# Case File Review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Agency  |  |
| Reviewer |  |
| Date of Review |  |
| Review Period |  |
| Assigned ES Worker |  |

### Case Information

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participant’s Initials  |  | MFIP Case Status |  |
| WF1 Record ID |  | Current TANF Month |  |
| MAXIS Case Number |  | Current EMPS Code |  |
| Household Composition  |  |

## Enrollment

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Did enrollment for the current sequence take place in the last 12 months? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, date:   | [ ]  No, the enrollment for this program sequence took place more than a year ago. Select N/A for all questions in this section and skip to the next one. | [ ]  See Comment Section  |
| Was the MFIP referral accepted and enrolled within 4 calendar days? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the referral was accepted and enrolled according to Hennepin County Policy. | [ ]  No, the referral was not accepted and enrolled within 4 calendar days.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Was the ES OV completed within 30 days of referral? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the ES OV was completed within 30 days according to DHS policy.  | [ ]  No, the ES OV was not completed within 30 days. | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| If the ES OV was not completed within 30 days of referral, was the Notice of Requirement to Attend Employment Services Overview (DHS-2929) sent according to policy and made available in WF1?[ ]  N/A – The Overview was scheduled and completed through live engagement with the participant.  | [ ]  Yes, the DHS-2929 was sent and is available to review in EDS or in WF1 Sessions. | [ ]  No, the DHS-2929 is not on file or was filled out incorrectly.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| If ES Overview took place on or after 1/1/22, have Overview documents been uploaded in EDS? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, OV documents have been uploaded to EDS. | No, the following is missing form EDS:[ ]  Hennepin County MFIP Overview Topic Checklist[ ]  DHS-3172, Rights, Responsibilities, and Consent | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Comments:  |
| Section summary: [ ]  Finding: immediate corrective action is required, see final report. [ ]  Area of Concern: needs improvement, see final report.[ ]  Meets Standards: no action required beyond comments listed above. [ ]  Best Practice: exemplary performance.[ ]  N/A: enrollment occurred more than 12 months ago, not reviewed.  |

## Engagement and Communication

|  |
| --- |
| In which of the following months is there case note documentation of at least monthly engagement and/or attempts to contact the participant? [ ]  See Comment Section |
| [ ]  Month 1 | [ ]  Month 2 | [ ]  Month 3 | [ ]  Review Month  |
| If there are overdue items on the case during the report period, were increased engagement attempts made and documented in order to complete them? (Increasing frequency of attempts, all available formats of communication used)[ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the worker has made multiple, proactive attempts to engage the participant via all available methods of contact.  | [ ]  No, case notes do not demonstrate an increase in attempts and/or utilization of all available methods of contact.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Do case notes show individualized engagement attempts and information? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, notes about engagement demonstrate individualized attempts to engage the participant about their own case.  | [ ]  No, there is insufficient documentation of individualized engagement efforts; this may include the use of Mass Case Notes as primary engagement.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Do case notes demonstrate that the participant has been give multiple options for how and where to meet with their worker?  | [ ]  Yes, the participant has been given options for how to receive services, according to Hennepin County’s Flexible Service Delivery Policy.  | [ ]  No, there is no documentation that the participant was given alternative ways to receive services.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Are most or all case notes entered at or within 3 days of the service or action described? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the time stamps on case notes show most or all are entered in a timely manner. | [ ]  No, the time stamps on case notes show that most or all case notes were entered more than 3 days after the action or service.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Could another person with reasonable knowledge of MFIP ES understand what engagement has happened and which services have been provided based on case note documentation?  | [ ]  Yes, case notes are clearly written and include sufficient level of detail. Another worker could read them and immediately begin providing effective services.  | [ ]  No, case notes are unclear, hard to understand or missing important details.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Comments:  |
| Section summary: [ ]  Finding: immediate corrective action is required, see final report. [ ]  Area of Concern: needs improvement, see final report.[ ]  Meets Standards: no action required beyond comments listed above. [ ]  Best Practice: exemplary performance.[ ]  N/A: not enough information to review. |

