

## **State of Child Welfare, 2009 Data Sources and Explanation**

### **General Data Information**

#### **County Type**

The statewide report and the county reports include county type and state totals. Comparing data at the county level is most appropriate when comparing a county against another one of the same type. County type (rural, rural mix, urban mix, urban) is based on 2000 Census population density.

<b>Rural</b>	<b>Rural Mix</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Urban Mix</b>
Adams	Armstrong	Allegheny	Beaver
Bedford	Butler	Bucks	Berks
Bradford	Cambria	Chester	Blair
Cameron	Carbon	Dauphin	Centre
Clarion	Fayette	Delaware	Cumberland
Clearfield	Franklin	Lackawanna	Erie
Clinton	Lawrence	Lehigh	Lancaster
Columbia	Lycoming	Luzerne	Lebanon
Crawford	Mercer	Montgomery	Washington
Elk	Perry	Northampton	Westmoreland
Forest	Schuylkill	Philadelphia	York
Fulton	Somerset		
Greene	Susquehanna		
Huntingdon	Wayne		
Indiana	Wyoming		
Jefferson			
Juniata			
McKean			
Mifflin			
Monroe			
Montour			
Northumberland			
Pike			
Potter			
Snyder			
Sullivan			
Tiago			
Union			
Venango			
Warren			

#### **Scope and Size**

Care should be taken in making statements related to small numbers of children.

#### **Foster Care**

In the context of this report, foster care is used to describe all children in substitute or out-of-home care except when specifically looking at children in care by placement setting. In the context of placement setting, foster care is used to describe a home or family-based placement setting.

## Report Indicators

### Child Abuse Reports

This indicator provides the total number of suspected child abuse reports throughout the year in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania has a differential response system for reporting and responding to child abuse and neglect reports. Reports are classified, depending on their degree of severity, as either Child Protective Service reports or General Protective Service reports. Child Protective Service reports include sexual abuse, physical abuse, or serious physical neglect. General Protective Service reports include less severe reports of general neglect (e.g. lack of adequate housing, truancy, parent-child conflict, etc). Only Child Protective Service reports are tracked in the ChildLine and Abuse Registry, and these are the reports noted in the *State of Child Welfare* report. General Protective Service reports are forwarded to county children and youth agencies by ChildLine for assessment, or are reported directly to the county agency by the public. County Children and Youth Agencies provide many families with services in the Commonwealth following General Protective Service assessments.

- The rate per 1000 children was calculated dividing the suspected cases by the 2000 Census child population from birth through age 18.
- **SOURCE:** *2008 Child Abuse Report* extracted from the ChildLine and Abuse Registry (1/1/08 – 12/31/08), Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families, U. S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population and Housing, 2000.

### Child Abuse Substantiations

This indicator notes the percentage of child abuse reports that are substantiated. Substantiated cases of child abuse are incidents of abuse that have been determined to meet Pennsylvania's definition of child abuse per the Pennsylvania Child Protective Services Law. Following a child protective services investigation, a determination is made as to whether the child abuse report is substantiated. This determination can be made by the county child welfare agency (referred to as an indicated report) or by the courts (referred to as a founded report).

**SOURCE:** *2008 Child Abuse Report* extracted from ChildLine and Abuse Registry (1/1/08 – 12/31/08), Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families

### Repeated Child Abuse

This indicator shows the rate of children who experience more than one incident of substantiated child abuse. "During the course of an investigation, it is possible that other previously unreported incidents become known. For example, an investigation can reveal another incident of abuse which was never before disclosed by the child or the family. These previously unreported incidents are registered with ChildLine and handled as

separate reports. Also, a child may be abused in one county then move to another county and become a victim of abuse again. This would be considered re-abuse whether or not the original county agency referred the matter to the new county agency. In both examples, such reports would be re-abuse of the child. Therefore, it is not accurate to assume that the victim and the family were known to the county agency in all instances where a child was a victim of multiple incidents of abuse. The statistics on re-abuse should be understood within this context (Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, 2008 Annual Child Abuse Report).” It is important to note that repeated child abuse may include overstated data.

**SOURCE:** *2008 Child Abuse Report* extracted from ChildLine and Abuse Registry (1/1/08 – 12/31/08), Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families

### **In-home Services**

This indicator reflects the number of children receiving in-home services and is tracked in a statewide database referred to as the CY-28 database. The June CY-28 quarterly report provides a full year of data on the number of children receiving in-home services. This is the first year that a new reporting form was used by County Children and Youth Agencies to report this data; therefore the information should be more accurate than what was reported in the past.

