifying indicators of quality practice for the programs being evaluated;
- b. effectively implementing internal and external evaluation methods, such as benchmarking, appropriate to the programs being evaluated;
- c. collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data from a range of sources; ~~and~~
- ~~e-d.~~ applying data literacy skills to assess data quality; and
- ~~d-e.~~ communicating evidence and findings to staff and other stakeholders in a manner that facilitates understanding and ~~their active~~ engagement.

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not fully implemented; or</u> • <u>There are some minor inconsistencies in training or staff competencies across regions or programs; or</u> • <u>Training could be better integrated with practice.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not addressed at all; or</u> • <u>Training only addresses basic competencies; or</u> • <u>Training is ad-hoc, optional, or dependent on individual supervisors or local initiatives and PQI staff are not sufficiently competent to implement and coordinate the PQI system.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

PA-PQI 2.02

Staff receive ongoing training in PQI activities including, as appropriate to individual roles and responsibilities:

- a. the goals, relevance, and inherent value of the PQI process;
- b. the roles of all staff in implementing the PQI process;
- c. data collection tools and forms;
- d. the key decision-making junctures in their work and how data should inform decisions; and

- e. case review forms and processes.

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not fully implemented; or</u> • <u>There are some minor inconsistencies in training across regions or programs but most staff receive the support they need.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not addressed at all; or</u> • <u>Training is limited to onboarding or only provided to specific staff.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

PA-PQI 2.03

~~Supervisors of direct service staff, p~~Program directors, ~~and~~ senior managers, and supervisors of direct service staff are trained on, or demonstrate competency in:

- a. collecting, monitoring, and interpreting data and using this evidence to evaluate and discuss performance as it relates to outcomes;
- b. facilitating team discussions about findings in a manner that encourages open dialogue, learning, and problem solving;
- ~~b-c.~~ targeting areas of improvement;
- ~~4.~~ supporting staff in ensuring data collection and integrity; and
- ~~e-d.~~ supporting staff in using data as evidence to inform casework and operational decision-making.

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>One of the standard's elements is not fully implemented; or</u> <u>More training is needed for some supervisors, program directors, or senior managers to develop full competency in the required elements.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement, e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>One of the standard's elements is not addressed at all; or</u> <u>Structured training is not consistently provided, and only some supervisors, program directors, or senior managers demonstrate competency through experience.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all, e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>There is little to no evidence that supervisors, program directors, or senior managers receive training or possess the required competencies.</u>

PA-PQI 3: Measures and Indicators

The agency identifies and utilizes measures and indicators for evaluating the following within the agency and with any contracted providers:

- the impact of services on individuals and families;
- the quality of service delivery; and
- management and operational performance.

Examples: *Measures, indicators, and tools required by regulation can be utilized to go beyond measuring compliance by engaging staff and other stakeholders inte:*

- a. *reviewing* data that is important for their work or interest;
- b. *using* data to benchmark results with other agencies providing the same funded services; or
- c. *comparing* data with other data collected by the agency that is not covered by contractual requirements in order to improve services.

Examples: Agencies providing child and family services are encouraged to integrate the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) Outcome Measures and Systemic Factors, particularly those identified in Performance Improvement Plans, into their overall PQI system.

Table of Evidence		
Standard Code	Evidence Type	Description
PA-PQI 3	On-Site Activities	<p>All Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews may include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PQI staff 2. Relevant staff 3. Other relevant <u>Community</u> stakeholders
PA-PQI 3	On-Site Evidence	<p>All Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of staff/stakeholder involvement in ongoing review of measures, indicators, data sources, and performance targets • Regulatory/licensing or other external reviews/reports • Documentation that COA Stakeholder Surveys were distributed (e.g. email chains, Stakeholder Survey Recipient Reporting Form, etc.)
PA-PQI 3	Self-Study	<p>County/Municipality Administered Agency, State Administered Agency (Central Office), or other Public Entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See PQI plan (PA-PQI 1) for a description of what is being measured, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ outcomes measures ○ outputs ○ data sources

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ performance indicators ○ performance targets ● See outcomes information provided in the Person-Centered Logic Model Core Concept in each Service Standard ● Agencies seeking re-accreditation only <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most recent Final Accreditation Report (FAR) <p>State Administered Agency (Regional Office)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● See Regional PQI plan for region-specific measures or indicators, if appropriate ● See outcomes information provided in the Person-Centered Logic Model Core Concept in each Service Standard ● Agencies seeking re-accreditation only <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most recent Final Accreditation Report (FAR)
--	--	--

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
1	<p>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</p> <p>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity, <u>as indicated by full implementation of the practices outlined in the PQI 3 Practice standards.</u> All elements or requirements outlined in the standard are evident in practice, with rare or no exceptions: exceptions do not impact service quality or agency performance.</p>
2	<p>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</p> <p>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 3 Practice standards.</u> The majority of the standards requirements have been met and the basic framework required by the standard has been implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Minor inconsistencies and not yet fully developed practices are noted; however, these do not significantly impact service quality or agency performance.

