

Section 3: Independent Exercise

Instructions

The attached state data profile for fictional State “X “ will allow you to apply some of the analysis skills and knowledge learned in today’s training. The exercise is to be completed at your own pace when it is convenient for you.

1. Examine the state data profile and look for inconsistencies, obvious errors such as transposition errors, or possible policy or programmatic issues that would cause a fluctuation in the data.
2. Note these errors or anomalies. Then draft some investigative questions about each that you would ask the State to help explain them or research them further.
3. You can check your how well you did by comparing your answers to the Answer Key. The Answer Key consists of an annotated state data profile (page 18) and some sample questions and possible reasons (page 33) for the errors, anomalies, or inconsistencies.

NOTE: The Data Profile used for this exercise is based on fictional State “X” and is for illustrative purposes only. The Data Profile format is based on what was available from the Children’s Bureau at the time this version of the toolkit was released and is subject to change. Some fields in this fictional Data Profile are blank. The figures and percentages presented here may not accurately represent the computations used by the Children’s Bureau.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

CHILD SAFETY PROFILE	Fiscal Year 2003						Fiscal Year 2004						Fiscal Year 2005					
	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. ²	%	Unique Childn. ²	%	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. ²	%	Unique Childn. ²	%	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. ²	%	Unique Childn. ²	%
I. Total CA/N Reports Disposed¹	28,147		59,223		42,887		26,275		58,441		41,672		27,884		59,128		41,923	
II. Disposition of CA/N Reports³																		
Substantiated & Indicated	7,262	25.8	11,581	19.6	9,562	22.2	6,142	23.4	14,741	25.2	10,010	24.0	6,842	24.5	13,130	22.2	9,810	23.4
Unsubstantiated	20,894	74.2	46,805	79.0	32,704	76.3	19,732	75.1	31,135	73.8	43,101	74.7	21,634	74.0	45,174	76.4	31,539	75.2
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	401	1.5	599	1.0	527	1.3	418	1.5	828	1.4	587	1.4
III. Child Cases Opened for Services⁴			5,841	50.4	4,751	49.7			7,429	50.3	5,071	50.7			6,229	50.1	4,888	49.7
IV. Children Entering Care Based on CA/N Report⁵			1,317	11.4	1,027	10.7			1,501	10.2	998	10.0			1,189	9.6	971	9.9
V. Child Fatalities⁶					2	0.2					1	0.1					342	0.8
STATEWIDE AGGREGATE DATA USED TO DETERMINE SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY																		
VI. Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence⁷ [Standard: 94.4% or more]					4,087 of 4,522	90.4					4,672 of 4,907	95.2					4,601 of 4,722	97.4
VII. Absence of Child Abuse and/or Neglect in Foster Care⁸ (12 months) [standard 99.67% or more]					1,810 of 1,832	98.80					1,916 of 1,933	99.12					1,894 of 1,902	99.60

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

ADDITIONAL SAFETY MEASURES FOR INFORMATION ONLY:																		
	Fiscal Year 2003						Fiscal Year 2004						Fiscal Year 2005					
	Hours				Unique Childn. ²	%	Hours				Unique Childn. ²	%	Hours				Unique Childn. ²	%
VIII. Median Time to Investigation in Hours (Child File) ⁹	121						118						109					
IX. Mean Time to Investigation in Hours (Child File) ¹⁰	119						120						110					
X. Average Time to Investigation in Hours (Agency File) ¹¹																		

CFSR Round One Safety Measures to Determine Substantial Conformity (Used primarily by States completing Round One Program Improvement Plans, but States may also review them to compare to prior performance)

	Fiscal Year 2003						Fiscal Year 2004						Fiscal Year 2005					
	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. ²	%	Unique Childn. ²	%	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. ²	%	Unique Childn. ²	%	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. ²	%	Unique Childn. ²	%
VI. Recurrence of Maltreatment ¹³ [Standard: 6.1% or less]																		
VII. Incidence of Child Abuse and/or Neglect in Foster Care ¹⁴ (9 months) [standard 0.57% or less]																		

NCANDS data completeness information for the CFSR

Description of Data Tests	Fiscal Year 2003		Fiscal Year 2004		Fiscal Year 2005	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Percent of duplicate victims in the submission [At least 1% of victims should be associated with multiple reports (same CHID). If not, the State would appear to have frequently entered different IDs for the same victim. This affects maltreatment recurrence]						
Percent of victims with perpetrator reported [File must have at least 75% to reasonably calculate maltreatment in foster care]						
Percent of perpetrators with relationship to victim reported [File must have at least 75% to reasonably calculate maltreatment in foster care]						
Percent of records with investigation start date reported [Needed to compute mean and median time to investigation]						
Average time to investigation in the Agency file [PART measure]						

FOOTNOTES TO DATA ELEMENTS IN CHILD SAFETY PROFILE

Each maltreatment allegation reported to NCANDS is associated with a disposition or finding that is used to derive the counts provided in this safety profile. The safety profile uses three categories. The various terms that are used in NCANDS reporting have been collapsed into these three groups.

Disposition Category	Safety Profile Disposition	NCANDS Maltreatment Level Codes Included
A	Substantiated or Indicated (Maltreatment Victim)	“Substantiated,” “Indicated,” and “Alternative Response Disposition Victim”
B	Unsubstantiated	“Unsubstantiated” and “Unsubstantiated Due to Intentionally False Reporting”
C	Other	“Closed-No Finding,” “Alternative Response Disposition – Not a Victim,” “Other,” “No Alleged Maltreatment,” and “Unknown or Missing”

Alternative Response was added starting with the 2000 data year. The two categories of Unsubstantiated were added starting with the 2000 data year. In earlier years there was only the category of Unsubstantiated. The disposition of “No alleged maltreatment” was added for FFY 2003. It primarily refers to children who receive an investigation or assessment because there is an allegation concerning a sibling or other child in the household, but not themselves, AND whom are not found to be a victim of maltreatment. It applies as a Maltreatment Disposition Level but not as a Report Disposition code because the Report Disposition cannot have this value (there must have been a child who was found to be one of the other values.)

Starting with FFY 2003, the data year is the fiscal year.

Starting with FFY2004, the maltreatment levels for each child are used consistently to categorize children. While report dispositions are based on the field of report disposition in NCANDS, the dispositions for duplicate children and unique children are based on the maltreatment levels associated with each child. A child victim has at least one maltreatment level that is coded “substantiated,” “indicated,” or “alternative response victim.” A child classified as unsubstantiated has no maltreatment levels that are considered to be victim levels and at least one maltreatment level that is coded “unsubstantiated” or “unsubstantiated due to intentionally false reporting.” A child classified as “other” has no maltreatment levels that are considered to be victim levels and none that are considered to be unsubstantiated levels. If a child has no maltreatments in the record, and report has a victim disposition, the child is assigned to “other” disposition. If a child has no maltreatments in the record and the report has either an unsubstantiated disposition or an other disposition, the child is counted as having the same disposition as the report disposition.

