

C-CFSR Proposed Outcomes and Indicators  
Draft June 2003

Below is a proposed set of outcomes and indicators, developed by the Child Welfare Outcomes and Accountability Workgroup, in consultation with the Chapin Hall Center for Children.

- The far left column represents the outcome we would like to achieve.
- The second column, “Federal,” lists the measures included in the U.S. DHHS’ federal review of state child welfare programs, Child and Family Service Review.
- The middle column, “State Enriched,” describes the measures that the Workgroup is proposing to use. These measures will supplement the federal measures to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the State’s child welfare system.
- The fourth column, “Short-term Development,” are measures we hope to develop for the next cycle of the California Child and Family Service Review. For data reasons, these measures were not available for the first cycle, but are planned for CWS/CMS enhancements.
- The far right column, “Future Development,” includes measures we would like to develop for subsequent C-CFSR cycles. These measures are contingent upon larger system changes, such as the implementation of the CDSS CWS Stakeholders’ Group’s Redesign efforts.

NOTES:

\* These indicators were taken directly or adapted from the CWDA list of outcome measures.

***Italicized & Bolded*** indicators measure process

Where possible, we propose that data be reported using these sub-populations.

- Age, by year and/or age group (under 1, 1-2, 3-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16+)
- Type of placement
- Race and ethnicity, and Native American/Indian heritage
- Children with disabilities+
- Types of abuse
- Perpetrator

C-CFSR Proposed Outcomes and Indicators  
Draft June 2003

PROFILE INFORMATION	Data Collected to Provide Background, Context and Demographics
	<p><u>A. Demographic and Census Information by county and/or zip code, including information such as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• age, race, ethnicity, or Native American/Indian heritage, income, other basic demographic characteristics</li> <li>• poverty rate</li> <li>• unemployment rate</li> <li>• rate of families with no health insurance</li> <li>• level of education for head of household</li> <li>• receipt of public assistance</li> <li>• active tribes</li> <li>• other</li> </ul> <p><u>B. Referral Information:</u> Rate of children with initial and/or substantiated report(s) of abuse and/or neglect per 1,000 children in child population by age group, type of abuse and disposition (e.g. substantiated, inconclusive, unfounded and evaluated out) county by county.</p> <p><u>C. Abuse in care:</u> Of all children in foster care during the period under review, what percent reported maltreatment by a foster care provider, and of those reports, what was the referral outcome?</p> <p><u>D. Foster care entries:</u> Rate of children entering out-of-home care per 1,000 children, county by county in aggregate form.*</p> <p><u>E. Placement type:</u> Percent of children entering care who are placed in kinship homes, foster family homes, FFA's and group homes for initial and overall placements.*</p> <p><u>F. Child Mortality information:</u> Number of child mortalities reported on CWS/CMS matched against vital statistics and other data sources. This data will come from the State Child Death Review Council Reconciliation Project, and will be made available on a flow basis.</p>

C-CFSR Proposed Outcomes and Indicators  
Draft June 2003

Safety Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
1. Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	<p><u>1A. Recurrence of maltreatment:</u> Of all children who were victims of substantiated or indicated child abuse and/or neglect during the first six months of the reporting period, what percent had another substantiated or indicated report within a six month period?</p> <p><u>1C. Incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care:</u> Of all children in foster care in the State during the period under review, what percent were the subjects of substantiated or indicated maltreatment by a foster parent or facility staff?</p>	<p><u>1B. Recurrence of maltreatment:</u> In the year under review, of all children who had a substantiated report of maltreatment, what percent had a subsequent substantiated report and did it occur within 3, 6, 12, or 24 months? Stratify by 1<sup>st</sup> report vs. 2<sup>nd</sup> or subsequent report.</p> <p><u>1D. Incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care:</u> Same as <u>1C</u>, but adjusted for time in care and type of placement.</p> <p><u>1E. Rate of abuse and/or neglect following permanency:</u> Percent of children with allegation/ substantiated report of abuse or neglect, within 12 months following permanency (guardianship, kinship, reunification).*</p>		