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
3	<p>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</p> <p>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 3 Practice standards</u>. he agency has not implemented the basic framework of the standard but instead has in place only part of this framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omissions or exceptions to the practices outlined in the standard occur regularly, or practices are implemented in a cursory or haphazard manner. • Service quality or agency functioning may be compromised. • Capacity is at a basic level.
4	<p>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</p> <p>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 3 Practice standards</u>. The agency's observed administration and management infrastructure and practices are weak or non-existent; or show signs of neglect, stagnation, or deterioration.</p>

PA-PQI 3.01

Staff throughout the agency and stakeholders, including contracted providers, participate in the ongoing review of outputs and individual outcomes for each program or service area, and related:

- a. quantitative and qualitative indicators;
- b. data sources including measurement tools and instruments for each identified measure; and
- c. performance targets.

Interpretation: *Agencies are encouraged to use standardized or recognized outcomes evaluation tools when available and appropriate. Functional assessments permit the analysis of an individual or family's status over time and, in the aggregate, this case-level data can inform the analysis of trends and relationships to correlating service delivery components.*

Interpretation: *Program outputs and individual outcomes must be identified in the logic model submitted in the Person-Centered Logic Model Core Concept in each assigned Service Standard.*

Interpretation: Agencies should assess variations in service population, service area, staffing, and other factors to develop baselines, performance targets, and benchmarks tailored to the local area or program.

Examples:

Outputs are what the program delivers. Examples of program outputs include:

- a. number of educational or clinical sessions provided;
- b. total number of individuals served over a specified period; and
- c. number of housing placements made.

Outcomes are the observable and measurable effects of a program's activities or interventions on its service recipients. Examples include:

- a. improved functioning as measured by the Children's Functional Assessment Rating Scale (CFARS);
- b. number/percent of homeless and runaway youth that are reunited with family during the past quarter;
- c. reduction in criminal justice system involvement; and
- d. improved family/community involvement.

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Participation is not fully consistent across all stakeholder groups; or</u> • <u>The agency has not developed indicators or performance targets for some of its programs or service areas.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Participation is limited; or</u>

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One stakeholder group (e.g., contracted providers) are infrequently represented; or</u> • <u>One or more high risk program(s) or service area(s) is not reviewed.</u>
4	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

PA-PQI 3.02

~~Thee evaluate the quality of its service-delivery practices, the agency identifies and uses outcome measures related to the followingsurveys clients annually to assess program quality.:~~

- ~~a. training and supervision of program staff; and~~
- ~~b.a. consumer satisfaction.~~

Examples: *Indicators of program quality that may be included in the survey can include client satisfaction or outcomes information. Issues covered by a client survey should correspond to the key service outcomes an agency wishes to track. Because survey length generally affects response rates, issues not pertinent to improving outcomes should be limited. The goal is to develop the shortest possible list of questions consistent with the survey's objective of assessing program quality.*

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
1	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
2	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>While annual surveys are conducted, they could be strengthened (e.g., the survey could be revised to improve return rate, or they could be conducted more frequently for some programs).</u>

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Surveys are not conducted for all programs; or</u> • <u>Data is collected but not always used to evaluate service quality or inform improvements.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all, e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The agency does not conduct outcome or satisfaction surveys.</u>

PA-PQI 3.03

To evaluate management and operational performance, the agency identifies and uses outcome measures across the agency, and with contracted providers when applicable, to:

- a. measure progress toward achieving its strategic goals and objectives;
- b. evaluate operational functions that influence service delivery; and
- c. identify and mitigate risk.

CFS Interpretation: *For child and family services agencies, implementation of this standard includes an examination of relevant systemic factors assessed by the Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSRs).*

Examples: *Examples of outcome measures related to operations and management can include:*

- a. *efficiency in the allocation and utilization of its human and financial resources to further the achievement of agency objectives;*
- b. *effectiveness of risk prevention measures;*
- c. *staff retention/turnover and satisfaction;*
- d. *service delivery costs versus benefits derived by persons served;*
- e. *achievement of budgetary objectives;*
- f. *effectiveness of public education and outreach;*

- g. *efforts to diversify the leadership or workforce;*~~and~~
- h. *staff fidelity to the process and quality standards set by the agency; and*
- h.i. *impact of technology, including artificial intelligence, on workforce wellbeing, organizational goals, and service delivery.*

Examples: *Agencies that use contracted providers may also measure important contract oversight and system integration processes, such as:*

- a. *the proportion of services that are meeting defined outcomes for persons served;*
- b. *the proportion of services that are evidence-based or meet nationally recognized treatment guidelines developed by consensus groups;*
- c. *the integration of performance and outcomes data across the system;*
- d. *the integration and coordination of service provision processes across the system including ease of access to services;*
- e. *the effectiveness of contractor training and technical assistance efforts;*
- f. *the satisfaction of stakeholders, such as high-volume referral agents (e.g., judges, court workers, schools, and law enforcement); and*
- g. *results of case reviews, including the percentage of charts in which a placement decision includes an appropriate application of clinical criteria.*

<u>Rating Indicators</u>	
<u>Rating</u>	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not fully implemented.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not addressed at all.</u>

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
4	<u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u>

PA-PQI 3.04

Findings and recommendations from external review and monitoring processes are integrated into the organization's PQI system.

