



Conditions of Children in or at Risk of Foster Care in Illinois

2014 MONITORING REPORT
OF THE *B.H.* CONSENT DECREE



**CHILDREN AND FAMILY
| RESEARCH | CENTER**

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK



Conditions of Children in or at Risk of Foster Care in Illinois

2014 MONITORING REPORT
OF THE *B.H.* CONSENT DECREE

A REPORT BY THE



**CHILDREN AND FAMILY
| RESEARCH | CENTER**

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Tamara Fuller, Ph.D.
Martin Nieto, M.A.
Xinrong Lei, Ph.D.
Satomi Wakita, Ph.D.
Saijun Zhang, Ph.D.
Yu-Ling Chiu, Ph.D.
Theodore P. Cross, Ph.D.

The Children and Family Research Center is an independent research organization created jointly by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services to provide independent evaluation of outcomes for children who are the responsibility of the Department. Funding for this work is provided by the Department of Children and Family Services. The views expressed herein should not be construed as representing the policy of the University of Illinois or the Department of Children and Family Services.

Any part of this report may be photocopied and distributed when appropriate credits are given. No part of this report, or the report in its entirety, may be sold for profit.

For questions about the content of the report contact:

Tamara Fuller at (217) 333-5837 or t-fuller@illinois.edu

This report is available on our website: <http://www.cfr Illinois.edu/>

For copies of this report contact:

Children and Family Research Center
School of Social Work
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
1010 West Nevada Street Suite 2080
Urbana, IL 61801
(217) 333-5837
(800) 638-3877 (toll-free)
cfr Illinois.edu



Designed by Thunderstruck Design.

© 2015 Children and Family Research Center, School of Social Work,
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Chapters

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

e

INTRODUCTION: The Evolution of Child Welfare Monitoring in Illinois

i

CHAPTER 1: Child Safety

1

CHAPTER 2: Children in Substitute Care: Safety, Continuity, and Stability

2

CHAPTER 3: Legal Permanence: Reunification, Adoption, and Guardianship

3

APPENDIX A: Indicator Definitions

A

APPENDIX B: Outcome Data by Region, Gender, Age and Race

B

APPENDIX C: Outcome Data by Sub-Region

C

APPENDIX D: *Julie Q.* v. Department of Children and Family Services

D

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	E-1
INTRODUCTION: The Evolution of Child Welfare Monitoring in Illinois	I-1
The Origin and Purpose of Child Welfare Outcome Monitoring in Illinois	I-1
Box I.1 The Children and Family Research Center	I-2
The Evolution of Outcome Monitoring in Illinois	I-6
The Current Monitoring Report of the <i>B.H.</i> Consent Decree	I-6
Box I.2 The CFRC Data Center	I-8
Future Efforts to Monitor Child Welfare Outcomes in Illinois	I-12
CHAPTER 1: Child Safety	1-1
Measuring Child Safety	1-1
Changes in Safety at a Glance	1-2
Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children with Substantiated Reports	1-3
Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children in Intact Family Cases	1-5
Maltreatment Recurrence Among Substantiated Children Who Do Not Receive Services	1-7
Discussion and Conclusions: Child Safety	1-7
CHAPTER 2: Children in Substitute Care: Safety, Continuity, and Stability	2-1
Measuring the Quality of Substitute Care	2-1
Changes in the Conditions of Children in Substitute Care at a Glance	2-2
Child Safety in Substitute Care	2-3
Box 2.1 Placement Type Terminology	2-4
Continuity with Family and Community	2-6
Restrictiveness of Placement Settings	2-6
Box 2.2 Initial Placement into Congregate Care Settings	2-8
Placement with Siblings	2-11
Placement Close to Home	2-13
Placement Stability	2-17
Placement Stability During the First Year in Substitute Care	2-17
Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care	2-19
Length of Time in Substitute Care	2-21
Discussion and Conclusions: Children in Substitute Care	2-22

CHAPTER 3: Legal Permanence: Reunification, Adoption, and Guardianship 3-1

Changes in Legal Permanence at a Glance	3-2
Measuring Legal Permanence	3-3
Children Achieving Legal Permanence	3-4
Children Achieving Reunification	3-5
Stability of Reunification	3-7
Children Achieving Adoption	3-7
Children Achieving Guardianship	3-9
Box 3.1 Measuring Adoption Stability	3-10
Stability of Guardianship	3-12
Children Who Exit Substitute Care Without Achieving Legal Permanence	3-12
Children Remaining in Substitute Care Over 36 Months	3-12
Discussion and Conclusions: Legal Permanence	3-13

APPENDIX A: Indicator Definitions A1

APPENDIX B: Outcome Data by Region, Gender, Age and Race B1

APPENDIX C: Outcome Data by Sub-region C1

APPENDIX D: *Julie Q.* v. Department of Children and Family Services D1

e

i

1

2

3

A

B

C

D

List of Figures

Figure 1.1	Service Dispositions Among Children with Substantiated Reports.....	1-3
Figure 1.2	12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children with Substantiated Reports	1-3
Figure 1.3	12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence by Age	1-4
Figure 1.4	12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence by Race.....	1-4
Figure 1.5	12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence Sub-region Heat Map.....	1-5
Figure 1.6	12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children Served in Intact Families	1-5
Figure 1.7	12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children Served in Intact Families by Age	1-6
Figure 1.8	12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children Served in Intact Families by Race	1-6
Figure 1.9	12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children Served in Intact Family Cases Sub-region Heat Map	1-6
Figure 1.10	12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence Among Substantiated Children Who Do Not Receive Services	1-7
Figure 1.11	Comparison of Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children Served in Intact Family and Children Who Do Not Receive Services	1-7
Figure 2.1	Children Maltreated in Substitute Care	2-3
Figure 2.2	Children Maltreated in Substitute Care by Age	2-5
Figure 2.3	Children Maltreated in Substitute Care by Placement Type.....	2-5
Figure 2.4	Children Maltreated in Substitute Care Sub-region Heat Map	2-6
Figure 2.5	Initial Placement Types	2-7
Figure 2.6	End of Year Placement Types.....	2-7
Figure 2.7	Initial Placement Into Congregate Care Settings Among Youth Ages 12 to 17	2-8
Figure 2.8	Initial Placement Into Congregate Care Settings by Region.....	2-8
Figure 2.9	Initial Placement Types by Age—FY2014	2-9
Figure 2.10	End of Year Placement Types by Age—FY2014	2-9
Figure 2.11	Initial Placement Types by Gender—FY2014.....	2-10
Figure 2.12	End of Year Placement Types by Gender—FY2014	2-10
Figure 2.13	Initial Placement Types by Race—FY2014.....	2-10
Figure 2.14	End of Year Placement Types by Race—FY2014.....	2-10
Figure 2.15	Initial Placement Types by Region—FY2014	2-11
Figure 2.16	End of Year Placement Types by Region—FY2014.....	2-11
Figure 2.17	Initial Placements with Siblings	2-12
Figure 2.18	End of Year Placements with Siblings.....	2-13
Figure 2.19	Median Distance from Home at Initial Placement	2-13
Figure 2.20	Median Distance from Home at Initial Placement by Age	2-13
Figure 2.21	Median Distance from Home at Initial Placement by Race	2-14
Figure 2.22	Median Distance from Home at Initial Placement Sub-region Heat Map	2-14
Figure 2.23	Median Distance from Home at Initial Placement by Placement Type.....	2-14

Figure 2.24	Median Distance from Home at End of Year	2-15
Figure 2.25	Median Distance from Home at End of Year by Age.....	2-15
Figure 2.26	Median Distance from Home at End of Year by Race	2-15
Figure 2.27	Median Distance from Home at End of Year by Placement Type	2-16
Figure 2.28	Median Distance from Home at End of Year Sub-region Heat Map.....	2-16
Figure 2.29	Median Distance from Home at End of Year by Placement Type and Sub-region FY2014 ..	2-17
Figure 2.30	Children with Stable Placements in First Year in Care	2-18
Figure 2.31	Placement Stability by Age.....	2-18
Figure 2.32	Placement Stability by Race	2-18
Figure 2.33	Placement Stability by Initial Placement Type.....	2-19
Figure 2.34	Placement Stability Sub-region Heat Map	2-19
Figure 2.35	Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care	2-19
Figure 2.36	Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care by Age.....	2-20
Figure 2.37	Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care by Race	2-20
Figure 2.38	Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care by Region	2-20
Figure 2.39	Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care by Placement Type.....	2-21
Figure 2.40	Median Length of Time in Substitute Care	2-21
Figure 2.41	Median Length of Time in Substitute Care by Region	2-21
Figure 3.1	Children Exiting to Permanence Within 12, 24, and 36 Months.....	3-4
Figure 3.2	Children Exiting to Reunification, Adoption, and Guardianship Within 36 Months.....	3-5
Figure 3.3	Children Exiting to Reunification Within 12, 24, and 36 Months.....	3-5
Figure 3.4	Children Exiting to Reunification Within 36 Months by Age.....	3-6
Figure 3.5	Children Exiting to Reunification Within 36 Months by Race	3-6
Figure 3.6	Children Exiting to Reunification Within 36 Months Sub-region Heat Map.....	3-7
Figure 3.7	Stable Reunifications 1, 2, 5, and 10 Years After Finalization.....	3-7
Figure 3.8	Children Exiting to Adoption Within 24 and 36 Months.....	3-8
Figure 3.9	Children Exiting to Adoption Within 36 Months by Age.....	3-8
Figure 3.10	Children Exiting to Adoption Within 36 Months by Race	3-9
Figure 3.11	Children Exiting to Adoption Within 36 Months Sub-region Heat Map.....	3-9
Figure 3.12	Stable Adoptions at 2, 5, and 10 Years After Finalization	3-10
Figure 3.13	Children Exiting to Guardianship Within 24 and 36 Months	3-11
Figure 3.14	Children Exiting to Guardianship Within 36 Months by Age	3-11
Figure 3.15	Children Exiting to Guardianship Within 36 Months Sub-region Heat Map.....	3-11
Figure 3.16	Stable Guardianships 2, 5, and 10 Years After Finalization	3-12
Figure 3.17	Exits from Substitute Care Within 36 Months: Children Ages 15 and Older (2011 Entry Cohort)	3-12
Figure 3.18	Exits from Substitute Care Within 36 Months	3-13

e

i

1

2

3

A

B

C

D



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since its inception in 1996, the Children and Family Research Center has produced an annual report that monitors the performance of the Illinois child welfare system in achieving its stated goals of child safety, permanency, and well-being. This *2014 Monitoring Report of the B.H. Consent Decree* uses child welfare administrative data through September 30, 2014 to describe the conditions of children in or at risk of foster care in Illinois. Following an introductory chapter, results of the analyses are presented in three chapters that capture the experience of a child as he or she travels through the child protection and child welfare systems.

- **Child Safety** examines maltreatment recurrence during the 12-month period following a child's substantiated maltreatment report. Rates of maltreatment recurrence are examined for three groups of children: all children with substantiated reports during the year, children with substantiated reports who were served in intact family cases, and children with substantiated reports who did not receive post-investigation services.
- **Children in Substitute Care: Safety, Continuity, and Stability** examines the experiences of children from the time they enter substitute care until the time they exit the child welfare system. This chapter includes four sections: 1) Safety in Substitute Care, 2) Continuity with Family and Community, 3) Placement Stability, and 4) Length of Time in Substitute Care.

- **Legal Permanence: Reunification, Adoption and Guardianship** examines exits from substitute care to reunification, adoption, or guardianship within 12, 24, and 36 months of entry. For those children who achieve permanence, the stability of their permanent living arrangement at one year (reunification only), two years, five years, and ten years after exiting the child welfare system is also described. This chapter also examines the population of children that remain in care longer than three years, as well as those that exit substitute care without achieving a legally permanent family (exits of this type include running away from their placement, incarceration, and aging out of the substitute care system).

In addition to the summary data presented in the chapters, the technical appendices contain definitions and detailed outcome data for each of the indicators included in the report.

Each of the chapters begins with a summary of the indicators used to measure the Illinois child welfare system's progress in achieving positive outcomes for children and families, as well as a metric that we have developed that measures the amount of change that has occurred on that indicator between the most recent two years of data that are available. The metric used is the "percent change" and is calculated by subtracting the older value of the indicator from the newer value of the indicator (to find the relative difference) then multiplying by 100. If the result is positive, it is a percentage increase and if negative, it is

a percentage decrease. In this report, changes of 5% or more were noted as significant. Changes of this magnitude are pictured with an upward or downward arrow, while changes of less than 5% are denoted with an equal sign. The following sections highlight the changes in indicators during FY2014. For additional details, please refer to the full chapters and appendices.

Changes in Child Safety at a Glance

Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children with Substantiated Reports

- =** Of all children with a substantiated report, the percentage that had another substantiated report within 12 months remained stable and was 11.3% of children with an initial substantiated report in 2013.

Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children Served in Intact Family Cases

- ↑** Of all children served at home in intact family cases, the percentage that had another substantiated report within 12 months increased from 10.0% of children with an initial substantiated report in 2012 to 12.1% of children with an initial substantiated report in 2013 (+21% increase).

Maltreatment Recurrence Among Substantiated Children Who Do Not Receive Services

- =** Of all children with an initial substantiated report who did not receive services, the percentage that had another substantiated report within 12 months remained stable and was 11.2% of children with an initial substantiated report in 2013.

Changes in the Conditions of Children in Substitute Care at a Glance

Child Safety in Substitute Care

- ↑** Of all children entering substitute care during the year, the percentage that had a substantiated

report during placement increased from 1.9% in 2013 to 2.1% in 2014 (+11% change).

Restrictiveness of Initial Placement Settings:

- =** Of all children entering substitute care, the percentage initially placed into a traditional foster home remained stable and was 25.5% in 2014.
- =** Of all children entering substitute care, the percentage initially placed into a kinship foster home remained stable and was 54.1% in 2014.
- =** Of all children entering substitute care, the percentage initially placed into a specialized foster home remained stable and was 2.6% in 2014.
- ↓** Of all children entering substitute care, the percentage initially placed into an institution or group home decreased from 18.2% in 2013 to 16.8% in 2014 (-8% change).

Restrictiveness of End of Year Placement Settings

- =** Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, the percentage placed in a traditional foster home remained stable and was 26.5% in 2014.
- =** Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, the percentage placed in a kinship foster home remained stable and was 39.8% in 2014.
- =** Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, the percentage placed in a specialized foster home remained stable and was 16.0% in 2014.
- =** Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, the percentage placed in an institution or group home remained stable and was 10.4% in 2014.
- =** Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, the percentage placed in independent living remained stable and was 7.3% in 2014.

Placement with Siblings

Of all children entering substitute care, the percentage that was initially placed in the same foster home with all their siblings in care:

For children with one or two siblings in care:

↓ decreased for children initially placed in traditional foster homes from 66.6% in 2013 to 61.1% in 2014 (-9% change).

= remained stable for children initially placed in kinship foster homes and was 81.6% in 2014.

For children with 3 or more siblings in care:

↑ increased for children initially placed in traditional foster homes from 1.8% in 2013 to 5.4% in 2014 (+200% change).

↑ increased for children initially placed in kinship foster homes from 54.0% in 2013 to 57.8% in 2014 (+7% change).

Of all children living in substitute care at the end of the year, the percentage that was placed in the same foster home as all their siblings in care:

For children with one or two siblings in care:

= remained stable for children in traditional foster homes and was 55.4% in 2014.

= remained stable for children in kinship foster homes and was 71.9% in 2014.

For children with 3 or more siblings in care:

↓ decreased for children in traditional foster homes from 12.0% in 2013 to 11.1% in 2014 (-8% change).

↓ decreased for children in kinship foster homes from 37.7% in 2013 to 33.6% in 2014 (-11% change).

Placement Close to Home

↑ For all children entering substitute care, the median distance from their home of origin to their initial placement increased from 10.1 miles in 2013 to 10.6 miles in 2014 (+5% change).

= Of all children in substitute care at the end of the fiscal year, the median distance from their home of origin to their placement at the end of year remained stable and was 10.6 miles in 2014.

Stability in Substitute Care

= Of all children entering substitute care and staying at least one year, the percentage that had two or fewer placements during their first year in care remained stable and was 79.1% of children who entered care in 2013.

Children Who Run Away From Substitute Care

↓ Of all children entering substitute care between the ages of 12 and 17 years, the percentage that ran away from a placement within one year of entry decreased from 23.6% in 2013 to 19.3% in 2014 (-18% change).

Length of Stay in Substitute Care

= For all children entering substitute care, the median number of months a child stays in care remained stable and was 30 months for children who entered care in 2011.

Changes in Permanence at a Glance

Children Achieving Reunification

= Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that was reunified with their parents within 12 months remained stable and was 20.3% of children who entered care in 2013.

= Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that was

reunified with their parents within 24 months remained stable and was 32.9% of children who entered care in 2012.

= Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that was reunified with their parents within 36 months remained stable and was 39.4% of those who entered care in 2011.

= Of all children who were reunified during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at one year remained stable and was 82.4% of children who were reunified in 2013.

= Of all children who were reunified during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at two years remained stable and was 81.3% of children who were reunified in 2012.

= Of all children who were reunified during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at five years remained stable and was 77.6% of children who were reunified in 2009.

= Of all children who were reunified during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at ten years remained stable and was 71.7% of children who were reunified in 2004.

Children Achieving Adoption

↓ Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that was adopted within 24 months decreased from 4.2% of those who entered care in 2011 to 3.2% of those who entered care in 2012 (-31% change).

= Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that was adopted within 36 months remained stable and was 11.1% of those who entered care in 2011.

= Of all children who were adopted during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at two years remained stable and was 97.9% of children who were adopted in 2012.

= Of all children who were adopted during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at five years remained stable and was 96.2% of children who were adopted in 2009.

= Of all children who were adopted during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at ten years remained stable and was 89.2% of children who were adopted in 2004.

Children Achieving Guardianship

↓ Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that attained subsidized guardianship within 24 months decreased from 0.9% of those who entered care in 2011 to 0.7% of those who entered care in 2012 (-22% change).

= Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that attained subsidized guardianship within 36 months remained stable and was 2.4% of children who entered care in 2011.

= Of all children who attained subsidized guardianship during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at two years remained stable and was 95.2% of children who attained guardianship in 2012.

= Of all children who attained subsidized guardianship during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at five years remained stable and was 90.0% of children who attained guardianship in 2009.

↑ Of all children who attained subsidized guardianship during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at ten years increased from 78.9% of those who attained guardianship in 2003 to 83.1% of those who attained guardianship in 2004 (+5% change).



INTRODUCTION

The Evolution of Child Welfare Monitoring in Illinois

Since its inception in 1996, the Children and Family Research Center (CFRC, the Center; see Box I.1) has been responsible for the annual report that monitors the performance of the Illinois child welfare system in achieving its stated goals of child safety, permanency, and well-being. The *B.H. Consent Decree Monitoring Report* (the *B.H. report*) is the culmination of the efforts of the Center's researchers to provide clear and comprehensive data to a variety of stakeholders who are concerned with the outcomes of abused and neglected children in Illinois. This report is not an evaluation of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS, the Department), the juvenile courts, private providers and community-based partners, or other human systems responsible for child protection and welfare. Rather, it is a monitoring report that examines specific performance indicators and identifies trends on selected outcomes of interest to the federal court, the Department, members of the *B.H.* class, and their attorneys. It is our hope that this report will not sit on a shelf, but will be used as a catalyst for dialogue between child welfare stakeholders at the state and local levels about the meanings behind these reported numbers and the strategies needed for quality improvement.

