

A large rectangular grid of graph paper, consisting of a dense pattern of small squares. The grid is enclosed within a thick black border. The grid is oriented horizontally and occupies the top portion of the page.



DCFS Trend Description - March 2009

Trend Indicators			Corresponding measure in the DCFS Quarterly Report (not always identical, but similar) Based on Federal submissions	Program Area
1	HB to SCF	Number and percent of Home-Based child clients who came into Out-of-Home care within 12 months of Home-Based case closure (with at least 30 days between HB closure and removal). (Data is pulled one year prior in order to look 12 months forward.)		HB
2	Abuse in foster care	Number and percent of children in Out-of-Home care who were victims of substantiated allegations of abuse and neglect by out-of-home parents, out-of-home care siblings, or residential staff. Please note that reported abuse may have occurred years prior to the disclosure	Safety – Measure 2 – Abuse by Foster parents, residential staff (does not include siblings) Goal is set at 99.68% children who DO NOT experience maltreatment by foster parent or residential staff.	SCF
3	Recidivism (from prior HB/SCF case)	Number and percent of substantiated child victims with a prior Home-Based or Out-of-Home care case within the last 12 months.		CPS/HB/SCF
4	Recidivism (from prior supported allegation)	Number and percent of substantiated child victims with a prior CPS substantiated allegation within the last 12 months.	Safety – Measure 1 – Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence (children without subsequent supported CPS case within 6 months)	CPS
5	Length in care (12 to 24 mths)	Number and percent of children in care for at least one year that attained permanency through case closure prior to 24 months of custody. (Data is pulled two years prior in order to look 24 months forward)		SCF
6	Length in care (less than 1 year)	Number and percent of children who entered Out-of-Home care who attained permanency through custody termination within one year. (Data is pulled one year prior in order to look 12 months forward)	Permanency 1 – Measure 1 – Timeliness of Reunification (children who reunify in less than 12 months. Goal is 74%) Permanency 2 – Measure 1 – Timeliness of Reunification (median months to reunification; Goal is 5.4 months)	SCF
7	Reentry	Number and Percent of children with prior custody episodes within 6, 12, and 18 months.	Permanency 1 – Measure 4 – Permanency of Reunification (children who were discharged from foster care to reunification who re-enter foster care in less than 12 months) Goal is 9%	SCF
8	Length in care (by goal, ethnicity, and sex)	Average months in care of cohorts of children in out-of-home care by goal, ethnicity and sex. Workers have 45 days to establish a goal and enter it in SAFE. Cases that were closed prior to a goal being established are not reported under this trend.		SCF
		Average length of stay of children in custody by ethnicity. Data is average number of months in care.		Diversity

DCFS Trend Description - March 2009

Trend Indicators			Corresponding measure in the DCFS Quarterly Report (not always identical, but similar) Based on Federal submissions	Program Area
9	CPS priority time frames	Percent of CPS investigations initiated within the time period mandated by state or local statute, regulation, or policy.	CFSR on-sight review and CPR	CPS
10	Placement Stability	Percent of children experiencing fewer than three placement changes within an Out-of-Home Care service episode.	Permanency 4 – Measures 1, 2, 3 – Placement Stability (Measure 1: children in foster care 12 months or less who had 2 or fewer placements. Goal is 86%) (Measure 2: children in foster care 12 to 24 months who had 2 or fewer placements. Goal is 65%) (Measure 3: children in foster care 24 months or more who had 2 or fewer placements. Goal is 39%)	SCF
11	Placement Types	Number and percent of children in placement by order of restrictiveness. Point-in-time: last day of the report period.		SCF
12	Length in care (children < 5)	Number and percent of all children younger than five years at entry who exit custody in year and who did not attain permanency within six months by closure reason.		SCF
13	Length in care (more than 6 mths)	Number and percent of all children exiting custody in year who did not attain permanency within six months by closure reason.		SCF
14	Educ. level/achievement	Number and percent of children age 18 or older, exiting care by education level.		TAL
15	Children with TPR in adopt. home	Number of children in custody who are legally freed for adoption and the percent who are placed in an adoptive home within six months.	Permanency 2 - Measure 1 to 5 - Adoption: 1: children exiting to adoption in less than 24 months; 2: Median time for all adoptions 3: children in care 17+ mths who are adopted w/in year; 4: children in care 17+ mths who become legally free w/in 6 mths 5: children legally free who are adopted w/in 1 year	Adoption
16	Adoption disruptions	Number and Percent of adoption placements that disrupt before finalization.	Permanency 3 - Measure 2: children legally free exiting to permanent homes	Adoption