**SOURCE:** June 2009 CY-28 File (7/1/08 – 6/30/09) submitted by counties to Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families. *Due to the change in the report format, there are some issues related to processing the CY-28 file within DPW. Two counties (Juniata and McKean) have no available data and there may be concerns with other counties as well.*

### **Children Entering Foster Care**

This indicator shows the total number of children who entered foster care placement between 4/1/08 – 3/31/09, as well as the percentage of children who entered foster care during the year for the first time.

**SOURCE:** AFCARS Longitudinal File produced by Hornby Zeller Associates for Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families

### **Children in Foster Care**

This indicator illustrates the total number of children in foster care placement between 4/1/08 and 3/31/09, and breaks out children in care by age, race, ethnicity, and placement setting.

**Age:** Age represents the child’s age at the beginning of the period (4/1/08) if the child was in placement on April 1, 2008 or the child’s age when he or she entered foster care during the year.

**Race and ethnicity:** Race and ethnicity breakouts include white, African American, Other and Latino. Latino is an ethnicity and not a race. The race percentages do not add to total population as children can be reported under multiple races. However, only eight counties have the ability to capture multiple races in their data systems presently; so the reporting of multiple races is relatively small. The “Other” category includes children who were not white and not African American, including a small number of Asian, American Indian, and Unable to Determine.

**Placement setting:** This indicator shows the latest placement setting that children are in during the year (4/1/08 – 3/31/09). Placement settings are the different environments that children are placed in when they enter the foster care system. Pre-adoptive settings as well as foster family settings (both relative and non-relative) are family-based placement settings. Group homes and institutions are more restrictive placement settings and are often referred to as congregate care settings.

**SOURCE:** AFCARS Longitudinal File produced by Hornby Zeller Associates for Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families

#### **Timely Reunification with Parents or Relatives**

This indicator shows the percentage of all children who entered foster care for the first time in a 12-month period (4/1/07 – 3/31/08) and were discharged (specifically children who were in foster care over eight days) to reunification with their parents or relatives in fewer than 12 months from the date of removal (4/9/07 – 3/31/09).

**SOURCE:** AFCARS Longitudinal File produced by Hornby Zeller Associates for Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families

#### **Re-entry into Foster Care**

This indicator shows the percentage of all children who were discharged to reunification with their parents or other relatives in a 12-month period (4/1/07 – 3/31/08) and re-entered foster care in less than 12 months following their reunification (4/2/07 – 3/31/09). The data system does not allow the capture of enough information on children discharged from care who re-entered foster care within the first year (4/1/07 – 3/31/08) to determine whether that discharge was a reunification to parents or relatives or discharge for another reason. This may result in an over-reporting of reunifications (and subsequent re-entries). Some counties may also have an over-count of re-entries because of nuances in their billing systems as well. An example of this could be when a child is a runaway from a foster placement the county may close out the child’s foster care setting payment. When the child is found the county records this as a re-entry. A similar example can occur in some counties that stop foster care setting payments for a temporary trial home visit.

**SOURCE:** AFCARS Longitudinal File produced by Hornby Zeller Associates for Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families

#### **Children Leaving Foster Care**

This indicator shows the number of children leaving foster care between 4/1/08 and 3/31/09 by discharge reason and the median length of time in foster care (in months) for those children to be discharged. Reunification, adoption, guardianship and living with other relatives are considered permanency outcomes. Emancipation, transfer to another agency, runaway and death of a child are not. It also shows the number of children remaining in care at the end of the year (3/31/09) and the median length of stay for those children.

**SOURCE:** AFCARS Longitudinal File produced by Hornby Zeller Associates for Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families

### **Foster Care Placement Stability**

This indicator notes the percentage of children in foster care between 12 and 24 months who experienced three or more placement settings. The file is comprised of all children in foster care between 12 and 24 months served during the timeframe of 4/1/08 – 3/31/09.

**SOURCE:** AFCARS Longitudinal File produced by Hornby Zeller Associates for Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families

### **Caseworker Visits**

The indicator represents the percentage of children who were visited on a monthly basis by a county or private agency child welfare worker. This percentage was determined from a statewide sample of children in foster care that was calculated by taking the number of full calendar months caseworkers conducted monthly visits, divided by the number of full calendar months that children in the sample were in care. The sample was extracted from the AFCARS longitudinal file (sample comprised of children discharged in the first AFCARS reporting period, children discharged in second reporting period, and children in care on the last day of the second period).

**SOURCE:** Statewide sample 10/1/08 – 9/30/09 collected by the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, Office of Children, Youth and Families