Please note that throughout the PowerPoint, “Case-Level Data” refers to results based on analysis of data from the 2,069 cases reviewed in fiscal years 2007 and 2008; “State-Level Data” refers to results based on analysis of data from the 32 States reviewed.
Results of the 2007 and 2008 Child and Family Services Reviews

Children’s Bureau
Administration for Children and Families
Department of Health and Human Services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 Reviews</th>
<th>2008 Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Delaware</td>
<td>• Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• North Carolina</td>
<td>• Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vermont</td>
<td>• California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Mexico</td>
<td>• Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Georgia</td>
<td>• Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kansas</td>
<td>• North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District of Columbia</td>
<td>• New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indiana</td>
<td>• South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Massachusetts</td>
<td>• Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arizona</td>
<td>• Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alabama</td>
<td>• Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oklahoma</td>
<td>• Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oregon</td>
<td>• Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minnesota</td>
<td>• Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Connecticut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scope of the Child and Family Services Reviews

| 7 Outcomes in the Areas of Safety, Permanency, and Child and Family Well-Being | 7 Systemic Factors |
## Determining Substantial Conformity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Systemic Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Onsite case record reviews and data indicators</td>
<td>• Statewide Assessment and stakeholder interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 95% of cases substantially achieved</td>
<td>• State plan requirements in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meet National Standards on data indicators</td>
<td>• State plan requirements function as required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cases Reviewed

- Cases Reviewed in **32 States**
- **2,069** Cases Reviewed
- **1,279** Foster Care Cases
- **790** In-Home Services Cases
The percent of male and female children across States is based on a total of 945 children. The gender of the child was not documented for all children in the review in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.
Case-Level Data: 32 States

Gender of Children in Cases Reviewed
Average Percent Across States

Female 48%
Male 52%
The race and ethnicity of children across States is based on a total of 713 children. Race and ethnicity was not documented for all children in the review in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.
### Race of Children in Cases Reviewed

**Average Percent Across States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Ethnicity of Children Reviewed</th>
<th>Total Number of Children</th>
<th>Average Percent of Children Across States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than One Race (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (Non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Determine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This slide is based on the average percent of primary reasons for case opening across the 2,069 cases reviewed in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.
Case-Level Data: 32 States

Primary Reason for Case Opening

Average Percent Across States

- **Neglect**: 37%
- **Substance Abuse (Parents)**: 15%
- **Physical Abuse**: 13%
- **Child’s Behavior**: 7%
- **Other**: 5%
- **Domestic Violence**: 4%
- **Sexual Abuse**: 4%
- **Juvenile Justice System**: 3%
- **Abandonment**: 3%
- **Medical Neglect**: 2%
- **Health of Parent**: 1%
- **Health of Child**: 0.4%
- **Emotional Maltreatment**: 10.4%
- **Substance Abuse (Child)**: 0%
The percentages of children in the different age ranges represented in this slide are based on a total of 1,279 children. The age of the child was not documented for all children in the review in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.
Case-Level Data: 32 States

Age of Child at Date of Entry into Most Recent Foster Care Episode

Average Percent Across States

- Younger than 6: 42%
- 6 to 9: 17%
- 10 to 12: 13%
- 13 to 15: 20%
- 16 and Older: 9%
Outcomes
Safety Outcome 1

Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

- **Item 1**: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment
- **Item 2**: Repeat maltreatment
Safety Outcome 2

Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

- **Item 3**: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care
- **Item 4**: Risk assessment and safety management
Permanency Outcome 1

Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

- **Item 5**: Foster care re-entries
- **Item 6**: Stability of foster care placement
- **Item 7**: Permanency goal for child
- **Item 8**: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives
- **Item 9**: Adoption
- **Item 10**: Other planned permanent living arrangement
Permanency Outcome 2

The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

- **Item 11**: Proximity of foster care placement
- **Item 12**: Placement with siblings
- **Item 13**: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care
- **Item 14**: Preserving connections
- **Item 15**: Relative placement
- **Item 16**: Relationship of child in care with parents
Well-Being Outcome 1

Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs.

