

# **Illinois Child Endangerment Risk Assessment Protocol FY14 Annual Evaluation**

Tamara L. Fuller, Ph.D.  
Martin Nieto, M.A.  
Children and Family Research Center  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Prepared for:

Illinois Department of Children and Family Services  
Bobbie Gregg, Interim Director

April 2014



# Illinois Child Endangerment Risk Assessment Protocol

## FY14 Evaluation

### 1. Introduction and Purpose

The Child Endangerment Risk Assessment Protocol (CERAP) is a safety assessment protocol used in child protection investigations and child welfare services in Illinois. It is designed to provide workers with a mechanism for quickly assessing the potential for moderate to severe harm to a child in the immediate or near future and for taking quick action to protect children. Workers utilize the protocol at specified milestones throughout the life of an investigation or child welfare case to help focus their decision-making to determine whether a child is safe or unsafe, and if unsafe, decide what actions must be taken to assure their safety.

CERAP procedures state that a new safety assessment should be completed at the following milestones during an investigation:

- 1) Within 24 hours after the investigator first sees the alleged child victim;
- 2) Whenever evidence or circumstances suggest that a child's safety may be in jeopardy;
- 3) Every five working days following the determination that a child is **unsafe** and a safety plan is implemented. Such assessment must continue until all children are assessed as being safe, the investigation is completed, or all children assessed as unsafe are removed from the legal custody of their parents/caregivers and legal proceedings are being initiated in Juvenile Court;
- 4) At the conclusion of the formal investigation, unless a service case is opened. This provision may be waived by the supervisor if the initial safety assessment was marked safe and no more than 30 days have elapsed since it was completed.

The CERAP should also be completed at several milestones during an intact family service case:

- 1) Within 5 working days after initial case assignment and upon any and all subsequent case transfers. Note: If the child abuse/neglect investigation is pending at the time of case assignment, the Child Protection Service Worker remains responsible for CERAP safety assessment and safety planning until the investigation is complete. When the investigation is completed and approved, the assigned intact worker has 5 working days to complete a new CERAP.
- 2) Every 90 calendar days from the case opening date.
- 3) Whenever evidence or circumstances suggest that a child's safety may be in jeopardy.
- 4) Every five working days following the determination that a child is unsafe and a safety plan is implemented. Such assessment must continue until all children are assessed as being safe, the investigation is completed, or all children assessed as unsafe are removed from the legal custody of their parents/caregivers and legal proceedings are being initiated in Juvenile Court.
- 5) Within 5 work days of a supervisory approved case closure.

Previous research conducted by the Children and Family Research Center (CFRC) indicated that statewide, only around half of the investigations that require a safety assessment *at the conclusion of the investigation* actually have one. Additional analyses examined the relationship between safety re-assessment at the conclusion of the investigation and maltreatment recurrence, defined as an additional indicated maltreatment report within 6 months of an earlier indicated report, and found that recurrence is much less likely in investigations in which a safety re-assessment occurred. Additional analysis included in the FY2013 CERAP evaluation found that the relationship between safety re-assessment and maltreatment recurrence remained significant even after controlling for the influence of family and case characteristics that are known to influence the likelihood of maltreatment recurrence, such as prior investigations and age of the child.<sup>1</sup>

Results from the FY2013 CERAP report were presented to the statewide CERAP Advisory Committee on June 19, 2013 and several additional research questions were developed. Specifically, the committee was interested in examining:

- 1) the relationship between DCFS region and CERAP completion at the conclusion of the investigation;
- 2) the relationship among “risk of harm” allegations (Allegation 60), CERAP completion, and maltreatment recurrence; and
- 3) the relationship between CERAP completion and maltreatment recurrence in intact family cases.

The current report examines each of these topics in this sequence. Prior to presenting the results of these three sets of analyses, the “descriptive analyses” that have appeared in the CERAP reports for the past several years are updated with data through the end of FY2013:

- 1) 6-month maltreatment recurrence rates for the state of Illinois;
- 2) the percentage of investigations that have a CERAP re-assessment at the conclusion of the investigation; and
- 3) the relationship between CERAP completion at the conclusion of the investigation and 6-month maltreatment recurrence.

---

<sup>1</sup> Fuller, T.L. & Nieto, M. (2013). *Illinois Child Endangerment Risk Assessment Protocol: FY13 Annual Evaluation*. Urbana, IL: Children and Family Research Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

## 2. Analyses and Results

### 2.1 Descriptive analysis

#### 2.1.1 6-month recurrence rates

Table 1 presents the 6-month recurrence rates for the state of Illinois over the past 10 years, defined as the percentage of children with an indicated maltreatment report within 6 months of an initial indicated maltreatment report. After peaking in 2004 at slightly over 8%, recurrence rates have been steadily declining over the past decade and were less than 7% during FY2013.

**Table 1. 6-Month Maltreatment Recurrence**

<b>FY</b>	<b>Number of children with an indicated report</b>	<b>Number of children with second indicated report within 6 months</b>	<b>% recurrent</b>
<b>2004</b>	25,009	2,014	8.1
<b>2005</b>	25,191	1,990	7.9
<b>2006</b>	24,239	1,884	7.8
<b>2007</b>	25,822	1,979	7.7
<b>2008</b>	27,121	2,075	7.7
<b>2009</b>	26,726	1,923	7.2
<b>2010</b>	26,185	1,875	7.2
<b>2011</b>	25,286	1,759	7.0
<b>2012</b>	25,561	1,797	7.0
<b>2013</b>	27,308	1,748	6.4

#### 2.1.2 Safety assessment at the conclusion of the investigations

According to CERAP procedures, not all investigations require an additional safety assessment at the conclusion of the investigation. The circumstances in which the requirement can be waived include: 1) if the initial safety determination is “safe” and the investigation is completed in less than 30 days, 2) if the investigation involves an already opened service case, or 3) if a service case is opened during or immediately following the investigation. Since these types of investigations do not require a safety assessment at the conclusion of the investigation, the following analyses exclude: 1) investigations closed within 30 days, 2) investigations involving families or children with open service cases, and 3) investigations that were referred to intact family services of placement services within 60 days of the investigation. Investigations with initial safety determinations of “safe” were retained in the analyses, but were examined separately. The results in Table 2 and Figure 1 show the percentage of investigations that have a safety assessment at the conclusion of the investigation each year from 2004 through 2013 (i.e., the “compliance” rate). Investigations in which the initial safety determination is “safe” have slightly higher compliance rates than investigations in which the initial safety


determination is “unsafe.” Rates of CERAP completion at the conclusion of the investigation rates increased substantially in FY2013.