Interpretation: *When agencies are involved in litigated third-party oversight, such as consent decrees, strategic plans and PQI plans (agency-wide plans or jurisdiction-specific plans) should indicate how the overall PQI system balances pursuit of compliance with the larger quality improvement agenda.*

CFS Interpretation: *For child and family services agencies, the PQI system must incorporate the findings of the Child and Family Services Review and support implementation of the strategies outlined in its Program Improvement Plan.*

Examples: *External review and monitoring processes can include:*

- a. *reviews related to federal, state, and local requirements;*
- b. *litigated third party oversight, including consent decrees;*
- c. *government audits;*
- d. *accreditation reviews; and*
- e. *other reviews, where appropriate.*

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
1	<u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u>
2	<u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u>

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Some external review and monitoring findings are not fully integrated into the agency's PQI processes; or</u> • <u>Recommendations are considered but do not always translate into fully documented actions.</u>
3	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Some external review and monitoring findings are not integrated into the agency's PQI processes at all; or</u> • <u>Documentation of how external monitoring influences quality improvement is minimal.</u>
4	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Reports from oversight bodies, courts, and/or federal and state reviews are either ignored or addressed only as compliance exercises.</u>

PA-PQI 4: Case Review

The agency maintains case review processes for each of its services that inform performance and quality improvement activities by evaluating:

- the impact of service delivery on each program's service population;
- the quality and effectiveness of service delivery practices; and
- the quality of documentation and data entry.

NA *The agency is only assigned the Early Childhood Education (PA-ECE) and/or Out-of-School Time Services (PA-OST) standards.*

NA *The agency provides only non-clinical group, crisis intervention, and/or information and referral services.*

Note: *The case review processes addressed in this standard produce aggregate qualitative and quantitative data from across each service area that can be used to evaluate the impact of the agency's service delivery practices on the outcomes of its service populations and to inform system-wide improvements, when indicated. These reviews are distinct from the case-level,*

supervisory review that is conducted for individual cases on a quarterly or more frequent basis to assess service plan implementation and the individual's progress towards meeting his or her service goals and desired outcomes. Findings from case reviews should be systematically integrated into the agency's broader PQI data analysis (PA-PQI 5) to identify patterns, trends, and opportunities for agency-wide improvement.

Table of Evidence		
Standard Code	Evidence Type	Description
PA-PQI 4	On-Site Activities	<p>All Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews may include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PQI staff 2. Relevant staff
PA-PQI 4	On-Site Evidence	<p>All Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of external case record audits, if applicable
PA-PQI 4	Self-Study	<p>County/Municipality Administered Agency, State Administered Agency (Central Office), or other Public Entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Qualitative case reviews 2. Case record reviews • Qualitative case review scoring tool(s) • Quantitative Case record review scoring tool • Sampling methodologies • Aggregate reports from the most recent case review processes <p>State Administered Agency (Regional Office)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggregate reports from the most recent case review processes

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
1	<p>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</p> <p>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity, <u>as indicated by full implementation of the practices outlined in the PA-PQI 4 Practice standards.</u> All elements or requirements outlined in the standard are evident in practice, with rare or no exceptions; exceptions do not impact service quality or agency performance.</p>
2	<p>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</p> <p>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 4 Practice standards.</u> The majority of the standards requirements have been met and the basic framework required by the standard has been implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor inconsistencies and not yet fully developed practices are noted; however, these do not significantly impact service quality or agency performance.
3	<p>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</p> <p>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 4 Practice standards.</u> The agency has not implemented the basic framework of the standard but instead has in place only part of this framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Omissions or exceptions to the practices outlined in the standard occur regularly, or practices are implemented in a cursory or haphazard manner. Service quality or agency functioning may be compromised. Capacity is at a basic level.
4	<p>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</p> <p>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 4 Practice standards.</u> The agency's observed administration and management infrastructure and practices are weak or non-existent; or show signs of neglect, stagnation, or deterioration.</p>

PA-PQI 4.01

The agency implements an annual qualitative case review (QCR) process on a sample of cases to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of services provided.

Interpretation: Jurisdictions can implement this standard by: (1) utilizing the CFSSR protocol in between federal reviews, (2) choosing some other nationally recognized QCR process such as the Quality Service Review, or (3) developing their own local QCR process.

Interpretation: Sample sizes for qualitative case reviews will vary depending on the caseload size of each jurisdiction or site. Reducing the sample size may be one way to reduce the overall cost and increase the feasibility of implementing an effective QCR process.

Examples: Qualitative case reviews monitor the quality and effectiveness of services provided by evaluating the following, as appropriate to the program:

- a. safety, well-being, and/or progress of the individual or family;
- b. timeliness and comprehensiveness of the completed assessment;
- c. appropriateness of the service plan and related service decisions for the individual or family;
- d. family engagement;
- e. collaboration with external service provider(s);
- f. achievement of service goals; and
- g. level to which service implementation and results are being monitored, evaluated, and modified.

~~**Examples:** Qualitative data obtained from case reviews can provide greater insight into the underlying practices causing a change in the quantitative data (PA-PQI 4.03). Conversely, the quantitative data can be used to determine the scope or breadth of a practice concern (e.g. system wide, regional, worker, etc.). As such, both qualitative and quantitative data have a critical role to play in any effective PQI system.~~

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The QCR process is occasionally delayed, but most reviews occur on schedule</u>

<u>Rating Indicators</u>	
<u>Rating</u>	
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The QCR process is regularly delayed beyond a year; or</u> <u>Only select programs or services are represented in the QCR process.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>There is little to no evidence of a QCR process; or</u> <u>A review process has not been conducted within the past two years.</u>

PA-PQI 4.02

Annual, qualitative case reviews include:

- reviewing selected case records;
- conducting case-specific interviews with persons served, workers, and other stakeholders involved with the case; and
- providing feedback to individual caseworkers.

<u>Rating Indicators</u>	
<u>Rating</u>	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>One of the standard's elements is not fully implemented.</u>

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not addressed at all.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

PA-PQI 4.03

Quarterly reviews of case records are conducted to:

- evaluate the presence, timeliness, clarity, quality, continuity, and completeness of required documents;
- monitor compliance with regulatory, funding, and accreditation requirements; and
- minimize risk associated with case record completeness and documentation.

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not fully implemented; or</u> • <u>The process has been slightly delayed but is currently underway.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p>

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not addressed at all; or</u> • <u>Reviews are not conducted quarterly;</u> • <u>Reviews are not conducted for one of the agency's services; or</u> • <u>Reviews are narrowly focused on compliance.</u>
4	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A review has not been conducted in over a year; or</u> • <u>Reviews are not conducted at all.</u>

PA-PQI 4.04

Case review processes include:

- a. staff at all levels of the agency including frontline staff;
- b. a stratified, random sample of both open and closed cases;
- c. uniform scoring tools to ensure consistency and permit comparison of information;
- d. measures to minimize conflict of interest such as ensuring that reviewers do not review cases in which they have been directly involved as a provider, supervisor, or consultant;
- e. measures to maintain process integrity such as third-party quality assurance checks; and
- f. mechanisms to address safety concerns identified in cases under review.

Interpretation:

Sampling: *The chosen sample must reflect all of an agency's regions and/or sites, each of its programs and service areas, and the various types of record reviews the agency conducts. Agencies should choose a sampling method that satisfies any applicable regulatory requirements and is appropriate to their size and agency structure.*

Closed cases: *COA does not define the percentage of closed cases that must be included in the sample. The majority of cases the agency reviews should be open, but the agency must include a sample of closed cases to evaluate documentation related to discharge planning, case closing, and aftercare.*

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>One of the standard's elements is not fully implemented.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>One of the standard's elements is not addressed at all; or</u> <u>Little effort is being made to ensure objectivity (e.g., supervisors frequently were the sole reviewers of supervisee cases).</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

PA-PQI 5: Gathering Data and Communicating Information

The agency's data management practices facilitate the collection, analysis, communication and interpretation of data.

Table of Evidence		
Standard Code	Evidence Type	Description
PA-PQI 5	On-Site Activities	<p>All Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews may include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant staff

		<p>2. CommunityExternal stakeholderss groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observe systems for collecting, analyzing, and communicating data
PA-PQI 5	On-Site Evidence	<p>All Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of stakeholder review and discussion of PQI summary reports PQI meeting minutes for the past six months Leadership team, management, and staff meeting schedules, agendas, and minutes from the past six months
PA-PQI 5	Self-Study	<p>County/Municipality Administered Agency, State Administered Agency (Central Office), or other Public Entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies and/or procedures for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Data management Reviewing and aggregating data Most recent aggregate data reports and additional summary documents (e.g., performance dashboards, reports of gains made against goals, annual scorecards, etc.) Documentation of reporting to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> staff, oversight entities, and stakeholders at least annually the public Documentation of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Decisions made at the agency level based on PQI findings (corrective actions, initiatives, etc.) Tracking the impact of decisions made (data reports that link to areas named in PIP, annual reports, etc.) Current agency and/or program improvement plans <p>State Administered Agency (Regional Office)</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggregate data reports and additional summary documents (e.g., performance dashboards, reports of gains made against goals, annual scorecards, etc.) • Documentation of reporting to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. staff, oversight entities, and stakeholders at least annually 2. the public • Documentation of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decisions made at the worker, program, and regional level based on findings (corrective actions, initiatives, etc.) 2. Tracking the impact of decisions made (data reports that link to areas named in PIP, annual reports, etc.) • Current regional and/or program improvement plans
--	--	--

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
1	<p>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity, <u>as indicated by full implementation of the practices outlined in the PQI 5 Practice standards.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All elements or requirements outlined in the standard are evident in practice, with rare or no exceptions: exceptions do not impact service quality or agency performance.
2	<p>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 5 Practice standards.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of the standards requirements have been met and the basic framework required by the standard has been implemented.

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor inconsistencies and not yet fully developed practices are noted; however, these do not significantly impact service quality or agency performance.
3	<p>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 5 Practice standards.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency has not implemented the basic framework of the standard but instead has in place only part of this framework. • Omissions or exceptions to the practices outlined in the standard occur regularly, or practices are implemented in a cursory or haphazard manner. • Service quality or agency functioning may be compromised. • Capacity is at a basic level.
4	<p>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all, <u>as noted in the ratings for the PA-PQI 5 Practice standards.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency's observed administration and management infrastructure and practices are weak or non-existent; or show signs of neglect, stagnation, or deterioration.

PA-PQI 5.01

Procedures for collecting, reviewing, and aggregating data:

- ensure data integrity and reliability;
- protect personal identifiable information (PII) in data reports;
- engage staff at all levels of the agency including frontline staff; and
- facilitate the development of useable reports for analysis and interpretation.

Interpretation Examples: *The aggregation of data reduces the risk of disclosing PII in most instances; however, risk of disclosure still exists particularly when data is being disaggregated*

~~and unique or easily observable characteristics might allow someone to be identified in the data set. As such, data collection and reporting procedures should include mechanisms for avoiding disclosure of PII such disclosure include such as~~ data suppression, rounding, reporting in ranges rather than exact counts, combining sub-groups into larger groups, etc.

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not fully implemented.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not addressed at all.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

PA-PQI 5.02

The agency analyzes disaggregated PQI data to:

- track and monitor identified measures;
- identify patterns and trends; and
- compare performance over time.

Interpretation: Agencies should disaggregate data to identify patterns of disparity or inequity that can be masked by aggregate data reporting. ~~Common characteristics used to disaggregate data include:~~

~~race and ethnicity/country of origin;~~

~~generation status;~~

~~immigrant/refugee status;~~

age-group;
sexual-orientation; and
gender/gender-identity.

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Data from across the agency is analyzed, but data is not analyzed for one of the agency's programs; or</u> • <u>Data from across the agency is analyzed, but only some of the data has been disaggregated to identify patterns of disparate outcomes; or</u> • <u>Data analysis does not include one of the standard's elements.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Data from across the agency is analyzed, but no data has been disaggregated to identify patterns of disparate outcomes; or</u> • <u>Most of the agency's PQL data has not been analyzed; or</u> • <u>Data analysis is not performed for most of the agency's programs or services; or</u> • <u>Data related to management and operational performance is not analyzed.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

PA-PQL 5.03

Summary reports of PQL information:

- a. are distributed and discussed with staff and stakeholders in a timeframe and format that facilitates review, analysis, interpretation, and timely corrective action;
- b. reflect multiple data sources, when appropriate, including quantitative and qualitative data and formal and informal information gathered;

- c. enable the comparison of data against the results of similar programs, internal or external benchmarks, etc.; and
- d. facilitate compliance with regulatory data reporting requirements.

Interpretation: *The content and format of PQI summary reports should take into account the needs of regional and/or local offices to ensure the data is presented in a useful way that facilitates corrective action at the worker and program level.*

Interpretation: *Timely corrective action should include ensuring information is distributed early enough that regional and local offices can evaluate and implement changes prior to the next round of internal or external reviews.*

Regarding element (d), in addition to the data itself, child and family services agencies participating in the Child and Family Services Reviews must be prepared to provide the federal government with:

- a. *the data source;*
- b. *the methodology for calculating or analyzing the data;*
- c. *the scope of the data (i.e. geographic, population, etc.);*
- d. *the time period applicable to the data;*
- e. *information pertaining to the completeness, accuracy and reliability of the data; and*
- f. *other known limitations of the data.*

Examples: *Methods for sharing findings can include:*

- a. *performance dashboards, report cards, or other types of summary reports;*
- b. *using monthly reports of key service delivery outputs and outcomes in staff supervision activities;*
- c. *conducting focus groups and presentations at community meetings; and*
- d. ~~*soliciting feedback via interviews or surveys;*~~
- e. *providing quarterly reports to ~~the~~ oversight entities, stakeholder advisory groups, and leaders on important data related to key operations and management functions; ~~and~~*
- f. ~~*quality review activities that engage community providers.*~~

Examples: *Regarding element (a), discussions with staff and stakeholders about PQI information can include:*

- a. *areas of strength and quality practice;*
- b. *areas for improvement; and*
- c. *how to prioritize targeted areas, identify interventions, and monitor the effectiveness of interventions over time.*

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Summary reports are created and distributed, but practice could be improved; or</u> • <u>Stakeholders have complained about reports that are hard to read or understand; or</u> • <u>Summary reports are not always distributed in a useful timeframe.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>There are many examples of relevant PQI data not being provided to stakeholders for review; or</u> • <u>Data is not formatted into reports; or</u> • <u>The format of reports is unclear and confusing; or</u> • <u>Confidentiality concerns have been raised or noted.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

PA-PQI 5.04

The agency has a mechanism for reporting, at least annually, to oversight entities, stakeholders, and staff on:

- a. key PQI activities that are ongoing, have been resolved, or that need further intervention;
- b. issues that require continued monitoring within the PQI system; and
- c. PQI priorities and goals for the coming year.

<u>Rating Indicators</u>	
<u>Rating</u>	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement, e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>There are minor inconsistencies in timeliness, depth, or accessibility across regions or stakeholder groups; or</u> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not fully implemented.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Practices depend on specific individuals or ad hoc processes rather than being embedded in the agency's PQI system; or</u> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not addressed at all.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

PA-PQI 5.05

The agency shares PQI information with the public as part of its public outreach and education strategy.

Note: ~~See PA-AM 45.01 for more information on developing a public outreach and education strategy.~~

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>• The level of detail may vary across service areas or reporting cycles.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>• Critical context is missing from the distributed information making it hard to understand.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

PA-PQI 5.06

The agency:

- acts on PQI findings at the worker, program, region/community, agency, and system level; and
- monitors the effectiveness of interventions and adjusts interventions, as needed.

Interpretation: *Information generated by the PQI system serves as evidence for identifying interventions in relation to:*

- ~~1. fulfilling the mission and meeting legal mandates;~~
- ~~2. monitoring progress toward strategic plans and long-term goals;~~
- ~~3. managing programs and operations efficiently and effectively;~~
- ~~4. supporting direct service staff to meet program goals, make informed case-level decisions, and have a positive impact on persons served; and~~
- ~~5. meeting regulatory requirements.~~

Examples: Agencies can use PQI findings and feedback to:

- a. *develop solutions;*
- b. *replicate good practice;*
- c. *recognize and motivate staff;*
- d. *update staff training and other professional development activities;*
- e. *improve organizational systems, processes, policies, and procedures; and*
- f. *eliminate or reduce identified problems.*

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The organization uses PQI data to improve programs; however, some available findings and recommendations are not being used; or</u> • <u>Actions made in response to findings and feedback are being monitored, and modifications are made when needed, but practice could be improved (e.g., the data is not being reviewed in a timely manner).</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>PQI data is not routinely used; or</u> • <u>Except for a few examples, the organization does not generate enough usable data to take meaningful action, or does not routinely use data in either of the ways listed in the standard; or</u> • <u>Important modifications are often not made despite evidence that they are needed.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

PA-PQI 5.07

The agency ~~develops~~**implements** improvement plans when issues have been identified that will involve coordinated and ongoing activities and monitoring.

Interpretation: *Improvement plans formally lay out the actions that will be taken to address areas in need of improvement that are identified by staff and stakeholders as crucial to meeting the agency's goals and delivering quality services. Improvement plans should be implemented when it is necessary to monitor and address the issue over time.*

Interpretation: *State-administered agencies should manage a statewide and regional performance improvement action planning process ~~in order to that include~~**stake both** system-wide action and ~~also allow for~~ targeted, **region-specific** PQI activities ~~based on regional context~~.*

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>There are minor inconsistencies in the implementation of improvement plans; or</u> • <u>Statewide and regional plans could be better aligned.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>There are significant inconsistencies in implementation of improvement plans; or</u> • <u>State-administered agencies have either state or regional plans but not both.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

PA-PQI 5.08

Agency leaders, senior managers, program directors, and supervisors:

- a. keep PQI on the agenda of management and staff meetings;
- b. integrate data discussions and outcomes monitoring into case reviews, supervision, performance review, and contract monitoring;
- c. regularly evaluate the need for and uses of data at the worker, program, region/community, agency, and system level; and
- d. evaluate the PQI infrastructure, processes, and procedures.

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
<u>1</u>	<p><u>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance</u> <u>A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.</u></p>
<u>2</u>	<p><u>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance</u> <u>A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not fully implemented.</u>
<u>3</u>	<p><u>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance</u> <u>A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement; e.g.,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Some programs or levels of leadership do not address PQI; or</u> • <u>One of the standard's elements is not addressed at all.</u>
<u>4</u>	<p><u>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</u> <u>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.</u></p>

~~PA-PQI 6: Contracting Practices~~ Moved to new PA-CON

~~The agency enters into contracts as a purchaser of services with due regard for practices that promote positive service recipient outcomes and efficient use of resources.~~

~~NA Contracting is managed by an external department.~~

~~NA State-administered agency regional office~~

Interpretation: ~~The standards in PA-PQI 6 apply to all contracts entered into by the agency in which it acts as a purchaser of (1) social and human services or (2) staff training and other personnel development services. This includes contracts with provider organizations as well as contracts with independent contractors.~~

Table of Evidence		
Standard Code	Evidence Type	Description
PA-PQI-6	On-Site Activities	<p>County/Municipality Administered Agency, State Administered Agency (Central Office), or other Public Entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interviews may include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agency head 2. Contract manager(s) 3. Contracted providers including independent contractors <p>State Administered Agency (Regional Office)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evaluated at the Central Office only
PA-PQI-6	On-Site Evidence	<p>County/Municipality Administered Agency, State Administered Agency (Central Office), or other Public Entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Additional contracts <p>State Administered Agency (Regional Office)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evaluated at the Central Office only
PA-PQI-6	Self-Study	<p>County/Municipality Administered Agency, State Administered Agency (Central Office), or other Public Entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contracting and procurement policies, procedures, and applicable regulations ● List of applicable contracts ● Sample of three applicable contracts <p>State Administered Agency (Regional Office)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evaluated at the Central Office Only

--	--	--

Rating Indicators	
Rating	
1	<p>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All elements or requirements outlined in the standard are evident in practice, with rare or no exceptions; exceptions do not impact service quality or agency performance.—
2	<p>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The majority of the standards requirements have been met and the basic framework required by the standard has been implemented.— ● Minor inconsistencies and not yet fully developed practices are noted; however, these do not significantly impact service quality or agency performance.—
3	<p>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement.—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The agency has not implemented the basic framework of the standard but instead has in place only part of this framework.— ● Omissions or exceptions to the practices outlined in the standard occur regularly, or practices are implemented in a cursory or haphazard manner.— ● Service quality or agency functioning may be compromised.— ● Capacity is at a basic level.—

Rating Indicators

Rating	
4	<p>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance</p> <p>A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The agency's observed administration and management infrastructure and practices are weak or non-existent; or show signs of neglect, stagnation, or deterioration.

PA-PQI 6.01: Contracting Practices

The pursuit of contracts is:

1. consistent with the agency's mission and practice model;
2. aligned with, and supportive of, the agency's service array and resource development goals; and
3. responsive to the identified needs and desired outcomes of persons served.

PA-PQI 6.02: Contracting Practices

The agency:

1. establishes a system of standardized contracting practices; and
2. conducts due diligence in contracting activities including review of possible risks.

PA-PQI 6.03: Contracting Practices

The agency has a process for verifying that prospective contractors:

1. have sufficient human and financial resources to fulfill the terms of the contract;
2. are licensed or otherwise legally authorized to provide the contracted services;
3. employ appropriately qualified staff; and
4. have a history of satisfactory performance under previous contracts with the agency, as applicable.

Interpretation: *The agency should have a process for verifying the qualifications of independent contractors or personnel employed by contracted providers including confirmation that providers:*

1. possess relevant licenses and/or credentials;

~~2. have the desired expertise and competencies for the contracted service, including cultural responsiveness and sufficient experience delivering services to the population served; and~~

~~3. receive appropriate supervision.~~

~~PA-PQI 7: Contract Monitoring and Quality Improvement~~ **Moved to new PA-CON**

~~The agency monitors, evaluates, and enhances the quality and effectiveness of services purchased from other provider organizations or independent contractors.~~

~~**Interpretation:** Contracting of services does not relieve the public agency of their responsibility to ensure that high quality, effective services are being delivered. Contract monitoring practices ensure contracted providers are in compliance with applicable law and regulation, providing high quality services, achieving identified deliverables, and meeting desired outcomes.~~

~~**Interpretation:** Public agencies must have a well-defined monitoring process that is laid out in its contract monitoring procedures. For state-administered agencies, this includes identifying the role of regional offices in implementing each of the contract monitoring and quality improvement activities identified in this Core Concept. For example, when case responsibility is shared by the regional office or when the contract originates at the regional office, it may be appropriate for the region to be more directly involved in contractor monitoring and quality improvement.~~

Table of Evidence

Standard Code	Evidence Type	Description
PA-PQI-7	On-Site Activities	<p>County/Municipality Administered Agency, State Administered Agency (Central Office) or other Public Entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interviews may include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agency leadership 2. In-house counsel 3. Contract manager(s) 4. PQI personnel 5. Contracted providers <p>State Administered Agency (Regional Office)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interviews may include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regional Director

		<p>2. PQI personnel</p> <p>3. Contracted providers</p>
PA-PQI-7	On-Site Evidence	<p>County/Municipality Administered Agency, State Administered Agency (Central Office) or other Public Entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See contracts in PA-PQI 6 • Additional contract monitoring plans • Documentation of technical assistance to contracted providers • Training curricula for contract manager(s) • Sample of three job descriptions for contract manager(s) • Documentation tracking contract managers' completion of required trainings <p>State Administered Agency (Regional Office)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of reporting/information sharing between the region and the central office regarding the quality of services from contracted providers
PA-PQI-7	Self-Study	<p>County/Municipality Administered Agency, State Administered Agency (Central Office) or other Public Entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract monitoring procedures • Sample of three contract monitoring plans • Contract monitoring tools and scoring mechanisms • Information provided to contractors • Sample of three contractor improvement plans • Sample of three contractor progress reports <p>State Administered Agency (Regional Office)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Self-Study Evidence

Rating Indicators

Rating	
1	<p>Full Implementation, Outstanding Performance A rating of (1) indicates that the agency's practices fully meet the standard and reflect a high level of capacity.—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All elements or requirements outlined in the standard are evident in practice, with rare or no exceptions; exceptions do not impact service quality or agency performance.—
2	<p>Substantial Implementation, Good Performance A rating of (2) indicates that an agency's infrastructure and practices are basically sound but there is room for improvement.—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The majority of the standards requirements have been met and the basic framework required by the standard has been implemented.—• Minor inconsistencies and not yet fully developed practices are noted; however, these do not significantly impact service quality or agency performance.—
3	<p>Partial Implementation, Concerning Performance A rating of (3) indicates that the agency's observed infrastructure and/or practices require significant improvement.—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The agency has not implemented the basic framework of the standard but instead has in place only part of this framework.—• Omissions or exceptions to the practices outlined in the standard occur regularly, or practices are implemented in a cursory or haphazard manner.—• Service quality or agency functioning may be compromised.—• Capacity is at a basic level.—
4	<p>Unsatisfactory Implementation or Performance A rating of (4) indicates that implementation of the standard is minimal or there is no evidence of implementation at all.—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The agency's observed administration and management infrastructure and practices are weak or non-existent; or show signs of neglect, stagnation, or deterioration.—