- **Item 17**: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents
- **Item 18**: Child and family involvement in case planning
- **Item 19**: Caseworker visits with child
- **Item 20**: Caseworker visits with parent(s)
Well-Being Outcome 2

- Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.
  - Item 21: Educational needs of the child
Well-Being Outcome 3

Children receive appropriate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

- **Item 22:** Physical health of child
- **Item 23:** Mental/behavioral health of child
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for children’s needs.

Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.
## State-Level Data: 32 States

### Outcomes

Average Percent Achieved Across States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>WB1</th>
<th>WB2</th>
<th>WB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Important Associations
These analyses were done using data from the 2,069 cases reviewed in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.
Case-Level Data: 32 States
Permanency Outcome 1

Items Associated with Stronger Performance in Permanency Outcome 1

- Item 3: Services to family to protect children in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into care
- Item 17A: Needs assessment and services to children
- Item 17B: Needs assessment and services to parents
- Item 19: Caseworker visits with child
- Item 20: Caseworker visits with parent(s)
This analysis was done using ratings and composite scores from the 32 States reviewed in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.
State-Level Data: 32 States

Item 19

Item Associated with Stronger Performance in Permanency Composite 4: Placement Stability

Item 19: Caseworker visits with child
These analyses were done using data from the 2,069 cases reviewed in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.
Additional Associations Related to Caseworker Visits with Parents

- Stronger performance in caseworker visits with parents is associated with stronger performance on Item 7 (timely establishment of permanency goals and timely filing for TPR).

- Stronger performance in caseworker visits with parents is also associated with stronger performance on Item 8 (reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives).
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parent
Item 17b: Needs and services of parents (Needs Assessed)
Item 17b: Needs and services of parents (Needs Addressed)
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning
Item 20: Caseworker visits with parents (Frequency)
Item 20: Caseworker visits with parents (Quality)
Case-Level Data: 32 States
Differences In Serving Mothers and Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Parent</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessed</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Addressed</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in Case Planning</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Visitation</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Visitation</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These percentages were calculated using the case-level data from the 1,279 foster care cases and 790 in-home cases reviewed in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.
Case-Level Data: 32 States
In-Home and Foster Care Differences on the Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Safety 1</th>
<th>Safety 2</th>
<th>Well-Being 1</th>
<th>Well-Being 2</th>
<th>Well-Being 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Home</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety
Percent of States Meeting Safety National Standards
NCANDS (preliminary findings)
Item 1: Timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment
Item 3: Services to family to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care
Item 4: Risk assessment and safety management
State-Level Data: 32 States

Safety Items

Average Across States: Percent of Cases Rated as Strength

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State-Level Data: 32 States

Safety Outcome 2
Item 4

Risk assessment and safety management

Low: 38%

High: 91%

Mean: 70%
These data are from the questions within Safety Item 4, Risk and Safety Management. They were calculated using the total number applicable to each question. In general that number varied for each question.
Case-Level Data: 32 States

Risk and Safety Assessment

Initial assessments:

- Risk: 89% of applicable cases
- Safety and development of safety plan: 84% of applicable cases

Ongoing assessments:

- Risk: 81% of applicable cases
- Safety and update of safety plan: 76% of applicable cases

Safety assessment prior to foster care case closure:

- 75% of applicable cases
These data are from the questions within Safety Item 4, Risk and Safety Management. (The percentage of cases was calculated based on the total number of cases rated for item 4 that had at least one of the above safety concerns noted. Some cases had more than one of the unaddressed safety concerns noted for the item.)
Case-Level Data: 32 States

Unaddressed Safety Concerns

21% of cases had unaddressed safety concerns. Safety concerns could include:

- Maltreatment allegations reported and inappropriately screened out
- Maltreatment allegations never formally reported or formally investigated
- Extensive delays in accepting an allegation for investigation or assessment
- Maltreatment allegations not substantiated despite evidence that would support a substantiation
- The case was closed prematurely
Permanency
2008 data are preliminary and have not been verified by all States. The AFCARS C File is not included in the data. No States were excluded from the preliminary 2005 data. In general, the information included in the Report To Congress may be slightly different from those reported here because more State analysis and adjustments may be applied based on known data quality issues.
Number of States Meeting Permanency Composite National Standards