1. The data element, “Total CA/N Reports Disposed,” is based on the reports received in the State that received a disposition in the reporting period under review. The number shown may include reports received during a previous year that received a disposition in the reporting year. Counts based on “reports,” “duplicated counts of children,” and “unique counts of children” are provided.
2. *The duplicated count of children (report-child pairs) counts a child each time that (s)he was reported. The unique count of children counts a child only once during the reporting period, regardless of how many times the child was reported.*
3. *For the column labeled “Reports,” the data element, “Disposition of CA/N Reports,” is based on upon the highest disposition of any child who was the subject of an investigation in a particular report. For example, if a report investigated two children, and one child is found to be neglected and the other child found not to be maltreated, the report disposition will be substantiated (Group A). The disposition for each child is based on the specific finding related to the maltreatment(s). In other words, of the two children above, one is a victim and is counted under “substantiated” (Group A) and the other is not a victim and is counted under “unsubstantiated” (Group B). In determining the unique counts of children, the highest finding is given priority. If a child is found to be a victim in one report (Group A), but not a victim in a second report (Group B), the unique count of children includes the child only as a victim (Group A). The category of “other” (Group C) includes children whose report may have been “closed without a finding,” children for whom the allegation disposition is “unknown,” and other dispositions that a State is unable to code as substantiated, indicated, alternative response victim, or unsubstantiated.*
4. The data element, “Child Cases Opened for Services,” is based on the number of victims (Group A) during the reporting period under review. “Opened for Services” refers to post-investigative services. The duplicated number counts each time a victim’s report is linked to on-going services; the unique number counts a victim only once regardless of the number of times services are linked to reports of substantiated maltreatment.
5. *The data element, “Children Entering Care Based on CA/N Report,” is based on the number of victims (Group A) during the reporting period under review. The duplicated number counts each time a victim’s report is linked to a foster care removal date. The unique number counts a victim only once regardless of the number of removals that may be reported.*
6. *The data element “Child Fatalities” counts the number of children reported to NCANDS as having died as a result of child abuse and/or neglect. Depending upon State practice, this number may count only those children for whom a case record has been opened either prior to or after the death, or may include a number of children whose deaths have been investigated as possibly related to child maltreatment. For example, some States include neglected-related deaths such as those caused by motor vehicle or boating accidents, house fires or access to firearms, under certain circumstances. The percentage is based on a count of unique victims of maltreatment for the reporting period.*
7. *The data element “Absence of Recurrence of Maltreatment” is defined as follows: Of all children who were victims of substantiated or indicated maltreatment allegation during the first 6 months of the reporting period, what percent were not victims of another substantiated or indicated maltreatment allegation within a 6-month period. This data element is used to determine the State’s substantial conformity with Safety Outcome #1.*

8. The data element “Absence of Child Abuse/or Neglect in Foster Care” is defined as follows: Of all children in foster care during the reporting period, what percent were not victims of substantiated or indicated maltreatment by foster parent or facility staff member. This data element is used to determine the State’s substantial conformity with Safety Outcome #2. A child is counted as not having been maltreated in foster care if the perpetrator of the maltreatment was not identified as a foster parent or residential facility staff. Counts of children not maltreated in foster care are derived by subtracting NCANDS count of children maltreated by foster care providers from AFCARS count of children placed in foster care. The observation period for this measure is 12 months. The number of children not found to be maltreated in foster care and the percentage of all children in foster care are provided
9. Median Time to Investigation in hours is computed from the Child File records using the Report Date and the Investigation Start Date (currently reported in the Child File in mmddyyyy format). The result is converted to hours by multiplying by 24.
10. Mean Time to investigation in hours is computed from the Child File records using the Report Date and the Investigation Start Date (currently reported in the Child File in mmddyyyy format). The result is converted to hours by multiplying by 24. Zero days difference (both dates are on the same day) is reported as “under 24 hours”, one day difference (investigation date is the next day after report date) is reported as “at least 24 hours, but less than 48 hours”, two days difference is reported as “at least 48 hours, but less than 72 hours”, etc.
11. Average response time in hours between maltreatment report and investigation is available through State NCANDS Agency or SDC File aggregate data. "Response time" is defined as the time from the receipt of a report to the time of the initial investigation or assessment. Note that many States calculate the initial investigation date as the first date of contact with the alleged victim, when this is appropriate, or with another person who can provide information essential to the disposition of the investigation or assessment.
12. The data element, “Children Maltreated by Parents while in Foster Care” is defined as follows: Of all children placed in foster care during the reporting period, what percent were victims of substantiated or indicated maltreatment by parent. This data element requires matching NCANDS and AFCARS records by AFCARS IDs. Only unique NCANDS children with substantiated or indicated maltreatments and perpetrator relationship “Parent” are selected for this match. NCANDS report date must fall within the removal period found in the matching AFCARS record.
13. The data element, “Recurrence of Maltreatment,” is defined as follows: Of all children associated with a “substantiated” or “indicated” finding of maltreatment during the first six months of the reporting period, what percentage had another “substantiated” or “indicated” finding of maltreatment within a 6-month period. The number of victims during the first six-month period and the number of these victims who were recurrent victims within six months are provided. This data element was used to determine the State’s substantial conformity with Safety Outcome #1 for CFSR Round One.

14. The data element, “Incidence of Child Abuse and/or Neglect in Foster Care,” is defined as follows: Of all children who were served in foster care during the reporting period, what percentage were found to be victims of “substantiated” or “indicated” maltreatment. A child is counted as having been maltreated in foster care if the perpetrator of the maltreatment was identified as a foster parent or residential facility staff. Counts of children maltreated in foster care are derived from NCANDS, while counts of children placed in foster care are derived from AFCARS. The observation period for these measures is January-September because this is the reporting period that was jointly addressed by both NCANDS and AFCARS at the time when NCANDS reporting period was a calendar year. The number of children found to be maltreated in foster care and the percentage of all children in foster care are provided. This data element was used to determine the State’s substantial conformity with Safety Outcome #2 for CFSR Round One.

Additional Footnotes (Examples)

- A. *An additional 4 fatalities were reported in the Agency File.*
- B. *Fewer than 75% of the perpetrator codes are shown for victims in the Child File. The data must be considered incomplete, and the performance on absence of maltreatment in foster care is subject to change when more complete perpetrator data are available.*
- C. *State does not yet submit a Child File. Due to this, we cannot calculate the two safety indicators. The Summary Data do not allow us to determine outcomes for individual children.*
For example, only the Child File allows us to:
 - 1) *Track individual children over time to determine whether maltreatment has recurred.*
 - 2) *Distinguish between one child maltreated twice compared to two children, each of whom was maltreated once.*

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

POINT-IN-TIME PERMANENCY PROFILE	Federal FY 2003 C		Federal FY 2004 AB		Federal FY 2005 AB	
	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
I. Foster Care Population Flow						
Children in foster care on first day of year ¹	11,427		11,229		12,018	
Admissions during year	10,846		11,615		11,877	
Discharges during year	11,184		11,612		12,015	
Children discharging from FC in 7 days or less	55		47		62	
Children in care on last day of year	11,089		11,232		11,853	
Net change during year	-338		+3		-228	
II. Placement Types for Children in Care						
Pre-Adoptive Homes	0	0.0	102	0.9	877	7.4
Foster Family Homes (Relative)	1,253	11.3	1,366	12.2	1,565	13.2
Foster Family Homes (Non-Relative)	6,432	58.0	6,211	55.3	5,180	43.7
Group Homes	1,065	9.6	1,921	17.1	1,304	11.0
Institutions	865	7.8	79	0.7	747	6.3
Supervised Independent Living	89	0.8	129	1.2	1,126	9.5
Runaway	122	1.1	137	1.2	107	.9
Trial Home Visit	1,253	11.3	1,276	11.3	948	8.0
Missing Placement Information	13	0.1	11	0.1	0.0	0.0
Not Applicable (Placement in subsequent year)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
III. Permanency Goals for Children in Care						
Reunification	5,766	52.0	5,419	48.2	6,389	53.9
Live with Other Relatives	388	3.5	236	2.1	462	3.9
Adoption	2,140	19.3	2,033	18.1	2,892	24.4
Long Term Foster Care	255	2.3	236	2.1	344	2.9
Emancipation	366	3.3	359	3.2	367	3.1
Guardianship	166	1.5	213	1.9	450	3.8
Case Plan Goal Not Established	2,007	18.1	573	5.1	770	6.5
Missing Goal Information	0	0.0	2,168	19.3	178	1.5