The Origin and Purpose of Child Welfare Outcome Monitoring in Illinois

The foundation of this report can be traced directly to the *B.H.* consent decree, which was approved by United States District Judge John Grady on December 20, 1991, and required extensive reforms of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services over the subsequent two and a half years.¹ According to the Decree:

“It is the purpose of this Decree to assure that DCFS provides children with at least minimally adequate care. Defendant agrees that, for the purposes of this Decree, DCFS’s responsibility to provide such care for plaintiffs includes an obligation to create and maintain a system which assures children are treated in conformity with the following standards of care:

- a. Children shall be free from foreseeable and preventable physical harm.

¹ *B.H. et al. v. Suter*, No. 88-cv-5599 (N.D. Ill., 1991). It should be noted that the name of the Defendant changes over time to reflect the name of the DCFS Director appointed at the time of the entry of a specific order. Susan Suter was the appointed Director at the time of the entry of the original Consent Decree in this case.

The Children and Family Research Center

BOX I.1

The Children and Family Research Center was established in 1996 through a cooperative agreement between the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). The purpose of the Center is to conduct research that is responsive to the DCFS mission and responsibilities under statutes and court orders and contribute to scientific knowledge about child safety, permanency, and child and family well-being. Since its establishment, the Center has emerged as an important leader in promoting university-agency partnerships to improve public child welfare systems. Center activities are organized around four core areas: 1) outcome monitoring and needs assessment; 2) program evaluation and data analysis; 3) training and technical assistance to advance best practice; and 4) knowledge dissemination.

Outcome Monitoring and Needs Assessment

The Center was created, in part, to monitor the performance of the Illinois child welfare system pursuant to the *B.H.* Consent Decree. Each year since 1997, the Center has compiled a comprehensive report that describes over 40 child welfare indicators related to child safety and permanence. Analyses for the *B.H.* report utilize a large, longitudinal database that contains DCFS administrative data on every Illinois child protective investigation and every child welfare case (both in-home and substitute care) dating back to the 1980s. The *B.H.* report is widely distributed to child welfare administrators, researchers, and policy makers throughout Illinois and the nation.

Program Evaluation and Data Analysis

One of the key elements of the success of the child welfare reforms in Illinois and other states has been the ability of child welfare administrators to rely on scientifically rigorous research that demonstrates the effectiveness of the program innovations being implemented. The Children and Family Research Center engages in rigorously-designed experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations of innovative

child welfare demonstration projects which have national implication and scope. For instance, CFRC served as the evaluator for three of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services Title IV-E waiver demonstrations projects and in 2013, CFRC began a new partnership with the State of Wisconsin Department of Children and Families (DCF) as the evaluator of its Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Project. The Wisconsin waiver evaluation, which runs through 2018, will test the effectiveness of a post-reunification support program, known as the P.S. Program, by comparing the rates of maltreatment recurrence and re-entry into substitute care of children who receive P.S. Program services compared to those who did not. In addition to the outcome evaluation, a process evaluation will document the implementation process using the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) framework, and a cost analysis will compare the costs and savings associated with the program.

In 2009, the Children and Family Research Center, in partnership with DCFS, applied for and received funding from the National Quality Improvement Center on Differential Response (QIC-DR) to implement and evaluate a Differential Response (DR) program in Illinois. This comprehensive, 4-year evaluation consisted of a randomized controlled trial that compared outcomes for families randomly assigned to either a traditional child protective services investigation (control group) or non-investigative child protective services response known as a family assessment (treatment group). The evaluation also documented the implementation process so that other states considering Differential Response can learn from the Illinois experience. Finally, a cost evaluation compared the short-term and long-term costs associated with the two CPS responses.

Most recently, CFRC was selected to evaluate the Oregon Differential Response Initiative. CFRC has worked collaboratively with staff from the Oregon Department of Human Services to develop methodologies for their process, outcome, and cost evaluations. Mixed-methods data collection strategies will be utilized to gather data from CPS caseworkers,

supervisors, administrators, screeners, coaches, service providers, community partners, and parents involved in the child protection system to answer a comprehensive list of research questions related to the effectiveness of the implementation strategies used and the impact of DR on child and family outcomes.

Training and Technical Assistance to Advance Best Practice

For over 15 years, CFRC's Foster Care Utilization Review Program (FCURP) has worked with DCFS to prepare for, conduct, and respond to the federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR). The CFSR is the means by which the federal government ensures state compliance with federal mandates. Using a continuous quality improvement process, FCURP has played a vital role in building and maintaining a viable public-private framework for supporting ongoing efforts to enhance child welfare outcomes in Illinois. FCURP supports DCFS and its private sector partners by 1) monitoring and reporting Illinois' progress toward meeting the safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes outlined in the Federal Child and Family Services Review; 2) providing training and education to help child welfare practitioners translate federal regulations and state policies into quality practice; and 3) providing technical assistance regarding the enhancement of child welfare organizational systems to promote system reform and efficiency of operations.

The Children and Family Research Center also provides technical assistance and data consultation to child welfare agencies and other non-profit organizations throughout Illinois and the Midwest on a variety of topics. Recent examples of assistance include:

- Data consultation to the Office of the Cook County Public Guardian
- Data analysis and consultation on serious maltreatment allegations among young children for the Illinois Children's Justice Task Force
- Grant-writing assistance provided to the United Way of Champaign County in their response to a request for proposals from the Illinois Children's Healthcare Foundation
- Assistance with survey development provided to Strengthening Families Illinois

- Grant-writing assistance provided to Champaign County Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA)

Knowledge Dissemination

Dissemination of the Center's research findings is widespread to multiple audiences within Illinois and throughout the country. Using a variety of information sharing strategies, the Center's researchers strive to put knowledge into the hands of both policy makers and practitioners, including:

- The Children and Family Research Center web site, through which interested parties can access and download all research and technical reports, research briefs on specific topics, and presentations given at state and national conferences.
- The CFRC Data Center, which provides summarized tables of DCFS performance data on child safety, stability, continuity, and family permanence. Each of the indicators reported on in the *B.H.* report (with the exception of the well-being indicators) can be examined by child demographics (age, race, and gender) and geographic area (Illinois total, DCFS region, DCFS service area, County, and Chicago Community Area). Outcome data for each indicator are displayed over a seven-year period, so that changes in performance can be tracked over time. In addition to the outcome indicator data, CFRC's Data Center also provides interested individuals with information on the number of child reports, family reports, and substantiation rates for the entire state and each county (see Box I.2 for additional information about CFRC's Data Center).
- Data Summits and Forums on topics of interest to DCFS and the child welfare community. Previous summits have focused on the nexus between juvenile justice and child welfare, effective early childhood and child abuse prevention programs, and the use of risk adjustment in performance outcomes for children's residential centers.
- Publication of research findings in peer-reviewed academic journals and presentations at state and national professional conferences.

- b. Children shall receive at least minimally adequate food, shelter, and clothing.
- c. Children shall receive at least minimally adequate health care.
- d. Children shall receive mental health care adequate to address their serious mental health needs.
- e. Children shall be free from unreasonable and unnecessary intrusions by DCFS upon their emotional and psychological well-being.
- f. Children shall receive at least minimally adequate training, education, and services to enable them to secure their physical safety, freedom from emotional harm, and minimally adequate food, clothing, shelter, health and mental health care.
- d. Provides for the prompt identification of the medical, mental health and developmental needs of children;
- e. Provides timely access to adequate medical, mental health and developmental services.
- f. Provides that while in DCFS custody, children receive a public education of a kind and quality comparable to other children not in DCFS custody.
- g. Provides that while in DCFS custody, children receive such services and training as necessary to permit them to function in the least restrictive and most homelike setting possible; and
- h. Provides that children receive adequate services to assist in the transition to adulthood.”

In order to meet this standard of care, it shall be necessary for DCFS to create and maintain a system which:

- a. Provides that children will be timely and stably placed in safe and appropriate living arrangements;
- b. Provides that reasonable efforts, as determined based on individual circumstances (including consideration of whether no efforts would be reasonable) shall be made to prevent removal of children from their homes and to reunite children with their parents, where appropriate and consistent with the best interests of the child;
- c. Provides that if children are not to be reunited with their parents, DCFS shall promptly identify and take the steps within its power to achieve permanency for the child in the least restrictive setting possible;

Under the terms of the *B.H.* Consent Decree, implementation of the required reforms was anticipated to occur by July 1, 1994. However, it became clear to the Court and to both parties that this ambitious goal would not be achieved in the two and a half years specified in the agreement. Consultation with a panel of child welfare and organizational reform experts led to the recommendation, among other things, to shift the focus of the monitoring from technical compliance (process) to the desired outcomes the parties hoped to achieve.² Both the plaintiffs and the defendants were in favor of a more results-oriented monitoring process, and together decided on three outcome categories: permanency, well-being, and safety.³ The two sides jointly moved to modify the decree in July 1996,⁴ outlining a series of new strategies based on measurable outcomes:

“The parties have agreed on outcome goals for the operation of the child welfare system covering the three areas of child safety, child and family well-being, and permanency of family relations.

² Mezey, S.G. (1998). Systemic reform litigation and child welfare policy: The case of Illinois. *Law & Policy*, 20, 203-230.

³ Puckett, K.L. (2008). *Dynamics of organizational change under external duress: A case study of DCFS's responses to the 1991 Consent Decree mandating permanency outcomes for wards of the state*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

⁴ *B.H. et al. v. McDonald* (1996). Joint Memorandum in Support of Agreed Supplemental Order, No 88-cv- 5599 (N.D. Ill., 1996).

a) The outcome goals agreed upon by the parties include the following:

- i) Protection: Promptly and accurately determine whether the family care of children reported to DCFS is at or above a threshold of safety and child and family well-being, and if it exceeds that threshold, do not coercively interfere with the family.
- ii) Preservation: When the family care of the child falls short of the threshold, and when consistent with the safety of the child, raise the level of care to that threshold in a timely manner.
- iii) Substitute care: If the family care of the child cannot be raised to that threshold within a reasonable time or without undue risk to the child, place the child in a substitute care setting that meets the child's physical, emotional, and developmental needs.
- iv) Reunification: When the child is placed in substitute care, promptly enable the family to meet the child needs for safety and care and promptly return the child to the family when consistent with the safety of the child.
- v) Permanency: If the family is unable to resume care of the child within a reasonable time, promptly arrange for an alternative, permanent living situation that meets the child's physical, emotional, and developmental needs.”⁵

In addition to specifying the outcomes of interest, the Joint Memorandum outlined the creation of a Children and Family Research Center “responsible for evaluating and issuing public reports on the performance of the child welfare service system operated

by DCFS and its agents. The Research Center shall be independent of DCFS and shall be within an entity independent of DCFS.”⁶ The independence of CFRC was an essential component of the settlement which was consistent with a growing national trend first identified by Senator Orrin Hatch as a means by which the autonomy of research universities would ensure that governmental programs could be held accountable for ensuring that authorized work is actually being done and whether programs were successful in addressing the perceived needs of the clients the program served.⁷ CFRC was also tasked, in consultation with the Department and counsel for the plaintiff class, with the development of outcome indicators to provide quantitative measures of progress toward meeting the goals set forth in the consent decree: “The Research Center will develop technologies and methods for collecting data to accurately report and analyze these outcome indicators. The Research Center may revise these outcome indicators after consultation with the Department and counsel for the plaintiff class to the extent necessary to improve the Center's ability to measure progress toward meeting the outcome goals.”⁸

The Joint Memorandum also specified the process through which the results of the outcomes monitoring would be disseminated: “The Research Center shall also provide to the parties and file with this Court an annual report summarizing the progress toward achieving the outcome goals and analyzing reasons for the success or failure in making such progress. The Center's analysis of the reasons for the success or failure of DCFS to make reasonable progress toward the outcome goals shall include an analysis of the performance of DCFS (including both DCFS operations and the operations of private agencies), and any other relevant issues, including, where and to the extent appropriate, changes in or the general conditions of the children and families or any other aspects of the child welfare system external to DCFS that affect the capacity of the Department to achieve its goals, and changes in the conditions and status of children and plaintiffs' counsel as the outcome indicators and data collection methods are developed...”⁹

⁵ Ibid, p. 2-4.

⁶ Joint Memorandum, p. 2

⁷ Hatch, O. (1982). Evaluations of government programs. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 5, 189-191.

⁸ Joint Memorandum, p. 4

⁹ Joint Memorandum, p. 4

The Evolution of Outcome Monitoring in Illinois

The *B.H.* parties agreed to give discretion to the Center in developing the specific indicators used to measure safety, permanency, and well-being. They also recognized the importance of exploring the systemic and contextual factors that influence outcomes, as well as the need for outcome indicators to change over time as data technology grows more sophisticated and additional performance issues emerge. The first “Outcomes Report” was filed with the Court in 1998 and included information on outcomes for children in the custody of the Department through fiscal year 1997. The indicators in the first monitoring report were simple, and included safety indicators of 1) maltreatment recurrence among intact family cases at 30, 180, and 300 days, and 2) maltreatment reports on children in substitute care (overall rate and rates by living arrangement, region, child age, child race, and perpetrator). The indicators for permanency in the first report included: 1) rate of children who entered substitute care from intact cases; 2) percentage of children returned home from substitute care within 6, 12, 18, and 24 months; 3) percentage of reunified children who re-enter foster care; 4) percentage of children adopted from substitute care and median length of time to adoption; 5) adoption disruptions; and 6) percentage of children moved to legal guardianship from substitute care. Each of these indicators was examined by child age, race, gender, and region. No indicators of child well-being were included in the earliest *B.H.* reports because child welfare administrative data systems did not yet capture information on child physical and mental health, development, and education in ways that could be easily translated into outcome indicators.

In the years since the first *B.H.* reports were filed, the State’s child welfare information management systems have become more comprehensive, which has facilitated the development of more sophisticated and reliable indicators of children’s safety and permanence. Although data on child well-being were not included in administrative data systems, separate studies were

conducted by the Center to assess the well-being of children in substitute care beginning in FY2000. In FY2003, two additional chapters were added to the *B.H.* report to examine placement stability, the use of least restrictive settings (i.e., most family like), and the continuity of family relationships while in care. In FY2009, data at the sub-regional level were included in order to more closely examine child welfare system functioning in light of the shifting of the overall substitute care caseload toward the non-Cook County regions and worsening performance on indicators “downstate.” The sub-regional analyses allowed for a more comprehensive assessment of the differences between rural and urban settings.

The Current Monitoring Report of the *B.H.* Consent Decree

The continual evolution of child welfare monitoring in Illinois is manifested in this year’s *B.H.* report.¹⁰ The report is organized into three chapters which attempt to capture the experience of a child as he or she travels through the child protection and child welfare systems. **Child Safety** is the first chapter. A child’s first contact with the child welfare system is typically through a Child Protective Services (CPS) investigation. Investigators make several decisions related to child safety, including whether the child is in immediate danger of a moderate to severe nature, whether there is credible evidence that maltreatment has occurred, whether to remove the child from the home and take the child into protective custody, and whether the family’s needs indicate that they would benefit from ongoing child welfare services. Regardless of whether additional child welfare services are provided, the child welfare system has a responsibility to keep children from additional maltreatment once they have been investigated. The first chapter of the report examines the Department’s performance in fulfilling this obligation by examining indicators related to maltreatment recurrence that occurs within 12 months of an indicated child maltreatment investigation.

The second chapter, **Children in Substitute Care: Safety, Continuity, and Stability**, examines the

¹⁰ There is typically a one year lag time between the most recent administrative data used for the *B.H.* monitoring report and the publication date. For instance, this year’s report, published in 2015, monitors outcomes through the end of FY2014.

experiences of children from the time they enter substitute care until the time they exit the child welfare system. Once removed from their homes, the public child welfare system and its private agency partners have a responsibility to provide children with living arrangements that ensure that they are safe from additional harm, maintain connections with their family members (including other siblings in care) and community, and provide stability. In addition, substitute care should be a temporary solution and children should live in substitute care settings for the shortest period necessary to ameliorate the issues which brought the children into care. This chapter examines how well the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services performs in providing substitute care living arrangements that meet these standards. It is organized into four sections: 1) Safety in Substitute Care, 2) Continuity with Family and Community, 3) Placement Stability, and 4) Length of Time in Substitute Care.

The third chapter examines **Legal Permanence: Reunification, Adoption and Guardianship** with in-depth analyses of each of these three exit types. The chapter examines the likelihood that a child will exit substitute care to reunification, adoption, or guardianship within 12, 24, and 36 months of entry. For those children who achieve permanence, the stability of their permanent living arrangement at one year (reunification only), two years, five years, and ten years after exiting the child welfare system is also assessed. This chapter also examines the population of children that remain in care longer than three years, as well as those who exit substitute care without achieving a legally permanent family (e.g., running away from their placement, incarceration, aging out of the substitute care system).

A fourth chapter on **Child Well-Being** was included in previous *B.H.* reports; it provided a close examination of the well-being of children involved in substantiated reports of child maltreatment in Illinois. Data for this chapter were obtained from a longitudinal study—known as the Illinois Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (ISCAW)—of 818 child protection cases sampled between 2008 and 2010 and followed

for approximately 18 months. Results of the analyses of this study can be found in previous *B.H.* reports as well as stand-alone reports that provide a comprehensive examination of the well-being of children involved in substantiated investigations in Illinois.^{11 12} All data collection and analysis associated with the ISCAW has been concluded, so the current *B.H.* report does not contain a chapter related to child well-being.

Each chapter contains numerous figures or tables that allow the reader to easily visualize Illinois' performance on the indicator over time. Readers interested in examining the results of the analyses more closely will find additional information in the technical Appendices to this report. Appendix A contains detailed **Indicator Definitions** for the majority of the indicators presented in the report. Appendix B contains the **Outcome Data** for each indicator over the past seven years for the State as a whole, along with breakdowns by child age, race, gender, and geographical region. Appendix C contains **Outcome Data by Sub-Region** for a selected number of indicators. The data provided in Appendices B and C are also available online via the CFRC Data Center (see Box I.2 for more information).

Each chapter also contains several features designed to aid the interpretation of the changes in child welfare system performance over time:

- Each chapter contains a summary of the indicators used to track the Department's progress in achieving positive outcomes for children and families, and the amount of change that has occurred on that indicator between the most recent two years that data are available. These summaries, titled **Changes at a Glance**, are presented near the beginning of each chapter and list each of the outcome indicators in that chapter and an icon that denotes whether the indicator has significantly increased, decreased, or remained stable during the most recent monitoring period. To create these summaries, two decisions were made: 1) What time period is of *most* interest to policy-makers and other child welfare

¹¹ Helton, J.J., & Cross, T.P. (2013). *The Well-Being of Illinois Children in Substantiated Investigations Wave 2 Report: Results from the Illinois Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being*. Urbana, IL: Children and Family Research Center.

¹² Helton, J.J., & Cross, T.P. (2012). *The Well-Being of Illinois Children in Substantiated Investigations: Baseline Results from the Illinois Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being*. Urbana, IL: Children and Family Research Center.

The CFRC Data Center

BOX 1.2

The Children and Family Research Center maintains a Data Center (cfrc.illinois.edu/datacenter.php) that is publically available and provides interested child welfare stakeholders with up-to-date information on the Illinois child welfare system. The CFRC Data Center allows users to examine many of the outcome indicators included in the *B.H.* report and to customize the information that they are interested in examining. Outcome indicators can be viewed at the state, region, sub-region, local area network (LAN), or county level, and can be further broken down by child race, age, and gender. The goal of the Data Center is to put child welfare data in the hands of the people who need it, including non-profit program managers and caseworkers, advocates, policy-makers, legislative staff, and community grant-writers who need current data to support their work. Information in the Data Center is organized into two main parts: data on **Outcome**

Indicators, which measure child welfare system performance, and **Population Data**, which provide a more global view of the children and families involved with the child welfare system in Illinois.