Composite 1 Individual Measure C1.2: Median Stay, Exits to Reunification

Median Time to Reunify - Months

Lower median raises composite score.
Composite 1 Individual Measure C1.3: Entry Cohort: Children entering foster care 6 months prior, percent exiting to reunification in less than 12 months of entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Median Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher percent raises composite score.
Composite 1 Individual Measure C1.4: Exit Cohort Re-Entry Within 12 Months

- 2005: 14.8
- 2006: 13.1
- 2007: 13.2
- 2008: 13.1

Lower median raises composite score.
Composite 2 Individual Measure C2.3: For Children in Foster Care for 17 Months or Longer at the Start of the Reporting Year, Percent Discharged to Adoption During the Year

National Median Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher percent raises composite score.
Composite 2 Individual Measure C2.4: For Children in Foster Care for 17 Months or Longer at the Start of the Reporting Year, Percent Who Became Legally Free for Adoption Within 6 Months of the Reporting Year

National Median Percent

FC > 17 Months Percent Legally Free in 6 Months

- 2005
- 2006
- 2007
- 2008

Higher percent raises composite score.
Composite 2 Individual Measure C2.5: For Children Legally Free for Adoption, Percent Adopted in Less Than 12 Months of Becoming Legally Free

National Median Percent

Legally Free Adoption < 12 Months

- 2005: 44.5%
- 2006: 49.1%
- 2007: 50.5%
- 2008: 53.1%

Higher percent raises composite score.
Composite 3 Individual Measure C3.1: Children in Care for 24+ Months, Percent Achieving Permanency Before 18

24+ Months Percent Achieving Permanency

- 2005: 25.5%
- 2006: 26.3%
- 2007: 25.8%
- 2008: 28.4%

Higher percent raises composite score.
Composite 3 Individual Measure C3.3:
Percent of Youth in Care > 3 Years Discharged to Emancipation

Emancipating Children - % in Care > 3 Years

- 2005
- 2006
- 2007
- 2008

Lower percent raises composite score.
Composite 4 Individual Measures: 
Children with 2 or Fewer Placements

- <12 Months: 82.4, 83.1, 82, 83.9
- 12 to 24 Months: 59.7, 60.7, 61, 61.8
- 24+ Months: 33.1, 34.2, 36.3, 32.8

Higher percent raises composite score.
4-Year Trend Summary
National Indicators and Measures

- Median time to reunification has increased
- Re-entry has improved from 2005 – flat last 3 years
- First-time entry cohorts to reunification showing improvement
- Timeliness of children becoming legally free is improved
- Improvement for children legally free adopted < 1 year
- Improvement for children in care 17 months adopted < 6 months
- More children in care over 2 years achieving permanency
- Improvement for long-stay children (3 years) turning 18 or emancipating in care
- Little change over 4 years with children experiencing fewer than 3 moves in placement
Item 5: Foster care re-entries
Item 6: Stability of foster care placement
Item 7: Permanency goal for child
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship, or permanent placement with relatives
Item 9: Adoption
Item 10: Other planned permanent living arrangement
Item 11: Proximity of foster care placement
Item 12: Placement with siblings
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care
Item 14: Preserving connections
Item 15: Relative placement
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents
State-Level Data: 32 States

Permanency Items

Average Across States: Percent of Cases Rated as Strength
State-Level Data: 32 States

**Permanency**

- **Permanency Outcome 1, Item 7**
  - 64% of cases rated a Strength

- **Permanency Outcome 1, Item 9**
  - 37% of cases rated a Strength

- **Permanency Outcome 2, Item 16**
  - 58% of cases rated a Strength
State-Level Data: 32 States

Permanency Outcome 1
Item 7

Establishing appropriate permanency goals for children in a timely manner

Low: 43%
High: 93%
Mean: 64%
These data are from the questions within Item 7, permanency goal for child. They were calculated using the total number applicable to each question. In general, that number varied for each question.
Case-Level Data: 32 States

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 7: Establishment of Permanency Goals and Filing TPR

Reviewers determined that the permanency goals were:

- Documented in the case record in 99% of the applicable cases reviewed
- Established in a timely manner in 78% of applicable cases
- Were considered appropriate in 85% of applicable cases

Reviewers found that in 73% of the applicable cases, the agency filed or joined a TPR in a timely manner, or had a compelling reason for not filing in a timely manner.
State-Level Data: 32 States

