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The 17 States Reviewed in FY 2001

- Arizona
- Arkansas
- Delaware
- District of Columbia
- Florida
- Georgia
- Indiana
- Kansas
- Massachusetts
- Minnesota
- New Mexico
- New York
- North Carolina
- North Dakota
- Oregon
- South Dakota
- Vermont
The 15 States Reviewed in FY 2002

- Alabama
- Alaska
- California
- Colorado
- Connecticut
- Michigan
- Montana
- Nebraska
- Ohio
- Oklahoma
- Pennsylvania
- Tennessee
- Texas
- West Virginia
- Wyoming
Scope of Child and Family Service Reviews

7 outcomes in the areas of safety, permanency, and child and family well being

7 systemic factors
## Determining Substantial Conformity

### Outcomes

- Case Record reviews and data indicators
- 90% of cases substantially achieved
- Meet national standards on data indicators

### Systemic Factors

- Stakeholder interviews and statewide assessment
- State plan requirements in place
- State plan requirements function as required
Changes in Rating Criteria from 2001 to 2002

- **Foster Care Re-Entries:** Changed definition to correspond to data indicator
- **Recurrence of Maltreatment:** Changed definition to correspond to data indicator
- **Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Relative Placement:** Added an indicator to onsite review of cases
- **Independent Living:** Incorporated into other items
**Number of Cases Reviewed**

Total number of cases = 1584

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care Cases</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Home Cases</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
African-American children were more likely to be in foster care than served in their own homes, when compared to white children.
Over-Representation of Children of Color in the 2002 Foster Care Cases

- White (289)
- Black (198)
- Hisp (67)
- NatAm (45)

- In-home
- FC
Relationship between Race/Ethnicity and Adoption Ratings - 2002 reviews

- Ratings for adoption (item 9) were not significantly associated with race/ethnicity of children
- 50% of cases with Native American children were rated “strength” for adoption, compared to 39% of all other cases
- 36% of cases with White children were rated “strength” for adoption, compared to 41% of all other cases
Relationship between Race/Ethnicity and Preserving Connections Ratings

• Ratings for preserving connections (item 14) were not significantly associated with race/ethnicity of children.

• Preserving connections was rated “strength” for 68% of Native American children, compared to 80% of all other children.

• 81% of cases with white children were rated “strength” for this item, compared to 78% of all other children.
Number of States in Substantial Conformity on the 7 Outcomes
Safety Outcomes

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

2. Children are safely maintained in their own homes whenever possible and appropriate.
Case Ratings for the Two Safety Outcomes

Cases were rated stronger in achieving Safety Outcome 1 (86% of 1447 cases) than Safety Outcome 2 (80% of 1403 cases)
Ratings on Safety Outcome 2 for In-Home and Foster Care Cases

Safety outcome 2 was substantially achieved for only 71% of children receiving services in their own homes, compared to 85% of children in foster care.
The risk of harm was managed effectively for 74% of children receiving services in their own homes, vs. 87% of children in foster care.
Common Concerns in “Risk of Harm” Ratings in 2002 States

Common reasons why “risk of harm” was rated “area needing improvement” include:

- The services provided to the family were not always sufficient to reduce the risk of harm (10 States)
- The agency did not consistently monitor families to assess participation in services and associated changes in risk (10 States)
Compliance with National Standards for Safety

13 of 32 States met the repeat maltreatment standard

17 of 32 States met the maltreatment in foster care standard
Permanency Outcomes

1. Children have permanency and stability in their living arrangements

2. The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children
Permanency Goals for Children in 2002 Cases

- Reunification - 39.1%
- Adoption - 28.0%
- LTFC/Emancipation - 20.1%
- Guardianship - 7.1%
- Perm.Place.W/ Relatives - 5.2%
- Other/Not Specified - .5%
Common concerns in 2002 States regarding permanency goals

• The goal of LTFC is often established without thorough consideration of adoption or guardianship (11 States)

• Appropriate concurrent planning efforts were not being implemented on a consistent basis (11 States)
Common permanency concerns - continued

• The goal of reunification was maintained for too long before reconsidering/reviewing the goal (10 States)

• Agency did not routinely file for TPR in a timely manner and reasons for not filing were often not documented in the case files (6 States)
Case Ratings for Permanency Outcomes 1 & 2

Cases were rated much higher in achieving Permanency Outcome 2 (79%) than Permanency Outcome 1 (63%).
Strength Ratings for Permanency Outcome 1 Indicators

Re-entries, Stability, Perm Goal, Reunify, Adopt, OPPLA

- Strength for both years
- 2002 Only

Bar chart showing percentage ratings for different outcomes.
2002 Cases

Of all indicators in the 2002 cases, adoption was the least likely indicator to be rated a strength.
### Additional Adoption Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of States with Adoption as a Strength</th>
<th>Percentage of Cases with Adoption as a Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4 States</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1 State</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of States Meeting Adoption National Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5 States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4 States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common Concerns Regarding Adoption Delays in 2002 States

- Agencies did not consistently conduct home studies or complete adoption-related paperwork in a timely manner (9 States)

- Lengthy appeals of TPR (9 States)

- Agencies and/or courts were reluctant to establish a goal of adoption or seek TPR unless an adoptive family had been identified (6 States)
Strength Ratings for Permanency
Outcome 2 Indicators

- Proximity
- Pl w/sibs
- Visit/Pas
- Preserve
- Relatives
- Rel w/pas

- Strength for both years
- 2001 Only
- 2002 Only
Well Being Outcomes

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

2. Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs

3. Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs
Cases were rated stronger in WB Outcome 2 (83%) than in WB Outcome 1 (62%) or WB Outcome 3 (71%)
Strength Ratings for Well Being
Outcome 1 Indicators for 2001 & 2002 by Cases

- Needs/Svcs
- Fam Inv
- Visits/ch
- Visits/pas
Strength Ratings for Well Being 1 Indicators for 2002 Only by States

- Assessing Needs and Providing Services (Item 17) - 0 States
- Family Involvement in Case Planning (Item 18) - 0 States
- Caseworker Visits with Children (Item 19) - 4 States
- Caseworker Visits with Parents (Item 20) - 0 States
A “strength” rating for Item 19 (caseworker visits with child) was significantly associated with “substantially achieved” ratings for 5 of the 7 outcomes.
Relationship between Caseworker Visits with Children and Other Indicator Ratings in 2002 Cases (1)

Significant relationships were found between caseworker visits with children and...

- Providing services to protect children in the home and prevent removal
- Managing the risk of harm to children
- Establishing permanency goals
- Achieving reunification, guardianship and permanent placement with relatives
Relationship between Caseworker Visits with Children and Other Indicator Ratings in 2002 Cases (2)

Significant relationships were also found between caseworker visits with children and . . .

- Achieving goal of other planned living arrangement
- Placement with siblings
- Preserving children’s connections while in foster care
- Maintaining the child’s relationship with parents
- Assessing needs and providing services to children and families
Finally, significant relationships were also found between caseworker visits with children and...
Well-Being Outcome 1 was substantially achieved for only 56% of in-home cases, compared to 67% of foster care cases.
Children in foster care received services to meet their physical and mental health needs more often than children who were served in their own homes.
Comparison of item strengths for in-home cases vs. foster cases in the 2002 cases

(Permanency indicators are not represented)
Statistically Significant Differences in Case Ratings for In-Home and Foster Care Cases
Statistically Significant Differences in Ratings for Fathers & Mothers in the 2002 Cases
Rank Order of Outcomes Across All Cases from Strongest to Weakest

1. Safety 1 (86%)
2. Well Being 2 (83%)
3. Safety 2 (80%)
4. Permanency 2 (79%)
5. Well Being 3 (71%)
6. Permanency 1 (63%)
7. Well Being 1 (62%)
# Strongest and Weakest Outcome Indicators Across All Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strongest Indicators</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weakest Indicators</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement Proximity (96%)</td>
<td>Adoption (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence of Maltx (92%)</td>
<td>Needs &amp; Services (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement with siblings (87%)</td>
<td>Family Involvement (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Placements (85%)</td>
<td>Permanency Goal (67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Systemic Factors

- Statewide Information System
- Case Review System
- Quality Assurance System
- Training
- Service Array
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community
- Foster & Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, & Retention
Determining Substantial Conformity for Systemic Factors

• Are State plan requirements and other program requirements attached to the systemic factor actually in place in the State?

• Are State plan requirements and other requirements attached to the systemic factor functioning as described in the applicable regulation or statute?
Substantial Conformity Ratings for Systemic Factors

- Subst Conf
- Not in Subst Conf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongest Factors</th>
<th>Weakest Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency Responsiveness (31)</td>
<td>Case Review System (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information System (28)</td>
<td>Service Array (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing/Recruit/Retention (27)</td>
<td>Training (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship of Systemic Factors & Case Ratings in 2002 Cases: Case Review System

States in substantial conformity with Case Review System had more cases rated as substantially achieved for:

Permanency Goal for child (P1) and

Families have enhanced capacity (WB1).
Relationship between Case Plans and Outcome Achievement

• The indicator, “developing case plans jointly with parents,” was determined to be a strength for only 6 of the total 32 States reviewed.

• States where this indicator was a strength had a significantly higher percentage of cases rated “substantially achieved” for Permanency Outcome 1, and all three Well-Being Outcomes.
States with Substantial Conformity ratings on Case Review System had higher ratings on:

- Adoption
- Proximity of placement
- Preserving connections
- Needs/services of child, parents and foster parents
- Child/family involvement in case planning
- Worker visits with parents
Agency Responsiveness to the Community

Collaboration APSR Coordination

Strength ANI
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

Lic Standards | Equally Applied | B'gr Checks | Diligent Recruitment | Cross Juris Placements
---|---|---|---|---
31 | 29 | 27 | 25 | 23
29 | 27 | 25 | 23 | 21
27 | 25 | 23 | 21 | 19
25 | 23 | 21 | 19 | 17
23 | 21 | 19 | 17 | 15
21 | 19 | 17 | 15 | 13
19 | 17 | 15 | 13 | 11
17 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 9
15 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 7
13 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 5
11 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 3
9 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 1

Strength and ANI Comparison
Other Relationships Between Systemic Factors and 2002 Case Ratings

Substantial Conformity on:
- Quality Assurance
- Foster & Adoptive Parent Licensing,
- Recruitment, and Retention

Higher Ratings on:
- Well being outcome 1
- Placement stability for children in foster care
## Strongest and Weakest Systemic Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongest Indicators</th>
<th>Weakest Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration (31)</td>
<td>Case Plans (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Standards (31)</td>
<td>Services are accessible (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal B’ground Checks (30)</td>
<td>Diligent Recruitment (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Juris placements (28)</td>
<td>Ongoing Staff Training (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic reviews (28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Major Points

- Better performance on safety outcomes than other outcomes
- Much need for improving permanency achievement and well being of children
- Adoption is least likely indicator to be achieved

- Status of Case Review System and it’s relationship to other areas
- Relationship of Caseworker Visits with Children to other findings
- Difference in findings for In-home and Foster Care Cases
- Implications for casework practice