To demonstrate how one might navigate the **Outcome Indicators** part of the Data Center, imagine a child welfare supervisor in the Peoria sub-region is interested in looking at placement stability outcomes in her sub-region in order to devise a local quality improvement plan. She can visit the Data Center's Outcome Indicators and click on the indicator which looks at the percentage of children entering substitute care that had two or fewer placements within a year of removal. Initially, she is presented with data for the entire state population, and she can then select any subset she wishes to focus on (the Peoria sub-region or McLean County, etc.).

CHILDREN AND FAMILY | RESEARCH | CENTER

ABOUT | NEWSROOM | RESEARCH | PUBLICATIONS | DATA CENTER

[Back to Indicator List](#) | [Directions](#)

Of all children' entering substitute care and staying for at least one year, what percentage had two or fewer placements within their first year of removal? ²

Illinois Region **Sub-Region** LAN County Chicago Community

Cook North Cook Central Cook South Aurora Rockford Champaign **Peoria** Springfield East St. Louis Marion

Once she has selected the geographical subset of interest, the supervisor can then examine tables with outcomes organized by race, age group,

or gender—with results presented for the past seven years. Each table can also be saved in Word or Excel.

Cook North Cook Central Cook South Aurora Rockford Champaign **Peoria** Springfield East St. Louis Marion

All Children | Race | Age Group | Gender |

FY	Children Entering and Staying One Year	Two or Fewer Placements	
		N	%
2007	599	490	81.6%
2008	598	482	80.6%
2009	518	421	81.3%
2010	567	479	84.5%
2011	622	519	83.4%
2012	501	429	85.6%
2013	518	435	84.0%


Save table as...
Excel Word

All Children | **Race** | Age Group | Gender |

Peoria	Children Entering and Staying One Year	Two or Fewer Placements	
		N	%

In 2013, a new section of the Data Center was launched that provides child welfare **Population Data** for children and families involved in the child welfare system in Illinois, including the number of families investigated and indicated for maltreatment. Additional measures have been added to this section of the Data Center, including the percentage of

child or family indicated reports, and the percentage of indicated reports by allegation type (neglect, abuse, sexual abuse, and risk of harm). Each of these metrics can be viewed at the county level through a new interactive state map. For example, Stephenson County is shown below.



stakeholders? 2) How large must a change be to be a “significant” change?

- Improvements in administrative data now allow us to track outcomes over long periods of time—some data can be traced back decades. Many of the figures in the chapters present outcome data over a 20-year period to show long-term trends. However, when trying to determine which child welfare outcomes may be starting to improve or decline, a more recent time frame is informative. Therefore, the summaries focus on the amount of change that has occurred during the *most recent 12 month period* for which data are available on a particular indicator. Significant changes (defined below) in either direction may indicate the beginning of a new trend or may be random fluctuation, but either way it is worth attention.
- To measure the change in each indicator, we calculated the “percent change” in the following manner: the older value of the indicator was subtracted from the more recent value of the indicator (to find the relative difference), divided by the older value, and then multiplied by 100 to determine the percentage change. To illustrate this process, if the percentage of children who achieve reunification within 12 months was 16% in 2010 and 24% in 2011, the percentage change would be:

$$\frac{\text{new value} - \text{old value}}{\text{old value}} \times 100$$

OR

$$\frac{24 - 16}{16} \times 100 = 50\%$$

If the result is positive, it is a percentage increase; if negative, it is a percentage decrease. In this fictional example, the change from 2010 to 2011 represents a 50% increase in the percentage of children reunified within 12 months.

- Looking at the percentage difference (a-b/a) rather than the actual difference (a-b) allows us to compare indicators of different “sizes” using a common metric, so that differences in indicators with very small values (such as the percentage of children maltreated in substitute care) are given the same attention as those of larger magnitude.
- Determining what counts as a “significant” amount of change in one year is subjective. In the current report, increases or decreases of 5% or more were noted as significant. Changes of this magnitude are pictured with an upward or downward arrow, while changes of less than 5% are pictured with an equal sign and described with the term “remained stable.” Please note that the phrase “remained stable” does not mean that the indicator did not change at all, only that the percent change was less than 5% in either direction. In addition, though the word “significant” is used to describe the percentage changes, this does not mean that tests of statistical significance were completed; it merely suggests that the amount of change is noteworthy.
- Chapters also contain “**heat maps**” to visually depict sub-regional performance. To create the heat map, the findings pertaining to the relevant indicator are compared to one another and ranked. The sub-regions and years in the top 25th percentile—those with the **best performance** in the selected indicator—are shown in the lightest shade. Those sub-regions and years in the bottom 25th percentile—those with the **worst performance** on this indicator—are shown in the darkest shade. Those that performed in the middle—between the 26th and 74th percentiles are shown in the medium shade. Each heat map provides a simple way to compare sub-regional performance over time and across the state. It is important to note that these “rankings” are relative only to performance among the ten sub-regions over the seven year time span depicted; they do

not relate to any national or state benchmarks. Readers are cautioned that even though it may appear that a given sub-region may be performing well when compared to other sub-regions in the state, this does not necessarily mean that its performance should be considered “good” or “excellent” compared to a standard or benchmark.

Careful thought goes into the selection of the indicators that are used to monitor system performance in the *B.H.* reports, and we strive to keep the indicators as consistent as possible from year to year so that any changes in the numbers or percentages reported in the chapters and appendices signify actual changes in performance. However, occasionally it is necessary to make changes to how certain indicators are measured, either because the administrative data used in the analysis has changed or because the child welfare system has changed. Based on such necessities, please note these small modifications that have been made to several indicators in the past two years:

- In previous versions of the *B.H.* report, the indicator for maltreatment in substitute care excluded substantiated reports of sexual abuse that occurred during placement. The exclusion of sexual abuse reports was instituted because a study conducted by CFRC found that about 16% of the sexual abuse reported while children were in substitute care actually occurred *prior* to entry into care (i.e., while they were living at home). Because the administrative database does not include an “incident date,” it is impossible to eliminate these prior occurrences from the measure. After discussion with the *B.H.* parties, the decision was made to include indicated sexual abuse reports in the measure for maltreatment in substitute care (see Chapter 2 for additional information).
- In March 2013, the Illinois Supreme Court issued a ruling in the case of *Julie Q. v. Department of Children and Family Services* (2013 IL 113783), holding that the Department exceeded its statutory authority by adding an allegation of neglect to its allegation system that included the

term “environment injurious” to a child’s health and welfare; more specifically, when it added Allegation 60—Substantial Risk of Physical Injury/Environment Injurious to Health and Welfare—to its allegation system in October 2001. Although the Illinois legislature reinserted language into the Abuse and Neglect Child Reporting Act (ANCRA) in July 2012 that included the “environment injurious” definition of neglect, the *Julie Q.* ruling still impacts the data in a number of ways. First, individuals who were indicated for Allegation 60 prior to July 13, 2012, were to be removed from the State Central Register and SACWIS, and the indicated findings were changed to unfounded. This lowers the number of indicated reports that appear in the administrative data, primarily during 2002 – 2012. This, in turn, affects all indicators in the *B.H.* report that include the number of children with indicated maltreatment reports, including Indicators 1.A, 1.B, 1.C, and 2.A. To remain as consistent as possible with previous reports, we used a version of the administrative data that included indicated reports of Allegation 60. Please see Appendix D for more information on how the *Julie Q.* ruling affects the indicators.

- A number of substitute care providers were missing their unique provider ID number during FY2012 and 2013, which affected the placement stability indicator in Chapter 2 (calculated by counting the number of different providers a child has over a given period of time). Because a large number of providers were missing their unique provider ID, a new provider ID was constructed using a combination of data from different sources, and the indicators were re-calculated for each fiscal year. The results in this report for the placement stability indicator (Indicator 2.H) will therefore be different from those presented in reports prior to 2012.
- Due to missing data, the prior *B.H.* report excluded data on children in independent living from several indicators in Chapter 3. Since the data for

these children was included in the FY2014 administrative data files, they are once again included in the analyses.

Future Efforts to Monitor Child Welfare Outcomes in Illinois

There is no question that the Illinois child welfare system looks quite different than the system described in the *B.H.* lawsuit, when basic needs of children were not being met. In FY1998, there were over 50,000 children in substitute care. Once in care, children languished with a median length of stay in excess of 44 months. Through the use of innovative reforms such as subsidized guardianship, performance based contracting, and structured safety assessment, Illinois safely and effectively reduced the number of children in care from 51,596 in FY1997 to 15,138 at the end of FY2014,¹³ and the median length of stay for children in substitute care is now 30 months.

Despite the impressive results of the past, the child welfare landscape in Illinois continues to evolve at a fast pace, and there are mounting concerns about performance on certain indicators. Although Illinois now has one of the lowest foster care entry rates in the nation, there is still a shortage of appropriate placements to meet the needs of children removed from their homes and placed into substitute care. This concern has been noted in previous *B.H.* reports and may be related to the Department's declining performance on several indicators over the most recent years, including the percentage of children placed close to home, the percentage of children placed with all of their siblings in care, and the percentage of children initially placed in congregate care settings. The *B.H.* plaintiff attorneys recently filed an emergency motion to enforce the consent decree, arguing that "severe shortages of necessary services and placements for children have risen to crisis proportions."¹⁴ Concerns relating to the safety of substitute care placements have also been noted by both the *B.H.* plaintiff and defendant attorneys after several years of declining performance on indicators contained in this monitoring report. The Children and Family Research

Center is conducting additional analyses related to maltreatment in substitute care; the results of these analyses will be provided to the *B.H.* attorneys, DCFS administrators, and eventually, the general public on our website, so that potential changes to practice and policy can be developed to address this concern.


The indicators and outcomes included in the *B.H.* report will also continue to evolve. The State's data management systems are becoming increasingly sophisticated, which will enable CFRC to expand the ways in which child safety and permanence are measured and tracked over time. The ending of the Illinois Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being leaves a gap in data that CFRC has to examine the well-being of children who are in or at risk of substitute care in Illinois. Additional sources of existing data on child well-being should be explored so that these important outcomes can continue to be tracked.

Our hope is that the *B.H.* report both serves its intended purpose of informing the *B.H.* parties on the performance of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, and that also it provides other child welfare stakeholders within the State with information that is useful to them and encourages further discussion on how to improve outcomes for children and families. We welcome feedback on the report, as well as suggestions for additional areas of study.¹⁵

¹³ The number of children in care at the end of FY2014 was taken from the DCFS FY2016 Budget Briefing, available online at: http://www.illinois.gov/dcf/aboutus/newsandreports/Documents/FY16_BudgetBriefing.pdf

¹⁴ *B.H. et al. v. Tate*. Plaintiffs' Emergency Motion to Enforce Consent Decree, No 88-cv- 5599 (N.D. Ill., 2015).

¹⁵ Contact information for the Children and Family Research Center can be found on the Acknowledgements page.



CHAPTER 1

Child Safety

1

Child safety is the paramount concern of the child protection and welfare systems. According to the most recent federal child welfare monitoring report, “Public child welfare agencies are responsible for ensuring that children who have been found to be victims of abuse or neglect are protected from further harm. Whether the child is placed in out-of-home care or maintained in the home, the child welfare agency’s first concern must be to ensure the safety of the child” (p. 5).¹ Once a child becomes involved in a substantiated report of child abuse or neglect, the child welfare system assumes partial responsibility for the safety and protection of the child from additional abuse or neglect.

Measuring Child Safety

In some ways, child safety is the most straightforward of all child welfare outcomes – safety is the *absence* of child maltreatment. Even so, there are many different ways to measure child safety, which can lead to inconsistencies in reporting and confusion when comparing or interpreting results. With that in mind, it is important to clearly describe the way child safety is measured in this chapter (see Appendix A for detailed descriptions of the indicators used in this report).

Maltreatment recurrence is the most common indicator used to assess child safety within the context of public child welfare. Typically, recurrence is defined as a substantiated² maltreatment report following a prior substantiated report that involves the same child or family. Other measures, called re-referrals or re-reports, take a broader view and include all subsequent reports following an initial report, regardless of whether the subsequent report was substantiated. Although recognizing the importance of all future contacts with child welfare, the current report uses the more common indicator of maltreatment recurrence that measures only additional substantiated maltreatment reports.

Indicators of maltreatment recurrence also vary widely in the length of time over which recurrence is monitored. Studies of safety assessment focusing on the immediate safety of children during the investigation typically use short recurrence follow-up periods, such as *60 days or less*. The federal recurrence measure used in the Child and Family Services Review examines maltreatment recurrence within the *6 months* following an initial substantiated report. Some recurrence studies track families for *several years* to observe if they are re-reported following an initial report.³ A large amount of

¹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Children and Families, Children’s Bureau. (2014). *Child Welfare Outcomes 2009 – 2012: Report to Congress*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare Information Gateway.

² In Illinois, maltreatment reports are indicated or unfounded, rather than substantiated or unsubstantiated. Within this report, the terms indicated and substantiated are used interchangeably.

³ For example, Drake, B., Jonson-Reid, M., Way, I., & Chung, S. (2003). Substantiation and recidivism. *Child Maltreatment*, 8, 248–260. Bae, H., Solomon, P.L., Gelles, R.J., & White, T. (2010). Effect of child protective services system factors on child maltreatment. *Child Welfare*, 89, 33–56.

Changes in Safety at a Glance

Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children with Substantiated Reports

- = Of all children with a substantiated report, the percentage that had another substantiated report within 12 months remained stable and was 11.3% of children with an initial substantiated report in 2013.

Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children Served in Intact Family Cases

- ↑ Of all children served at home in intact family cases, the percentage that had another substantiated report within 12 months increased from 10.0% of children with an initial substantiated report in 2012 to 12.1% of children with an initial substantiated report in 2013 (+21% increase).

Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children Who Do Not Receive Services

- = Of all children with an initial substantiated report who did not receive services, the percentage that had another substantiated report within 12 months remained stable and was 11.2% of children with an initial substantiated report in 2013.

research now confirms that once a family is reported to Child Protective Services (CPS), their risk of a subsequent report is greatest within the first few months of the first report and decreases over time.⁴ The current report uses a 12-month recurrence period for the safety indicators, which allows us to capture the period of greatest risk for maltreatment recurrence among families with an initial report.⁵

The final consideration when selecting indicators of child safety is the population to be monitored. In Illinois, the mandate for ensuring child safety extends to all children investigated by the Department, regardless of whether post-investigation services are offered. Not all families – even those in which maltreatment is substantiated – receive post-investigation services. Figure 1.1 shows the service dispositions of children with substantiated reports each year from 2008 to 2014. As shown, a majority do not receive any post-investigation services; the percentage of children that did not receive

services after a substantiated maltreatment report increased from 60% in 2008 to 69% in 2013, but then declined to 66% in 2014. After declining for several consecutive years, the percentage of children with substantiated maltreatment reports served at home in what are known as “intact family cases” increased to 21% in 2014 – up from 17% in the previous year.⁶ About 13-14% of children with substantiated maltreatment are served in substitute care – a percentage that has remained steady across the past seven years.⁷

The relationship between post-investigation service provision and risk of maltreatment recurrence is complex. Many studies have found that families who receive child welfare services are at higher risk of maltreatment recurrence than those who are not provided with services, which seems counter-intuitive, since services are provided to reduce family risk factors and decrease future maltreatment. The relationship between child welfare service provision and increased recurrence

⁴Fluke, J.D., Shusterman, G.R., Hollinshead, D.M., & Yuan, Y.T. (2008). Longitudinal analysis of repeated child abuse reporting and victimization: Multistate analysis of associated factors. *Child Maltreatment*, 13, 76-88. Lipien, L., & Forthofer, M.S. (2004). An event history analysis of recurrent child maltreatment in Florida. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28, 947-966. Zhang, S., Fuller, T., & Nieto, M. (2013). Didn't we just see you? Time to recurrence among frequently encountered families in CPS. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 35, 883-889.

⁵Because a one-year observation period is used to track maltreatment recurrence, the figures and appendix tables for this chapter appear to end in 2013 rather than 2014. This is misleading because, although the initial report occurred during 2013, the 12-month observation period extends through June 30, 2014.

⁶This percentage includes those children with substantiated reports that occurred while the child was already being served in an intact family case as well as children served in an intact family case within 60 days of the substantiated report.

⁷This percentage includes those children with substantiated reports that occurred while the child was in substitute care as well as children placed in substitute care within 60 days of a substantiated report.

Figure 1.1
Service Dispositions Among Children with Substantiated Reports





Figure 1.2
12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children with Substantiated Reports



has been attributed to both increased surveillance by caseworkers and to the fact that families who receive services typically have more risk factors than families not recommended for services. Monitoring overall maltreatment recurrence rates without regard to service disposition ignores the fact that children served in one setting may be more or less safe than those served in another. In this chapter, separate indicators therefore examine maltreatment recurrence among 1) all children with substantiated reports; 2) substantiated children served in intact family cases; and 3) substantiated children with no post-investigation service case (see Appendix B, Indicators 1.A, 1.B, and 1.C, respectively). Maltreatment that occurred while children were in substitute care placements is analyzed in Chapter 2.

Maltreatment Recurrence among Children with Substantiated Reports

Figure 1.2 displays the 12-month maltreatment recurrence rate for all children with a substantiated maltreatment report over the past 20 years (see Appendix B, Indicator 1.A). Recurrence rates were

highest in 1994 and then began a steady decline until 2002, when the rate leveled at around 11.5% for the next 6 years. In 2009, recurrence rates decreased slightly to 11.1% and have remained at around that level through the most recent year.

A fair amount of research has examined the child, family, and case characteristics that are related to maltreatment recurrence. This research points to child age as an important predictor of recurrence – younger children are much more likely to experience maltreatment recurrence than older children.⁸ This is also true in Illinois: maltreatment recurrence rates are highest among children 0 – 8 years and decrease as child age increases. Although the rate of maltreatment recurrence is lowest among adolescents 15 years and older, the rate in this age group has increased over the past 3 years from 7.2% to 9.0% (see Figure 1.3 and Appendix B, Indicator 1.A).

Prior to 2012, there were consistent differences in the maltreatment recurrence rates among children of different races, with Hispanic children having the

⁸Bae, H., Solomon, P.L., & Gelles, R.J. (2009). Multiple child maltreatment recurrence relative to single recurrence and no recurrence. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31, 617-624. Connell C.M., Bergeron, N., Katz, K.H., Saunders, L., & Tebes, J.K. (2007). Re-referral to child protective services: The influence of child, family, and case characteristics on risk status. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 31, 573-588. Kahn, J.M., & Schwalbe, C. (2010). The timing to and risk factors associated with child welfare system recidivism at two decision-making points. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 32, 1035-1044. Fluke, J.D., Shusterman, G.R., Hollinshead, D.M., & Yuan, Y.T. (2008). Longitudinal analysis of repeated child abuse reporting and victimization: Multistate analysis of associated factors. *Child Maltreatment*, 13, 76-88.

Figure 1.3
12-Month Maltreatment
Recurrence by Age





Figure 1.4
12-Month Maltreatment
Recurrence by Race



lowest rate, followed by African American children and then White children (see Figure 1.4 and Appendix B, Indicator 1.A). However, there was an increase in maltreatment recurrence among African American children in the most recent year, and they now have the highest maltreatment recurrence rates of the three groups (Hispanic children = 7.9%, White children = 11.6%, African American children = 12.2%).