## Compliance

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| During the review period, was there an incident of non-compliance addressed with the participant? | [ ]  Yes. Complete the remainder of this section.  | [ ]  No. Select N/A for all questions in this section and skip to the next one.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Do case notes document increased, ongoing attempts to engage with the participant through non-compliance? (NOITS and Sanction letters are not considered to be tools of engagement.) [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the worker continued attempts to engage the participant despite non-compliance. | [ ]  No, the worker did not continue attempts to engage the participant OR only communicated via forms/letters.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| If the case is coded FSS or there is information that the case is potentially FSS, has the FSS Pre-Sanction Checklist been followed appropriately? [ ]  N/A  | [ ]  Yes, the worker used the pre-sanction checklist as appropriate.  | [ ]  No, the worker took unallowable steps to address non-compliance.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| [ ] f a Notice of Intent to Sanction (NOITS) was sent to the participant during the review period, was the NOITS issued appropriately? (Sent for a legitimate incident of noncompliance, clearly written, allowing at least 10 days for compliance)[ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the NOITS was issued correctly.  | No, the NOITS was not completed correctly.[ ]  Reason for issuing NOITS is invalid or incorrect. [ ]  NOITS does not clearly state what actions are required to avoid sanction.[ ]  The participant wasn’t given enough time to comply.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| If an ES sanction was imposed on this case during the review period, is the Outgoing Status Update documented in WF1? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the Outgoing Status Update is documented in WF1. | [ ]  No, the Outgoing Status update is not documented in WF1 and should have been.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Comments:  |
| Section summary: [ ]  Finding: immediate corrective action is required, see final report. [ ]  Area of Concern: needs improvement, see final report.[ ]  Meets Standards: no action required beyond comments listed above. [ ]  Best Practice: exemplary performance.[ ]  N/A: not enough information to review.  |

## Assessment

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Hennepin County policy requires ESPs to complete the EM within the first 90 days of all new enrollments. Was the initial Employability Measure completed for the current enrollment sequence? [ ]  N/A – Enrollment less than 90 days ago, EM is not due yet. | [ ]  Yes, the initial EM has been completed for this program sequence.  | No, initial EM is overdue. [ ]  The worker has increased engagement attempts in order to complete the overdue assessment.[ ]  The worker has engaged with the participant without completing the overdue assessment.[ ]  The worker has not increased engagement attempts in order to complete the overdue assessment; failure to do so has been cited above under “Engagement and Communication.” | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Hennepin County policy requires ESPs to complete the EM when a participant reaches 24 and 48 TANF Months. If either the 24th or 48th month has passed on the case during the current enrollment sequence, was an Ongoing EM completed?[ ]  N/A  | [ ]  Yes, and Ongoing EM has been completed for this program sequence.  | [ ]  No, there are no documented attempts to schedule the EM. | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Do all EMs completed during this enrollment sequence include scores and sufficient rationales for each score?[ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the EMs have been completed fully and includes rationale for each score.  | [ ]  No, the EMs are incomplete, missing rationales for scores, or appears to be scored incorrectly.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Comments:  |
| Section summary: [ ]  Finding: immediate corrective action is required, see final report. [ ]  Area of Concern: needs improvement, see final report.[ ]  Meets Standards: no action required beyond comments listed above. [ ]  Best Practice: exemplary performance.[ ]  N/A: not enough information to review. |