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

POINT-IN-TIME PERMANENCY PROFILE	Federal FY 2003 C		Federal FY 2004 AB		Federal FY 2005 AB	
	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
IV. Number of Placement Settings in Current Episode						
One	3,049	27.5	1,269	11.3	2,560	26.1
Two	2,207	19.9	2,179	19.4	2,205	18.6
Three	2,173	19.6	2,460	21.9	2,406	20.3
Four	1,830	16.5	1,575	14.0	1,825	15.4
Five	832	7.5	1,415	12.6	1,019	8.6
Six or more	998	9.0	2,336	20.8	1,304	11.0
Missing placement settings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
V. Number of Removal Episodes						
One	8,816	79.5	8,536	76.0	9,162	77.3
Two	1,819	16.4	2,100	18.7	486	17.7
Three	311	2.8	449	4.0	2,098	4.1
Four	67	0.6	90	0.8	47	0.4
Five	23	0.2	34	0.3	36	0.3
Six or more	55	0.5	23	0.2	24	0.2
Missing removal episodes	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
VI. Number of children in care 17 of the most recent 22 months² (percent based on cases with sufficient information for computation)						
	5,123	46.2	4,908	43.7	5,376	45.2
VII. Median Length of Stay in Foster Care (of children in care on last day of FY)						
	15.8		15.3		14.9	
VIII. Length of Time to Achieve Perm. Goal						
	# of Children Discharged	Median Months to Discharge	# of Children Discharged	Median Months to Discharge	# of Children Discharged	Median Months to Discharge
Reunification	7,211	8.9	7,013	8.6	7,111	8.0
Adoption	1,788	37.8	1,793	30.6	1,803	26.5
Guardianship	622	6.3	754	6.2	725	6.2
Other	250	29.5	276	27.2	244	27.2
Missing Discharge Reason (footnote 3, page 10)	1	---	0	---	0	---
Total discharges (excluding those w/ problematic dates)	9,872		9,836		9,883	
Dates are problematic (footnote 4, page10)	14	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A

Statewide Aggregate Data Used in Determining Substantial Conformity: Composites 1 through 4			
	FY2003c	FY2004c	FY2005ab
IX. Permanency Composite 1: Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification [standard: 110.2 or higher]. Scaled Scores for this composite incorporate two components	NA	State Score =	
Component A: Timeliness of Reunification The timeliness component is composed of three timeliness individual measures, a1, a2, and a3			
Measure (C1) - a1: Exits to reunification in less than 12 months: Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the year shown, and who had been in foster care for 8 days or longer, what percent was reunified in less than 12 months from the date of the most recent entry into foster care? (Includes trial home visit adjustment) [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 69.9%]	NA	N= xx 70.3%	
Measure (C1) - a2: Exits to reunification, median stay: Of all children discharged from foster care (FC) to reunification in the year shown, and who had been in care for 8 days or longer, what was the median length of stay(in months) from the date of the most recent entry into FC until the date of reunification? (This includes trial home visit adjustment) [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 6.5 months]	NA	N= xx; Median 5.5 months	
Measure (C1) - a3: Entry cohort reunification in < 12 months: Of all children entering foster care (FC) in the second 6 months of the year prior to the year shown, and who remained in FC for 8 days or longer, what percent was discharged from FC to reunification in less than 12 months from the date of first entry into FC? (Includes trial home visit adjustment)[No Standard; national median = 39.3%]	NA	N= xx 30.5%	
Component B: Permanency of Reunification The permanency component has one measure.			
Measure (C1) - b1: Re-entries to foster care in less than 12 months: Of all children discharged from foster care (FC) to reunification in the year prior to the one shown, what percent re-entered FC in less than 12 months from the date of discharge? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 15.0%]	NA	N=xx 6.1%	

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

	FY2003c	FY2004c	FY2005ab
X. Permanency Composite 2: Timeliness of Adoptions [standard: 103.0 or higher]. Scaled Scores for this composite incorporate three components.	NA (Not Applicable)	State Score	State Score
Component A: Timeliness of Adoptions of Children Discharged From Foster Care. There are two individual measures of this component. See below.			
Measure (C2) - a1: Exits to adoption in less than 24 months: Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in the year shown, what percent was discharged in less than 24 months from the date of the most recent entry into foster care? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 24.6%]	NA	N = xx 28.3%	
Measure (C2) - a2: Exits to adoption, median length of stay: Of all children who were discharged from foster care (FC) to a finalized adoption in the year shown, what was the median length of stay in FC (in months) from the date of the most recent entry into FC to the date of discharge? [No Standard; FY04 national median = 32.5 months]	NA	N= 30 months	
Component B: Progress Toward Adoption for Children Who Meet ASFA Time-In-Care Requirements. There are two individual measures. See below.			
Measure (C2) - b1: Children in care 17+ months, adopted by the end of the year: Of all children in foster care (FC) on the first day of the year shown, and who were in FC for 17 continuous months or longer, what percent was discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption before the end of the year shown? [No Standard; FY04 national median = 17.7%]	NA	N= xx 17.8%	
Measure (C2) - b2: Children in care 17+ months achieving legal freedom within 6 months: Of all children in Foster Care (FC) on the first day of the year shown, and who were in FC for 17 continuous months or longer, what percent became legally free for adoption (i.e., a Termination of Parental Rights was granted for each living parent) in less than 6 months from the beginning of the year shown? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 7.4%]	NA	N= xx 9.5%	
Component C: Progress Toward Adoption of Children Who Are Legally Free for Adoption. There is one measure for this component. See below.			
Measure (C2) - c1: Legally free children adopted in less than 12 months: Of all children who became legally free for adoption in the prior fiscal year, what percent was discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in less than 12 months of becoming legally free? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 43.7%]	NA	N= xx 43.9%	

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

	FY2003c	FY2004c	FY2005ab
XI. Permanency Composite 3: Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care [standard: 111.7 or higher]. Scaled Scores for this composite incorporate two components	NA	State Score =	State Score = xx
Component A: Achieving permanency for Children in Foster Care for Extended Periods of Time. This component has two measures.			
Measure (C3) - a1: Exits to permanency for children with TPR: Of all children who were discharged from foster care in the year shown, and who were legally free for adoption (i.e., there was a Termination of Parental Rights for each living parent), what percent was discharged to a permanent home prior to their 18th birthday? A permanent home is defined as having a discharge reason of adoption, guardianship, or reunification (including living with relative) [No Standard; FY04 national median 97.0%]	NA	N= xx 94.5%	
Measure (C3) - a2: Exits to permanency prior to 18th birthday for children in care for 24 + months. Of all children in foster care for 24 months or longer on the first day of the year shown, what percent was discharged to a permanent home prior to their 18th birthday? A permanent home is defined as having a discharge reason of adoption, guardianship, or reunification (including living with relative). [No Standard; FY 04 national median 24.5%]	NA	N= xx 25.5%	
Component B: Growing up in foster care This component has one measure.			
Measure (C3) - b1: Children Emancipated Who Were in Foster Care for 3 Years or More. In the year shown, of all children who exited foster care with a discharge reason of emancipation prior to their 18th birthday, or who reached their 18th birthday while in foster care, what percent was in foster care for three years or longer? [No Standard; FY 04 national median 50.7%]	NA	N= xx 58.5%	

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

	FY2003c	FY2004c	FY2005ab
XII. Permanency Composite 4: Placement Stability [national standard: 108.5 or higher]. Scaled scored for this composite incorporates no components but three individual measures (below)	NA	State Score = xx	State Score = xx
Measure C4 - 1) Two or fewer placement settings for children in care for less than 12 months. Of all children in foster care (FC) during the year shown, and who were in FC for at least 8 days but less than 12 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 83.3%]		N= xx 75.5%	
Measure C4 - 2) Two or fewer placement settings for children in care for 12 to 24 months. Of all children in foster care (FC) during the year shown , and who were in FC for at least 12 months but less than 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 59.9%]		N = xx 54.5%	
Measure C4 - 3) Two or fewer placement settings for children in care for 24+ months. Of all children in foster care (FC) during the year shown, and who were in FC for at least 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 33.9%]		N= xx 24.5%	

Special Footnotes for Composite Measures:

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

PERMANENCY PROFILE FIRST-TIME ENTRY COHORT GROUP	Federal FY 2003 C		Federal FY 2004 AB		Federal FY 2005 AB	
	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
I. Number of children entering care for the first time in cohort group (% = 1 st time entry of all entering within first 6 months)	5,266	81.7	5,322	80.1	5,201	81.6
II. Most Recent Placement Types						
Pre-Adoptive Homes	0	0.0	240	4.5	328	6.3
Foster Family Homes (Relative)	506	9.6	436	8.2	562	10.8
Foster Family Homes (Non-Relative)	2,533	48.1	2,613	49.1	2,543	48.9
Group Homes	669	12.7	591	11.1	598	11.5
Institutions	53	1.0	112	2.1	135	2.6
Supervised Independent Living	16	0.3	16	0.3	26	0.5
Runaway	53	1.0	16	0.3	114	2.2
Trial Home Visit	1,374	26.1	1,283	24.1	947	18.2
Missing Placement Information	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Not Applicable (Placement in subsequent yr)	0	0.0	16	0.3	0	0.0
III. Most Recent Permanency Goal						
Reunification	3,747	71.7	4,050	76.1	3,870	74.4
Live with Other Relatives	53	1.0	16	0.3	0	0.0
Adoption	253	4.8	255	4.8	322	6.2
Long-Term Foster Care	47	0.9	85	1.6	16	0.3
Emancipation	0	0.0	32	0.6	0	0.0
Guardianship	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Case Plan Goal Not Established	1,137	21.6	883	16.6	936	18.0
Missing Goal Information	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
IV. Number of Placement Settings in Current Episode						
One	1,701	32.3	4,018	77.5	4,192	80.6
Two	1,301	24.7	921	17.3	843	16.2
Three	1,085	20.6	112	2.1	73	1.4
Four	469	8.9	90	1.7	36	0.7
Five	253	4.8	75	1.4	21	0.4
Six or more	453	8.6	0	0.0	36	0.7
Missing placement settings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

PERMANENCY PROFILE FIRST-TIME ENTRY COHORT GROUP (continued)	Federal FY 2003 C		Federal FY 2004 AB		Federal FY 2005 AB	
	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
V. Reason for Discharge						
Reunification/Relative Placement	2,734	81.8	2,863	87.3	2,908	88.1
Adoption	12	0.2	0	0.0	84	2.4
Guardianship	279	8.4	230	7.0	183	6.3
Other	316	9.5	98	3.0	106	3.2
Unknown (missing discharge reason or N/A)	0	0.0	89	2.7	0	0.0
	Number of Months		Number of Months		Number of Months	
VI. Median Length of Stay in Foster Care	17.8		18.3		Not Yet Determinable	

ACFARS Data Completeness and Quality Information:

	Federal FY 2003c		Federal FY 2004ab		Federal FY 2005ab	
	N	As a % of Exits Reported	N	As a % of Exits Reported	N	As a % of Exits Reported
File contains children who appear to have been in care less than 24 hours						
File contains children who appear to have exited before they entered						
Missing dates of latest removal						
File contains "Dropped Cases" between report periods with no indication as to discharge	37	1.1	33	1.0	280	8.4
Missing discharge reasons						
	N	As a % of adoption exits	N	As a % of adoption exits	N	As a % of adoption exits
File submitted lacks data on Termination of Parental Rights for finalized adoptions						
Foster Care file has different count than Adoption File of (public agency) adoptions (N= adoption count disparity).						
	N	Percent of cases having missing data	N	As a Percent of cases having missing data	N	As a Percent of cases having missing data

File submitted lacks count of number of placement settings in episode for each child						
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

Note: These are CFSR Round One permanency measures. They are intended to be used primarily by States completing Round One Program Improvement Plans, but could also be useful to States in CFSR Round Two in comparing their current performance to that of prior years:

	Federal FY 2003 C		Federal FY 2004 AB		Federal FY 2005 AB	
	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
IX. Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from foster care, what percentage was reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal for home? (4.1) [Standard: 76.2% or more]	5,141	71.3	5,098	72.7	5,333	75.0
X. Of all children who exited care to a finalized adoption, what percentage exited care in less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from home? (5.1) [Standard: 32.0% or more]	386	21.6	366	20.4	399	22.1
XI. Of all children served who have been in foster care less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home, what percentage have had no more than two placement settings? (6.1) [Standard: 86.7% or more]	3,070	77.3	3,223	78.5	3,772	80.8
XII. Of all children who entered care during the year, what percentage re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode? (4.2) [Standard: 8.6% or less]	998	9.2	1,092	9.2	1,069	9.0

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

FOOTNOTES TO DATA ELEMENTS IN THE PERMANENCY PROFILE

¹The FY03, FY04, and FY05 counts of children in care at the start of the year exclude X, X, and X children, respectively. They were excluded to avoid counting them twice. That is, although they were actually in care on the first day, they also qualify as new entries because they left and re-entered again at some point during the same reporting period. To avoid counting them as both "in care on the first day" and "entries," the Children's Bureau selects only the most recent record. That means they get counted as "entries," not "in care on the first day."

²We designated the indicator, *17 of the most recent 22 months*, rather than the statutory time frame for initiating termination of parental rights proceedings at *15 of the most 22 months*, since the AFCARS system cannot determine the *date the child is considered to have entered foster care* as defined in the regulation. We used the outside date for determining the *date the child is considered to have entered foster care*, which is 60 days from the actual removal date.

³This count only includes case records missing a discharge reason, but which have calculable lengths of stay. Records missing a discharge reason and with non-calculable lengths of stay are included in the cell "Dates are Problematic".

⁴The dates of removal and exit needed to calculate length of stay are problematic. Such problems include: 1) missing data, 2) faulty data (chronologically impossible), 3) a child was in care less than 1 day (length of stay = 0) so the child should not have been reported in foster care file, or 4) child's length of stay would equal 21 years or more. These cases are marked N/A = Not Applicable because no length of stay can legitimately be calculated.

⁵This First-Time Entry Cohort median length of stay was X months in FY03. This includes X children who entered and exited on the same day (who had a zero length of stay).

⁶This First-Time Entry Cohort median length of stay was X months for FY04. This includes X children who entered and exited on the same day (who had a zero length of stay).

⁷This First-Time Entry Cohort median length of stay is Not Yet Determinable for FY05. This includes X children who entered and exited on the same day (they had a zero length of stay). The designation, Not Yet Determinable occurs when a true length of stay for the cohort cannot be calculated because fewer than 50% of the children have exited.

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Answer Key for Independent Exercise

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

CHILD SAFETY PROFILE	Fiscal Year 2003						Fiscal Year 2004						Fiscal Year 2005					
	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. ²	%	Unique Childn. ²	%	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. ²	%	Unique Childn. ²	%	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. ²	%	Unique Childn. ²	%
I. Total CA/N Reports Disposed¹	28,147		59,223		42,887		26,275		58,441		41,672		27,884		59,128		41,923	
II. Disposition of CA/N Reports³																		
Substantiated & Indicated	7,262	25.8	11,581	19.6	9,562	22.2	6,142	23.4	14,741	25.2	10,010	24.0	6,842	24.5	13,130	22.2	9,810	23.4
Unsubstantiated	20,894	74.2	46,805	79.0	32,704	76.3	19,732	75.1	31,135	73.8	43,101	74.7	21,634	74.0	45,174	76.4	31,539	75.2
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	401	1.5	599	1.0	527	1.3	418	1.5	828	1.4	587	1.4
III. Child Cases Opened for Services⁴			5,841	50.4	4,751	49.7			7,429	50.3	5,071	50.7			6,229	50.1	4,888	49.7
IV. Children Entering Care Based on CA/N Report⁵			1,317	11.4	1,027	10.7			1,501	10.2	998	10.0			1,189	9.6	971	9.9
V. Child Fatalities⁶					2	0.2					1	0.1					342	0.8
STATEWIDE AGGREGATE DATA USED TO DETERMINE SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY																		
VI. Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence⁷ [Standard: 94.4% or more]					4,087 of 4,522	90.4					4,672 of 4,907	95.2					4,601 of 4,722	97.4
VII. Absence of Child Abuse and/or Neglect in Foster Care⁸ (12 months) [standard 99.67% or more]					1,810 of 1,832	98.80					1,916 of 1,933	99.12					1,894 of 1,902	99.60