**Table 2. Indicated children\* with CERAP re-assessments at investigation close**

Fiscal Year	Total number indicated children*	Initial CERAP safety determination			CERAP re-assessment at investigation close	
			n	%	n	%
2004	9,297	Unsafe	1,479	16	428	29
		Safe	7,818	84	2,488	32
2005	9,509	Unsafe	1,153	12	395	34
		Safe	8,356	88	2,853	34
2006	11,124	Unsafe	1,175	11	378	32
		Safe	9,949	89	3,810	38
2007	12,464	Unsafe	1,172	9	446	38
		Safe	11,292	91	4,724	42
2008	12,497	Unsafe	1,245	10	469	38
		Safe	11,252	90	4,870	43
2009	12,903	Unsafe	1,436	11	562	39
		Safe	11,467	89	5,172	45
2010	13,050	Unsafe	1,460	11	488	33
		Safe	11,590	89	5,158	45
2011	13,437	Unsafe	1,556	12	594	38
		Safe	11,881	88	5,435	46
2012	14,323	Unsafe	1,747	12	625	36
		Safe	12,576	88	5,586	44
2013	15,514	Unsafe	1,800	12	794	44
		Safe	13,714	88	7,084	52

\*This is the number of initial indicated children during the year, after excluding investigations completed in less than 30 days, investigations involving already open service cases, and investigations in which services were open within 60 days of report date.

**Figure 1. Indicated children\* with CERAP re-assessments at investigation close**



\*This is the number of initial indicated children during the year, after excluding investigations completed in less than 30 days, investigations involving already open service cases, and investigations in which services were open within 60 days of report date.

### **2.1.3 Safety reassessment at investigation conclusion and maltreatment recurrence**

The next set of analyses examined the bivariate (i.e., two variable) relationship between the completion of a safety assessment at the conclusion of an investigation and child safety, which was defined as 6-month maltreatment recurrence rates (see Table 3). The analyses were conducted using the following steps:

- 1) the number of children with indicated allegations of maltreatment during the fiscal year was determined;
- 2) children in investigations that did not require a safety assessment at the conclusion of the investigation were excluded (i.e., those in investigations closed within 30 days of the report date, those with an open child or family service case at the report date, and those with a new child or family service case opened within 60 days of the report date);
- 3) information on the initial safety determination (safe or unsafe) was collected, so that analyses could compare outcomes for children initially assessed as safe versus unsafe;
- 4) the number and percentage of these children with an additional safety assessment at the milestone "At the conclusion of the formal investigation, unless a service case is opened" was calculated;
- 5) for each of these groups (safe/unsafe and re-assessment/no re-assessment), the recurrence rates were calculated;

- 6) statistically significant differences between the recurrence rates for those with and without a safety assessment at the conclusion of the investigation are noted in the table.

Several important findings should be noted. Looking only at children who were initially determined to be *unsafe* in the initial safety assessment, those who had a safety assessment at the conclusion of the investigation were significantly less likely to have a second indicated report than those who did not (see Figure 2). The significant relationship between safety re-assessment at the conclusion of the investigation and lower maltreatment recurrence is also observed among children who were assessed as safe in the initial safety assessment completed at the beginning of the investigation (see Figure 3). Also, in general, children found to be unsafe at the time of the initial safety assessment were more likely to experience maltreatment recurrence than those found to be safe.

**Table 3. Safety reassessment at investigation conclusion and 6-month maltreatment recurrence**

	Initial Safety Decision	Additional CERAP completed			Number Recurrent	% Recurrent
			n	%		
2004	Unsafe (n=1,479)	No	1,051	71.1	156	14.8***
		Yes	428	28.9	14	3.3
	Safe (n=7,818)	No	5,330	68.2	466	8.7***
		Yes	2,488	31.8	125	5.0
2005	Unsafe (n=1,153)	No	758	65.7	90	11.9***
		Yes	395	34.3	16	4.1
	Safe (n=8,356)	No	5,503	65.9	503	9.1***
		Yes	2,853	34.1	152	5.3
2006	Unsafe (n=1,175)	No	797	67.8	84	10.5*
		Yes	378	32.2	26	6.9
	Safe (n=9,949)	No	6,139	61.7	564	9.2***
		Yes	3,810	38.3	232	6.1
2007	Unsafe (n=1,172)	No	726	62.0	69	9.5
		Yes	446	38.0	45	10.1
	Safe (n=11,292)	No	6,568	58.2	583	8.9***
		Yes	4,724	41.8	268	5.7
	Unsafe (n=1,245)	No	776	62.3	93	12.0

2008	Safe (n=11,252)	Yes	469	37.7	41	8.7
		No	6,382	56.7	558	8.7***
		Yes	4,870	43.3	310	6.4
2009	Unsafe (n=1,436)	No	874	60.9	97	11.1***
		Yes	562	39.1	29	5.2
	Safe (n=11,467)	No	6,295	54.9	603	9.6***
		Yes	5,172	45.1	265	5.1
2010	Unsafe (n=1,460)	No	972	66.6	111	11.4***
		Yes	488	33.4	20	4.1
	Safe (n=11,590)	No	6,432	55.5	498	7.7***
		Yes	5,158	44.5	257	5.0
2011	Unsafe (n=1,556)	No	962	61.8	92	9.6***
		Yes	594	38.2	29	4.9
	Safe (n=11,881)	No	6,446	54.3	561	8.7***
		Yes	5,435	45.7	266	4.9
2012	Unsafe (n=1,747)	No	1,122	64.2	139	12.4**
		Yes	625	35.8	43	6.9
	Safe (n=12,576)	No	6,990	55.6	598	8.6***
		Yes	5,586	44.4	319	5.7
2013	Unsafe (n=1,800)	No	1,006	55.9	118	11.7***
		Yes	794	44.1	40	5.0
	Safe (n=13,714)	No	6,630	48.3	472	7.1**
		Yes	7,084	51.7	404	5.7