Permanency Outcome 1

Item 9

Making concerted efforts to achieve a finalized adoption in a timely manner

Low: 18%

Mean: 37%

High: 64%
These findings were derived from a qualitative analysis of all Item 9 Main Reason statements in the 1,279 foster care cases reviewed in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.
Case-Level Data: 32 States
Permanency Outcome 1

Item 9 Concerns

- Lack of effective concurrent planning (especially when goals of reunification and adoption identified)
- Lack of effort to identify pre-adoptive families
- Worker turnover/lack of urgency on part of agency to pursue adoption goal
- Court delays: multiple and ongoing continuances; lengthy TPR appeals; parents given more time for reunification; changes in bench officers
- Challenges to achieve timely adoptions where practice dictates that adoption goals are not put in place until after TPR
- Progress on adoption goal delayed due to child staying in care to keep services in place
- Lack of clarity regarding availability of subsidies
The top three metro sites were identified by sorting all metro sites from the 32 States reviewed by the average percentage of substantial conformity achieved within Permanency Outcome 1. The top three metro sites are the 3 metro sites across the 32 States with the highest average percentage of cases achieving substantial conformity in each site. The top three sites for Permanency Outcome 1 were not necessarily the same sites achieving top performance in the Well-Being Outcome 1 analysis.
Permanency 1: Three Top-Performing Metro Sites
These findings were derived from a qualitative analysis of all Main Reason statements in Items 5-7 in the 3 top-performing metro sites.
Case-Level Data: 32 States

Permanency Outcome 1
Top Three Metro Sites: Qualitative Findings

Item 5
- Provision of post-reunification services
- Utilization of risk tools/reintegration assessments

Item 6
- Utilization of relative placements
- Improvement of independent living services for youth

Item 7
- Ongoing and meaningful concurrent planning
- Goals established and case plans developed quickly
These findings were derived from a qualitative analysis of all Main Reason statements in Items 8 and 9 in the 3 top-performing metro sites.
Case-Level Data: 32 States

Permanency Outcome 1
Top Three Metro Sites: Qualitative Findings

**Item 8**
- Multi-system collaboration
- Early emphasis on reunification
- Utilization of relative placements

**Item 9**
- Ongoing and meaningful concurrent planning
- Filing TPR prior to 15 months of child entering foster care, when appropriate
- Permanency (including option of adoption) addressed meaningfully in family team meetings
- Early search for adoptive families
These findings were derived from a qualitative analysis of all Main Reason statements in Item 10 in the 3 top-performing metro sites.
Case-Level Data: 32 States
Permanency Outcome 1
Top Three Metro Sites: Qualitative Findings

Item 10

- Engaging youth in independent living services at a young age
- Emphasis on utilizing standardized assessment tools
Well-Being
Item 17: Needs and services of child, parents, foster parents
Item 18: Child and family involvement in case planning
Item 19: Caseworker visits with child
Item 20: Caseworker visits with parent(s)
Item 21: Educational needs of the child
Item 22: Physical health of the child
Item 23: Mental/behavioral health of the child
State-Level Data: 32 States
Well-Being Items
Average Across States: Percent of Cases Rated as Strength on Item

[Bar chart showing percent of cases rated as strength across different years: 50, 52, 73, 43, 87, 86, 78]
State-Level Data: 32 States

Well-Being Outcome 1
Item 17

Assessing and addressing the needs and services of children, parents, and foster parents

Low: 29%
Mean: 50%
High: 69%
These data are from the questions within Items 17a, 17b, and 17c, relating to the needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents. They were calculated using the total number applicable to each question. In general, that number varied for each question.
Case-Level Data: 32 States

Needs Assessed and Addressed

Child welfare agencies assessed and addressed identified needs for mothers, fathers, children, and foster parents in:

- **Mothers**: Assessed: 79% of applicable cases; Addressed: 72% of applicable cases
- **Fathers**: Assessed: 52% of applicable cases; Addressed: 46% of applicable cases
- **Children**: Assessed: 88% of applicable cases; Addressed: 84% of applicable cases
- **Foster Parents**: Assessed: 87% of applicable cases; Addressed: 83% of applicable cases
State-Level Data: 32 States