Previous *B.H.* monitoring reports have noted consistent differences in maltreatment recurrence rates by region, with lower recurrence rates in the Cook and Northern regions compared to the Central and Southern regions. These differences persist: of the children with substantiated reports in FY2013, recurrence rates were lowest in the Northern region (9.2%) and Cook region (9.5%), and higher in the Central region (12.8%) and Southern region (15.5%; see Appendix B, Indicator 1.A). To gain a more complete picture of these regional differences, Figure 1.5 displays a sub-regional “heat map” showing 12-month maltreatment recurrence rates among all children with a substantiated report (see Appendix C, Indicator 1.A

for corresponding data). To create the heat map, recurrence rates in each sub-region of Illinois for each year in the 7-year period were compared to one another and ranked. The sub-regions and years in the top 25th percentile – those with the **best performance** on this indicator – are shown in the lightest shade. Those sub-regions and years in the bottom 25th percentile – those with the **worst performance** on this indicator – are shown in the darkest shade. Those that performed in the middle – between the 26th and 74th percentiles – are shown in the medium shade. The heat map therefore provides a visually simple way to compare a large amount of information on sub-regional performance both over time and across the state. It is possible to tell reasonably quickly if a region or sub-region is doing well (relative to the other regions in the state over the past 7 years) by looking for the areas with the lightest shade. It is important to note that these “rankings” are relative only to the performance within the ten sub-regions over the 7-year timespan and not to any national or state benchmarks. Thus, even though a given sub-region may be performing “well” compared to other sub-regions in the state (as indicated by a light

Figure 1.5
12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence
Sub-region Heat Map

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Cook North							
Cook Central							
Cook South							
Aurora							
Rockford							
Champaign							
Peoria							
Springfield							
East St. Louis							
Marion							


shade on the heat map), this does not necessarily mean that its performance should be considered “good” or “excellent” compared to a standard or benchmark.

Examination of Figure 1.5 reveals that the highest recurrence rates in the state are in the Marion and Springfield sub-regions, and that performance in these two sub-regions is consistently poor throughout the 7-year observation period. Conversely, the lowest recurrence rates are in the Cook Central region and more recently in the Cook North and Aurora sub-regions.

Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children in Intact Family Cases

In some instances, the Department will indicate a child for maltreatment, but decide that it is in the best interest of the child and family to receive services at home rather than place the child into substitute care. Families in these cases, known as “intact family cases,” are of special interest to the Department because their history of substantiated maltreatment places them at increased risk of repeat maltreatment

Figure 1.6
12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence
Among Children Served in Intact Families



compared to families with no history of maltreatment. Figure 1.6 displays the 12-month recurrence rates for children served in intact family cases (see Appendix B, Indicator 1.B).

Similar to overall recurrence, recurrence among children served in intact families peaked at 17.5% in 1994. Rates then declined, first sharply and then more gradually, over the next several years, before reaching their lowest point (9.2%) in 2002. Rates of maltreatment recurrence among children in intact families have fluctuated since then, climbing from 9.2% in 2002 to 11.5% in 2010, then declining to 10.0% in 2012, and finally increasing again to 12.1% in 2013.

The relationships of child age and race/ethnicity to recurrence among children served in intact families are similar to those for overall maltreatment recurrence (see Appendix B, Indicator 1.B). Recurrence is much more likely to occur among younger children – children under three years old served in intact families are over three times more likely to experience recurrence than those 15 years and older.

Figure 1.7
12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence
Among Children Served in Intact
Families by Age




Figure 1.8
12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence
Among Children Served in Intact
Families by Race




Figure 1.8 displays the 12-month maltreatment recurrence rates for children served in intact families by race. White children served in intact families are much more likely to experience repeat maltreatment than African American and Hispanic children (see Appendix B, Indicator 1.B).

When recurrence in intact families is examined at the sub-region level (see Appendix C, Indicator 1.B), several trends are apparent (Figure 1.9). Once again, recurrence rates are generally lower in the Cook sub-regions (lighter shade) and highest in the Marion sub-region (darker shade). Maltreatment recurrence rates among intact families worsened in all of the sub-regions in the most recent year, which is a cause for concern (see Appendix C, Indicator 1.B).

Figure 1.9
12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence
Among Children Served in Intact Families
Sub-region Heat Map

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Cook North							
Cook Central							
Cook South							
Aurora							
Rockford							
Champaign							
Peoria							
Springfield							
East St. Louis							
Marion							

Maltreatment Recurrence Among Substantiated Children Who Do Not Receive Services

Two thirds (66%) of the children who had substantiated reports of maltreatment in 2014 did not receive any post-investigation child welfare services (see Figure 1.1). Figure 1.10 displays the 12-month maltreatment recurrence rates for children with a substantiated report that did not receive services (either intact family or substitute care) following the investigation (i.e., the case was substantiated and closed; see Appendix B, Indicator 1.C). The trend is very similar to that for overall maltreatment recurrence: the peak in 1994 was followed by a decrease until around 2002, and then a relatively stable pattern from 2002 until present.

Figure 1.10
12-Month Maltreatment Recurrence
Among Substantiated Children Who
Do Not Receive Services





Figure 1.11 compares the 12-month maltreatment recurrence rates between substantiated children served in intact family cases and substantiated children who received no post-investigation services. Until around 2006, children served in intact families were slightly to moderately safer (that is, less likely to experience

maltreatment recurrence) than those not provided services. However, because recurrence rates among children provided with intact family services increased after 2002 while those among children not provided with services remained level, the recurrence rates of the two groups have become very similar.

Figure 1.11
Comparison of Maltreatment Recurrence
Among Children Served in Intact Family Cases
and Children Who Do Not Receive Services



Discussion and Conclusions: Child Safety

When examining child safety, the true litmus test of child welfare system performance is how well it protects children from additional maltreatment *after* they become known to the system. The primary indicator used in this report to assess the Department's performance in this area is the rate of maltreatment recurrence, measured as the occurrence of a second substantiated report within 12 months of an initial substantiated report. Illinois experienced a rapid decline in maltreatment recurrence in the late 1990s, following the implementation of a structured safety assessment protocol known as the Child Endangerment

Risk Assessment Protocol (CERAP). However, the past decade has seen little reduction in the statewide rate of recurrence, which has remained around 11%.

One of the most complex decisions a CPS worker makes is whether or not to provide ongoing child welfare services to a family following a substantiated investigation. In order to make this decision, CPS workers must weigh multiple factors at once, such as the immediate safety threats in the household, the long-term risk factors, the protective capacities and supports of the parents, the availability of services in the community, and the parents' ability to utilize services. Informal and formal agency policies regarding which families should receive services also influence CPS worker decision-making. In Illinois, widespread budget cuts among state agencies in FY2013 resulted in a policy change at DCFS regarding the eligibility criteria for intact family services. According to this policy change, which was made effective on August 15, 2012, intact family services were available only to those families involved in an indicated maltreatment investigation that met one or more of the following criteria at the time of case opening: the child involved in the investigation was 6 years or younger; the parent was a former ward of the Department; the family had been investigated at least 6 times in the past; there was an indicated report involving any member of the household in the past 6 months; or an indicated paramour was involved with the family.⁹ As a result of this policy change, the number of children with an indicated maltreatment report that were provided with intact family services declined from 5,561 in FY2012 to 4,691 in FY2013. In addition to the restricting intact family services to those families with the highest risk for maltreatment recurrence, the revised policy shortened the length of time that families could receive services to a maximum of 5 – 7 months. Although riskier families were being served for shorter periods of time, the services themselves were the same.

Although we cannot specifically attribute the changes in maltreatment recurrence rates among children served in intact family cases to the policy changes that

occurred in FY2013, recurrence rates in this group did increase from 10% in FY2012 to 12.1% in FY2013. The eligibility restrictions regarding intact family service provision outlined in the August 2012 policy transmittal were lifted several months later, and the number of children with indicated maltreatment served in intact family cases increased from 4,691 in FY2013 to 6,355 in FY2014. Continued monitoring of maltreatment recurrence among children and families that do and do not receive post-investigation services will allow us to observe what impact – if any – the policy change *may have* had on child safety. However, monitoring alone will not allow us to determine the effectiveness of intact family services in reducing maltreatment recurrence. In order to do that, more rigorous data about the services that were provided and the families that they were provided needs to be collected and analyzed.

⁹ Department of Children and Family Services (August 3, 2012). Action transmittal 2012.06.



CHAPTER 2

Children in Substitute Care: Safety, Continuity, and Stability

Children should only be removed from their parents and placed in substitute care when it is necessary to ensure their safety and well-being. Once removed from their homes, the public child welfare system and its private agency partners have a responsibility to provide children with living arrangements that ensure that they are safe from additional harm, maintain connections with their family members (including other siblings in care) and community, and provide stability. In addition, substitute care should be a temporary solution and children should live in substitute care settings for the shortest period necessary to ameliorate the issues which brought them into care. This chapter examines how well the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services performs in providing substitute care living arrangements that meet these standards. It is organized into four sections: 1) Child Safety in Substitute Care, 2) Continuity with Family and Community, 3) Placement Stability, and 4) Length of Time in Substitute Care.

Measuring the Quality of Substitute Care

This chapter employs several indicators to measure the quality of the substitute care placements of Illinois children. These indicators are described in the following sections and technical definitions are provided in

Appendix A. The chapter examines both initial placements and placements at the end of the year for several indicators (placement restrictiveness, placement with siblings, and placement close to home). It is important to keep in mind that the children in these two samples are not the same: “initial placement” includes children who entered care within a given fiscal year (counting each entry once and only once). Since children who enter and stay only a few months have the same weight as children who enter and stay for years, initial placement samples overrepresent children who are in care for a short period of time. The “end of year placement” sample includes all children in care on the last day of the fiscal year (June 30). Children who are in care for several years are counted in several “end of year” samples, while children who enter after June 30th and exit before June 30th of the following year are not counted at all. Thus, end of year samples overrepresent children who have been in care for a long time. The other indicators examined in this chapter (safety, placement stability, and length of time in care) do not differentiate between initial and end of year placements.

As in the other chapters of this report, performance on each indicator is examined by child gender, age, race, and geographic region, and noteworthy differences in performance are presented in the chapter. In addition, placement

Changes in the Conditions of Children in Substitute Care at a Glance

Child Safety in Substitute Care

- ↑ Of all children placed in substitute care during the year, the percentage that had a substantiated report during placement increased from 1.9% in 2013 to 2.1% in 2014 (+11% change).

Restrictiveness of Initial Placement Settings

- = Of all children entering substitute care, the percentage initially placed into a traditional foster home remained stable and was 25.5% in 2014.
- = Of all children entering substitute care, the percentage initially placed into a kinship foster home remained stable and was 54.1% in 2014.
- = Of all children entering substitute care, the percentage initially placed into a specialized foster home remained stable and was 2.6% in 2014.
- ↓ Of all children entering substitute care, the percentage initially placed into an institution or group home decreased from 18.2% in 2013 to 16.8% in 2014 (-8% change).

Restrictiveness of End of Year Placement Settings

- = Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, the percentage placed in a traditional foster home remained stable and was 26.5% in 2014.
- = Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, the percentage placed in a kinship foster home remained stable and was 39.8% in 2014.
- = Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, the percentage placed in a specialized foster home remained stable and was 16.0% in 2014.
- = Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, the percentage placed in an institution or group home remained stable and was 10.4% in 2014.

- = Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, the percentage placed in independent living remained stable and was 7.3% in 2014.

Placement with Siblings

Of all children entering substitute care, the percentage that was initially placed in the same foster home with all their siblings in care:

For children with one or two siblings in care:

- ↓ Decreased for children initially placed in traditional foster homes from 66.6% in 2013 to 61.1% in 2014 (-8% change).
- = Remained stable for children initially placed in kinship foster homes and was 81.6% in 2014.

For children with 3 or more siblings in care:

- ↑ Increased for children initially placed in traditional foster homes from 1.8% in 2013 to 5.4% in 2014 (+200% change).
- ↑ Increased for children initially placed in kinship foster homes from 54.0% in 2013 to 57.8% in 2014 (+7% change).

Of all children living in substitute care at the end of the year, the percentage that was placed in the same foster home with all their siblings in care:

For children with one or two siblings in care:

- = Remained stable for children in traditional foster homes and was 55.4% in 2014.
- = Remained stable for children in kinship foster homes and was 71.9% in 2014.

For children with 3 or more siblings in care:

- ↓ Decreased for children in traditional foster homes from 12.0% in 2013 to 11.1% in 2014 (-8% change).
- ↓ Decreased for children in kinship foster homes from 37.7% in 2013 to 33.6% in 2014 (-11% change).

Changes in the Conditions of Children in Substitute Care at a Glance CONT'D

Placement Close to Home

- ↑ Of all children entering substitute care, the median distance from their home of origin to their initial placement increased from 10.1 miles in 2013 to 10.6 miles in 2014 (+5% change).
- = Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, the median distance from their home of origin to their placement at the end of year remained stable and was 10.6 miles in 2014.

Stability in Substitute Care

- = Of all children entering substitute care and staying at least one year, the percentage that had two or fewer placements during their first year in care remained stable and was 79.1% of children who entered care in 2013.

Children Who Run Away From Substitute Care

- ↓ Of all children entering substitute care between the ages of 12 and 17 years, the percentage that ran away from a placement within one year of entry decreased from 23.6% in 2013 to 19.3% in 2014 (-18% change).

Length of Stay in Substitute Care

- = Of all children entering substitute care, the median length of stay in substitute care remained stable and was 30 months for children who entered care in 2011.


setting has a significant impact on many aspects of a child's stay in substitute care, and is therefore examined in relation to several of the indicators in this chapter (see Box 2.1 for definitions of the placement types used in Illinois).

Child Safety in Substitute Care

Children in substitute care should be safe from maltreatment. This section examines the percentage of children in substitute care who had a substantiated report during their placement. Two things are important to keep in mind when interpreting the results based on this indicator. First, the indicator includes substantiated child maltreatment reports from any perpetrators that occur while children are in substitute care, unlike the federal outcome measure for maltreatment in foster care, which only includes maltreatment perpetrated by a foster parent or facility staff member. Second, the indicator includes substantiated reports of sexual abuse that are reported during placement.¹ Figure 2.1 shows the percentage of children that experienced a substantiated maltreatment report while in substitute care placement each year from 1995 through 2014. Rates of maltreatment in substitute care were at their

highest (3.1%) in the mid-1990s, declined fairly consistently through 1998, and then remained relatively level until 2006. Since 2006, the percentage of children maltreated while in care has increased from 1.4% to 2.1% in 2014, which is the highest this rate has been since 1997.

Figure 2.1
Children Maltreated in Substitute Care



¹ Monitoring reports prior to FY2014 excluded substantiated reports of sexual abuse from this indicator.

Placement Type Terminology

BOX 2.1

Children in substitute care live in a number of different settings. At the simplest level of distinction, substitute care placement types can be categorized into those that can be considered “foster homes” versus “congregate care” settings. The former category includes placements where a child lives with a foster parent in their home, and includes kinship foster homes, traditional foster homes, and specialized or treatment foster homes.

Kinship foster care involves placement of children with relatives in the relatives’ homes. Relatives are the preferred placement for children who must be removed from their birth parents, as this kind of placement maintains the children’s connections with their families. In Illinois, kinship care providers may be licensed or unlicensed.

Traditional foster care involves placement of children with non-relatives in the non-relatives’ homes. These traditional foster parents have been trained, assessed, and licensed to provide shelter and care.

Specialized foster care (also called treatment or therapeutic foster care) involves placement of children with foster families who have been specially trained to care for children with certain medical or behavioral needs. Examples include medically fragile children, children with emotional or behavioral disorders, and HIV+ children. Treatment foster care programs generally require more training for foster parents, provide more support for children and caregivers than regular family foster care, and have lower limits on the number of children that can be cared for in the home.

While it is preferred that children in substitute care live in family settings, some children have physical or behavioral needs that require placement in a congregate care facility – a non-family setting where a group of children receive specialized care and treatment. Many states, including Illinois, use the term **group home** to refer to a non-family, community-based residence that houses more children than are permitted to reside in a foster

family home, but fewer than reside in a residential treatment center (in Illinois, the number of children in a group home is limited to 10 or fewer). Group homes are operated by professional staff who work in rotating shifts.

All other congregate care settings are combined in the current chapter into a broad category called **“institutions.”** This broad category includes a variety of congregate care placements such as residential treatment centers, detention centers, hospitals and other health facilities, and emergency shelters. Since the number of children placed in group homes is relatively small, these children are sometimes combined with those in other congregate care settings in several of the analyses in this chapter. In these instances, the combined term “Institution/ Group Home” is used.

Independent living and **transitional living programs** are distinct from substitute care placements. According to DCFS policy guides, independent living services are defined as “casework and other supportive services provided by a licensed child welfare agency...to eligible youth who will be living in an apartment in the community and are intended to prepare the youth for transition to adulthood and self-sufficiency” and transitional living services are defined as “caseworker and other supportive services to assist eligible youth to complete their secondary education (high school graduation or achievement of a GED), to assist a youth to develop basic self-sufficiency skills, and to prepare the youth for an independent living program.”²

² Retrieved from <http://dcfswebresource.dcfs.illinois.gov/definitions/>

There are no notable differences in maltreatment in substitute care when this indicator is examined by gender, but rates differ by child age. As with other indicators of maltreatment reoccurrence, younger children are more vulnerable and children 15 and older are less likely to have a substantiated report of maltreatment while in care (see Figure 2.2 and Appendix B, Indicator 2.A). For example, in 2014, 1.7% of children under 3 years and 2.8% of children 3 to 8 years were maltreated in care, compared to 1.0% of those 15 years and older. Rates of maltreatment in care have increased over the past seven years for every age group except for children under age 3, which is about the same as it was seven years ago.

Figure 2.2
Children Maltreated in Substitute Care by Age





Figure 2.3 presents the rates of maltreatment in care by placement type. In almost every year, maltreatment was most likely to occur in kinship foster homes and least likely to occur in congregate care settings (e.g., institutions and group homes). However, in 2014, the rate of maltreatment in congregate care settings was equal to the rate in kinship foster homes, because the percentage of children maltreated in congregate care settings increased substantially in the past 3 years, from 0.7% in 2011 to 2.6% in 2014.

Figure 2.3
Children Maltreated in Substitute Care by Placement Type



Maltreatment rates in substitute care vary by region of the state, with the Cook region consistently having lower rates of maltreatment in care (see Appendix B, Indicator 2.A). There is even more variability in maltreatment rates at the sub-region level, as shown in the heat map in Figure 2.4 (see Appendix C, Indicator 2.A).³ To create the heat map, maltreatment rates in each sub-region in Illinois between 2008 and 2014 were compared to one another and ranked. The sub-regions and years in the top 25th percentile – those with the **best performance** on this indicator – are shown in the lightest shade. Those sub-regions and years in the bottom 25th percentile – those with the **worst performance** on this indicator – are shown in the darkest shade. Those that performed in the middle – between the 26th and 74th percentiles – are shown in the medium shade. The heat map therefore provides a visually simple way to compare a large amount of information on sub-regional performance both over time and across the state. It is possible to tell reasonably quickly if a region or sub-region is doing well (relative to the other sub-regions in the state over the past 7 years) by looking for the areas

³ The region of placement is determined by the region of the agency supervising the case.

in the lightest shade. It is important to note that these “rankings” are relative only to the performance within the ten sub-regions over the seven year time span and not to any national or state benchmarks. Thus, even though a given sub-region may be performing “well” compared to other sub-regions in the state (as indicated by a light shade on the heat map), this does not necessarily mean that its performance should be considered “good” or “excellent” compared to a standard or benchmark. Figure 2.4 shows the lower rates of maltreatment in care in the Cook North and Cook Central sub-regions (lighter shades) and the higher rates of maltreatment in substitute care in the Rockford, Champaign, and Marion sub-regions (darker shade).