\*p < .05

\*\*p < .001


\*\*\*p < .0001



**Figure 2. 6-month maltreatment recurrence rates among initially unsafe children with and without a CERAP safety assessment at investigation close**



**Figure 3. 6-month maltreatment recurrence rates among initially safe children with and without a CERAP safety assessment at investigation close**



## 2.2 Regional analysis of CERAP re-assessments at the investigation conclusion

The statewide numbers and percentages of investigations that had a CERAP re-assessment at the conclusion of the investigation were analyzed and compared by DCFS administrative region: Cook (the three Cook regions were combined in this analysis), Northern, Central, and Southern. Table 4 and Figure 4 present the data for the investigations in which the initial safety determination for the household was “unsafe.” The results indicate that rates of safety re-assessment were highest in the Central and Southern regions. Compliance rates in the Northern region were consistently the lowest in the state until 2012, when they significantly improved and are now on par with those in the Central and Southern regions. Rates in the Cook region have been consistently lower than those in the Central and Southern regions and remained so in FY2013.


**Table 4. Indicated children\* with CERAP re-assessments at investigation close by region (initial safety determination = unsafe)**

Fiscal Year	Region	Initial CERAP Safety Decision = Unsafe	CERAP re-assessment at investigation close	
			n	%
2004	Cook	849	253	29.8
	Northern	76	3	4.0
	Central	336	109	32.4
	Southern	155	47	30.3
2005	Cook	563	184	32.7
	Northern	104	19	18.3
	Central	272	107	39.3
	Southern	130	63	48.5
2006	Cook	578	181	31.3
	Northern	125	14	11.2
	Central	280	105	37.5
	Southern	108	37	34.3
2007	Cook	515	174	33.8
	Northern	120	36	30.0
	Central	336	137	40.8
	Southern	72	29	40.3
2008	Cook	553	208	37.6

	Northern	164	44	26.8
	Central	393	181	46.1
	Southern	80	22	27.5
2009	Cook	517	174	33.7
	Northern	250	81	32.4
	Central	538	249	46.3
	Southern	66	30	45.5
2010	Cook	631	177	28.1
	Northern	221	57	25.8
	Central	434	180	41.5
	Southern	80	37	46.3
2011	Cook	641	211	32.9
	Northern	208	59	28.4
	Central	486	208	42.8
	Southern	137	72	52.6
2012	Cook	919	274	29.8
	Northern	138	59	42.8
	Central	501	201	40.1
	Southern	99	46	46.5
2013	Cook	910	348	38.2
	Northern	139	57	41.0
	Central	579	300	51.8
	Southern	84	41	48.8

\* This is the number of initial indicated children during the year, after excluding investigations completed in less than 30 days, investigations involving already open service cases, and investigations in which services were open within 60 days of report date.

**Figure 4. Indicated children\* with CERAP re-assessments at investigation close by region (initial safety determination = unsafe)**



\*This is the number of initial indicated children during the year, after excluding investigations completed in less than 30 days, investigations involving already open service cases, and investigations in which services were open within 60 days of report date.

Table 5 and Figure 5 present the number and percentages of investigations with an initial safety determination of “safe” that had a safety re-assessment at the conclusion of the investigation. Comparison of the compliance rates among the four regions reveals a clear pattern: rates are highest in the Southern region over the entire 10 year period, followed by the Central region, then the Northern region, with the Cook region having the lowest rates. In general, compliance rates have been increasing over time in all regions except Cook, where rates have been relatively the same for the past several years.

**Table 5. Indicated children\* with CERAP re-assessments at investigation close by region (initial safety determination = safe)**


Fiscal Year	Region	Initial CERAP Safety Decision = Safe	CERAP re-assessment at investigation close	
			n	%
2004	Cook	1,971	346	17.6
	Northern	851	68	8.0
	Central	2,952	1,177	39.9
	Southern	1,388	653	47.1
2005	Cook	1,730	351	20.3

	Northern	996	172	17.3
	Central	3,575	1,437	40.2
	Southern	1,373	611	44.5
2006	Cook	2,360	524	22.2
	Northern	998	252	25.3
	Central	4,319	1,924	44.6
	Southern	1,441	742	51.5
2007	Cook	2,754	874	31.7
	Northern	1,302	518	39.8
	Central	4,628	2,083	45.0
	Southern	1,758	943	53.6
2008	Cook	2,791	791	28.3
	Northern	1,206	451	37.4
	Central	4,877	2,370	48.6
	Southern	1,601	899	56.2
2009	Cook	2,883	764	26.5
	Northern	1,254	460	36.7
	Central	4,935	2,636	53.4
	Southern	1,510	933	61.8
2010	Cook	3,119	762	24.4
	Northern	1,152	385	33.4
	Central	4,858	2,605	53.6
	Southern	1,610	925	57.5
2011	Cook	3,260	826	25.3
	Northern	1,078	368	34.1
	Central	4,845	2,597	53.6
	Southern	1,692	1,033	61.1

2012	Cook	3,890	933	24.0
	Northern	1,036	519	50.1
	Central	5,020	2,499	49.8
	Southern	1,641	1,027	62.6
2013	Cook	4,187	1,094	26.1
	Northern	1,085	621	57.2
	Central	5,880	3,667	62.3
	Southern	1,562	996	63.8

\*This is the number of initial indicated children during the year, after excluding investigations completed in less than 30 days, investigations involving already open service cases, and investigations in which services were open within 60 days of report date.

**Figure 5. Indicated children\* with CERAP re-assessments at investigation close by region (initial safety determination = safe)**



\*This is the number of initial indicated children during the year, after excluding investigations completed in less than 30 days, investigations involving already open service cases, and investigations in which services were open within 60 days of report date.

### 2.3 Allegation 60 analysis

When a call comes to the State Central Register (SCR), intake workers gather information from the maltreatment reporter about the alleged incident of abuse or neglect. Based on the information provided, which can be ample or minimal, the SCR worker assigns one or more allegation types to the report that describe the types of harm that are alleged. Many of the allegations of harm can be categorized as resulting from either abuse or neglect (see Table 6 for a list of the allegations assigned to screened-in reports in Illinois).

**Table 6: DCFS Allegations of Abuse and Neglect**

Abuse Allegations	Neglect Allegations
Death (1)	Death (51)
Head Injuries (2)	Head Injuries (52)
Internal Injuries (4)	Internal Injuries (54)
Burns (5)	Burns (55)
Poisons/Noxious Substances (6)	Poisons/Noxious Substance (56)
Wounds (7)	Wounds (57)
Bone Fractures (9)	Bone Fractures (59)
Substantial Risk of Physical Injuries/ Environment Injurious to Health and Welfare (10)	Substantial Risk of Physical Injuries/ Environment Injurious to Health and Welfare (60)
Cuts, Bruises, Welts, Abrasions, or Oral Injuries (11)	Cuts, Bruises, Welts, Abrasions, or Oral Injuries (61)
Human Bites (12)	Human Bites (62)
Sprains/Dislocations (13)	Sprains/Dislocations (63)
Tying/Close Confinement (14)	
Substance Misuse (15)	Substance Misuse (65)
Torture (16)	
Mental and Emotional Impairment (17)	Mental and Emotional Impairment (67)
Sexually Transmitted Diseases (18)	
Sexual Penetration (19)	
Sexual Exploitation (20)	
Sexual Molestation (21)	
Substantial Risk of Sexual injury (22)	
	Inadequate Supervision (74)
	Abandonment/Desertion (75)
	Inadequate Food (76)
	Inadequate Shelter (77)
	Inadequate Clothing (78)
	Medical Neglect (79)
	Failure to Thrive (81)

Environmental Neglect (82)
Malnutrition (non-organic) (83)
Lock-out (84)
Medical Neglect of Disabled Infants (85)

Source: DCFS Procedures 300 Appendix B

Allegation #60 (Substantial Risk of Physical Injury/Environment Injurious to Health and Welfare, also known as “risk of harm”) has received additional scrutiny in the recent past. According to DCFS Procedures 300 (Appendix B), this allegation of harm is to be used when the type or extent of harm is undefined but the total circumstances lead a reasonable person to believe that the child is in substantial risk of physical injury. Allegation 60 is assigned to reports in which the risk of physical injury or environment which is injurious is due to neglect rather than abuse. Examples of environments which are injurious to the health and welfare of a child include but are not limited to:

- domestic violence;
- exposure to toxic vapors resulting from flammable and/or corrosive chemicals used in the manufacture of illicit drugs in the child’s home environment;
- subjecting the child to participation in or the witnessing of the physical abuse or restraint of another person; and
- allowing or encouraging a child to be involved in a criminal activity.

The broad nature of this allegation raised questions from the CERAP Advisory Committee about the relationship of Allegation 60 to safety assessment, compliance, and maltreatment recurrence. To explore the question, a series of analyses was conducted that examine these relationships:

- 1) First, the number of children with at least one indicated allegation each year was separated into three groups: 1) those with indicated allegation 60 only, 2) those with indicated allegation 60 plus at least one other indicated allegation, and 3) those with at least one indicated allegation other than allegation 60 (see Table 7 and Figure 6).
- 2) Children in investigations that did not require a safety assessment at the conclusion of the investigation were excluded from the sample (i.e., those in investigations closed within 30 days of the report date, those with an open child or family service case at the report date, and those with a new child or family service case opened within 60 days of the report date).
- 3) Information on the initial safety determination (safe or unsafe) was collected, so that analyses could compare outcomes for children initially assessed as safe versus unsafe;
- 4) The number and percentage of children with an additional safety assessment at the milestone “At the conclusion of the formal investigation, unless a service case is opened” were calculated (see Figure 7).
- 5) For each of these groups (safe/unsafe and re-assessment/no re-assessment), the 6-month maltreatment recurrence rate was calculated (see Tables 8 and 9, Figure 8).




The results of this first step of the analysis are shown in Table 7 and Figure 6. When examined over time, it is clear that the portion of indicated investigations containing Allegation 60 (either alone or in combination with other allegations) has been increasing over the past decade.

**Table 7: Indicated Allegation Types for Children in Investigations 2004-2013**


FY	Number of children with an indicated report	Indicated allegation type		
		Indicated allegation type	N	%
2004	25,009	Allegation 60 only	5,333	21.3
		Allegation 60 plus other	1,845	7.4
		Other allegations	17,831	71.3
2005	25,191	Allegation 60 only	6,662	26.5
		Allegation 60 plus other	2,028	8.1
		Other allegations	16,501	65.5
2006	24,239	Allegation 60 only	7,221	29.8
		Allegation 60 plus other	1,817	7.5
		Other allegations	15,201	62.7
2007	25,822	Allegation 60 only	7,881	30.5
		Allegation 60 plus other	1,966	7.6
		Other allegations	15,975	61.9
2008	27,121	Allegation 60 only	8,747	32.3
		Allegation 60 plus other	2,192	8.1
		Other allegations	16,182	57.5
2009	26,726	Allegation 60 only	9,220	34.5
		Allegation 60 plus other	2,142	8.0
		Other allegations	15,364	57.5
2010	26,185	Allegation 60 only	9,582	36.6
		Allegation 60 plus other	2,268	8.7
		Other allegations	14,335	54.8
2011	25,286	Allegation 60 only	9,632	38.1
		Allegation 60 plus other	2,276	9.0
		Other allegations	13,378	52.9
2012	25,561	Allegation 60 only	7,313	28.6
		Allegation 60 plus other	2,775	10.9
		Other allegations	15,473	60.5
2013	27,308	Allegation 60 only	9,559	35.0
		Allegation 60 plus other	2,826	10.4
		Other allegations	14,923	54.6

**Figure 6: Indicated Allegation Types for Children in Investigations 2004-2013**



After separating the children with indicated allegations during the fiscal year into these three mutually exclusive groups, children in investigations that did not require a safety assessment at the conclusion of the investigation were excluded (i.e., those in investigations closed within 30 days of the report date, those with an open child or family service case at the report date, and those with a new child or family service case opened within 60 days of the report date). Then, information on the initial safety determination (safe or unsafe) was collected so that the number and percentage of these children with an additional safety assessment at the conclusion of the investigation could be calculated. Figure 7 compares the percentage of children who were initially assessed as unsafe and had an additional CERAP assessment at the conclusion of the investigation by allegation type: those with allegation 60 versus those with other allegations. The results suggest that initially unsafe children in investigations of allegation 60 are *less* likely to have a safety re-assessment at the conclusion of the investigation than those investigated for other types of allegations.

**Figure 7. Indicated children\* with CERAP re-assessments at investigation close: Allegation 60 versus Other Allegations**



\*This is the number of initial indicated children during the year, after excluding investigations completed in less than 30 days, investigations involving already open service cases, and investigations in which services were open within 60 days of report date.

Tables 8 and 9 present the relationships among allegation type (allegation 60 only, allegation 60+other, and other allegations), CERAP completion at the conclusion of the investigation, and 6-month maltreatment recurrence. For clarity, the results are presented separately for children who were initially assessed as unsafe in the first safety assessment during the investigation (Table 8) and children who were initially assessed as safe (Table 9).

**Table 8. Safety reassessment at investigation conclusion and 6-month maltreatment recurrence (initial safety determination = unsafe)**

FY	Allegation Type	Additional CERAP completed		Number Recurrent	% Recurrent	
			N			%
2004	Allegation 60 only (n=269)	No	210	78.1	37	17.6
		Yes	59	21.9	2	3.4
	Allegation 60 + other (n=152)	No	116	76.3	16	13.8
		Yes	36	23.7	1	2.8
	Other allegation(s) (n=1,058)	No	725	68.5	103	14.2
		Yes	333	31.5	11	3.3


2005	Allegation 60 only (n=238)	No	168	70.6	32	19.1
		Yes	70	29.4	5	7.1
	Allegation 60 + other (n=114)	No	88	77.2	14	15.9
		Yes	26	22.8	1	3.9
	Other allegation(s) (n=801)	No	502	62.7	44	8.8
		Yes	299	37.3	10	3.3
2006	Allegation 60 only (n=297)	No	228	76.8	22	9.7
		Yes	69	23.2	4	5.8
	Allegation 60 + other (n=70)	No	52	74.3	11	21.2
		Yes	18	25.7	2	11.1
	Other allegation(s) (n=808)	No	517	64.0	51	9.9
		Yes	291	36.0	20	6.9
2007	Allegation 60 only (n=276)	No	186	67.4	20	10.8
		Yes	90	32.6	7	7.8
	Allegation 60 + other (n=97)	No	57	58.8	6	10.5
		Yes	40	41.2	2	5.0
	Other allegation(s) (n=799)	No	483	60.5	43	8.9
		Yes	316	39.5	36	11.4
2008	Allegation 60 only (n=309)	No	200	64.7	28	14
		Yes	109	35.3	8	7.3
	Allegation 60 + other (n=118)	No	85	72.0	11	12.9
		Yes	33	28.0	5	15.2
	Other allegation(s) (n=818)	No	491	60.0	54	11.0
		Yes	327	40.0	28	8.6
2009	Allegation 60 only (n=439)	No	252	57.4	34	13.5
		Yes	187	42.6	17	9.1
	Allegation 60 + other (n=119)	No	90	75.6	10	11.1
		Yes	29	24.4	3	10.3
	Other allegation(s) (n=878)	No	532	60.6	53	10.0
		Yes	346	39.4	9	2.6

2010	Allegation 60 only (n=440)	No	310	70.5	45	14.5
		Yes	130	29.5	7	5.4
	Allegation 60 + other (n=124)	No	88	71.0	11	12.5
		Yes	36	29.0	5	13.9
	Other allegation(s) (n=896)	No	574	64.1	55	9.6
		Yes	322	35.9	8	2.5
2011	Allegation 60 only (n=531)	No	326	61.4	26	8.0
		Yes	205	38.6	11	5.4
	Allegation 60 + other (n=139)	No	82	59.0	12	14.6
		Yes	57	41.0	3	5.3
	Other allegation(s) (n=886)	No	554	62.5	54	9.8
		Yes	332	37.5	15	4.5
2012	Allegation 60 only (n=429)	No	309	72.0	54	17.5
		Yes	120	28.0	9	7.5
	Allegation 60 + other (n=180)	No	124	68.9	15	12.1
		Yes	56	31.1	5	8.9
	Other allegation(s) (n=1,138)	No	689	60.5	70	10.2
		Yes	449	39.5	29	6.5
2013	Allegation 60 only (n=571)	No	336	58.8	35	10.4
		Yes	235	41.2	16	6.8
	Allegation 60 + other (n=189)	No	112	59.3	19	17.0
		Yes	77	40.7	4	5.2
	Other allegation(s) (n=1,040)	No	558	53.7	64	11.5
		Yes	482	46.4	20	4.2

The 6-month recurrence rates among initially unsafe children that did and did not have a CERAP re-assessment at the conclusion of the investigation are compared in Figure 8. The comparison on the left shows children with indicated Allegation 60 only and the comparison on the right shows the children with any other type of indicated allegation. Examination of the results in Figure 8 leads to the following conclusions:

- In general, recurrence rates are higher among children investigated for allegation 60 than children investigated for other types of allegations.
- The relationship between CERAP completion at the conclusion of the investigation and lower maltreatment recurrence holds true for both investigations of allegation 60 and other allegations.

**Figure 8. 6-month maltreatment recurrence rates among initially unsafe children with and without a CERAP safety assessment at investigation close: Allegation 60 only (left) and Other Allegations (right)**



**Table 9. Safety reassessment at investigation conclusion and 6-month maltreatment recurrence (initial safety determination = safe)**

FY	Allegation Type	Additional CERAP completed			Number Recurrent	% Recurrent
			N	%		
2004	Allegation 60 only (n=1,433)	No	990	69.1	95	9.6
		Yes	443	30.9	30	6.8
	Allegation 60 + other (n=370)	No	270	73.0	30	11.1
		Yes	100	27.0	10	10.0
	Other allegation(s) (n=6,015)	No	4,070	67.7	341	8.4
		Yes	1,945	32.3	85	4.4
2005	Allegation 60 only (n=1,985)	No	1,295	65.2	128	9.9
		Yes	690	34.8	39	5.7
	Allegation 60 + other (n=464)	No	334	72.0	40	12.0
		Yes	130	28.0	9	6.9
	Other allegation(s) (n=5,907)	No	3,874	65.6	335	8.7
		Yes	2,033	34.4	104	5.1
2006	Allegation 60 only (n=2,780)	No	1,731	62.3	169	9.8
		Yes	1,049	37.7	64	6.1
	Allegation 60 + other (n=541)	No	369	68.2	43	11.7
		Yes	172	31.8	22	12.8
	Other allegation(s) (n=6,628)	No	4,039	60.9	352	8.7
		Yes	2,589	39.1	146	5.6
2007	Allegation 60 only (n=3,302)	No	1,944	58.9	218	11.2
		Yes	1,358	41.1	96	7.1
	Allegation 60 + other (n=550)	No	371	67.5	39	10.5
		Yes	179	32.5	11	6.2
	Other allegation(s) (n=7,440)	No	4,253	57.2	326	7.7
		Yes	3,187	42.8	161	5.1

2008	Allegation 60 only (n=3,450)	No	2,000	58.0	186	9.3
		Yes	1,450	42.0	104	7.2
	Allegation 60 + other (n=577)	No	355	61.5	41	11.6
		Yes	222	38.5	14	6.3
	Other allegation(s) (n=7,225)	No	4,027	55.7	331	8.2
		Yes	3,198	44.3	192	6.0
2009	Allegation 60 only (n=3,682)	No	2,100	57.0	236	11.2
		Yes	1,582	43.0	62	3.9
	Allegation 60 + other (n=625)	No	356	57.0	56	15.7
		Yes	269	43.0	31	11.5
	Other allegation(s) (n=7,160)	No	3,839	53.6	311	8.1
		Yes	3,321	46.4	172	5.2
2010	Allegation 60 only (n=3,995)	No	2,347	58.8	189	8.1
		Yes	1,648	41.2	110	6.7
	Allegation 60 + other (n=653)	No	368	56.4	41	11.1
		Yes	285	43.6	19	6.7
	Other allegation(s) (n=6,942)	No	3,717	53.5	268	7.2
		Yes	3,225	46.5	128	4.0
2011	Allegation 60 only (n=4,376)	No	2,442	55.8	230	9.4
		Yes	1,934	44.2	94	4.9
	Allegation 60 + other (n=714)	No	417	58.4	57	13.7
		Yes	297	41.6	13	4.4
	Other allegation(s) (n=6,791)	No	3,587	52.8	274	7.6
		Yes	3,204	47.2	159	5.0
2012	Allegation 60 only (n=3,271)	No	1,891	57.8	149	7.9
		Yes	1,380	42.2	67	4.9
	Allegation 60 + other (n=961)	No	523	54.4	67	12.8
		Yes	438	45.6	39	8.9
	Other allegation(s) (n=8,344)	No	4,576	54.8	382	8.4
		Yes	3,768	45.2	213	5.7




2013	Allegation 60 only (n=4,630)	No	2,304	49.8	170	7.4
		Yes	2,326	40.2	130	5.6
	Allegation 60 + other (n=1,017)	No	532	52.3	48	9.0
		Yes	485	47.7	42	8.7
	Other allegation(s) (n=8,067)	No	3,794	47.0	254	6.7
		Yes	4,273	53.0	232	5.4

The 6-month recurrence rates among initially safe children that did and did not have a CERAP re-assessment at the conclusion of the investigation are compared in Figure 9. The comparison on the left shows children with indicated Allegation 60 only and the comparison on the right shows the children with any other type of indicated allegation. Things to note in these figures include:

- Recurrence rates are higher among children investigated for allegation 60 than children investigated for other types of allegations.
- The relationship between CERAP completion at the conclusion of the investigation and lower maltreatment recurrence holds true for both investigations of allegation 60 and other allegations, although the differences are less striking than those in Figure 8 (unsafe children).

**Figure 9. 6-month maltreatment recurrence rates among initially safe children with and without a CERAP safety assessment at investigation close: Allegation 60 only (left) and Other Allegations (right)**



## 2.4 Intact family analysis

The final analysis examines the relationship between CERAP completion and maltreatment recurrence among children in intact family cases. As previously mentioned, the CERAP should also be completed at several milestones during an intact family service case:

- 1) Within 5 working days after initial case assignment and upon any and all subsequent case transfers. Note: If the child abuse/neglect investigation is pending at the time of case assignment, the Child Protection Service Worker remains responsible for CERAP safety assessment and safety planning until the investigation is complete. When the investigation is completed and approved, the assigned intact worker has 5 work days to complete a new CERAP.
- 2) Every 90 calendar days from the case opening date.
- 3) Whenever evidence or circumstances suggest that a child's safety may be in jeopardy.
- 4) Every five working days following the determination that a child is unsafe and a safety plan is implemented. Such assessment must continue until all children are assessed as being safe, the investigation is completed, or all children assessed as unsafe are removed from the legal custody of their parents/caregivers and legal proceedings are being initiated in Juvenile Court.
- 5) Within 5 working days of a supervisory approved case closure.

The second column in Table 10 displays the number of children in intact family cases that opened during each fiscal year between 2004 and 2013, inclusive. Although a new CERAP assessment is supposed to be completed by the intact family caseworker within 5 working days of *case assignment*, date of case assignment is not available in the Integrated Database used for the current analyses. The closest date to this milestone that is available within the Integrated Database is the *case opening* date. To measure CERAP completion among intact family cases, we assume that case assignment to an intact family caseworker occurs within 7-10 days of the date of case opening, and therefore a CERAP should be completed within 15 days of intact family case opening for most cases. The third and fourth columns in Table 10 display the number and percentage of children in intact family cases that had a CERAP assessment completed within 15 days of their case opening date. The results indicate that the percentage of children in intact family cases that had a CERAP completed within 15 days of case opening increased each year from 2004 to 2012 (although some years only very slightly), but decreased from 66.5% in 2012 to 55.0% in 2013.

**Table 10. Number and percentage of children in intact family cases with CERAP assessments within 15 days of case opening**

FY	Children in intact family cases opened during the year	Children in intact family cases with a CERAP completed within 15 days of case opening	
		n	%
2004	19,850	3,096	15.6
2005	19,088	6,631	34.7
2006	17,075	7,607	44.6
2007	16,453	8,897	54.1
2008	15,665	9,586	61.2
2009	15,916	10,133	63.7
2010	14,565	9,332	64.1
2011	16,589	10,725	64.7
2012	17,393	11,570	66.5
2013	10,517	5,782	55.0

The prior analysis examined all intact family cases that opened during a fiscal year, regardless of the reason for case opening. Intact family cases can be opened for a variety of reasons, not all of which are related to indicated child abuse or neglect. In order to provide a more nuanced analysis of CERAP completion among intact family cases, we created an intact family case typology based on the “case open reason” contained within the Integrated Database. In this typology, intact cases could be opened due to: Abuse (non-sexual), Sexual Abuse, Neglect, Dependency, and Other (see Appendix Table 1 for the specific case open codes included in each of these categories). After excluding the intact family cases that were opened for reasons other than abuse or neglect (i.e., those opened for dependency and other reasons), the percentage of children in intact family cases with CERAP assessments within 15 days of case opening was substantially higher (see Table 11).

**Table 11. Number and percentage of children in intact family cases\* with CERAP assessments within 15 days of case opening**

FY	Children in intact family cases opened during the year	Children in intact family cases with a CERAP completed within 15 days of case opening	
		n	%
2004	11,892	2,479	20.9
2005	11,541	5,360	46.4
2006	10,514	6,188	58.9
2007	10,434	7,202	69.0
2008	10,798	8,035	74.4
2009	10,727	8,229	76.7

<b>2010</b>	9,603	7,512	78.2
<b>2011</b>	11,292	8,825	78.2
<b>2012</b>	12,318	9,885	80.3
<b>2013</b>	6,703	5,014	74.8

\*Includes only those intact family cases opened for reasons of abuse, sexual abuse, or neglect.

Table 12 and Figure 10 examine CERAP completion rates among intact family cases by region. Several patterns are apparent in the results. First, CERAP completion rates among intact family cases vary considerably by region; completion rates are highest in the Southern and Cook regions, and lower in the Northern and Central regions. Second, completion rates across all regions increased from FY2004 until FY2008, and then remained fairly level until FY2012. There was a decrease in CERAP completion rates in intact family cases during FY2013 in the Cook and Northern regions.


**Table 12. Number and percentage of children in intact family cases\* with CERAP assessments within 15 days of case opening by region**

FY	Region	Children in intact family cases opened during the year	Children in intact family cases with a CERAP completed within 15 days of case opening	
			n	%
<b>2004</b>	Cook	4,697	925	19.7
	Northern	2,229	576	25.8
	Central	3,170	527	16.6
	Southern	1,796	451	25.1
<b>2005</b>	Cook	4,337	2,147	49.5
	Northern	2,060	922	44.8
	Central	3,190	1,207	37.8
	Southern	1,954	1,084	55.5
<b>2006</b>	Cook	3,843	2,765	72.0
	Northern	1,930	933	48.3
	Central	3,063	1,381	45.1
	Southern	1,678	1,109	66.1
<b>2007</b>	Cook	3,988	3,029	76.0
	Northern	1,934	1,198	61.9
	Central	2,792	1,638	58.7
	Southern	1,720	1,337	77.7

<b>2008</b>	Cook	3,774	2,882	76.4
	Northern	2,655	1,931	72.7
	Central	2,591	1,742	67.2
	Southern	1,778	1,480	83.2
<b>2009</b>	Cook	4,140	3,326	80.3
	Northern	2,531	1,790	70.7
	Central	2,531	1,836	72.5
	Southern	1,525	1,277	83.7
<b>2010</b>	Cook	3,342	2,889	86.5
	Northern	2,149	1,536	71.5
	Central	2,538	1,771	69.8
	Southern	1,574	1,316	83.6
<b>2011</b>	Cook	4,030	3,383	84.0
	Northern	2,725	1,965	72.1
	Central	2,778	1,957	70.5
	Southern	1,759	1,520	86.4
<b>2012</b>	Cook	4,066	3,476	85.5
	Northern	3,227	2,480	76.9
	Central	3,234	2,362	73.0
	Southern	1,791	1,567	87.5
<b>2013</b>	Cook	2,358	1,771	75.1
	Northern	1,328	834	62.8
	Central	2,033	1,520	74.8
	Southern	984	889	90.4

\*Includes only those intact family cases opened for reasons of abuse, sexual abuse, or neglect.

**Figure 10. Children in intact family cases opened during the fiscal year with CERAP assessments within 15 days of case opening**



\*Includes only those intact family cases opened for reasons of abuse, sexual abuse, or neglect.

The final analysis compares maltreatment recurrence among intact family cases that did and did not have a CERAP assessment completed within 15 days of case opening. For this analysis, maltreatment recurrence was defined as an indicated maltreatment report within 6 months of the intact family case open date. Cases that were opened for reasons other than abuse or neglect (i.e., those listed in the dependency and other categories in Appendix Table 1) were excluded from the analysis. The results presented in Table 13 and Figure 11 suggest that unlike safety assessment at the conclusion of the investigation, there is no *consistent* relationship between CERAP completion after intact family cases opening and maltreatment recurrence within 6 months. In some years the maltreatment rates between the two groups are statistically equivalent, in some years they are higher among cases without a CERAP assessment, and in others they are higher among cases with a CERAP assessment.

**Table 13. 6-month maltreatment recurrence among intact family cases with and without a CERAP assessment within 15 days of case opening**


	Total Number of Children	CERAP Completed Within 15 Days of Case Opening			Number Recurrent	% Recurrence
			n	%		
<b>2004</b>	11,892	Yes	2,479	20.9	164	6.6
		No	9,413	79.1	617	6.6
<b>2005</b>	11,541	Yes	5,360	46.4	365	6.8
		No	6,181	53.6	395	6.4
<b>2006</b>	10,514	Yes	6,188	58.9	403	6.5
		No	4,326	41.1	338	7.8*
<b>2007</b>	10,434	Yes	7,202	69.0	471	6.5
		No	3,232	31.0	231	7.2
<b>2008</b>	10,798	Yes	8,035	74.4	516	6.4
		No	2,763	25.6	230	8.3**
<b>2009</b>	10,727	Yes	8,229	76.7	532	6.5
		No	2,498	23.3	113	4.5**
<b>2010</b>	9,603	Yes	7,512	78.2	561	7.5
		No	2,091	21.8	124	5.9*
<b>2011</b>	11,292	Yes	8,825	78.2	515	5.8
		No	2,467	21.8	142	5.8
<b>2012</b>	12,318	Yes	9,885	80.3	546	5.5
		No	2,433	19.7	167	6.9
<b>2013</b>	6,703	Yes	5,014	74.8	400	8.0
		No	1,689	25.2	125	7.4

\*p < .05

\*\*p < .001

\*\*\*p < .0001

**Figure 11. 6-month maltreatment recurrence among intact family cases with and without a CERAP assessment within 15 days of case opening**



### 3. Summary

The FY2014 CERAP evaluation attempted to answer three research questions:

- 1) Is there a relationship between DCFS region and CERAP completion at the conclusion of the investigation?
- 2) Is there a relationship between “risk of harm” (Allegation 60), CERAP completion, and maltreatment recurrence? and
- 3) Is there a relationship between CERAP completion and maltreatment recurrence in intact family cases?

#### 3.1 Regional analysis of CERAP completion at the conclusion of the investigation

The results of this analysis indicated that there are regional differences in the rates of CERAP completion at the conclusion of the investigation. Among cases in which the initial safety assessment determined that children in the household were unsafe, rates of safety re-assessment were highest in the Central and Southern regions. Completion rates in the Northern region were consistently the lowest in the state until 2012, when they significantly improved and are now on par with those in the Central and Southern regions. Rates in the Cook region have been consistently lower than those in the Central and Southern regions and remained so in FY2013.



### **3.2 CERAP completion among “risk of harm” investigations**

The next set of analyses examined CERAP completion at the conclusion of the investigation among investigations of “risk of harm” (allegation 60) and found that initially unsafe children in investigations of allegation 60 are *less* likely to have a safety re-assessment at the conclusion of the investigation than those investigated for other types of allegations. In general, recurrence rates among children investigated for allegation 60 are higher than children investigated for other types of allegations. However, children investigated for allegation 60 that had a CERAP assessment at the conclusion of the investigation were *less likely* to experience maltreatment recurrence within 6 months than those that did not have a CERAP assessment at the conclusion of the investigation.

### **3.3 CERAP completion and maltreatment recurrence among intact family cases**

The final research question examined the relationship between CERAP completion among intact family cases and maltreatment recurrence within 6 months of case opening. Rates of CERAP completion within 15 days of the case opening among intact family cases opened for reasons related to child abuse or neglect were high – at or near 80% in 2010-2012. Completion rates dropped to 75% for intact cases opened during FY2013. When the completion rates were examined regionally, rates were 10-15% higher in the Southern and Cook regions than in the Northern and Central regions. In addition, the drop in completion rates observed during 2013 can be attributed to decreases in CERAP completion in the Cook and Northern regions. Finally, when the relationship between CERAP completion among intact family cases and 6-month maltreatment recurrence was examined, the relationship was inconsistent over time – it was significant some years not others. The lack of a consistently significant relationship between CERAP completion among intact family cases and later maltreatment recurrence does not mean that safety assessment among intact families is unimportant, it merely suggests that other child or family variables that were not analyzed are more predictive of recurrence.

**Appendix Table 1. Intact Family Case Open Types and Codes**

Abuse (non-sexual)	AB	Abuse
	AC	Abuse Control Group
	AF	Abuse/Family First
	AR	Abuse/Family First Reunification
	CA	Court Ordered Abuse
Neglect	CN	Court Ordered Neglect
	DN	Dependent/Neglect
	DR	Differential Response
	NC	Neglect/Control Group
	NF	Neglect/Family First
	NG	Neglect
	NR	Neglect/Family First Reunification
Sexual Abuse	SA	Sexual Abuse
	SC	Sexual Abuse/Control Group
	SF	Sexual Abuse/Family First
	SR	Sex AB/Family First Reunification
Dependency	CB	Child Behavior Problems
	CI	Child Illness/Handicap
	DP	Dependent
	PC	Parent Child Problems
	PF	Putative Father
Other	CH	Cuban/Haitian-Unmin
	AD	Adoption
	AA	Adoption Assistance
	DA	DASA Family Preservation
	DF	Donated Funds
	EF	Extended Family
	GS	Guardian Successor
	IC	Invest/Control Group
	IF	Invest/Family First
	MI	Missing
	OT	Other
	PA	Post Adoption
	PI	Pending Investigation
	PS	Preventative Services
	RA	Refugee Assistance-Unmin
	SG	Subsidized Guardianship
	SO	Serv to Other Agency
	TD	Unknown
	UF	Unfounded Family Preservation
	UM	Unwed Mother
	UR	Unfounded Family Reunification
	UK	Unknown
	YI	Governor's Youth Initiative