Well-Being Outcome 1

Item 18

Child and family involvement in case planning

Low: 27%
Mean: 52%
High: 75%
These data are from the questions within Item 18, case planning. They were calculated using the total number applicable to each question. In general, that number varied for each question.
Case-Level Data: 32 States

Involvement in Case Planning

Child welfare agencies are making concerted efforts to involve children and parents in case planning in:

- **Mothers**: 74% of applicable cases
- **Fathers**: 48% of applicable cases
- **Children**: 71% of applicable cases
State-Level Data: 32 States
Well-Being Outcome 1
Item 19

Caseworker visits with child

Low: 26%
High: 89%
Mean: 73%
State-Level Data: 32 States

Well-Being Outcome 1
Item 20

Caseworker visits with parents

Low: 20%

High: 70%

Mean: 43%
These data are from the questions within Items 19 and 20, relating to caseworker visits with the child and caseworker visits with the parents. They were calculated using the total number applicable to each question. In general, that number varied for each question.
The frequency and quality of visits between the caseworker and the parents, and the caseworker and child, were sufficient in:

- **Mother**
  - Frequency: 69% of applicable cases
  - Quality: 70% of applicable cases

- **Father**
  - Frequency: 42% of applicable cases
  - Quality: 50% of applicable cases

- **Child**
  - Frequency: 81% of applicable cases
  - Quality: 76% of applicable cases
The top three metro sites were identified by sorting all metro sites from the 32 States reviewed by the average percentage of substantial conformity achieved within Well-Being Outcome 1. The top three metro sites are the 3 metro sites across the 32 States with the highest average percentage of cases achieving substantial conformity in each site. The top three sites for Well-Being Outcome 1 were not necessarily the same sites achieving top performance in the Permanency Outcome 1 analysis.
Well-Being 1: Three Top-Performing Metro Sites
These findings were derived from a qualitative analysis of all Main Reason statements in Item 17 in the 3 top-performing metro sites.
Case-Level Data: 32 States
Well-Being Outcome 1
Top Three Metro Sites: Qualitative Themes

Item 17

- Formal team meetings utilized (TDM, FTM, etc.)
- Coordination between all involved agencies and providers in ongoing assessments and service planning
- Wide array of services available
- Responsiveness of workers noted by children, parents, and foster parents
These findings were derived from a qualitative analysis of all Main Reason statements in Item 18 in the 3 top-performing metro sites.
Item 18

- Active engagement of non-custodial and incarcerated parents
- Family-centered and strengths-based approaches (team meetings, mediation) effective in building working relationships
- Strong rapport developed between workers and children/parents
These findings were derived from a qualitative analysis of all Main Reason statements in Item 19 in the 3 top-performing metro sites.
Case-Level Data: 32 States

Well-Being Outcome 1

Top Three Metro Sites: Qualitative Themes

Item 19

- Frequency of visits increased based on case circumstances
- Transitions for children anticipated and addressed in visits
- High frequency of visits in in-home cases
- Youth developed bond with workers and perceived visits as helpful in moving toward permanency
These findings were derived from a qualitative analysis of all Main Reason statements in Item 20 in the 3 top-performing metro sites.
Case-Level Data: 32 States
Well-Being Outcome 1
Top Three Metro Sites: Qualitative Themes

Item 20
- Persistent efforts made for frequent contact
- Repeated attempts to locate absent parents and engage non-custodial parents
- High frequency/quality of visits with fathers
- Scheduling adjusted to meet the needs of parents
- Incarcerated parents visited
- Parents reported relationship with workers progressed over time
- Visitation continued even after shift from reunification to other permanency goals
Systemic Factors
The 7 Systemic Factors

- Statewide information system
- Case review system
- Quality assurance system
- Agency responsiveness
- Service array and resource development
- Staff and provider training
- Parent licensing, recruitment, and retention
State-Level Data: 32 States