C-CFSR Proposed Outcomes and Indicators  
Draft June 2003

Safety Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
2. Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.	<p><b><u>2A: Recurrence of abuse/neglect in homes where children were not removed:</u></b> Percent of children with an allegation (inconclusive or substantiated) who were not removed and whose next event was a substantiated allegation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subsequent substantiated allegation at 3, 6, 12 months (a) after initial report, and (b) after case closure</li> <li>• By inconclusive vs. substantiated initial allegation</li> <li>• By abuse type</li> <li>• By perpetrator</li> <li>• By receipt of ER services</li> <li>• By receipt of remedial and rehabilitative services that are culturally appropriate</li> </ul> <p><b><u>2B: Percent of child abuse and neglect referrals that have resulted in an in-person investigation.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of referrals that were responded to timely</li> <li>• % of referrals that have not been responded to.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>2E. Assessment of kin and non-kin homes % of homes that had completed health and safety assessments within 1,3,6 or more months of being known to the agency.</u></b></p> <p>NOTE: 2E is pending CWS/CMS system change.</p>	<p><b><u>2D: Recurrence of abuse/neglect for at-risk children:</u></b> Of “enrolled” (i.e., open case with circumstantial abuse/neglect), children &amp; families receiving services, what percent went on to have a substantiated report/allegation?</p> <p>NOTE: 2D is contingent upon implementation of CWS Stakeholders differential response proposal, and defining and flagging “enrolled” children on CWS/CMS.</p>

C-CFSR Proposed Outcomes and Indicators  
Draft June 2003

Safety Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
2. Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.		<p><b><u>2C: Social worker visits.</u></b>  <b><i>Stratified by visits with child, parents and caregivers.</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>% of cases with 1-monthly social worker visits.</i></b></li> <li>• <b><i>% of cases with semi-annual visits</i></b></li> <li>• <b><i>% of cases with no social worker visits.</i></b></li> </ul>		

C-CFSR Proposed Outcomes and Indicators  
Draft June 2003

Permanency Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
3. Children have permanency and stability in their living situations (State modification: without increasing reentry).	<p><u>3B. Stability of foster care placement:</u> Of all children who have been in foster care less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal, what percent had no more than two placement settings?</p> <p><u>3D. Length of time to achieve adoption goal:</u> Of all the children who exited foster care during the period under review to a finalized adoption, what percent exited care in less than 24 months from the time of latest removal from home?</p> <p><u>3E. Length of time to achieve reunification:</u> Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of the discharge from foster care, what percent were reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from the home?</p> <p><u>3F. Foster care re-entries:</u> Of all the children who entered care during the year under review, what percent re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode?</p>	<p><u>3A. Length of time to exit foster care:</u> Of those children in an entry cohort, % exiting foster care within 3, 6, 12, 24, 36, 48 and 60 months of entry.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % exiting to adoption</li> <li>• % exiting to Kin-GAP</li> <li>• % exiting to other guardianship</li> <li>• % exiting to reunification</li> <li>• % exiting to emancipation</li> <li>• % exiting to probation or incarceration</li> <li>• % exiting for other reasons</li> <li>• % still in care</li> </ul> <p><u>3C. Multiple placements:</u> Of those children in an entry cohort, % of those remaining in care with 3,4,5 or more placements within 12, 24, 36, 48 and 60 months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequency and constellations of placements</li> <li>• Reasons for placement change(s)</li> </ul> <p><u>3G. Foster care re-entries:</u> Of children in an entry cohort, for those exiting to <i>reunification or guardianship</i>, % who re-entered care within 12, 24 and 36 months, stratified by time in care 3, 6, 12, 24 months (48 and 60 months for guardianship) of a prior foster care episode.*</p>	<p><u>3H. Foster care re-entries:</u> Of children in an entry cohort, for those exiting to <i>adoption</i>, % who re-entered care within 12, 24, 36, 48 and 60 months of a prior foster care episode.*</p> <p><b><u>3I. Timely Court Hearings</u></b> <b><i>What % of children had timely court hearings after the 26-week permanency hearing?</i></b></p>	<p><u>3J. Foster care re-entries:</u> Note: need an enhancement to CWS/CMS to track severity of abuse allegation to access the severity of events that preceded re-entry</p>

C-CFSR Proposed Outcomes and Indicators  
Draft June 2003

Permanency Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
4. The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.	<p><u>4A. Sibling placements:</u> For each child entering care for the first time, % of their total time in foster care when all siblings were placed together (stratify by # of siblings, and full, ½ or step). Also collect for additional cohort: siblings placed together within 30 days.</p> <p>Of those not placed together, what % of the time were all of them placed with relatives?</p> <p><u>4B. Use of least restrictive care settings:</u> For children entering care, what is the predominant placement type?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By entry cohort</li> <li>• Stratify by distance</li> <li>• Identify by relative and non-relative placement type</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: 4B Program staff will provide methodology for restrictive placement types.</p> <p><u>4C. Identification of Indian heritage:</u> % of children identified as Native American within 1, 3, 6, 12, or 24 months of referral.</p>		