Trends Revision Proposal

Revision of the current Trend Measures : The following is a proposal to be discussed by the Trend Analysis Committee at the next meeting. In essence, the Trends would be incorporated into the DCFS quarterly reports (Demographic Data and the Performance & Outcomes report). The Data team is currently looking at combining several quarterly reports into one. Some trends (see table below) would be replaced by existing measures, others would be added to the current reports, and a few would be eliminated. The rationale for each trend is also listed. A discussion about which additional measures the group would like to add to the Trends (such as for kinship cases) should be part of a future meeting. Our final proposal will then be presented to the QIC committee. Comments from committee members are included after each section.

Trend Indicators			Revision Proposal	Rationale	Progr. Area
1	HB to SCF	Number and percent of Home-Based child clients who came into Out-of-Home care within 12 months of Home-Based case closure (with at least 30 days between HB closure and removal). (Data is pulled one year prior in order to look 12 months forward.)	Keep this trend, but break it out by case type groups as in Annual Report (PSS/PSC, PFP/PFR, CCS/CIS). Also, change to rolling year (vs. by quarter).	This is one of the few measures that looks at HB cases, and it looks at whether our HB services were effective or not. But because the numbers are small, changing to a rolling year will provide more meaningful data (= one year's worth of data, moves forward by one quarter each time: April 08 to March 09, then July 08 to June 09, etc.)	HB
<p><i>Comments: Marty wondered if we should look at this over a period of two years. Navina said we can assess that to see what makes most sense. Bert wondered if it shows if we are giving effective services. Navina explained how the data is pulled after 30 days of case closure to try to capture effectiveness of services.</i></p>					
2	Abuse in foster care	Number and percent of children in Out-of-Home care who were victims of substantiated allegations of abuse and neglect by out-of-home parents, out-of-home care siblings, or residential staff.	Replace this trend with the CFSR measure: Safety – Measure 2 – Abuse by Foster parents, residential staff (does not include abuse by siblings/other children in home) For discussion: Should we add a separate measure that looks at abuse in foster care by other children in the home?	The federal measure includes only abuse by foster parents and residential facility staff, not siblings/other children in the home. If group feels that abuse in foster care by siblings/other children in the home should also be tracked, a separate measure could be added.	SCF
<p><i>Comments: Linda P. has more information about what type of home or facility the abuse occurred in as she hand checks these on a quarterly basis. Reports are available for review by regional IAs when abuse occurs in out-of-home care by foster siblings, so regions should look at this on a regional basis. This does include licensed kin, and the Data Unit will keep looking at this to see if it becomes a problem.</i></p>					
3	Recidivism (from prior HB/SCF case)	Number and percent of substantiated child victims with a prior Home-Based or Out-of-Home care case within the last 12 months.	Keep this trend, but separate it into HB and SCF. Change to rolling year (vs. by quarter). Also, change to a prospective view (looking forward rather than back): this means that instead of looking at the child victims this year who had a prior HB or SCF episode, we look at the child population who exited HB/SCF last year to see which percentage was re-victimized subsequently.	Separating this trend into HB and SCF will give us more meaningful data. Changing to prospective data allows use of the HB and SCF closed cases as denominator which means it can be an indicator of division performance in these services areas. As it currently is we cannot really use it well to evaluate these services.	CPS/H B/ SCF
<p>Comments: In order to see details of who the perpetrator was and what the allegations were, the regions can pull this data and review on a case-by-case basis.</p>					