Stakeholder Interviews

Total Number of Stakeholder Interviews Conducted:
• 2,305

Types of Interviews:
• State and Local Tribal Representative(s)
• State and Local Child Welfare Director(s) and Administrators
• State and Local Agency Staff
• State and Local Administrative Review Bodies
• State and Local Court System Representative(s) including Judges, GALs, etc.
• Biological Parents
• State and Local Foster/Adoptive Parent Association Members and Foster/Adoptive Parents
• Youth Being Served by the Agency
• Law Enforcement Representative(s)
Systemic Factor 1: Statewide Information System
Systemic Factor 2: Case Review System
Systemic Factor 3: Quality Assurance System
Systemic Factor 4: Staff and Provider Training
Systemic Factor 5: Service Array and Resource Development
Systemic Factor 6: Agency Responsiveness to the Community
Systemic Factor 7: Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention
State-Level Data: 32 States

Systemic Factors

Number of States Achieving Substantial Conformity

- SF1: 27
- SF2: 1
- SF3: 28
- SF4: 22
- SF5: 8
- SF6: 31
- SF7: 22
Item 25: Written Case Plan
Item 26: Periodic Reviews
Item 27: Permanency Hearings
Item 28: Termination of Parental Rights
Item 29: Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers
State-Level Data: 32 States

Case Review System

Number of States Rated Strength
These findings were derived from a qualitative analysis of all Item 28 narratives captured during stakeholder interviews in all 32 States reviewed in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.
State-Level Data: 32 States

Systemic Factors

Item 28: Common findings across States with higher performance

- Required that compelling reasons be put in court orders
- Utilized information systems to consider ASFA requirements and issued alerts to ensure timeliness (agency and court system)
- Instituted specialized organizations within the court system to facilitate TPR cases
- Training for judges and parents’ attorneys
- Strong agency emphasis on concurrent planning
Item 35: Array of Services
Item 36: Service Accessibility
Item 37: Individualizing Services
State-Level Data: 32 States

Service Array and Resource Development

Number of States Rated Strength

- Item 35: 13
- Item 36: 1
- Item 37: 15
These findings were derived from a qualitative analysis of all Item 35 narratives captured during stakeholder interviews in all 32 States reviewed in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.
State-Level Data: 32 States

Systemic Factors

Item 35: Common findings across States with higher performance

- Concept of wrap-around as a way of coordinating and delivering services
- Strong connections to community-based organizations
- Access to independent funding streams to address gaps in service array
- Use of Family Group Decision Making
- Prevalence of specialized services to address domestic violence, substance abuse, and adolescent populations
CFSR Program Improvement Plans
CFSR PIP Strategies
13 States reviewed in FYs 2007 and 2008 have approved PIPs

- Develop and implement practice models
- Adopt evidence-based assessment tools
- Strengthen worker contacts with families to engage, assess and provide services
- Implement processes like family team meetings to facilitate engagement, assessment and service provision
- Enhance supervision and QA/CQI processes
CFSR PIP Strategies (continued)

- Access T/TA through NRCs
- Improve or develop safety assessments
- Develop and implement differential or alternative response
- Strengthen diligent search requirements for non-custodial parents and relatives
- Concurrent planning
CFSR PIP Strategies (continued)

- Develop processes for closer review of children with goals of OPPLA, or children who have been in care for long periods of time.

- Strengthen recruitment/retention activities and initiatives.

- Develop and implement well-being checklists with agencies and courts.
Challenges with CFSR PIP Development and Implementation

- State child welfare agencies underestimating time to design and implement practice model
- State child welfare agencies underestimating time to design and implement differential response
- State child welfare agencies needing to revisit round one CFSR PIP strategies that have not been effective; e.g., safety assessments
- Activities in PIPs still driven by State child welfare agency vs. shared responsibility with external entities; e.g., mental health, court, Medicaid, etc.
Challenges with CFSR PIP Development and Implementation (continued)

- T/TA efforts can still be piecemeal and neither comprehensive nor integrated into other initiatives
- Challenges for State child welfare agencies with other mandates; e.g., consent decrees
- Impact of current economic crisis on State child welfare budgets, etc.
Challenges with CFSR PIP Development and Implementation (continued)

- Some States suspended QA reviews and do not have baseline data for item measures.
- Program improvement needs to be driven by agency leadership and must be integrated with a larger vision and plan.
- States need to conduct analysis of data before developing PIP strategies in some areas; e.g., placement stability.
Children’s Bureau Web Site

www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb