# Case File Review

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assigned Worker |  | Date of Review |  |
| Reviewer |  | Review Period  |  |
| Participant’s Initials  |  | MFIP Case Status |  |
| WF1 Record ID |  | Current TANF Month |  |
| MAXIS Case # |  | Current EMPS Code |  |
| Referral Date |  | WF1 Enrollment Date |  |
| Case status notes  |  |

## Enrollment

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 |
| Was the Notice of Requirement to Attend Employment Services Overview (DHS-2929) sent correctly within the first 30 days of enrollment and on file in WF1? [ ]  N/A – OV scheduled and completed through engagement with the participant within 30 days of enrollment. No DHS-2929 was needed.  | [ ]  Yes, the DHS-2929 was sent correctly and is on file in WF1. | [ ]  No, the DHS-2929 was not sent within 30 days. [ ]  No, the DHS-2929 is not on file in WF1.[ ]  No, the DHS-2929 was completed incorrectly.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| If ES Overview has been completed, have Overview documents been uploaded in EDS? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, OV documents have been uploaded to EDS. | [ ]  No, the Hennepin County MFIP Overview Topic Checklist is missing.[ ]  No, the DHS-3172, Rights, Responsibilities, and Consent is missing. [ ]  Required documents are in EDS but are incomplete.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Was the participant offered flexible service delivery options during the enrollment process?  | [ ]  Yes, case documentation shows that the participant was offered flexible options for receiving services.  | [ ]  No, there is no documentation showing that the participant received flexible options.  | ☐ 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 to complete them? (Increasing frequency of attempts, using all available formats of communication)[ ]  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 |
| 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 Employment Services 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 lacking details. [ ]  No, case notes are missing surrounding important meetings within the review period.  | [ ]  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 to complete the overdue assessment.[ ]  The worker has engaged with the participant without completing the overdue assessment.[ ]  The worker has not increased engagement attempts 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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Have any pending Employment Plans (EPs) on file been acted on appropriately? [ ]  N/A – No pending plans on file.  | [ ]  Yes, there is a pending plan on file, but it has been pending for fewer than 10 days and the worker has taken steps to finalize it.  | [ ]  No, there is a pending plan on file that appears to have been pending for more than 10 days.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Is there an EP on file that was activated in the last 12 months?  | [ ]  Yes, date:  | [ ]  No. Select N/A for all questions in this section and skip to the next one. | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Has the current 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 current 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 current 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 include the participant’s current activities? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the plan includes the participant’s current activities. | No, according to information on file, the participant’s activities have changed. [ ]  The worker has increased engagement attempts to update the plan.[ ]  The worker has engaged with the participant without updating the EP. [ ]  The worker has not increased engagement attempts to update the EP; failure to do so has been cited above under “Engagement and Communication.” | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Does the current EP contain clear, specific, and accurate information about the participant’s activities, hours, and EMPS code?[ ]  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, incorrect, and/or contains program acronyms.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Has an employment plan review been completed if the current plan is: * 3+ months old for UP case or
* 6+ months old for FSS case

 [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the employment plan review has been completed. | No, the EP has not been reviewed. [ ]  The worker has increased engagement attempts to complete the EP review.[ ]  The worker has engaged with the participant without completing the EP review.[ ]  The worker has not increased engagement attempts 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 show the worker has offered support services to the participant during the review period?  | [ ]  Yes, support services have been offered to the participant. | [ ]  No, there is no documentation about this.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| If support services were requested/needed by the participant, did the worker follow up appropriately? (thorough assessment of the need, accurate information provided to the participant, efficient response) [ ]  N/A – None requested. | [ ]  Yes, the worker followed up appropriately on the request(s) for support services. | [ ]  No, the worker’s follow up was not thorough, accurate, and/or efficient.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Were support services provided during the report period documented correctly in the Support Services section of WF1? [ ]  N/A – None issued. | [ ]  Yes, support services are documented correctly, and each entry corresponds with a case note about the interaction with the participant.  | [ ]  No, support services are documented incorrectly.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| Does the casework show the worker offered the participant resources during the review period?  | [ ]  Yes, resources have been offered to the participant. | [ ]  No, there is no documentation about this.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| If resources were requested/needed during the review period did the worker follow up appropriately with support and information? [ ]  N/A | [ ]  Yes, the worker followed up appropriately on the participant’s need.  | [ ]  No, the worker’s follow up was not thorough, accurate, and/or efficient.  | [ ]  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. [ ]  No, the appropriate activities are not open, and the mismatch will impact performance measures. | [ ]  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 to verify the hours that were entered.  | [ ]  No, hours have been entered, but were tracked incorrectly and/or corresponding logs are not available in EDS.  | [ ]  See Comment Section |
| If Assessment hours have been added within the last two months of the review 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. |