Figure 2.4
Children Maltreated in Substitute Care
Sub-region Heat Map

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Cook North							
Cook Central							
Cook South							
Aurora							
Rockford							
Champaign							
Peoria							
Springfield							
East St. Louis							
Marion							

Continuity with Family and Community Restrictiveness of Placement Settings

When it is in the best interest of a child to be placed in substitute care, it is both federal and state policy to place children in the least restrictive, most family-like setting possible. The Adoption Assistance and Child

Welfare Act of 1980 required states “to place a child in the least restrictive and most family-like setting that will meet the needs of the child.”⁴ In 1996, Congress required states to include in their Title IV-E state plans a provision that indicated the state shall consider giving preference to an adult relative over a non-related caregiver when determining a placement for a child, provided that the relative caregiver meets all relevant child protection standards.

One advantage of the least restrictive family-like setting is that it increases bonding capital. Bonding capital refers to strong social ties that exist between people who share a key attribute such as family, friendship, church membership, residence, and so forth. At the individual level, bonding capital is measured as a person’s primary source of social support.⁵ One advantage of placement with kin is that it builds on a child’s existing bonding capital. However, research finds that children in traditional foster care eventually develop bonds with foster parents comparable to those who are placed with kin.⁶

Placement restrictiveness is examined in two different groups of children: 1) initial placements of children entering care in a given year and 2) children in care at the end of the year. The first indicator (initial placements) overrepresents children who are in care a short period of time, but provides important information about initial placements, which can influence a child’s trajectory through substitute care. The second indicator (end of year placements) overrepresents children who have been in care a long time, but provides a better sense of the overall population of children in care than initial placements. Figures for the two indicators are presented side by side so readers can compare the patterns for initial and end of year placements.

Initial placement types for children entering care during fiscal years 2008 through 2014 are shown in Figure 2.5.⁷ Most children entering care are initially placed in a kinship foster home, and that percentage has increased from 49.9% in 2008 to a high of 54.1% in 2014 (Appendix B, Indicator 2.B.3). The percentage of children


⁴ Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980, Pub. L. 96-272.

⁵ Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

⁶ Testa, M., Bruhn, C.M. & Helton, J. (2010). Comparative safety, stability, and continuity of children’s placements in formal and informal substitute care. In M.B. Webb, et al., *Child Welfare and Child Well-being: New Perspectives from the National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-being*, (pp. 159-191). New York: Oxford.

⁷ Only children who remain in substitute care for 7 days or longer are included in these analyses, i.e., children with very short stays (6 days or less) are excluded.


Figure 2.5
Initial Placement Types



initially placed in traditional foster homes has decreased, from 30.3% in 2008 to 25.5% in 2014 (Appendix B, Indicator 2.B.1). The percentage of children initially placed in specialized foster homes is very small compared to other types of placements, and was 2.6% in 2014 (Appendix B, Indicator 2.B.2). The percentage of children with an initial placement in congregate care settings (group homes and institutions) had been increasing – from 16.5% in 2008 to 20.7% in 2012 – but has since decreased to 16.8% in 2014 (Appendix B, Indicator 2.B.4). Initial placement in a congregate care setting can occur for a variety of reasons: some children are placed in shelters and other congregate care settings because no other suitable placement can be found, and some children are placed in residential centers based on an assessment of their physical, emotional, and mental health needs. However, the fact that 28% of these initial placements in institutions and group homes last less than one week suggests that they are being used as temporary placements fairly frequently. Additional analysis of initial placements into congregate care settings is provided in Box 2.2.

Among children in substitute care at the end of the year (Figure 2.6), the percentage of children in kinship foster homes has slightly increased from

Figure 2.6
End of Year Placement Types



36.2% in 2008 to 39.8% in 2014 (Appendix B, Indicator 2.C.3). The percentage of children in traditional foster homes at the end of the year has remained consistent for the last 7 years and was 26.5% in 2014 (Appendix B, Indicator 2.C.1). The percentage of children in specialized foster homes at the end of the year has also been consistent for the last 7 years and was 16% in 2014 (Appendix B, Indicator 2.C.2). The percentage of children in group homes (1.4% in 2014) or institutions (9.0% in 2014) at the end of the year has remained consistent for the last 7 years (Appendix B, Indicators 2.C.4 and 2.C.5). The percentage of youth in independent living at the end of the year has decreased from 9.8% in 2008 to 7.3% in 2014 (Appendix B, Indicator 2.C.6).⁸

The use of different placement types for both initial placements and later placements varies with child age, gender, race, and geographical region of the state. These relationships will be explored in more detail by examining the initial and end of year placements during the most recent fiscal year for which complete data are available (FY2014). Most young children (8 years and younger) are initially placed in family-like settings such as kinship or traditional foster homes

⁸ The analyses on children living in independent living programs are reintroduced in the current report. Data on children living in independent living programs were not available last year, so they were not included in the analyses.

Initial Placement into Congregate Care Settings

BOX 2.2

Two years ago, the CFRC raised a concern about the percentage of children whose initial placements were in group homes and institutions, which had increased from 13.3% of children entering substitute care in 2006 to 20.7% of those who entered care in 2012.⁹ This concern prompted a more in-depth look at the types of children who were being initially placed into these congregate care settings. The analyses revealed that youth ages 15 years and older were more likely to be initially placed into an institution or group home than in a foster home. In addition, the percentage of children (of all ages) initially placed into congregate care settings experienced rapid increases in both the Cook and Southern regions of the state.

Continued monitoring of this trend now reveals the encouraging news that the percentage of children entering care and initially placed in congregate care settings in the state has decreased from 20.7% of those who entered care in 2012 to 16.8% of those who entered care in 2014 (see Appendix B, Indicator 2.B.4). Additional analyses were done to determine if this improvement occurred for all children in the state or if it was limited to specific age groups or geographical regions. Figure 2.7 displays the percentage of youth ages 15-17 years and 12-14 years who entered care during 2008 through

2014 and were placed in an institution or group home as their initial placement. The results for youth ages 15 to 17 years show a steady increase in initial placements in congregate care through 2012, and then a decline from 51.1% in 2012 to 45.9% in 2014. When the results for youth ages 12 to 14 years are examined, however, they reveal that the percentage of these youth placed into congregate care settings has continued to grow throughout the seven year period, from 29.5% of those who entered care in 2008 to 40.3% of those who entered care in 2014, the highest level to date.

When regional differences in initial placements into group homes and institutions are examined, it is readily apparent that it is a much more common practice in the Cook region than in all other regions (Figure 2.8). However, the percentage of children (of all ages) initially placed into congregate care settings in the Cook region has decreased dramatically in the past two years, from 48.0% in 2012 to 32.0% in 2014. In the Southern region, the large increase in initial congregate care placements that occurred between 2009 and 2010 – from 4.6% to 18.0% -- has been maintained since 2010; 20.3% of children entering substitute care in 2014 in the Southern region were initially placed in a group home or institution.

Figure 2.7
Initial Placement Into Congregate Care Settings Among Youth Ages 12 to 17






Figure 2.8
Initial Placement Into Congregate Care Settings by Region



⁹ Children and Family Research Center. (2013). *Conditions of Children in or at Risk of Foster Care in Illinois: 2012 Monitoring Report of the B.H. Consent Decree*. Urbana, IL: Children and Family Research Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. See pages 2-8.


Figure 2.9
Initial Placement Types by Age—FY2014



(Figure 2.9). However, the proportion of children initially placed in foster homes decreases as child age increases: in 2014, 94.3% of children 0 to 2 years were placed in a foster home, compared to 81.2% of 9 to 11 year olds, 59.7% of 12 to 14 year olds, and 46.1% of youth ages 15 years and older. The reverse is true for initial placement in an institution or group home – the proportion of children placed in these settings increases with child age: from 5.7% of children under 3 years to 45.9% of youth 15 years and older.

The pattern of children's placement types at the end of the fiscal year looks slightly different than that of their initial placements (see Figure 2.10). The primary difference is that there are smaller percentages of children in institutions and group homes across all age groups at the end of the year compared to initial placements. For instance, there are very few children ages 0 to 8 years old in congregate care at the end of 2014; almost all children that age are in foster homes. For children ages 9 years and older, the percentages in institutions and group homes at the end of the year are smaller than those at initial placement. However, 22.5% of children age 12 to 14 years and 25.5% of those 15 years and older were living in congregate care settings at the end of 2014.

Figure 2.10
End of Year Placement Types by Age—FY2014



This pattern suggests that though institutions and group homes are frequently being utilized as temporary initial placements for children of all age groups, the majority of children in congregate care are being moved to other types of placements. Many of these children are likely moved to specialized foster homes, which show much higher frequency of use at the end of the year than at initial placement. Over one fourth of children age 15 and older were placed in independent living at the end of year.

Initial placement types are not noticeably different for males and females (see Figure 2.11 and Appendix B, Indicators 2.B.1 – 2.B.4). However, analysis of end of year placement types shows that females are more likely than males to be placed in kinship foster homes (41.5% versus 38.2% for males), traditional foster homes (28.4% versus 24.7% for males), and independent living programs (9.0% versus 5.8% for males); while males are more often placed than females in specialized foster homes (17.8% versus 14.1% for females) and group homes or institutions (13.4% versus 7.1% for females; see Figure 2.12 and Appendix B, Indicators 2.C.1 – 2.C.6). This pattern suggests that a higher proportion of males than females is placed in more restrictive placement settings at the end of the year.

Figure 2.11
Initial Placement Types by Gender—FY2014




Figure 2.13
Initial Placement Types by Race—FY2014




Figure 2.12
End of Year Placement Types by Gender—FY2014






Figure 2.14
End of Year Placement Types by Race—FY2014



Initial placement types vary by child race (Figure 2.13 and Appendix B, Indicators 2.B.1 – 2.B.4). White children were less likely to be initially placed in a group home or institution (11.9%) than African American (21.1%) or Hispanic (21.4%) children in 2014. When the end of year placements are compared by child race (Figure 2.14 and Appendix B, Indicators 2.C.1 – 2.C.6),


African American children were less likely to be placed in kinship foster homes (35.4%) compared to both White and Hispanic children (44.8% and 43.4%, respectively) and more likely to be placed in specialized foster homes (18.4% versus 12.9% of White children), institutions (9.8% versus 8.4% of White children), and independent living (9.8% versus 4.6% of White children).

Figure 2.15
Initial Placement Types by Region—FY2014



When initial placement settings are examined regionally (see Figure 2.15 and Appendix B, Indicators 2.B.1 – 2.B.4), the Cook region had a much lower proportion of children initially placed into kinship foster homes in 2014 (41.0%) compared to the other regions (Northern = 62.7%, Central = 59.5%, Southern = 55.8%) and a much higher proportion of initial placements into institutions/group homes (32.0%) compared to other regions (Northern = 9.7%, Central = 5.8%, and Southern = 20.3%). When children's placement settings at the end of the year are examined regionally (see Figure 2.16 and Appendix B, Indicators 2.C.1 – 2.C.6), the Cook region had the smallest percentage of children living in kinship foster homes at the end of 2014: 33.1% compared to 46.0% in the Northern region, 41.8% in the Central region, and 45.6% in the Southern region. Conversely, the Cook region had the highest percentage of children in independent living (11.7%) compared to other regions (Northern = 4.9%, Central = 4.5%, and Southern = 4.0%).

Figure 2.16
End of Year Placement Types by Region—FY2014



Placement with Siblings

Siblings provide one another with emotional support, a sense of connection, and continuity as they are removed from what is familiar to them and placed into substitute care.¹⁰ In 2014, 44% of children in care had one or two siblings and 21% had three or more siblings. Research has shown the benefits of maintaining sibling relationships for children in substitute care: children who are placed with siblings are less likely to experience placement disruptions,¹¹ more likely to be reunified with their parents,¹² and less at risk for internalizing problems such as depression.¹³ The benefit of being placed with siblings is stronger for the children who have resided in their foster homes for shorter periods of time.¹⁴

The importance of maintaining sibling connections among children in substitute care is reflected in several pieces of legislation at the national and state level. The 2008 Fostering Connections to Success and

¹⁰ McBeath, B., Kothari, B.H., Blakeslee, J., Lamson-Siu, E., Bank, L., Linares, L.O., . . . Schlonsky, A. (2014). Intervening to improve outcomes for siblings in foster care: Conceptual, substantive, and methodological dimensions of a prevention science framework. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 39, 1-10.

¹¹ Leathers, S.J. (2005). Separation from siblings: Associations with placement adaptation and outcomes among adolescents in long-term foster care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 27, 793-819.

¹² Albert, V. N., & King, W. C. (2008). Survival analyses of the dynamics of sibling experiences in foster care. *Families in Society*, 89, 533-541.

¹³ Hegar, R. L., & Rosenthal, J. A. (2009). Kinship care and sibling placement: Child behavior, family relationships, and school outcomes. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31, 670-679.

¹⁴ Ibid.


Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-135) instructs states to make “reasonable efforts” to place siblings together. In Illinois, the importance of sibling relationships among children in DCFS care was reinforced when the “Preserving Sibling Relationships for Children in State Care and Adopted through DCFS” public act (P.A. 97-1076) was enacted in 2012. This Act amended the Children and Family Services Act and specified that when placing a child into a substitute care placement, “the Department shall place the child with the child’s sibling or siblings...unless the placement is not in each child’s best interest, or is otherwise not possible under the Department’s rules. If the child is not placed with a sibling under the Department’s rules, the Department shall consider placements that are likely to develop, preserve, nurture, and support sibling relationships, where doing so is in each child’s best interest.”¹⁵

Despite the strong preference for placing siblings together in substitute care, sometimes it may be better to place siblings apart, for example, to protect a vulnerable sibling from sibling abuse or bullying. However, sometimes siblings are separated simply because not enough foster families are willing to take sibling groups. It is more difficult to find foster families who have the resources (physical, emotional, and financial) to provide for a sibling group. Some members of sibling groups may have physical or emotional disabilities that require specialized foster care. Additionally, some foster parents prefer one gender or a specific age range of children.

The likelihood of a child being placed initially with all of his or her siblings is related to two factors: the size of the sibling group and the type of foster home (kin or traditional foster home). As might be expected, children with fewer siblings (1 or 2) were more likely to be placed initially with all their siblings than children with 3 or more siblings (see Figure 2.17 and Appendix B, Indicator 2.D). Additionally, children initially placed with kin are more likely to be placed with siblings than children initially placed in non-kin placements. In 2014, 81.6 percent of children with 1 or 2

siblings were initially placed together in kinship foster homes compared to 61.1 percent of children with 1-2 siblings who were initially placed together in traditional foster homes. For children with 3 or more siblings, 57.8 percent were initially placed together in kinship foster homes, compared to only 5.4 percent of children initially placed in traditional foster homes in 2014.


Figure 2.17
Initial Placements with Siblings



When the percentage of children placed with all their siblings in care is examined at the end of each fiscal year, the overall pattern is the same: smaller sibling groups and placement with kin increase the likelihood of siblings living together (Figure 2.18, Appendix B, Indicator 2.E). However, in kinship homes a smaller proportion of children are placed with all of their siblings at the end of the year than in their initial placements. In other words, more sibling groups are initially placed together in kinship homes and eventually separated than are initially separated and subsequently placed together. Although the percentage of children initially placed with large sibling groups in traditional foster homes was very low in 2014 (5.4%), the percentage at the end of 2014 was higher (11.1%).

¹⁵ The full text of P.A. 97-1076 is available online: <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/97/HB/PDF/09700HB5592lv.pdf>

Figure 2.18
End of Year Placements with Siblings




Placement Close to Home

Another indicator of continuity is the distance between a child's home of origin and his or her placement in substitute care. Close proximity to home and family of origin helps maintain the social and cultural capital that children receive from their neighborhood and schools. It also facilitates the possibility and frequency of visitation, which is correlated with permanence for children in residential treatment.¹⁶ The Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 requires states to place children in settings that are close to their parent's home, if they will benefit from this closer setting.¹⁷


Figure 2.19 shows the median distance between children's initial placements in substitute care and their homes of origin over the past 20 years. Although there was a slight decline from 2006 to 2009, the median distance of initial placements from children's homes has been slowly increasing over time. In 2014, the median distance was 10.6 miles, which is the greatest distance in the past two decades.

Figure 2.19
Median Distance from Home at Initial Placement



Median distance from home at initial placement varies by children's age. Figure 2.20 shows that children 9 years and older tend to have a larger median distance from home at initial placement than younger children. In 2014, the median distance from home at initial placement for children under 3 years and 3 to 8 years old was 9.2 and 10.2 miles respectively, but it was 12.9 and 15.4 miles for children 9 to 14 years and 15 years and older, respectively (see Appendix B, Indicator 2.F).

Figure 2.20
Median Distance from Home at Initial Placement by Age




¹⁶ Lee, L.J. (2011) Adult visitation and permanency for children following residential treatment. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33, 1288-1297.

¹⁷ Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980, Pub. L. 96-272.

Median distance from home at initial placement also varies by children's race (see Figure 2.21 and Appendix B, Indicator 2.F). White children have substantially larger median distance at initial placement than African American children, and the discrepancy has remained relatively consistent over time. In 2014, the median distance from home at initial placement for African American children is 8.5 miles compared to 8.9 miles for Hispanic children and 16.1 miles for White children.

Figure 2.21
Median Distance from Home at Initial Placement by Race




A child's placement near his or her home of origin at the initial placement is also influenced by geographical region, which is shown in the sub-region heat map (see Figure 2.22 and Appendix C, Indicator 2.F).¹⁸ Two sub-regions, Springfield and Marion, have consistently performed in the bottom 25th percentile through the seven year period. Performance across the rest of the sub-regions has also worsened over time, with the exception of the Rockford and Peoria sub-regions.

Distance between a child's home of origin and his or her initial placement is also influenced by the type of initial placement (Figure 2.23).¹⁹ Children with initial placements into kinship foster homes have consistently been closest to their homes of origin, with a median distance of 3 miles in 2014. Median distances from home are much greater for children initially placed in traditional foster homes (13.5 miles in 2014) and institutions and group homes (12.9 miles in 2014).

Figure 2.22
Median Distance from Home at Initial Placement Sub-region Heat Map

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Cook North							
Cook Central							
Cook South							
Aurora							
Rockford							
Champaign							
Peoria							
Springfield							
East St. Louis							
Marion							


Figure 2.23
Median Distance from Home at Initial Placement by Placement Type



¹⁸ The region and sub-region are determined by where the case opened.

¹⁹ Note that the distance for children in specialized foster homes is not included, because the numbers of these children are very small, and the median distance based on the numbers is unstable.

Figure 2.24 shows the median distance between children's homes and their placements at the end of the fiscal year over the past 20 years. The median distance from home has been steadily increasing over time, from 5 miles in 1994 to over 10 miles in 2014.



Similar to initial placements, distance from home at the end of the fiscal year varies by children's age and race (see Appendix B, Indicator 2.G). Figure 2.25 shows that older children are consistently placed farther away from their homes than younger children, and the median distance for children 9 and older has been on the rise since 2010. White children have consistently been placed farther from their homes than both African American and Hispanic children (see Figure 2.26).

When placement settings at the end of the year are examined (see Figure 2.27), children living in kinship foster homes are much closer to their home of origin (median miles = 4.3 in 2014) than children living in other placement types (traditional foster home = 14.0 miles, specialized foster home = 14.1 miles, independent living = 13.9 miles, group home = 30.2 miles, and institution = 52.8 miles). These median distances have been

Figure 2.25
Median Distance from Home at End of Year by Age






Figure 2.26
Median Distance from Home at End of Year by Race



fairly steady over time, with the exception of congregate care settings. The distance from home for children living in group homes has increased from 25.4 in 2008 to 30.2 in 2014 (which decreased from a high of 36.8 in 2013) and in institutions from 36.8 miles in 2008 to 52.8 miles in 2014.



Similar to initial placements, the distances from children's homes to their placements at the end of the year show wide variation by sub-region (see Figure 2.28 and Appendix C, Indicator 2.G).²⁰ Distances in the Cook sub-regions have remained relatively stable over the past seven years, while those in Aurora and Champaign sub-regions have worsened after 2011. Distances from home in the Springfield and Marion sub-regions are almost twice as large as those in other regions.

Figure 2.28
Median Distance from Home at End of Year Sub-region Heat Map

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Cook North							
Cook Central							
Cook South							
Aurora							
Rockford							
Champaign							
Peoria							
Springfield							
East St. Louis							
Marion							

Variation in the proximity of placements to children's homes of origin can be further examined by looking at the median distance of placement types across sub-regions (see Figure 2.29). The variation of median distance from home for kinship and traditional foster homes are small across sub-regions, with a range of 2.1 – 8.1 miles for kinship foster homes and 10.0 – 31.6 miles for traditional foster homes. In contrast, the variation in the distance from home for group homes, institutions, independent living, and specialized foster homes are large, with a range of 17.1 – 145.6 miles for group homes, 20.6 – 122.9 miles for institutions, 9.9 – 94.8 miles for independent living, and 10.0 – 52.1 miles for specialized foster homes. Except for kinship foster homes, placements in the Cook sub-regions generally have the shortest median distance from home. Congregate care placements in the Marion, East St. Louis, Springfield, Peoria, and Champaign sub-regions have median distances of at least 90 miles from children's homes of origin. For children in independent living programs, the median distance from their home of origin has been relatively steady within each sub-region,

²⁰ The region and sub-region are determined by where the case opened.

with the exception of in the Central region, where the median distance from home at the end of the year has increased dramatically in the past seven years, from 9.2 miles in 2008 to 79.5 miles in 2014.

Placement Stability


Placement stability is important for children in substitute care, and placement instability has numerous negative consequences for a child's well-being and likelihood of achieving permanence. For example, placement instability during the first year of care has been tied to later negative outcomes such as increased mental health costs²¹ and increased ER visits.²² Two measures of placement stability are included in this monitoring report, both of which focus on placement stability within the first year of entering substitute care. The first measure defines stability as two or fewer placements during the first year in care among children who entered care and stayed at least a year,²³ and the second measure examines children (ages 12 to 17) who run away from substitute care during their first year in care. The focus on stability in the first year is warranted by the fact that 70% of disruptions occur within the first six months of a placement.²⁴

Placement Stability During the First Year in Substitute Care

Using the definition provided above, the percentage of children who experience stability has remained around 77-79% for many years (see Figure 2.30).

Consistent with other research,²⁵ placement stability in Illinois is related to child age: children under 3 years old experience the highest level of stability, while those 15 years and older experience the least stability (Figure 2.31 and Appendix B, Indicator 2.H). Of the children who entered care in 2013, 83.7% of children under 3 years of age had two or fewer placements in their first year in care, compared to 71.5% of the children 15 years and older.

Figure 2.29
Median Distance from Home at End of Year by Placement Type and Sub-region FY2014



²¹ Rubin, D.M., Alessandrini, E.A., Feudtner, C., Mandell, D.S., Localio, A.R., & Hadley, T. (2004). Placement stability and mental health costs for children in foster care. *Pediatrics*, 113, 1336-1341.

²² Rubin, D.M., Alessandrini, E.A., Feudtner, C., Localio, A.R., & Hadley, T. (2004). Placement changes and emergency department visits in the first year of foster care. *Pediatrics*, 114, 354-360.

²³ See Appendix A for technical definitions of all the indicators included in this report.

²⁴ Jones, A. D., & Wells, S. J. (2008). *PATH/Wisconsin - Bremer Project: Preventing placement disruptions in foster care. Final report*. Saint Paul, MN: Center for Advanced Studies in Child Welfare, School of Social Work, University of Minnesota. Retrieved from http://www.cehd.umn.edu/SSW/g-s/media/Final_report.pdf.

²⁵ Barth, R.P., Lloyd, E.C., Green, R.L., James, S., Leslie, L.K., & Landsverk, J. (2007). Predictors of placement moves among children with and without emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 15, 46-55.

Figure 2.30
Children with Stable Placements in First Year in Care






Figure 2.31
Placement Stability by Age



White children are more likely to experience placement stability than African American children (see Figure 2.32 and Appendix B, Indicator 2.H). Of the children who entered care in 2013, 84.4% of White children had two or fewer placements during their first year in care compared to 74.4% of African American children. Hispanic children are not included here because of their small numbers, which make the percentages relatively unstable across years.

Figure 2.32
Placement Stability by Race



Placement stability is also influenced by initial placement types (see Figure 2.33). Children who are initially placed in kinship foster homes experience the highest levels of stability (between 83% and 86% in the past 7 years). Children initially placed in traditional foster homes also experience high levels of stability (between 75% and 79%). Children who are initially placed in group homes or institutions are the least likely to experience stability during their first year in care (between 47% and 59%). The percentages of children in specialized foster homes are not shown, since very few children (i.e., less than 2%) are initially placed in this type of placement.

Figure 2.34 shows the sub-region heat map for placement stability during the first year of substitute care (see Appendix C, Indicator 2.H). As with the other heat maps throughout this report, the darkest-shaded boxes represent the sub-regions and years with the worst performance (the bottom 25%) and the lightest-shaded boxes represent the best performance (the top 25%). Placement stability is lowest in the Cook sub-regions (between 63% and 73% in the past 7 years) and highest in the sub-regions of Aurora (average rate of 81% in the past 7 years), Champaign (average rate of 83%), Peoria (average rate of 83%), and East St. Louis (average rate of 80%).

Figure 2.33
Placement Stability by Initial Placement Type




Figure 2.34
Placement Stability Sub-region Heat Map


	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Cook North							
Cook Central							
Cook South							
Aurora							
Rockford							
Champaign							
Peoria							
Springfield							
East St. Louis							
Marion							

Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care

Children who run away from substitute care are different from typical runaways: “Unlike other runaways, youth who run away from foster care are generally not trying to escape from abuse or neglect.”²⁶ Instead, youth who run away from foster care are often running to something (usually family or friends), although some report that they dislike their placement. Running away puts children at risk for victimization, sexual exploitation, and substance use. It also limits their access to school and services, such as counseling, medication, and substance abuse treatment. Children who run away are more likely to do so early in their placement, often in their first few months in care. Instability increases the likelihood of children running away from care. For example, children who have two placements are 70% more likely to run away than those who are in their first placement.²⁷

The measure of running away used in the current chapter is the percentage of children that run away within one year of entry into substitute care. Since running away occurs most frequently among older children, this indicator includes children who are 12-17 years old when they enter care. The percentage of children who run away from substitute care has been around 20% for the past 20 years (see Figure 2.35).

Figure 2.35
Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care



²⁶ National Runaway Switchboard Executive Summary. (2010). Running away from foster care: Youths' knowledge and access of services. Retrieved on April 20, 2011 from http://www.nrscrisisline.org/media/whytheyrun/report_files/042111_Part%20C%20Exec%20Summary.pdf

²⁷ Courtney, M.E. & Zinn, A. (2009) Predictors of running away from out-of-home care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31, 1298-1306.

Similar to other research on children who run away from substitute care,²⁸ older children ages 15-17 years are more likely to run away than children ages 12-14 years (Figure 2.36) and African American children are more likely to run away than White children (Figure 2.37 and Appendix B, Indicator 2.I).

Figure 2.36
Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care by Age






Figure 2.37
Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care by Race



Children in the Cook region have traditionally been more likely to run away than in other regions. The percentage of children living in the Cook region that ran away during their first year increased dramatically from 18.1% in 2008 to 34.5% among those who entered care in 2011, but has since declined to 30.9% of those who entered care in 2013. Percentages of children living in other regions who run away are lower – approximately 12 - 20% in most years (see Figure 2.38 and Appendix B, Indicator 2.I).

Figure 2.38
Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care by Region




Placement setting also influences the likelihood that a child will run away from substitute care (see Figure 2.39). Children who run away are more likely to live in institutions or group homes than in any other type of placement setting.

²⁸ Courtney, M.E. & Zinn, A. (2009). Predictors of running away from out-of-home care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31, 1298-1306.

²⁹ Other Placement includes: Home of Parent, Hospital/Health Facility, Independent Living, Other, Transitional Living Program, Unauthorized Placement, and Unknown.

Figure 2.39
Children Who Run Away from
Substitute Care by Placement Type²⁹



Length of Time in Substitute Care

There has been a long-held value that children should not languish in foster care. Children may need to have the state take custody to keep them safe, but they should not be raised in a substitute care setting for long periods of time. Once a child is placed in substitute care, the goal is to move them out of care as quickly as it is safe and reasonable to do so. The length of time a child spends in substitute care is affected by a variety of factors, including their permanency goal, the type of placement in which they live, and the type of maltreatment that brought them into care.

In this report, length of time in substitute care is measured by calculating the median length of stay for all children who enter substitute care in a given fiscal year, in other words, the number of months it takes for 50% of those children to exit substitute care. The most recent year for which median length of stay in substitute care can be determined is 2011, since there needs to be enough time for 50% the children who enter in a given year to exit. After peaking in 1992 at 51 months, the median length of stay for children in substitute care in Illinois decreased to about 30 months, where it remained for most of the 2000s (Figure 2.40).

Figure 2.40
Median Length of Time in Substitute Care





Figure 2.41 shows the regional differences in median length of stay in substitute care. There are notable regional differences: children in the Cook region spend substantially longer time in substitute care (41 - 48 months) than children who reside in other regions. The median length of stay for the most recent (2011) entry cohort was 41 months in the Cook region, 24 months in the Northern region, and 26 months in both the Central and Southern regions (see Appendix B, Indicator 2.J).

Figure 2.41
Median Length of Time in Substitute Care
by Region



Discussion and Conclusions: Children in Substitute Care

Once the decision is made to remove children from their homes, the child welfare system has a responsibility to provide them with substitute care living arrangements that ensure they are safe from additional harm, maintain connections with their family members and siblings in care, and provide stability. The most recent data on substitute care placements in Illinois highlight several areas of concern. A primary concern is the rate of maltreatment in substitute care, which has been increasing over the past several years, from 1.6% in 2007 to 2.1% in 2014. Although the overall rate of substantiated maltreatment in substitute care is small, the worsening performance over the past several years is a cause for concern and the additional analyses have been completed to better understand which children are at highest risk. The analyses included in this report suggest that maltreatment in care is most likely to occur among children living in kinship foster care – 2.5% of children living in kinship foster homes were maltreated in 2014. A report completed by the CFRC in 2009 found that unlicensed kin foster homes were significantly less safe than either licensed kin foster homes or traditional foster homes,³⁰ and a recent update of that study confirms that children living in unlicensed kinship placements that never become licensed are at significantly higher risk of maltreatment compared to children who are living in kinship placements that are licensed or eventually become licensed.³¹ These findings raise important questions about the reasons that kin foster parents become licensed or fail to become licensed that could shed light on the higher rates of maltreatment among kin foster placements. Unfortunately, the administrative data related to unlicensed kin foster providers is quite scant – even basic demographic information on the providers is missing the majority. A small, qualitative study of kin foster providers could provide valuable

information to the Department about why some providers choose to remain unlicensed and the risk factors in these homes that are related to maltreatment.

The increase in maltreatment among children placed in group homes and institutions is also troubling – the rate has more than tripled since 2011. This increase is especially noteworthy because of disturbing revelations in late 2014 about a range of serious problems in residential treatment facilities for youth in DCFS custody. A series of news articles reported hundreds of DCFS wards from 2011 to 2014 being physical assaulted, sexual abused, or bullied in care.³² Several residential treatment centers were described as negligent in supervising youth, employing staff who demeaned or abused youth, and generally failing to provide for youths' needs. Soon after the series of articles was published, DCFS stopped placements in a number of facilities highlighted in the newspaper series and began unannounced inspections of residential treatment centers across Illinois. The Department also made plans to improve procedures for investigating maltreatment in congregate care, provide training on human trafficking, and revise methods for finding runaways.³³ Other developments designed to improve residential treatment include new legislation intended to improve enforcement of regulations on residential care,³⁴ a new contract with the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Illinois at Chicago to monitor residential care until a longer term plan is developed,³⁵ and consultation from Casey Family Programs, the world's largest foundation devoted to foster care.³⁶ As with any notable trend in the outcome included in the *B.H.* monitoring report, the CFRC will continue to measure the number and percentage of children and youth living in group homes and institutions who are maltreated while living in care.

Running away from care was mentioned as an issue in the last *B.H.* monitoring report and has also been a concern mentioned in newspaper reports on youths in residential care. The same newspaper articles detailing

³⁰ Nieto, M., Fuller, T., & Testa, M. (2009). *License status of kinship foster parents and the safety of children in their care*. Urbana, IL: Children and Family Research Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

³¹ Nieto, M., & Fuller, T. (2015). *Foster home license status and maltreatment in care*. Urbana, IL: Children and Family Research Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

³² Chicago Tribune. (January 25, 2015). *Harsh treatment*. Retrieved from <http://www.chicagotribune.com>.

³³ Eldeib, D., Marx, G. & Jackson, D. (April 3, 2015). Fixes to residential treatment on the way in Illinois, but budget woes loom. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from <http://www.chicagotribune.com>.

³⁴ Chicago Tribune. (January 25, 2015). *Harsh treatment*. Retrieved from <http://www.chicagotribune.com>.

³⁵ Tareen, S. (March 10, 2015). Illinois DCFS to allow outside experts in ACLU deal. *Northwest Herald*. Retrieved from <http://www.nwherald.com/>

³⁶ Eldeib, D., Marx, G. & Jackson, D. (April 3, 2015). Fixes to residential treatment on the way in Illinois, but budget woes loom. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from <http://www.chicagotribune.com>.

abuse in residential treatment also describe a pattern of youth repeatedly running away from placements, sometimes engaging in criminal behavior or being sexually exploited during runaway episodes.³⁷ Given that a large majority of runaway episodes occur in institutions and group homes, a major part of addressing running away needs to focus on improving the quality of group homes and institutions serving DCFS wards. The findings in this year's report indicate that running away was much more common among older adolescents (15 to 17 years), youth placed in congregate care, youth in Cook County, and, correspondingly, among African American youth. Given that youth running from care tend to run to a destination rather than just away, it is not surprising that running away was more common in a densely populated region where public transportation is well-developed. Although the most recent data show a reduction in the percentage of youth who ran away from placement during their first year in care, additional monitoring is needed to determine if this encouraging trend will continue.

A final area that continues to be of concern is the proximity of placements to children's homes of origin. Placing children close to the homes of their biological families facilitates visitation, maintains social bonds with family members, and preserves school and community ties. Concerns about the increasing distances of children's placements from their homes were raised in the last *B.H.* monitoring report, and current data show that the median distance from home at the end of FY2014 remains the same as it was last year. Examination of this indicator by subgroups indicates that the greatest increases in distances from home have occurred among older youth (those ages 12 years and older) and youth placed in group homes and institutions. The availability of foster homes willing to take older youth and the closing of several residential treatment centers in the Southern region may be a factor in the increases in median distances from home. Additional inquiry into foster home capacity throughout the state is recommended.

³⁷ Chicago Tribune. (January 25, 2015). *Harsh treatment*. Retrieved from <http://www.chicagotribune.com>.



CHAPTER 3

Legal Permanence: Reunification, Adoption, and Guardianship

All children deserve permanent homes. Although abuse and neglect sometimes make it necessary to place children temporarily in “substitute” homes, federal and state child welfare policies mandate that permanency planning should begin at the time of placement and that children should be placed in safe, nurturing, permanent homes within a reasonable time frame. In Illinois, there are three processes through which children can exit substitute care and attain a permanent home: reunification with parents, adoption, and guardianship.

Reunification with parents is the preferred method for achieving permanence for children in substitute care and is the most common type of exit, accounting for 51% of foster care exits nationally in 2013.¹ Reunification is possible when parents are able to make changes in their lives, often with the benefit of child welfare and other services, to ensure that their children will be safe and adequately cared for when they return home. In some cases, parents cannot make the necessary changes to ameliorate the conditions which brought the children to the attention of

the system. In these instances, child welfare professionals are obligated to find alternative permanent homes for children as expeditiously as possible. A second permanency option is **adoption**, in which kin or non-kin adoptive parents legally commit to care for children; adoptive parents have all the same rights and responsibilities in relation to their children as biological parents, while receiving financial support from the state. Adoption accounted for 21% of foster care exits in the most recent national data, but it is difficult to find adoptive homes for many children – 31% of children in substitute care waiting to be adopted had been waiting three years or more.² **Guardianship** is a third permanency option that involves caregivers, almost always kin, assuming legal custody and permanent care of children with financial support from the state. This form of permanence is advantageous for caregivers who want to commit to permanent care but do not wish to terminate the rights of the biological parent, who is typically a close relative of the guardian. Guardianship is a much less frequently used permanency option for children in substitute care, accounting for only 7% of all exits nationally in 2013.³








¹U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2014). *The AFCARS report: Preliminary FY 2013 estimates*. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/cb/afcarsreport21.pdf>

²Ibid.






³Ibid.

Changes in Legal Permanence at a Glance

Children Achieving Reunification

-  Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that was reunified with their parents within 12 months remained stable and was 20.3% of children who entered care in 2013.
-  Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that was reunified with their parents within 24 months remained stable and was 32.9% of children who entered care in 2012.
-  Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that was reunified with their parents within 36 months remained stable and was 39.4% of those who entered care in 2011.
-  Of all children who were reunified during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at one year remained stable and was 82.4% of children who were reunified in 2013.
-  Of all children who were reunified during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at two years remained stable and was 81.3% of children who were reunified in 2012.
-  Of all children who were reunified during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at five years remained stable and was 77.6% of children who were reunified in 2009.
-  Of all children who were reunified during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at ten years remained stable and was 71.7% of children who were reunified in 2004.

Children Achieving Adoption

-  Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that was adopted within 24 months decreased from 4.2% of those who entered care in 2011 to 3.2% of those who entered care in 2012 (-24% change).
-  Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that was adopted within 36 months remained stable and was 11.1% of those who entered care in 2011.
-  Of all children who were adopted during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at two years remained stable and was 97.9% of children who were adopted in 2012.
-  Of all children who were adopted during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at five years remained stable and was 96.2% of children who were adopted in 2009.
-  Of all children who were adopted during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at ten years remained stable and was 89.2% of children who were adopted in 2004.

Changes in Legal Permanence at a Glance

Children Achieving Guardianship

- ↓ Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that attained subsidized guardianship within 24 months decreased from 0.9% of those who entered care in 2011 to 0.7% of those who entered care in 2012 (-22% change).
- = Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, the percentage that attained subsidized guardianship within 36 months remained stable and was 2.4% of children who entered care in 2011.
- = Of all children who attained subsidized guardianship during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at two years remained stable and was 95.2% of children who attained guardianship in 2012.
- = Of all children who attained subsidized guardianship during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at five years remained stable and was 90.0% of children who attained guardianship in 2009.
- ↑ Of all children who attained subsidized guardianship during the year, the percentage that remained with their family at ten years increased from 78.9% of those who attained guardianship in 2003 to 83.1% of those who attained guardianship in 2004 (+5% change).

Measuring Legal Permanence

Although the number of permanency options available to children in substitute care in Illinois is small, the number of potential indicators for measuring system performance related to the achievement of legal permanence is far greater. Good indicators are thoughtfully tied to the system's critical performance goals, which in this case involve moving children from temporary placements in substitute care to permanent homes and doing so in a timely manner. Thus, permanency indicators should measure both the **likelihood** of achieving permanence as well as the **timeliness** in which it is achieved. In addition, the **stability** of the permanent placements should be monitored to ensure that the children who exit substitute care do not re-enter care.

Many child welfare performance monitoring efforts, including versions of the Illinois *B.H.* monitoring

report prior to 2010, do not include separate outcome indicators for the three types of exits to permanent homes (e.g., reunification, adoption, and guardianship), instead relying on a combined or overall “permanency rate” that captures all exits to permanent homes. However, research demonstrates that the type of exit affects rates and frequency of permanence.⁴ For example, reunification tends to occur more quickly than adoption or guardianship because of the focus on first attempting to reunify children with their parents prior to finding alternative permanent homes. In addition, policy and practice changes may affect one type of exit positively while adversely affecting another, consequently a policy's effect on exits to permanence would be masked if only a combined indicator was utilized. This chapter, therefore, examines each type of permanency exit (reunification, adoption, and guardianship) separately, although the overall (e.g., combined) permanency rate is presented first to provide context and continuity with previous reports.

⁴Akin, B.A. (2011). Predictors of foster care exits to permanency: A competing risks analysis of reunification, guardianship, and adoption. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33, 999-1011. Connell, C.M., Katz, K.H., Saunders, L., & Tebes, J.K. (2006). Leaving foster care – the influence of child and case characteristics on foster care exit rates. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 28, 780-798.

For each type of permanence, **timeliness** is monitored by showing the percentage of children in each yearly entry cohort that exits substitute care within 12 months (for reunification only due to the low frequency of adoptions and guardianships occurring within 12 months), 24 months, and 36 months.⁵ For each type of permanence, the percentage of children exiting within 36 months is further examined by child age, gender, race, and geographic region or sub-region, and notable differences in subgroups are described in the chapter. The **stability** of each type of permanence is monitored by examining the percentage of reunifications, adoptions, and guardianships that remain intact (i.e., the children do not re-enter substitute care) within one year (reunification only), two years, five years, and ten years post-discharge.


Although child welfare systems strive to provide all children in substitute care with a permanent home in a timely manner, this goal is not achieved for all children. Some children exit substitute care to situations in which they do not have a legally permanent home – they run away, they are incarcerated, they emancipate or “age out.” In addition, each year many children remain in care for periods much longer than 36 months. If exits to reunification, adoption, and guardianship are considered positive outcomes, then exits from care without attaining permanence and lengthy stays in care (longer than 3 years) should be considered negative outcomes. It is equally important to monitor negative as well as positive outcomes, so this chapter also examines “other exits” from care and children that remain in care longer than 36 months.

Children Achieving Legal Permanence

Figure 3.1 shows the overall permanency rate in Illinois – the percentage of children exiting substitute care to all three types of permanence combined – over a 20 year period. For comparison, the percentages of children exiting to permanence within 12 months, 24 months, and 36 months are shown. Permanency rates improved during the late 1990’s as the result of numerous

policy changes. The improvements in the permanency rates are seen most clearly in the 36-month permanency rate, to a lesser extent in the 24-month permanency rate, and much less in the 12-month permanency rate. There has been little change in overall permanency rates since 2001, with rates around 21% at 12 months, 39% at 24 months, and 54% at 36 months.

Figure 3.1
Children Exiting to Permanence Within 12, 24, and 36 Months




Although Figure 3.1 provides a good picture of the overall pattern of exits to permanence over the last two decades, it does not tell us anything about the relative frequencies of the three different types of permanence. Figure 3.2 shows the percentages of children who exit substitute care within 36 months separately for each of the three types of permanence: reunification, adoption, and guardianship (see Appendix B, Indicators 3.A.3, 3.C.2, and 3.E.2).

Figure 3.2 shows that reunification has always been the most common type of exit from substitute care. For most of the 2000s, around 35% of the children who entered substitute care each year were reunified with their families within 36 months. Reunifications within

⁵Please note, because entry cohorts are used to examine permanency rates over time, the most recent entry cohort available to examine permanence within 36 months is the 2011 entry cohort.

36 months have increased slightly in recent years, from 35.2% of children who entered care in 2006 to 39.4% of children who entered care in 2011.

Figure 3.2
Children Exiting to Reunification, Adoption, and Guardianship Within 36 Months




It is also apparent from Figure 3.2 that the reason for the upsurge in overall permanency rates in the mid-to-late 1990s was the dramatic increase in the percentage of exits to adoption during those years. However, since their peak in the early 2000s, rates of adoptions within 36 months of entry have been slowly declining over the past decade, from 17.3% of children who entered care in 1999 to 11.1% of children who entered care in 2011. Although the overall trend has been one of decline, the 36-month adoption rates for the 2010 (10.9%) and 2011 (11.1%) entry cohorts represent an increase compared to the 2008 (9.8%) and 2009 (9.3%) cohorts.

Subsidized guardianship was introduced as a new permanency option in the late 1990s, and contributed to the increase in overall permanence seen in the late 1990s. After peaking at 5% for children who entered care in 2002, exits to subsidized guardianship within 36 months of entry have slowly declined over the past eight years to 2.4% for children who entered care in 2011.

Children Achieving Reunification

Figure 3.3 shows the percentage of children exiting substitute care to reunification within 12 months, 24 months, and 36 months of their entry into care (see Appendix B, Indicators 3.A.1, 3.A.2, and 3.A.3). Rates of reunification within all three timeframes show generally similar trends over the 20-year period, although the changes in trends are more noticeable for the reunifications within 24 and 36 months of entry. In general, reunification rates increased in the late 1990s and then stabilized for almost a decade between 1997 and 2006. Rates of reunification within 24 and 36 months of entry increased among children entering care between 2006 and 2009, but have since decreased: reunifications within 24 months decreased from 35.6% of children who entered care in 2009 to 32.9% of children who entered care in 2012, and reunifications within 36 months decreased from 42.1% of children who entered care in 2009 to 39.4% of children who entered care in 2011.


Figure 3.3
Children Exiting to Reunification Within 12, 24, and 36 Months



Child age is related to the likelihood that children will be reunified with parents within 36 months of entry (see Figure 3.4 and Appendix B, Indicator 3.A.3).

Children between ages 3 and 8 years were the most likely to be reunified – 51.0% of the children in this age group who entered care in 2011 were reunified within three years. Very young children (those less than 3 years) and youth between 9 and 14 years were reunified less often – 36.2% and 40.4% for the 2011 entry cohorts, respectively. Youth ages 15 years and older were the least likely to be reunified with their parents; only 21.6% of the youth in this age group who entered care in 2011 were reunified by 2014.

Figure 3.4
Children Exiting to Reunification Within 36 Months by Age



A child's race influences the likelihood of being reunified with parents within 36 months of entry. In general, White children are more likely to be reunified than African American children (see Figure 3.5, and Appendix B, Indicator 3.A.3). The reunification rate among African American children has increased from 31.4% in the 2010 cohort to 34% in the 2011 cohort. For White children, the rate dropped slightly, from 45.6% in the 2010 cohort to 43.7% in the 2011 cohort. Reunification rates among Hispanic children have fluctuated between the other two groups due to the small number of Hispanic children in substitute care.

Figure 3.5
Children Exiting to Reunification Within 36 Months by Race




Figure 3.6 displays the sub-regional heat map showing reunification exits within 36 months of entry into substitute care (see Appendix C, Indicator 3.A.3). To create the heat map, reunification rates in each sub-region of Illinois for the past seven years were compared to one another and ranked. The sub-regions and years in the top 25th percentile – those with the **best performance** on this indicator – are shown in the lightest shade. Those sub-regions and years in the bottom 25th percentile – those with the **worst performance** on this indicator – are shown in the darkest shade. Those that performed in the middle – between the 26th and 74th percentiles – are shown in the medium shade. The heat map therefore provides a visually simple way to compare a large amount of information on sub-regional performance both over time and across the state. It is possible to tell reasonably quickly if a region or sub-region is doing well (relative to the other sub-regions in the state over the past 7 years) by looking for the areas in the lightest shade. It is important to note that these “rankings” are relative only to the performance within the ten sub-regions over the seven year time span and not to any national or state benchmarks. Thus, even though a given sub-region may be performing “well” compared

to other sub-regions in the state (as indicated by a light shade on the heat map), this does not necessarily mean that its performance should be considered “good” or “excellent” compared to a standard or benchmark.

Figure 3.6
Children Exiting to Reunification
Within 36 Months Sub-region Heat Map

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Cook North							
Cook Central							
Cook South							
Aurora							
Rockford							
Champaign							
Peoria							
Springfield							
East St. Louis							
Marion							


As can be seen in Figure 3.6, reunification rates in the Cook sub-regions are the lowest in the state for the entire time period (darkly shaded areas). The Marion sub-region shows comparatively high reunification rates across most of the observation period (lightly shaded areas). Reunification rates improved in the Aurora sub-region for children in the 2011 cohort, but declined among children in Rockford and Peoria sub-regions.

Stability of Reunification

Reunification is only truly permanent if children can remain safely in their homes and are not removed again. Figure 3.7 displays the percentage of children that remain stable in their homes (and do not re-enter care) within 1, 2, 5, and 10 years following reunification with their parents

(see Appendix B, Indicators 3.B.1, 3.B.2, 3.B.3, and 3.B.4). Two things stand out as important when examining Figure 3.7. The first is that, predictably, the percentage of stable reunifications decreases as the length of time post-reunification increases. For example, of the children that exited care to reunification in 2009, 84.9% remained reunified with their parents within one year, 82.1% remained reunified within two years, and 77.6% remained reunified within 5 years (children in the 2009 exit cohort have not reached the 10 year post-reunification mark). Second, the rates of stability following reunification from substitute care have been relatively level for the exit cohorts of the past decade.

Figure 3.7
Stable Reunifications 1, 2, 5, and
10 Years After Finalization




Children Achieving Adoption

Because adoption is typically considered only after it becomes clear that reunification is not achievable, adoptions rarely occur within 12 months. Figure 3.8, therefore, shows the percentage of children who exit substitute care through adoption within 24 and 36 months after entry. The overall pattern of the two

lines is similar, but the likelihood of being adopted is much greater within 36 months of entry than within 24 months. The increase in adoptions that occurred in the late 1990s can be seen in both the percentage of children adopted within 24 months and 36 months, although the increase is more dramatic among adoptions within 36 months. After this dramatic increase, the percentages of children exiting to adoption within 36 months leveled off during the early 2000s, and then declined from 16.5% of children that entered care in 2002 to 9.3% of those who entered care in 2009. The most recent data for children who entered care in 2010 and 2011 shows increasing rates of adoption within 36 months (10.9% and 11.1%, respectively; see Appendix B, Indicators 3.C.1 and 3.C.2).


Figure 3.8
Children Exiting to Adoption
Within 24 and 36 Months



Children who are less than 3 years old when they enter care are substantially more likely to be adopted than older children (see Figure 3.9 and Appendix B, Indicator 3.C.2), a finding that is consistent nationally.⁶ In fact, there is an inverse relationship between child age and the likelihood of adoption from substitute care, such that the older a child is when entering

care, the less likely he or she is to be adopted within 36 months. However, the percentage of children less than 3 years old that exit to adoption within 36 months has decreased in recent years, from 23.7% among children who entered care in 2007 to 19.3% among children who entered care in 2011. Although rates of adoption within 36 months have also decreased among children in the other age groups over the same time period, the decline has been the steepest for children less than 3 years. The likelihood of children ages 15 and older being adopted from substitute care within 36 months is very small, and decreased from 3.0% among children entering care in 2006 to 0.6% among children who entered care in 2010 before increasing to 1.8% among children who entered care in 2011.

Figure 3.9
Children Exiting to Adoption
Within 36 Months by Age




White children are more likely to exit substitute care to adoption within 36 months than are African American and Hispanic children. Of the children that entered care in 2011, 15.0% of White, 7.6% of African American, and 3.8% of Hispanic children were adopted within 36 months. The difference in the percentages of White and African American children has

⁶U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2013). *The AFCARS report: Preliminary FY 2012 estimates*. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/cb/afcarsreport20.pdf>

become larger in the past few years (see Figure 3.10 and Appendix B, Indicator 3.C.2). The percentage of Hispanic children adopted was comparatively lower, although these results should be interpreted with some caution because the number of Hispanic children in the foster care population is small.

Figure 3.10
Children Exiting to Adoption Within 36 Months by Race



Trends in children exiting substitute care to adoption within 36 months at the sub-region level are shown in Figure 3.11 (see Appendix C, Indicator 3.C.2). The Champaign sub-region is in the top 25th percentile (when compared to all other regions) over the entire observation period, while the three Cook sub-regions are in the bottom 25th percentile for the majority of the last 5 years. In general, performance on the indicator has worsened in most of the sub-regions, with the exception of the Champaign and Marion sub-regions, which have experienced stable or slightly improved performance.

Figure 3.11
Children Exiting to Adoption Within 36 Months
Sub-region Heat Map

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Cook North							
Cook Central							
Cook South							
Aurora							
Rockford							
Champaign							
Peoria							
Springfield							
East St. Louis							
Marion							

Children Achieving Guardianship

Subsidized guardianship began in Illinois in September 1996 when the state received federal Title IV-E waiver authority to extend subsidies to guardians. Development of the subsidized guardianship program went hand-in-hand with a major increase in kin adoptions. As case-workers explored permanency options with kin as part of the new subsidized guardianship program, they discovered that more kin than anticipated chose adoption.

The percentage of children exiting substitute care to guardianship within 24 and 36 months of entry into care is shown in Figure 3.13 (as with adoptions, very few children exit to guardianship within 12 months of entry, so those percentages are not shown.) The percentage of children exiting to guardianship within 36 months of entry increased steadily between 1996 and 2002 as the new subsidized guardianship program was implemented. Since 2002, the percentage of children entering substitute care that exit within 36 months via subsidized guardianship has seen a fairly constant decline, from 5.0% of

Measuring Adoption Stability

BOX 3.1

Measuring the stability of adoptions is important in determining the continuity of care children receive after they leave the child welfare system to an adopted home. Although media portrayals and anecdotal accounts from caseworkers suggest that adoptions from the child welfare system in Illinois fail at concerning rates,⁷ the analyses in this report that measure rates of adoption stability tell a different story. However, the terminology used to describe adoption stability varies considerably, which can cause confusion when trying to interpret research results.


For instance, the Child Welfare Information Gateway distinguishes between adoption disruptions and adoption dissolutions: adoption disruptions occur before an adoption is finalized, but after a child is placed in an adoptive home, and adoption dissolutions occur after adoptions are legally finalized. In both cases, the child re-enters substitute care and is placed into a new foster home.⁸ National research suggests that between 10-25% of planned adoptions disrupt before they are finalized due to a variety of factors related to the child (age, behavioral issues), the adoptive family (lack of support), and the child welfare agency (overstaffed, lack of continuity of case).⁹ Dissolution rates are harder to measure due to a variety of factors, but best estimates indicate that between 1-7% of adoptions dissolve after they are legally finalized.¹⁰ Dissolutions occur for similar reasons as disruptions, but also include the cost of providing care for the child and a lack of information and support.

Due to limitations in the administrative data, pre-finalization adoption disruptions cannot be measured and included in the *B.H.* report. Instead, an adoption stability measure is used to examine the number of children remaining in their adoptive homes within 2, 5, and 10 years after the adoption is finalized. If the adopted child has been placed into substitute care within these time periods, it

is considered a non-stable adoption. This may mean that an adoption dissolution occurred, but it may also mean that adopted children are not in the home for other reasons such as temporary placement in specialized foster care or a residential treatment facility for more intensive treatment than possible in a home setting. This adoption stability measure does not include children who leave their adopted home due to a short-term crisis, such as a short respite placement.

Based on this measure, adoption stability has been remarkably consistent over the past two decades (see Figure 3.12 and Appendix B, Indicators 3.D.1, 3.D.2, and 3.D.3). Within 2 years of being adopted, 97.9% of children are in their adoptive homes; within 5 years, 96.2% of children are in their adoptive homes; and within 10 years, 89.2% of children are in their adoptive homes.

Figure 3.12
Stable Adoptions at 2, 5, and 10 Years After Finalization



⁷ For example, see Knight, M. (December 29, 2011). Failed adoptions create more homeless youths. *The New York Times*. Available online: <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/30/us/failed-adoptions-create-more-homeless-youths.html?pagewanted=1&r=2>


⁸ Child Welfare Information Gateway. (2012). Adoption Disruption and Dissolution. Retrieved from https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/s_disrup.pdf

⁹ George, R. M., Howard, E. C., Yu, D., & Radomsky, S. (1997). Adoption, disruption, and displacement in the child welfare system, 1976-94. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chapin Hall Center for Children; Festinger, T. (2002). After adoption: Dissolution or permanence? *Child Welfare*, 81(3), 515-533; Festinger, T. (2012). Adoption disruption: Rates, correlates, and service needs. In G. P. Mallon & P. M. Hess (Eds.), *Child Welfare for the 21st Century: A handbook of practices, policies, and programs* (2nd ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

¹⁰ Goerge et al. (1997). Adoption, disruption, and displacement in the child welfare system, 1976-94. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chapin Hall Center for Children; U.S. General Accounting Office. (2003). *Foster care: States focusing on finding permanent homes for children, but long-standing barriers remain* (GAO-03-626T). Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/110/109829.pdf>.

children who entered in 2002 to 2.4% for children who entered care in 2011 (see Appendix B, Indicator 3.E.2). The rates of children who exit to subsidized guardianship within 24 months of entry has also declined (see Appendix B, Indicator 3.E.1).

Figure 3.13
Children Exiting to Guardianship
Within 24 and 36 Months



In the past, children ages 9 to 14 years when they enter substitute care were more likely to exit care to guardianship compared to children of other ages (see Figure 3.14 and Appendix B, Indicator 3.E.2). However, the percentage of children in this age group who exit to guardianship has declined rather dramatically in recent years: from 8.3% of children ages 9 – 14 years who entered care in 2007 to 3.3% of children who entered care in 2011. There was also a precipitous decline in the percentage of youth ages 15 and older who exited to guardianship within 36 months: only one youth (0.2%) in this age group who entered care in 2011 exited to guardianship by 2014.

Sub-regional comparisons in exits to guardianship are shown in Figure 3.15 (see Appendix C, Indicator 3.E.2). The general trend over the entire seven year period is one of declining performance. In the Rockford, Springfield, and East St. Louis sub-regions, less than 5 children who entered care in 2009, 2010, or 2011 have exited to subsidized guardianship within 36 months.

Figure 3.14
Children Exiting to Guardianship
Within 36 Months by Age





Figure 3.15
Children Exiting to Guardianship Within 36
Months Sub-region Heat Map

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Cook North							
Cook Central							
Cook South							
Aurora							
Rockford							
Champaign							
Peoria							
Springfield							
East St. Louis							
Marion							

Stability of Guardianship

The percentage of children who exited substitute care to guardianships and remained in these homes within two years post-discharge has been generally stable over the past several years, ranging from 93.5% to 97.4%. The percentages of children that remain in stable guardianships within five years post-discharge has ranged from 86.3% to 91.4% and within ten years post-discharge from 78.9% to 85.4% (see Figure 3.16 and see Appendix B, Indicators 3.F.1, 3.F.2 and 3.F.3).