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

ADDITIONAL SAFETY MEASURES FOR INFORMATION ONLY:																		
	Fiscal Year 2003						Fiscal Year 2004						Fiscal Year 2005					
	Hours				Unique Childn. ²	%	Hours				Unique Childn. ²	%	Hours				Unique Childn. ²	%
VIII. Median Time to Investigation in Hours (Child File)⁹	121						118						109					
IX . Mean Time to Investigation in Hours (Child File)¹⁰	119						120						110					
X. Average Time to Investigation in Hours (Agency File)¹¹																		
CFSR Round One Safety Measures to Determine Substantial Conformity (Used primarily by States completing Round One Program Improvement Plans, but States may also review them to compare to prior performance)																		
	Fiscal Year 2003						Fiscal Year 2004						Fiscal Year 2005					
	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. ²	%	Unique Childn. ²	%	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. ²	%	Unique Childn. ²	%	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. ²	%	Unique Childn. ²	%
VI. Recurrence of Maltreatment¹³ [Standard: 6.1% or less]																		
VII. Incidence of Child Abuse and/or Neglect in Foster Care¹⁴ (9 months) [standard 0.57% or less]																		
NCANDS data completeness information for the CSFR																		
Percent of duplicate victims in the submission [At least 1% of victims should be associated with multiple reports (same CHID). If not, the State would appear to have frequently entered different IDs for the same victim. This affects maltreatment recurrence]	Fiscal Year 2003						Fiscal Year 2004			Fiscal Year 2005								
Percent of victims with perpetrator reported [File must have at least 75% to reasonably calculate maltreatment in foster care]	Number		Percent		Number		Percent		Number		Percent							
Percent of perpetrators with relationship to victim reported [File must have at																		

least 75% to reasonably calculate maltreatment in foster care]						
Percent of records with investigation start date reported [Needed to compute mean and median time to investigation]						
Average time to investigation in the Agency file [PART measure]						
Percent of records with AFCARS ID reported in the Child File [Needed to calculate maltreatment in foster care by the parents]						

FOOTNOTES TO DATA ELEMENTS IN CHILD SAFETY PROFILE

Each maltreatment allegation reported to NCANDS is associated with a disposition or finding that is used to derive the counts provided in this safety profile. The safety profile uses three categories. The various terms that are used in NCANDS reporting have been collapsed into these three groups.

Disposition Category	Safety Profile Disposition	NCANDS Maltreatment Level Codes Included
A	Substantiated or Indicated (Maltreatment Victim)	“Substantiated,” “Indicated,” and “Alternative Response Disposition Victim”
B	Unsubstantiated	“Unsubstantiated” and “Unsubstantiated Due to Intentionally False Reporting”
C	Other	“Closed-No Finding,” “Alternative Response Disposition – Not a Victim,” “Other,” “No Alleged Maltreatment,” and “Unknown or Missing”

Alternative Response was added starting with the 2000 data year. The two categories of Unsubstantiated were added starting with the 2000 data year. In earlier years there was only the category of Unsubstantiated. The disposition of “No alleged maltreatment” was added for FYY 2003. It primarily refers to children who receive an investigation or assessment because there is an allegation concerning a sibling or other child in the household, but not themselves, AND whom are not found to be a victim of maltreatment. It applies as a Maltreatment Disposition Level but not as a Report Disposition code because the Report Disposition cannot have this value (there must have been a child who was found to be one of the other values.)

Starting with FFY 2003, the data year is the fiscal year.

Starting with FFY2004, the maltreatment levels for each child are used consistently to categorize children. While report dispositions are based on the field of report disposition in NCANDS, the dispositions for duplicate children and unique children are based on the maltreatment levels associated with each child. A child victim has at least one maltreatment level that is coded “substantiated,” “indicated,” or “alternative response victim.” A child classified as unsubstantiated has no maltreatment levels that are considered to be victim levels and at least one maltreatment level that is coded “unsubstantiated” or “unsubstantiated due to intentionally false reporting.” A child classified as “other” has no maltreatment levels that are considered to be victim levels and none that are considered to be

unsubstantiated levels. If a child has no maltreatments in the record, and report has a victim disposition, the child is assigned to “other” disposition. If a child has no maltreatments in the record and the report has either an unsubstantiated disposition or an other disposition, the child is counted as having the same disposition as the report disposition.

1. The data element, “Total CA/N Reports Disposed,” is based on the reports received in the State that received a disposition in the reporting period under review. The number shown may include reports received during a previous year that received a disposition in the reporting year. Counts based on “reports,” “duplicated counts of children,” and “unique counts of children” are provided.
2. *The duplicated count of children (report-child pairs) counts a child each time that (s)he was reported. The unique count of children counts a child only once during the reporting period, regardless of how many times the child was reported.*
3. *For the column labeled “Reports,” the data element, “Disposition of CA/N Reports,” is based on upon the highest disposition of any child who was the subject of an investigation in a particular report. For example, if a report investigated two children, and one child is found to be neglected and the other child found not to be maltreated, the report disposition will be substantiated (Group A). The disposition for each child is based on the specific finding related to the maltreatment(s). In other words, of the two children above, one is a victim and is counted under “substantiated” (Group A) and the other is not a victim and is counted under “unsubstantiated” (Group B). In determining the unique counts of children, the highest finding is given priority. If a child is found to be a victim in one report (Group A), but not a victim in a second report (Group B), the unique count of children includes the child only as a victim (Group A). The category of “other” (Group C) includes children whose report may have been “closed without a finding,” children for whom the allegation disposition is “unknown,” and other dispositions that a State is unable to code as substantiated, indicated, alternative response victim, or unsubstantiated.*
4. The data element, “Child Cases Opened for Services,” is based on the number of victims (Group A) during the reporting period under review. “Opened for Services” refers to post-investigative services. The duplicated number counts each time a victim’s report is linked to on-going services; the unique number counts a victim only once regardless of the number of times services are linked to reports of substantiated maltreatment.
5. *The data element, “Children Entering Care Based on CA/N Report,” is based on the number of victims (Group A) during the reporting period under review. The duplicated number counts each time a victim’s report is linked to a foster care removal date. The unique number counts a victim only once regardless of the number of removals that may be reported.*
6. *The data element “Child Fatalities” counts the number of children reported to NCANDS as having died as a result of child abuse and/or neglect. Depending upon State practice, this number may count only those children for whom a case record has been opened either prior to or after the death, or may include a number of children whose deaths have been investigated as possibly related to child maltreatment. For example, some States include neglected-related deaths such as those caused by motor vehicle or boating accidents, house fires or access to firearms, under certain circumstances. The percentage is based on a count of unique victims of maltreatment for the reporting period.*