Trends Revision Proposal

Trend Indicators		Revision Proposal	Rationale	Progr. Area
4	Recidivism (from prior supported allegation) <i>Number and percent of substantiated child victims with a prior CPS substantiated allegation within the last 12 months.</i>	Replace this trend with the CFSR measure: Safety – Measure 1 – Absence of Maltreatment Recurrence (children without subsequent supported CPS case within 6 months)	The only difference is that the CFSR measure looks at 6 months of no recidivism and the Trend at 12 months. Also, the CFSR is a prospective measure (looks forward: CPS child victims without another victimization), while trend looks back.	CPS
<p><i>Comments: DV, neglect, and other chronic allegations are the types of allegations in these cases. Southwest Region seems to have a higher percentage than other regions, and Sam will pull these data by office to get the detail. Jeff asked if these data show any seasonal trends, and Navina explained that we haven't noticed that in the past.</i></p>				
5	Length in care (12 to 24 mths) <i>Number and percent of children in care for at least one year that attained permanency through case closure prior to 24 months of custody. (Data is pulled two years prior in order to look 24 months forward)</i>	Replace this trend with the CFSR measure: Permanency 3 - Measure 1 - Permanency for children in foster care for long periods of time (measures children in SCF for 24 months or more who exited to a permanent home within that year and before their 18th birthday)	The CFSR measure is slightly different, but very important for us as it looks at all children in care for two years or more. Goal is 31% and we're only at 11%.	SCF
<p><i>Comments: We are a long way from meeting the federal goal. It may be that we don't have as many children in care for two years. It is important to make sure we are trending in the right way. Dawn explained how her region looks at all cases of children who have been in care for 36 months, and that report is available to all regions. Tanya and Navina will look at specific age groups in these cases.</i></p>				
6	Length in care (less than 1 year) <i>Number and percent of children who entered Out-of-Home care who attained permanency through custody termination within one year. (Data is pulled one year prior in order to look 12 months forward)</i>	Replace this trend with the CFSR measures: Permanency 1 – Measure 1 – Timeliness of Reunification (children who reunify in less than 12 months. Goal is 74%) Permanency 1 – Measure 2 – Timeliness of Reunification (median months to reunification; Goal is 5.4 months)	Slightly different measure as it looks just at reunification, not all children who attain permanency w/in 12 months. Not that for federal measures reunification means both custody returned to parents and temporary custody to kin. However these are the majority of our re-entries, we have few to no re-entries from emancipation or adoption.	SCF
<p><i>Comments: In the Trend data, this has been trending downward. Even though this appears bad, it may be that we have less re-entry.</i></p>				
7	Reentry <i>Number and Percent of children with prior custody episodes within 6, 12, and 18 months.</i>	Replace this trend with the CFSR measure: Permanency 1 – Measure 4 – Permanency of Reunification (children who were discharged from foster care to reunification who re-enter foster care in less than 12 months) Goal is 9%	Similar measure, but looks at reentry into care in reunification cases only (i.e. children returning to parents or placed with kin.) Also, looks only at reentry within 12 months (neither 6 nor 18 months). Finally, this is a prospective measure (i.e. looks at children who exited care last year and re-entered within 12 months).	SCF

Trends Revision Proposal

Trend Indicators		Revision Proposal		Rationale		Progr. Area
<p><i>Comments: It appears that we are keeping children in care longer, but also having a high re-entry rate. Navina explained that we are going in the right direction as the Data Team has been tracking this for the CFSR. Southwest Region appears to be doing well in both of these measures. Sam will look into this and let the group know what he finds out.</i></p>						
8	<p>Length in care (by goal, ethnicity, and sex)</p>	<p><i>Average months in care of cohorts of children in out-of-home care by goal, ethnicity and sex. Workers have 45 days to establish a goal and enter it in SAFE. Cases that were closed prior to a goal being established are not reported under this trend.</i></p>	<p>Replace this trend with the Demographic Data measure: "Average Months in Care by Goal" on both, closed and open cases. Added to that will be the average in care by ethnicity and the average months in care for the total number of cases. May also add time in care by age group, see #12.</p>	<p>Average months in care by sex doesn't seem to show significant differences, but by ethnicity is important because of disparities nation-wide. By goal can indicate which cases are trending differently and this is already being measured in the Demographics report. This measure also includes the average months in care in currently open cases. Note may change to use median instead of average to be more consistent with federal measures and because it may be a better statistic for this data.</p>		SCF
<p><i>Comments: It was suggested to group similar items together, which Navina will do in the quarterly report.</i></p>						
9	<p>CPS priority time frames</p>	<p><i>Percent of CPS investigations initiated within the time period mandated by state or local statute, regulation, or policy.</i></p>	<p>Replace with the CPR measure (CPS.A1: "Timeliness", see page 6 in the most recent Quarterly report - Performance & Outcomes). Add data progression to monitor trend over time and a graph.</p>	<p>Timeliness of initiating CPS investigation is already measured by the CPR. The only difference is that unable to locate cases are not included in this measure (makes very little difference in the percentages). Also, priority 1, 2, and 3 cases are together (not separate like in the this trend), but there are almost no priority 1 and priority 2 are usually in the mid- 90s.</p>		CPS
<p><i>Comments: We have consistently done well in this area. Dawn explained that she liked seeing the breakout of priority 1, 2, and 3, but they can pull this regionally. Navina suggested that we could keep the breakout, but lump priority 1 and 2 together. Dawn agreed that statewide, it is reasonable to go with this suggestion as they can pull the detail in the region.</i></p>						
10	<p>Placement Stability</p>	<p><i>Percent of children experiencing fewer than three placement changes within an Out-of-Home Care service episode.</i></p>	<p>Replace this trend with the CFSR measures: Permanency 4 – Measures 1, 2, 3 – Placement Stability (Measure 1: children in foster care 12 months or less who had 2 or fewer placements. Goal is 86%) (Measure 2: children in foster care 12 to 24 months who had 2 or fewer placements. Goal is 65%) (Measure 3: children in foster care 24 months or more who had 2 or fewer placements. Goal is 39%)</p>	<p>This CFSR measure is one that we monitor closely anyway and it provides placement stability data split up in three groups of cases.</p>		SCF