C-CFSR Proposed Outcomes and Indicators  
Draft June 2003

Permanency Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
4. The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.		<p><u>4D. Notification to Tribes:</u> Of those children identified as Native American, % where Tribal notification occurred within 30, 60, or 90 days.</p> <p><u>4E. ICWA placement preferences:</u> Of those children identified as Native American:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % placed w/ extended family</li> <li>• % placed w/ other members of the child's Tribe</li> <li>• % placed w/ other Indian families</li> <li>• % placed w/ non-Indian families</li> </ul> <p><b><u>4F. Visitation between parents and children. Percent of children who visit their parents (stratify by visitation frequency i.e., weekly, monthly).</u></b></p>		

C-CFSR Proposed Outcomes and Indicators  
Draft June 2003

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
5. Children receive adequate services to meet their physical, emotional and mental health needs.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.	<p><u>5A. Health information:</u> Percent children in care more than 30 days with a Health Passport.*</p> <p><u>5B. Receipt of health screenings:</u> percent children in care with CHDP, dental exams, psychotropic medications, and immunizations that comply with periodicity table.*</p> <p><u>5C. Receipt of mental health services among those referred:</u> Percent of CWS children with mental health referrals who receive mental health services. Stratify by in-home versus out-of-home care.</p> <p>NOTE: Recommend efforts focus on obtaining these data from health professionals/systems.</p>		<p><u>5D. Prevention services:</u> FM Children receive Health Passport and screenings.</p> <p><u>5E. Receipt of mental health screening:</u> Percent of children in care who received an initial mental health screening within 30 days of initial placement.</p>

C-CFSR Proposed Outcomes and Indicators  
Draft June 2003

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
<p>6. Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.</p>	<p>Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.</p>	<p><u>6A. Education information:</u> % in care more than 30 days with an Education Passport, and % in care more than 180 days with a complete HEP.*</p> <p><u>6B. School stability, attendance:</u> For children in care for one or more school years*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of children enrolled in the same school</li> <li>• % with school change during year, and # of school changes</li> <li>• % of children with IEP who receive services</li> <li>• % of children performing below grade level</li> </ul> <p><u>6C. School enrollment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of entries enrolled within 1, 2,3, and 4 weeks or more of out-of-home placement</li> <li>• % enrolled within 1, 2, 3, and 4 weeks of a placement change.</li> </ul>	<p><u>6D. School stability, attendance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % with adequate (TBD) yearly attendance</li> <li>• # of school days missed</li> <li>• % in non-public schools</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: 6D unavailable via CWS/CMS, and would require data match with education. May require MOU w/ CDE or statutory change.</p>	<p><u>6E. School performance:</u> Percentage of children in care at grade level on standardized state tests (requires match to planned statewide education data); stratified by special and regular education (by entry cohort, age, and placement type).</p>

C-CFSR Proposed Outcomes and Indicators  
Draft June 2003

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
7. Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Source: No quantifiable federal measure available; obtained during review of 50 cases statewide.		<p><u>7. Receipt of support services</u>: Percentage of parents able to access and use support services identified in case plans, by case closure.</p> <p>NOTE: Post exit survey needed to access 7.</p>	

C-CFSR Proposed Outcomes and Indicators  
Draft June 2003

Child & Family Well-Being Outcomes	Indicators			
	Federal	State Enriched	Short-term Development	Future Development
8. Youth emancipating from foster care are prepared to transition to adulthood.		<p><u>8A. Of youth emancipating from foster care, the percentage *:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• with High School diploma or GED</li> <li>• enrolled in college or higher education program</li> <li>• with ILP training</li> <li>• who completed a vocational training program</li> <li>• are employed or have other means of support</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: Data source for this measure is the county ILP report</p> <p>RECONCILE THIS LIST W/ NATIONAL STANDARDS TO BE RELEASED BY ACF (ie, Chaffee requirements and probation)</p>	<p><u>8B. Of youth emancipating from foster care, the percentage *:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• with an emancipation hearing</li> <li>• with the documents required by AB 686</li> </ul> <p><u>8C. Of youth in foster care, % w/ complete Living Skills Assessment: % who are identified as needing self sufficiency skills training.</u></p> <p>NOTE: 8C is contingent upon implementation of Transitional Independent Living Plan form and changes to CWS/CMS.</p>	<p><u>8D. Of youth in foster care, the percentage *:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• who are on probation or incarcerated.*</li> <li>• who are transferred into the juvenile justice system.</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: This measure would require a data match the Department of Corrections.</p>