PA-PQI 7.01: Contract Monitoring and Quality Improvement

Written contracts contain all significant terms and conditions in accordance with applicable law.

~~NA Contracting is managed by an external department.~~

Interpretation: ~~“Significant terms” can include, as appropriate to the type of contract:~~

- ~~1. roles and responsibilities of participating agencies;~~
- ~~2. services to be provided;~~
- ~~3. service authorization including eligibility criteria;~~
- ~~4. provisions and/or requirements for provider training and technical assistance, as necessary;~~
- ~~5. duration of contract including delineation of follow-up services;~~
- ~~6. policies and procedures for sharing information including access to case record provisions;~~
- ~~7. methods for resolving disputes;~~
- ~~8. utilization management protocols;~~
- ~~9. performance and quality improvement responsibilities;~~
- ~~10. a plan and procedure for timely payment and consequences for failure to pay;~~
- ~~11. documentation necessary for, and means of reporting to, funding or oversight bodies;~~
- ~~12. required levels of insurance; and~~
- ~~13. conditions for termination of the contract.~~

PA-PQI 7.02: Contract Monitoring and Quality Improvement

The agency integrates contract monitoring into its performance and quality improvement activities by developing a plan for monitoring contractor progress that:

- ~~1. is developed in partnership with the provider and tailored to the service being provided;~~
- ~~2. establishes goals and performance measures for service quality, consumer satisfaction, and outcomes;~~
- ~~3. specifies monitoring activities including frequency and responsible parties;~~
- ~~4. establishes specific requirements for provider participation in performance and quality improvement activities including qualitative and quantitative data reporting and corrective action;~~
- ~~5. outlines how performance data will be monitored and reported out; and~~
- ~~6. establishes mechanisms for ongoing, regular communication between the public agency and the contracted provider.~~

~~**Interpretation:** In regard to element (d), the collection, analysis, and distribution of contract monitoring data should be aligned with the agency's performance and quality improvement system, ensuring that incoming data is used to inform continuous quality improvement of purchased services.~~

~~**Examples:** In regard to element (e), in addition to sharing findings with relevant staff within the public and private agency, the agency may also wish to tailor reports for additional stakeholder groups that have an impact on, or vested interest in, performance achievement such as the public, courts, provider networks, citizen review boards, and legislators.~~

~~**Examples:** Monitoring activities include, but are not limited to:~~

- ~~1. review of performance reports from contracted providers to track progress and identify trends/concerns;~~
- ~~2. case reviews;~~
- ~~3. meetings; and~~
- ~~4. visits to the program.~~

~~**PA-PQI 7.03: Contract Monitoring and Quality Improvement**~~

~~Contracted providers receive information on:~~

- ~~1. agency mission, principles, logic models, and system-wide performance indicators;~~
- ~~2. relevant service-delivery policies and procedures;~~
- ~~3. relevant federal and state requirements;~~
- ~~4. technical assistance procedures;~~
- ~~5. the conflict resolution and provider appeal process; and~~
- ~~6. other information necessary to establish consistent practice and policy implementation.~~

~~**NA Contracting is managed by an external department.**~~

~~**Examples:** Technical assistance can include providing the support needed to:~~

- ~~1. use the information management system for data reporting;~~
- ~~2. understand how data will be used to track performance;~~
- ~~3. ensure service continuity and quality; and~~
- ~~4. support implementation of system-wide practice initiatives.~~

~~**PA-PQI 7.04: Contract Monitoring and Quality Improvement**~~

~~Systems are in place to collect and respond to contractor performance concerns identified by public agency staff at all levels, including frontline staff and supervisors, and when areas of concern are identified, the agency:~~

- ~~1. develops an improvement plan in conjunction with the contractor;~~

- ~~2. ensures contractor follow-up and remediation; and~~
- ~~3. terminates contracts if contractors do not comply with improvement action/remediation plans.~~

~~PA-PQI 7.05: Contract Monitoring and Quality Improvement~~

~~A qualified staff member is assigned to oversee and monitor each contract and is trained and supervised on:-~~

- ~~1. facilitating partnership and collaboration;~~
- ~~2. understanding and using data collection and monitoring tools;~~
- ~~3. the relationship between the PQI system, contract monitoring, and quality service delivery;~~
- ~~4. report writing; and~~
- ~~5. contract requirements.~~

~~**Interpretation:** When monitoring responsibilities are spread across divisions, personnel should work collaboratively to ensure their efforts are aligned, findings are shared, and duplication of effort is minimized.~~