7. The data element “Absence of Recurrence of Maltreatment” is defined as follows: Of all children who were victims of substantiated or indicated maltreatment allegation during the first 6 months of the reporting period, what percent were not victims of another substantiated or indicated maltreatment allegation within a 6-month period. This data element is used to determine the State’s substantial conformity with Safety Outcome #1.
15. The data element “Absence of Child Abuse/or Neglect in Foster Care” is defined as follows: Of all children in foster care during the reporting period, what percent were not victims of substantiated or indicated maltreatment by foster parent or facility staff member. This data element is used to determine the State’s substantial conformity with Safety Outcome #2. A child is counted as not having been maltreated in foster care if the perpetrator of the maltreatment was not identified as a foster parent or residential facility staff. Counts of children not maltreated in foster care are derived by subtracting NCANDS count of children maltreated by foster care providers from AFCARS count of children placed in foster care. The observation period for this measure is 12 months. The number of children not found to be maltreated in foster care and the percentage of all children in foster care are provided
16. Median Time to Investigation in hours is computed from the Child File records using the Report Date and the Investigation Start Date (currently reported in the Child File in mmddyyyy format). The result is converted to hours by multiplying by 24.
17. Mean Time to investigation in hours is computed from the Child File records using the Report Date and the Investigation Start Date (currently reported in the Child File in mmddyyyy format). The result is converted to hours by multiplying by 24. Zero days difference (both dates are on the same day) is reported as “under 24 hours”, one day difference (investigation date is the next day after report date) is reported as “at least 24 hours, but less than 48 hours”, two days difference is reported as “at least 48 hours, but less than 72 hours”, etc.
18. Average response time in hours between maltreatment report and investigation is available through State NCANDS Agency or SDC File aggregate data. "Response time" is defined as the time from the receipt of a report to the time of the initial investigation or assessment. Note that many States calculate the initial investigation date as the first date of contact with the alleged victim, when this is appropriate, or with another person who can provide information essential to the disposition of the investigation or assessment.
19. The data element, “Children Maltreated by Parents while in Foster Care” is defined as follows: Of all children placed in foster care during the reporting period, what percent were victims of substantiated or indicated maltreatment by parent. This data element requires matching NCANDS and AFCARS records by AFCARS IDs. Only unique NCANDS children with substantiated or indicated maltreatments and perpetrator relationship “Parent” are selected for this match. NCANDS report date must fall within the removal period found in the matching AFCARS record.
20. The data element, “Recurrence of Maltreatment,” is defined as follows: Of all children associated with a “substantiated” or “indicated” finding of maltreatment during the first six months of the reporting period, what percentage had another “substantiated” or “indicated” finding of maltreatment within a 6-month period. The number of victims during the first six-month period and the number of these victims who were recurrent victims within six months are provided. This data element was used to determine the State’s substantial conformity with Safety Outcome #1 for CFSR Round One.

21. The data element, “Incidence of Child Abuse and/or Neglect in Foster Care,” is defined as follows: Of all children who were served in foster care during the reporting period, what percentage were found to be victims of “substantiated” or “indicated” maltreatment. A child is counted as having been maltreated in foster care if the perpetrator of the maltreatment was identified as a foster parent or residential facility staff. Counts of children maltreated in foster care are derived from NCANDS, while counts of children placed in foster care are derived from AFCARS. The observation period for these measures is January-September because this is the reporting period that was jointly addressed by both NCANDS and AFCARS at the time when NCANDS reporting period was a calendar year. The number of children found to be maltreated in foster care and the percentage of all children in foster care are provided. This data element was used to determine the State’s substantial conformity with Safety Outcome #2 for CFSR Round One.

Additional Footnotes (Examples)

- A. *An additional 4 fatalities were reported in the Agency File.*
- B. *Fewer than 75% of the perpetrator codes are shown for victims in the Child File. The data must be considered incomplete, and the performance on absence of maltreatment in foster care is subject to change when more complete perpetrator data are available.*
- C. *State does not yet submit a Child File. Due to this, we cannot calculate the two safety indicators. The Summary Data do not allow us to determine outcomes for individual children.*
For example, only the Child File allows us to:
 - 1) *Track individual children over time to determine whether maltreatment has recurred.*
 - 2) *Distinguish between one child maltreated twice compared to two children, each of whom was maltreated once.*

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

POINT-IN-TIME PERMANENCY PROFILE	Federal FY 2003 C		Federal FY 2004 AB		Federal FY 2005 AB	
	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
I. Foster Care Population Flow						
Children in foster care on first day of year ¹	11,427		11,229		12,018	
Admissions during year	10,846		11,615		11,877	
Discharges during year	11,184		11,612		12,015	
Children discharging from FC in 7 days or less	55		47		62	
Children in care on last day of year	11,089		11,232		11,853	
Net change during year	-338		+3		-228	
II. Placement Types for Children in Care						
Pre-Adoptive Homes	0	0.0	102	0.9	877	7.4
Foster Family Homes (Relative)	1,253	11.3	1,366	12.2	1,565	13.2
Foster Family Homes (Non-Relative)	6,432	58.0	6,211	55.3	5,180	43.7
Group Homes	1,065	9.6	1,921	17.1	1,304	11.0
Institutions	865	7.8	79	0.7	747	6.3
Supervised Independent Living	89	0.8	129	1.2	1,126	9.5
Runaway	122	1.1	137	1.2	107	.9
Trial Home Visit	1,253	11.3	1,276	11.3	948	8.0
Missing Placement Information	13	0.1	11	0.1	0.0	0.0
Not Applicable (Placement in subsequent year)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
III. Permanency Goals for Children in Care						
Reunification	5,766	52.0	5,419	48.2	6,389	53.9
Live with Other Relatives	388	3.5	236	2.1	462	3.9
Adoption	2,140	19.3	2,033	18.1	2,892	24.4
Long Term Foster Care	255	2.3	236	2.1	344	2.9
Emancipation	366	3.3	359	3.2	367	3.1
Guardianship	166	1.5	213	1.9	450	3.8
Case Plan Goal Not Established	2,007	18.1	573	5.1	770	6.5
Missing Goal Information	0	0.0	2,168	19.3	178	1.5

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

POINT-IN-TIME PERMANENCY PROFILE	Federal FY 2003 C		Federal FY 2004 AB		Federal FY 2005 AB	
	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
IV. Number of Placement Settings in Current Episode						
One	3,049	27.5	1,269	11.3	2,560	26.1
Two	2,207	19.9	2,179	19.4	2,205	18.6
Three	2,173	19.6	2,460	21.9	2,406	20.3
Four	1,830	16.5	1,575	14.0	1,825	15.4
Five	832	7.5	1,415	12.6	1,019	8.6
Six or more	998	9.0	2,336	20.8	1,304	11.0
Missing placement settings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
V. Number of Removal Episodes						
One	8,816	79.5	8,536	76.0	9,162	77.3
Two	1,819	16.4	2,100	18.7	486	17.7
Three	311	2.8	449	4.0	2,098	4.1
Four	67	0.6	90	0.8	47	0.4
Five	23	0.2	34	0.3	36	0.3
Six or more	55	0.5	23	0.2	24	0.2
Missing removal episodes	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
VI. Number of children in care 17 of the most recent 22 months² (percent based on cases with sufficient information for computation)	5,123	46.2	4,908	43.7	5,376	45.2
VII. Median Length of Stay in Foster Care (of children in care on last day of FY)	15.8		15.3		14.9	
VIII. Length of Time to Achieve Perm. Goal	# of Children Discharged	Median Months to Discharge	# of Children Discharged	Median Months to Discharge	# of Children Discharged	Median Months to Discharge
Reunification	7,211	8.9	7,013	8.6	7,111	8.0
Adoption	1,788	37.8	1,793	30.6	1,803	26.5
Guardianship	622	6.3	754	6.2	725	6.2
Other	250	29.5	276	27.2	244	27.2
Missing Discharge Reason (footnote 3, page 10)	1	---	0	---	0	---
Total discharges (excluding those w/ problematic dates)	9,872		9,836		9,883	
Dates are problematic (footnote 4, page10)	14	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

Statewide Aggregate Data Used in Determining Substantial Conformity: Composites 1 through 4

	FY2003c	FY2004c	FY2005ab
IX. Permanency Composite 1: Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification [standard: 110.2 or higher]. Scaled Scores for this composite incorporate two components	NA	State Score =	
Component A: Timeliness of Reunification The timeliness component is composed of three timeliness individual measures, a1, a2, and a3			
Measure (C1) - a1: Exits to reunification in less than 12 months: Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the year shown, and who had been in foster care for 8 days or longer, what percent was reunified in less than 12 months from the date of the most recent entry into foster care? (Includes trial home visit adjustment) [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 69.9%]	NA	N= xx 70.3%	
Measure (C1) - a2: Exits to reunification, median stay: Of all children discharged from foster care (FC) to reunification in the year shown, and who had been in care for 8 days or longer, what was the median length of stay(in months) from the date of the most recent entry into FC until the date of reunification? (This includes trial home visit adjustment) [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 6.5 months]	NA	N= xx; Median 5.5 months	
Measure (C1) - a3: Entry cohort reunification in < 12 months: Of all children entering foster care (FC) in the second 6 months of the year prior to the year shown, and who remained in FC for 8 days or longer, what percent was discharged from FC to reunification in less than 12 months from the date of first entry into FC? (Includes trial home visit adjustment)[No Standard; national median = 39.3%]	NA	N= xx 30.5%	
Component B: Permanency of Reunification The permanency component has one measure.			
Measure (C1) - b1: Re-entries to foster care in less than 12 months: Of all children discharged from foster care (FC) to reunification in the year prior to the one shown, what percent re-entered FC in less than 12 months from the date of discharge? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 15.0%]	NA	N=xx 6.1%	