Trends Revision Proposal

Trend Indicators			Revision Proposal	Rationale	Progr. Area
<p><i>Comments: The federal measure is strict compared to what the Trend looks at. In the 12-month cohort, we seem to be trending in the right way, maybe due to the congregate care initiative.</i></p>					
11	Placement Types	<i>Number and percent of children in placement by order of restrictiveness. Point-in-time: last day of the report period.</i>	Keep this one and add it to the Demographic Data report.		SCF
<p>Comments: This looks at several different cohorts, based on structure and supervision.</p>					
12	Length in care (children < 5)	<i>Number and percent of all children younger than five years at entry who exit custody in year and who did not attain permanency within six months by closure reason.</i>	Drop this one.	Open for discussion. If group feels that we need to keep a measure that looks at children 5 and under, then proposal is that we add it to trend # 8: average months in care by age group (0-5, 6-13, 14+)	SCF
13	Length in care (more than 6 mths)	<i>Number and percent of all children exiting custody in year who did not attain permanency within six months by closure reason.</i>	Drop this one.	There are lots of other measures that look at this in various ways.	SCF
<p><i>Comments: Trend 12 and 13 were reviewed together. Add Trend 12 to Trend 8.</i></p>					
14	Educ. level/achievement	<i>Number and percent of children age 18 or older, exiting care by education level.</i>	Put this measure on hold until education tab in SAFE has been revised.	Data in SAFE is currently not reliable because workers don't update this when closing cases. Revisions are planned. Until then, we have other measures (QCR: Learning Progress) that look at this. Also, this indicator did well in the last CFSR.	TAL
<p><i>Comments: Linda P. asks workers to enter this information every quarter. While this measure is on hold, think about what would be useful to see about all children in care. Navina asked that the group gather feedback from the field within the next couple of weeks on what will be useful in the new Education tab in SAFE (scheduled to be released in about six months to a year).</i></p>					
15	Children with TPR in adopt. home	<i>Number of children in custody who are legally freed for adoption and the percent who are placed in an adoptive home within six months.</i>	Replace these two trends with the following CFSR measures: Permanency 2 - Measure 1 to 5 - Adoption: 1: children exiting to adoption in less than 24	Data in SAFE for Trend 15 and 16 is currently not reliable. There are several CFSR measures we currently track which cover adoptions, but not exactly these two issues.	Adoption

Trends Revision Proposal

Trend Indicators			Revision Proposal	Rationale	Progr. Area
16	Adoption disruptions	<i>Number and Percent of adoption placements that disrupt before finalization.</i>	months; 2: Median time for all adoptions 3: children in care 17+ mths who are adopted w/in year; 4: children in care 17+ mths who become legally free w/in 6 mths 5: children legally free who are adopted w/in 1 year Permanency 3 - Measure 2 - children legally free exiting to permanent homes		Adoption