## Planning

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is there an Employment Plan (EP) on file that is less than one year old?  | [ ]  Yes, date:  | [ ]  No. Select N/A for all questions in this section and skip to the next one. | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Has the most recent EP’s signature page been uploaded in EDS? [ ]  N/A  | [ ]  Yes, the signature page has been uploaded. | [ ]  No, the signature page has not been added to EDS and should have been.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Does the EP include multiple, individualized goals, both short and long term, that connect to activities in the plan? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the plan includes sufficient documentation of the participant’s goals.  | [ ]  No, the goals are missing or insufficient. | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Does the EP include multiple, individualized participant strengths? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the plan includes multiple, individualized strengths.  | [ ]  No, strengths are missing or insufficient. | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Does the current EP type match the EMPS code in review month? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the EP type and EMPS code match.  | [ ]  No, plan type and EMPS code are mismatched, and an updated plan may be needed.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Does the current EP contain an appropriate number of hours based the participant’s goals, activities, and household composition?[ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the total number of hours on the plan are appropriate. | [ ]  No, the number of hours on the plan are not appropriate.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Does the current EP contain clear, specific information about the participant’s activities and requirements?[ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the information in the plan is clear and specific enough for a participant to understand.  | [ ]  No, the language in the plan is confusing, vague, hard to understand, and/or contains program acronyms.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| If the current plan is: * 3+ months old for UP case or
* 6+ months old for FSS case,

has an employment plan review been attempted and/or completed appropriately?  [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the employment plan has been reviewed and found appropriate and reasonable. | No, the EP has not been reviewed. [ ]  The worker has increased engagement attempts in order to complete the EP review.[ ]  The worker has engaged with the participant without completing the EP review.[ ]  The worker has not increased engagement attempts in order to complete the overdue EP review; failure to do so has been cited above under “Engagement and Communication.” | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Comments:  |
| Section summary: [ ]  Finding: immediate corrective action is required, see final report. [ ]  Area of Concern: needs improvement, see final report.[ ]  Meets Standards: no action required beyond comments listed above. [ ]  Best Practice: exemplary performance.[ ]  N/A: not enough information to review  |

## Resources and Supports

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Does the casework indicate worker has offered support services to the participant? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, there evidence that support services have been offered to the participant. | [ ]  No, there is no documentation about this.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Are support services recorded correctly in the Support Services section of WF1? [ ]  N/A – None issued during review period. | [ ]  Yes, support services are recorded, and each entry includes a case note.  | [ ]  No, support services should have been recorded OR are recorded but incompletely or incorrectly. | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| If in addition to transportation supports, other support services have been given in the report period, do case notes clearly document the approval process? [ ]  N/A – None issued during review period. | [ ]  Yes, case notes about approved supports are sufficient.  | [ ]  No, supports were issued but case notes are missing or insufficient.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Does the casework indicate the worker has offered the participant resources and/or referrals that are relevant to the participant’s needs? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, there evidence that relevant resources/referrals have been offered in the report period. | [ ]  No, there is no documentation about this.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Does the casework indicate the worker has evaluated the participant’s childcare needs and assisted in obtaining CCAP if needed?[ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, there evidence that CCAP needs have been assessed. | [ ]  No, there is no documentation around assessment of CCAP needs.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Comments: |
| Section summary: [ ]  Finding: immediate corrective action is required, see final report. [ ]  Area of Concern: needs improvement, see final report.[ ]  Meets Standards: no action required beyond comments listed above. [ ]  Best Practice: exemplary performance.[ ]  N/A: not enough information to review. |

## Documentation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Are activities open correctly in WF1 at time of review? * Local Flag open when referral is received and closed once ES OV has been completed.
* Activities match those in current EP.
* Assessment open after OV is complete (doesn’t need to be listed in EP).
 | [ ]  Yes, the WF1 activities are correct.  | [ ]  No, the appropriate activities are not open. Update activities to match current EP.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| If participation hours were entered in WF1 during the review period, were the corresponding logs uploaded to EDS (job search, school log, etc.)?[ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the corresponding logs are available in EDS. | [ ]  No, hours have been entered, but corresponding logs are not available in EDS.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| If Assessment hours have been added within the report period, do case notes show meaningful engagement has taken place? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, assessment hours are tracked for meaningful engagement.  | [ ]  No, hours have been added but case notes do not demonstrate meaningful engagement.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Comments:  |
| Section summary: [ ]  Finding: immediate corrective action is required, see final report. [ ]  Area of Concern: needs improvement, see final report.[ ]  Meets Standards: no action required beyond comments listed above. [ ]  Best Practice: exemplary performance.[ ]  N/A: not enough information to review. |