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

	FY2003c	FY2004c	FY2005ab
X. Permanency Composite 2: Timeliness of Adoptions [standard: 103.0 or higher]. Scaled Scores for this composite incorporate three components.	NA (Not Applicable)	State Score	State Score
Component A: Timeliness of Adoptions of Children Discharged From Foster Care. There are two individual measures of this component. See below.			
Measure (C2) - a1: Exits to adoption in less than 24 months: Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in the year shown, what percent was discharged in less than 24 months from the date of the most recent entry into foster care? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 24.6%]	NA	N = xx 28.3%	
Measure (C2) - a2: Exits to adoption, median length of stay: Of all children who were discharged from foster care (FC) to a finalized adoption in the year shown, what was the median length of stay in FC (in months) from the date of the most recent entry into FC to the date of discharge? [No Standard; FY04 national median = 32.5 months]	NA	N= 30 months	
Component B: Progress Toward Adoption for Children Who Meet ASFA Time-In-Care Requirements. There are two individual measures. See below.			
Measure (C2) - b1: Children in care 17+ months, adopted by the end of the year: Of all children in foster care (FC) on the first day of the year shown, and who were in FC for 17 continuous months or longer, what percent was discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption before the end of the year shown? [No Standard; FY04 national median = 17.7%]	NA	N= xx 17.8%	
Measure (C2) - b2: Children in care 17+ months achieving legal freedom within 6 months: Of all children in Foster Care (FC) on the first day of the year shown, and who were in FC for 17 continuous months or longer, what percent became legally free for adoption (i.e., a Termination of Parental Rights was granted for each living parent) in less than 6 months from the beginning of the year shown? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 7.4%]	NA	N= xx 9.5%	
Component C: Progress Toward Adoption of Children Who Are Legally Free for Adoption. There is one measure for this component. See below.			
Measure (C2) - c1: Legally free children adopted in less than 12 months: Of all children who became legally free for adoption in the prior fiscal year, what percent was discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in less than 12 months of becoming legally free? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 43.7%]	NA	N= xx 43.9%	

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

	FY2003c	FY2004c	FY2005ab
XI. Permanency Composite 3: Achieving Permanency for Children in Foster Care [standard: 111.7 or higher]. Scaled Scores for this composite incorporate two components	NA	State Score =	State Score = xx
Component A: Achieving permanency for Children in Foster Care for Extended Periods of Time. This component has two measures.			
Measure (C3) - a1: Exits to permanency for children with TPR: Of all children who were discharged from foster care in the year shown, and who were legally free for adoption (i.e., there was a Termination of Parental Rights for each living parent), what percent was discharged to a permanent home prior to their 18th birthday? A permanent home is defined as having a discharge reason of adoption, guardianship, or reunification (including living with relative) [No Standard; FY04 national median 97.0%]	NA	N= xx 94.5%	
Measure (C3) - a2: Exits to permanency prior to 18th birthday for children in care for 24 + months. Of all children in foster care for 24 months or longer on the first day of the year shown, what percent was discharged to a permanent home prior to their 18th birthday? A permanent home is defined as having a discharge reason of adoption, guardianship, or reunification (including living with relative). [No Standard; FY 04 national median 24.5%]	NA	N= xx 25.5%	
Component B: Growing up in foster care This component has one measure.			
Measure (C3) - b1: Children Emancipated Who Were in Foster Care for 3 Years or More. In the year shown, of all children who exited foster care with a discharge reason of emancipation prior to their 18th birthday, or who reached their 18th birthday while in foster care, what percent was in foster care for three years or longer? [No Standard; FY 04 national median 50.7%]	NA	N= xx 58.5%	

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

	FY2003c	FY2004c	FY2005ab
XII. Permanency Composite 4: Placement Stability [national standard: 108.5 or higher]. Scaled scored for this composite incorporates no components but three individual measures (below)	NA	State Score = xx	State Score = xx
Measure C4 - 1) Two or fewer placement settings for children in care for less than 12 months. Of all children in foster care (FC) during the year shown, and who were in FC for at least 8 days but less than 12 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 83.3%]		N= xx 75.5%	
Measure C4 - 2) Two or fewer placement settings for children in care for 12 to 24 months. Of all children in foster care (FC) during the year shown , and who were in FC for at least 12 months but less than 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 59.9%]		N = xx 54.5%	
Measure C4 - 3) Two or fewer placement settings for children in care for 24+ months. Of all children in foster care (FC) during the year shown, and who were in FC for at least 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? [No Standard; FY 04 national median = 33.9%]		N= xx 24.5%	

Special Footnotes for Composite Measures:

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

PERMANENCY PROFILE FIRST-TIME ENTRY COHORT GROUP	Federal FY 2003 C		Federal FY 2004 AB		Federal FY 2005 AB	
	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
I. Number of children entering care for the first time in cohort group (% = 1 st time entry of all entering within first 6 months)	5,266	81.7	5,322	80.1	5,201	81.6
II. Most Recent Placement Types						
Pre-Adoptive Homes	0	0.0	240	4.5	328	6.3
Foster Family Homes (Relative)	506	9.6	436	8.2	562	10.8
Foster Family Homes (Non-Relative)	2,533	48.1	2,613	49.1	2,543	48.9
Group Homes	669	12.7	591	11.1	598	11.5
Institutions	53	1.0	112	2.1	135	2.6
Supervised Independent Living	16	0.3	16	0.3	26	0.5
Runaway	53	1.0	16	0.3	114	2.2
Trial Home Visit	1,374	26.1	1,283	24.1	947	18.2
Missing Placement Information	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Not Applicable (Placement in subsequent yr)	0	0.0	16	0.3	0	0.0
III. Most Recent Permanency Goal						
Reunification	3,747	71.7	4,050	76.1	3,870	74.4
Live with Other Relatives	53	1.0	16	0.3	0	0.0
Adoption	253	4.8	255	4.8	322	6.2
Long-Term Foster Care	47	0.9	85	1.6	16	0.3
Emancipation	0	0.0	32	0.6	0	0.0
Guardianship	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Case Plan Goal Not Established	1,137	21.6	883	16.6	936	18.0
Missing Goal Information	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
IV. Number of Placement Settings in Current Episode						
One	1,701	32.3	4,018	77.5	4,192	80.6
Two	1,301	24.7	921	17.3	843	16.2
Three	1,085	20.6	112	2.1	73	1.4
Four	469	8.9	90	1.7	36	0.7
Five	253	4.8	75	1.4	21	0.4
Six or more	453	8.6	0	0.0	36	0.7
Missing placement settings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

PERMANENCY PROFILE FIRST-TIME ENTRY COHORT GROUP (continued)	Federal FY 2003 C		Federal FY 2004 AB		Federal FY 2005 AB	
	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
V. Reason for Discharge						
Reunification/Relative Placement	2,734	81.8	2,863	87.3	2,908	88.1
Adoption	12	0.2	0	0.0	84	2.4
Guardianship	279	8.4	230	7.0	183	6.3
Other	316	9.5	98	3.0	106	3.2
Unknown (missing discharge reason or N/A)	0	0.0	89	2.7	0	0.0
	Number of Months		Number of Months		Number of Months	
VI. Median Length of Stay in Foster Care	17.8		18.3		Not Yet Determinable	

ACFARS Data Completeness and Quality Information:

	Federal FY 2003c		Federal FY 2004ab		Federal FY 2005ab	
	N	As a % of Exits Reported	N	As a % of Exits Reported	N	As a % of Exits Reported
File contains children who appear to have been in care less than 24 hours						
File contains children who appear to have exited before they entered						
Missing dates of latest removal						
File contains "Dropped Cases" between report periods with no indication as to discharge	37	1.1	33	1.0	280	8.4
Missing discharge reasons						
	N	As a % of adoption exits	N	As a % of adoption exits	N	As a % of adoption exits
File submitted lacks data on Termination of Parental Rights for finalized adoptions						
Foster Care file has different count than Adoption File of (public agency) adoptions (N= adoption count disparity).						
	N	Percent of cases having missing data	N	As a Percent of cases having missing data	N	As a Percent of cases having missing data
File submitted lacks count of number of placement settings in episode for each child						

Example Child and Family Services Review Data Profile For Illustrative Purposes Only: July 17, 2006

	Federal FY 2003 C		Federal FY 2004 AB		Federal FY 2005 AB	
	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
IX. Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from foster care, what percentage was reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal for home? (4.1) [Standard: 76.2% or more]	5,141	71.3	5,098	72.7	5,333	75.0
X. Of all children who exited care to a finalized adoption, what percentage exited care in less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from home? (5.1) [Standard: 32.0% or more]	386	21.6	366	20.4	399	22.1
XI. Of all children served who have been in foster care less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home, what percentage have had no more than two placement settings? (6.1) [Standard: 86.7% or more]	3,070	77.3	3,223	78.5	3,772	80.8
XII. Of all children who entered care during the year, what percentage re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode? (4.2) [Standard: 8.6% or less]	998	9.2	1,092	9.2	1,069	9.0

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

¹The FY03, FY04, and FY05 counts of children in care at the start of the year exclude X, X, and X children, respectively. They were excluded to avoid counting them twice. That is, although they were actually in care on the first day, they also qualify as new entries because they left and re-entered again at some point during the same reporting period. To avoid counting them as both "in care on the first day" and "entries," the Children's Bureau selects only the most recent record. That means they get counted as "entries," not "in care on the first day."

²We designated the indicator, *17 of the most recent 22 months*, rather than the statutory time frame for initiating termination of parental rights proceedings at *15 of the most 22 months*, since the AFCARS system cannot determine the *date the child is considered to have entered foster care* as defined in the regulation. We used the outside date for determining the *date the child is considered to have entered foster care*, which is 60 days from the actual removal date.

³This count only includes case records missing a discharge reason, but which have calculable lengths of stay. Records missing a discharge reason and with non-calculable lengths of stay are included in the cell "Dates are Problematic".

⁴The dates of removal and exit needed to calculate length of stay are problematic. Such problems include: 1) missing data, 2) faulty data (chronologically impossible), 3) a child was in care less than 1 day (length of stay = 0) so the child should not have been reported in foster care file, or 4) child's length of stay would equal 21 years or more. These cases are marked N/A = Not Applicable because no length of stay can legitimately be calculated.

⁵This First-Time Entry Cohort median length of stay was X months in FY03. This includes X children who entered and exited on the same day (who had a zero length of stay).

⁶This First-Time Entry Cohort median length of stay was X months for FY04. This includes X children who entered and exited on the same day (who had a zero length of stay).

⁷This First-Time Entry Cohort median length of stay is Not Yet Determinable for FY05. This includes X children who entered and exited on the same day (they had a zero length of stay). The designation, Not Yet Determinable occurs when a true length of stay for the cohort cannot be calculated because fewer than 50% of the children have exited.

This data profile is for illustrating the format and showing the national standards. Changes in the format may be made over time. All CFSR Round One safety Results are on page 2; Permanency Round one results are on page 15.

ANSWER KEY FOR INDEPENDENT EXERCISE

CHILD SAFETY PROFILE

1. **Disposition of CA/N Reports – Unsubstantiated:** For 2004, the unique children count and percentage is greater than the duplicate children count and percentage. The unique count and percentage should be less than the duplicated count. Are these numbers transposed or is there a data mapping problem?

The two numbers were inadvertently transposed.

2. **Disposition of CA/N Reports – Other:** In 2003 there were no reports classified as having a disposition of “other,” but there were dispositions of “other” in 2004 and 2005. Why did this change occur?

In the past the State had not used the categories that would have been mapped to “other.” The State did begin to report this category in 2004.

3. **Fatalities:** In 2005, there was an increase in the number of fatalities, from 2 in 2004 to 342 in 2005. Why?

Due to a change in legislation, the State began to report fatalities due to neglect. One of the 342 fatalities was due to physical abuse by a parent, and the others were due to neglect, such as injury that resulted from a lack of supervision.

POINT-IN-TIME PERMANENCY PROFILE

4. **Placement Types for Children in Care – Pre-Adoptive Homes:** In FY 2003, there were no reported children placed in Pre-Adoptive Homes. In FY 2004 there were a small number at 0.9%, and in 2005 there was a sudden increase to 7.4%. Was this a mapping issue, practice issue, or both?

The State did not begin to report Pre-Adoptive homes until Federal FY 2004. The State provided training at the end of 2004 and beginning of 2005 to encourage workers to enter this new placement type into the SACWIS. The results of these efforts were not reflected in the data until 2005.

5. **Placement Types for Children in Care – Institutions:** The number of children placed in an Institutional setting dropped sharply in 2004, and then increased to its previous level in 2005. Was this a SACWIS issue?

The State had incorrectly changed the mapping of institutional placement settings to map to other placement categories. The problem has been fixed.

6. **Placement Types for Children in Care – Supervised Independent Living:** The year 2005 saw a sharp increase of children placed in a Supervised Independent Living setting. What accounts for this change?

Due to an increase in older children in the foster care population, a new pilot program was instituted in 2005 which involved a large amount of funding for Supervised Independent Living programs.

7. **Permanency Goals for Children in Care – Missing Goal Information:** There were no missing goals in 2003, but in 2004 there were 19.3% goals reported as missing. In 2005, the number missing decreased to 1.5%. Why are there such sharp fluctuations?

Before the State converted to their new SACWIS, all missing case plan goals were mapped to “Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established.” Following conversion at the end of FY 2004, the State corrected this. When the data was reviewed, the State realized that there was a large number of case plan goals missing, and they began a clean-up effort and provided training to workers on entering this information.

8. **Number of Placement Settings in Current Episode:** For 2004, children appeared to have several more placement settings than in the previous and subsequent years. Why?

During conversion to the new SACWIS system, the number of placement settings across all removal episodes was inadvertently reported. This error has been recognized and is now fixed.

9. **Number of Removal Episodes:** For 2005, there was a sharp increase in the number of children with three removal episodes, and a decrease in the number of children with two removal episodes. Why?

The two numbers were transposed. The number of children with two removal episodes should be 2,098 and the number with three removal episodes should be 486.

10. **Length of Time to Achieve Permanency Goal - Adoption:** The Median Months to Discharge decreases significantly from 2003-2005. Has there been a change in reporting?

Beginning in 2003, judges began pushing for adoptions to be finalized more quickly in an effort to decrease time to adoption.

PERMANENCY PROFILE: FIRST-TIME ENTRY COHORT GROUP

11. **Reason for Discharge – Adoption:** In 2004, there were no reported Adoptions for this group and 2.7% of cases had a discharge reason of “unknown.” Why did this occur?

Due to changes in the State’s extraction routine, Adoptions were inadvertently reported as “unknown.” This has since been corrected.

AFCARS DATA COMPLETENESS AND QUALITY OF INFORMATION

12. **File contains “dropped cases”:** There was a notable increase in the incidence of dropped cases in 2005. Why?

In 2005, the State implemented a new search and merge function into the SACWIS. If Case A was merged with Case B, both record numbers were still being reported. The State is aware of this and is working on correcting the problem.