Figure 3.16
Stable Guardianships 2, 5, and 10 Years After Finalization




Children Who Exit Substitute Care Without Achieving Legal Permanence

Within three years of entering substitute care, over half of all children exit the system through the planned permanency options of reunification, adoption, or guardianship. However, some children exit the system without ever achieving a legally permanent relationship with a parent or guardian. Many of these “non-permanency exits” – incarceration, running away, and aging out – occur mainly among older youth. In fact, youth who enter care when they are 15 years or

older are almost equally likely to exit care through a non-permanent exit type as they are to reunification, adoption, and guardianship combined (see Figure 3.17). Of the 625 youth who were 15 years and older when they entered substitute care in 2011, 153 of them (24%) exited care without achieving legal permanence. Within this 24% of children who exit without permanence, the largest group (12%) consisted of youth with a court-ordered release from substitute care but no permanent home. Another 3% of these youth aged out of the system. Youth who exited care with a “service completion” code (6%) had their case closed due to completion of child welfare services prior to the age of 18 but did not achieve legal permanence.

Figure 3.17
Exits from Substitute Care Within 36 Months: Children Ages 15 and Older (2011 Entry Cohort)




Children Remaining in Substitute Care Over 36 Months

Although a little over half of all children who enter substitute care in a given year attain permanence within 36 months through reunification, adoption, or guardianship, a significant portion of children remain in care longer than three years. For children entering care between 2005 and 2011, the portion that remained in care at 36 months after entry has been consistently around 41% (see Figure 3.18). For example, of the 4,855

children that entered substitute care in 2011, 39% were reunified within three years, 11% were adopted, 2.4% were taken into guardianship, 4.9% exited through another means (e.g. aging out, court ordered release), and 42.2% remained in care.

Figure 3.18
Exits from Substitute Care Within 36 Months



Discussion and Conclusions: Legal Permanence

When children are removed from their homes and placed into substitute care, the goal for most children is to reunify them with their parents as soon as it is deemed safe to do so. However, not all parents are able to make the changes in their lives that are necessary for their children to return home. For these children, permanent families are sought through either adoption or guardianship. In Illinois, a little over half of all children who enter substitute care achieve some form of family

permanency (reunification, adoption, or guardianship) within three years, and this overall permanency rate has been very consistent over the past decade. However, a focus on the combined permanency rate masks recent or emerging trends in the rates of reunification, adoption, and guardianship.

After many years of stagnancy, the percentage of children reunified with their parents within 36 months of entering substitute care has increased over the past five years – from 35.2% of those who entered care in 2006 to 39.4% of those who entered care in 2011. Over the same time span, however, rates of adoption within 36 months of entry into substitute care have decreased – from 14.3% of children who entered care in 2006 to 11.1% of children who entered care in 2011. Rates of adoptions have declined more noticeably among some groups of children compared to others, especially among children living in the Cook region, where rates have declined from 12.2% of children who entered care in 2006 to 5.4% of children who entered care in 2011 – a 56% decrease in the past five years.

The use of guardianship as a permanency option increased dramatically in the late 1990s and early 2000s but has waned considerably since then; only 2.4% of the children who entered substitute care in 2011 exited to guardianship by the end of 2014. The decline in the use of guardianship is puzzling, given that the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services was a pioneer in both practice and research on subsidized guardianship.¹¹ In 1997, Illinois was one of 8 states selected to implement a federal waiver that enabled states to use federal Title IV-E funds otherwise earmarked for foster care to support payments to kin providing subsidized guardianship. The waiver demonstration ended in 2006 and a Children and Family Research Center report argued this put the continuation of the Illinois subsidized guardianship program at risk.¹² But in 2008, drawing on the successful experience of Illinois and other states,¹³ Congress passed the Fostering Connections Act, which permanently enabled all states to use Title IV-E funds to support subsidized guardianship.

¹¹ Children and Family Research Center. (n.d.) *A decade of family permanence in Illinois: 1997-2007*. Urbana, IL: CFRC, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Testa, M. F. (2002). Subsidized guardianship: Testing an idea whose time has finally come. *Social Work Research*, 26, 145–158.

¹² Children and Family Research Center. (n.d.) *A decade of family permanence in Illinois: 1997-2007*. Urbana, IL: CFRC, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

¹³ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (2011). *Synthesis of Findings: Subsidized Guardianship Child Welfare Waiver Demonstrations*. Washington, DC: Author.

The Fostering Connections Act, however, introduced a requirement that was not present in the Illinois subsidized guardianship waiver demonstration project: only those kin who are licensed foster care providers are eligible to receive subsidies. Although it is possible to issue waivers for non-safety licensing standards for individual cases, these are designed primarily for minor deviations from housing and training requirements and are issued in very small percentages of cases nationwide.¹⁴ The licensing requirement presents a challenge for many kinship foster care providers in Illinois,¹⁵ a majority of whom are not licensed and therefore would no longer receive subsidies once they became legal guardians of their foster children. The loss of subsidies for unlicensed kinship foster care providers associated with legal guardianship subsequent to the Fostering Connections Act was a disincentive for these parents and may have contributed to the decline in the rates of guardianship in Illinois that followed the implementation of the Act.

A recent federal report examined the implementation of the Fostering Connections Act in the states and found that kin foster care providers balk at seeking licensure for a variety of reasons, including the time required to obtain a license, the necessity of providing personal information, or the overwhelming nature of the paperwork required. Some caregivers do not have dwellings that meet the requirements for licensure or cannot meet other standards, and others want to avoid association with the child welfare system.¹⁶ The results presented in this report should motivate further inquiry into the status of guardianship in Illinois and the reasons for the recent decline, including the possible role of licensing. One useful step would be to conduct a qualitative interview study of kinship foster care providers, which would explore, among other topics, their reaction to the subsidized guardianship option and the requirement of licensure.

¹⁴ Children's Bureau. (2011). *Report to Congress on states' use of waivers of non-safety licensing standards for relative foster family homes*. Washington, DC: Author.

¹⁵ See testimony of then DCFS Director Erwin McEwen in U.S House of Representative Committee on Ways and Means (2010). *Hearing on the implementation of the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

¹⁶ Children's Bureau. (2011). *Report to Congress on states' use of waivers of non-safety licensing standards for relative foster family homes*. Washington, DC: Author.



APPENDIX A

Indicator Definitions

Appendix A provides definitions of the indicators used in the following chapters of this report:

Chapter 1 - Child Safety

Chapter 2 - Children in Substitute Care: Safety, Continuity, and Stability

Chapter 3 - Legal Permanence: Reunification, Adoption, and Guardianship

The data used to compute these indicators come from the September 30, 2014 data extract of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services Integrated Database, which is maintained by Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago. The acronyms included in the indicator definitions come from the Integrated Database Codebook.¹

¹ Chapin Hall. (2003). *Illinois Department of Children and Family Services Integrated Database Codebook (Version 10)*. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago.

Chapter 1: Child Safety

Indicator 1.A: Of all children with a substantiated report, what percentage had another substantiated report within 12 months?

Definition: All children with a substantiated report of maltreatment during the fiscal year, and the percentage of those children that had another substantiated report of maltreatment within 12 months of the initial report.

Indicator 1.B: Of all children served at home in intact family cases, what percentage had a substantiated report within 12 months?

Definition: All children who are served at home in an intact family case, and the percentage of those children who experienced a substantiated report of maltreatment within a year of their case open date. Intact family cases are defined as those in which all children in a family are at home at the time the family case opens and do not enter substitute care within 30 days after case opening.

Indicator 1.C: Of all children in a substantiated report who did not receive intact family or substitute care services, what percentage had another substantiated report within 12 months?

Definition: All children with a substantiated report during the fiscal year who were not part of either a family case or placed in substitute care at the time of the initial report or within 60 days of the initial report, and the percentage of those children that had another substantiated report within 12 months of the initial report.

Chapter 2: Children in Substitute Care: Safety, Continuity, and Stability

Indicator 2.A: Of all children placed in substitute care during the year, what percentage had a substantiated report during placement?

Definition: All children ever served in substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage that had a substantiated report during placement. This analysis excludes cases lasting less than seven days, placements lasting less than seven days, and reports made less than seven days into the placement.

Indicator 2.B.1: Of all children entering substitute care, what percentage is placed in a traditional foster home in their first placement?

Definition: All children entering substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage initially placed in traditional foster homes. The Traditional Foster Home category includes Foster Home Boarding DCFS (FHB), Foster Home Indian (FHI), Foster Home Boarding Private Agency (FHP), and Foster Home Adoption (FHA). Cases lasting less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 2.B.2: Of all children entering substitute care, what percentage is placed in a specialized foster home in their first placement?

Definition: All children entering substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage initially placed in specialized foster homes. The Specialized Foster Home category includes Foster Home Specialized (FHS) and Foster Home Treatment (FHT). Cases lasting less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 2.B.3: Of all children entering substitute care, what percentage is placed in a kinship foster home in their first placement?

Definition: All children entering substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage initially placed in kinship foster homes. The Kinship Foster Home category includes Delegated Relative Authority (DRA) and Home of Relative (HMR). Cases lasting less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 2.B.4: Of all children entering substitute care, what percentage is placed in a group home or institution in their first placement?

Definition: All children entering substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage initially placed in a group home or institution. The Group Home or Institution category includes Group Home (GRH), Detention Facility/Jail (DET), Institution DCFS (ICF), Institution Department of Corrections (IDC), Institution Department of Mental Health (IMH), Institution Private Child Care Facility (IPA), Institution Rehabilitation Services (IRS), Nursing Care Facility (NCF), and Youth Emergency Shelters (YES). Cases lasting less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 2.C.1: Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed in traditional foster homes?

Definition: All children in substitute care at the end of the fiscal year, and the percentage placed in traditional foster homes. The Traditional Foster Home category includes Foster Home Boarding (FHB), Foster Home Indian (FHI), Foster Home Boarding Private Agency (FHP), and Foster Home Adoption (FHA).

Indicator 2.C.2: Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed in specialized foster homes?

Definition: All children in substitute care at the end of the fiscal year, and the percentage placed in specialized foster homes. The Specialized Foster Home category includes Foster Home Specialized (FHS) and Foster Home Treatment (FHT).

Indicator 2.C.3: Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed in kinship foster homes?

Definition: All children in substitute care at the end of the fiscal year, and the percentage placed in kinship foster homes. The Kinship Foster Home category includes Delegated Relative Authority (DRA) and Home of Relative (HMR).

Indicator 2.C.4: Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed in group homes?

Definition: All children in substitute care at the end of the fiscal year, and the percentage placed in group homes. The Group Home category includes only Group Home (GRH).

Indicator 2.C.5: Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed in institutions?

Definition: All children in substitute care at the end of the fiscal year, and the percentage placed in institutions. The Institution category includes Detention Facility/Jail (DET), Institution DCFS (ICF), Institution Department of Corrections (IDC), Institution Department of Mental Health (IMH), Institution Private Child Care Facility (IPA), Institution Rehabilitation

Services (IRS), Nursing Care Facility (NCF), and Youth Emergency Shelters (YES).

Indicator 2.C.6: Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed in independent living?

Definition: All children in substitute care at the end of the fiscal year, and the percentage placed in an independent living. The Independent Living category includes Community Integrated Living Arrangement (CIL), Independent Living Only (ILO), and Transitional Living Program (TLP).

Indicator 2.D: Of all children entering substitute care, what percentage is placed with their siblings in their first placement?

Definition: All children entering substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage of children placed in the same home as all of their siblings in substitute care in their initial placement. Children with no siblings in substitute care are excluded from this analysis. Siblings of children in substitute care who are not in substitute care are also excluded. Siblings are defined as children who belong to a common family based on the ID number of the family.

Indicator 2.E: Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed with their siblings?

Definition: All children in substitute care at the end of the fiscal year, and the percentage of children placed in the same home as all of their siblings in substitute care at the end of the fiscal year. Children with no siblings in substitute care are excluded from this analysis. Siblings of children in substitute care who are not in substitute

care are also excluded. Siblings are defined as children who belong to a common family based on the ID number of the family.

Indicator 2.F: For all children entering substitute care, what is the median distance from their home of origin to their initial placement?

Definition: All children entering substitute care during the fiscal year, and the median distance (in miles) from the child's home of origin to the child's initial placement. Only children with valid address data are used in the calculation of the median. Region and sub-region categories are based on where the case opened.

Indicator 2.G: For all children in substitute care at the end of the fiscal year, what is the median distance from their home of origin?

Definition: All children in substitute care (excluding those in independent living) at the end of the fiscal year, and the median distance (in miles) from the child's home of origin to the child's placement at the end of the fiscal year. Only children with valid address data are used in the calculation of the median. Region and sub-region categories are based on where the case opened.

Indicator 2.H: Of all children entering substitute care and staying for at least one year, what percentage had two or fewer placements within their first year of removal?

Definition: All the children who stayed in substitute care for at least one year, and the percentage that had two or fewer placements within their first year in substitute care. The following placement types were excluded from the calculation of placement stability: runaway, detention, respite care (defined as a placement of less than 30 days

where the child returns to the same placement), hospital stays, and placements coded as “whereabouts unknown.”

Indicator 2.I: Of all children ages 12 to 17 entering substitute care, what percentage ran away from a substitute care placement during their first year?

Definition: All children ages 12 to 17 entering substitute care, and the percentage that ran away from their substitute care placement within one year from the case opening date. Runaway includes Runaway, Abducted, and Whereabouts Unknown.

Indicator 2.J: For all children entering substitute care for the first time during the fiscal year, what is the median length of stay in substitute care?

Definition: All children entering substitute care during the fiscal year, and the median number of months children stay in substitute care. The median represents the amount of time that it took half of children who entered substitute care in a given fiscal year to exit care, either through permanence (reunification, adoption, or subsidized guardianship) or emancipation. This indicator looks only at first spells and excludes spells lasting less than seven days.

Chapter 3: Legal Permanence: Reunification, Adoption, and Guardianship

Indicator 3.A.1: Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage was reunified with their parents within 12 months of their date of entry into substitute care?

Definition: All children who entered substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage reunified

within 12 months of date of entry into substitute care. Cases lasting less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.A.2: Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage was reunified with their parents within 24 months from their date of entry into substitute care?

Definition: All children who entered substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage reunified within 24 months of date of entry into substitute care. Cases lasting less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.A.3: Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage was reunified with their parents within 36 months of date of entry into substitute care?

Definition: All children who entered substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage reunified within 36 months of date of entry into substitute care. Cases lasting less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.B.1: Of all children who were reunified during the year, what percentage remained with their family at one year?

Definition: All children reunified with their biological family during the fiscal year, and the percentage that did not re-enter substitute care within one year of reunification. Cases that re-entered substitute care and stayed less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.B.2: Of all children who were reunified during the year, what percentage remained with their family at two years?

Definition: All children reunified with their biological family during the fiscal year, and the percentage that did not re-enter substitute care within two years of reunification. Cases that re-entered substitute care and stayed less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.B.3: Of all children who were reunified during the year, what percentage remained with their family at five years?

Definition: All children reunified with their biological family during the fiscal year, and the percentage that did not re-enter substitute care within five years of reunification. Cases that re-entered substitute care and stayed less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.B.4: Of all children who were reunified during the year, what percentage remained with their family at ten years?

Definition: All children reunified with their biological family during the fiscal year, and the percentage that did not re-enter substitute care within ten years of reunification. Cases that re-entered substitute care and stayed less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.C.1: Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage was adopted within 24 months of date of entry into substitute care?

Definition: All children who entered substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage adopted within 24 months of date of entry into substitute care. Cases lasting less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.C.2: Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage was

adopted within 36 months of date of entry into substitute care?

Definition: All children who entered substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage adopted within 36 months of date of entry into substitute care. Cases lasting less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.D.1: Of all children who were adopted during the year, what percentage remained with their family at two years?

Definition: All children adopted during the fiscal year, and the percentage that did not re-enter substitute care within two years of adoption. Cases that re-entered substitute care and stayed less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.D.2: Of all children who were adopted during the year, what percentage remained with their family at five years?

Definition: All children adopted during the fiscal year, and the percentage that did not re-enter substitute care within five years of adoption. Cases that re-entered substitute care and stayed less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.D.3: Of all children who were adopted during the year, what percentage remained with their family at ten years?

Definition: All children adopted during the fiscal year, and the percentage that did not re-enter substitute care within ten years of adoption. Cases that re-entered substitute care and stayed less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.E.1: Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage attained subsidized guardianship within 24 months of date of entry into substitute care?

Definition: All children who entered substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage that attained subsidized guardianship within 24 months of date of entry into substitute care. Cases lasting less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.E.2: Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage attained subsidized guardianship within 36 months of date of entry into substitute care?

Definition: All children who entered substitute care during the fiscal year, and the percentage that attained subsidized guardianship within 36 months of date of entry into substitute care. Cases lasting less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.F.1: Of all children who attained subsidized guardianship during the year, what percentage remained with their family at two years?

Definition: All children taken into subsidized guardianship during the fiscal year, and the percentage that did not re-enter substitute care within two years of guardianship. Cases that re-entered substitute care and stayed less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.F.2: Of all children who attained subsidized guardianship during the year, what percentage remained with their family at five years?

Definition: All children taken into subsidized guardianship during the fiscal year, and the percentage that did not re-enter substitute care within five years of

guardianship. Cases that re-entered substitute care and stayed less than seven days are excluded.

Indicator 3.F.3: Of all children who attained subsidized guardianship during the year, what percentage remained with their families at ten years?

Definition: All children taken into subsidized guardianship during the fiscal year, and the percentage that did not re-enter substitute care within ten years. Cases that re-entered substitute care and stayed less than seven days are excluded.



APPENDIX B

Outcome Data by Region, Gender, Age, and Race

Appendix B provides data on each of the outcome indicators defined in Appendix A for the most recent seven state fiscal years. For each indicator, data is presented for the state as a whole, followed by breakdowns by DCFS administrative region, child gender, age, and race.

The data used to compute these indicators come from the September 30, 2014 data extract of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services Integrated Database, which is maintained by Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago. Indicator data is available online at <http://www.cfr.illinois.edu/outcomeindicators.php>

Maltreatment Recurrence Within 12 Months

Indicator 1.A	Of all children with a substantiated report, what percentage had another substantiated report within 12 months?						
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Children with substantiated reports	26,652	27,998	27,498	26,989	26,104	26,566	28,078
Children with another substantiated report within 12 months	3,073	3,259	3,050	2,930	2,836	2,909	3,161
Percent	11.5%	11.6%	11.1%	10.9%	10.9%	11.0%	11.3%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	624	8.3%	672	8.6%	630	8.5%	654	8.9%	629	8.9%	727	9.4%	753	9.5%
Northern	694	10.2%	893	11.4%	781	9.9%	662	9.0%	642	9.1%	642	9.0%	710	9.2%
Central	1,160	14.0%	1,106	13.2%	1,085	12.9%	1,024	12.3%	1,010	12.6%	1,029	13.1%	1,074	12.8%
Southern	595	14.8%	588	14.6%	554	14.6%	590	14.7%	552	13.9%	504	13.6%	624	15.5%

Female	1,490	11.1%	1,631	11.5%	1,501	10.7%	1,434	10.5%	1,404	10.6%	1,445	10.9%	1,551	10.8%
Male	1,563	12.0%	1,605	11.9%	1,517	11.5%	1,472	11.2%	1,400	11.1%	1,435	11.0%	1,575	11.7%

Under 3	916	12.0%	1,037	12.5%	938	11.5%	892	11.1%	873	11.8%	829	11.3%	897	11.6%
3 to 5	705	13.0%	719	12.7%	726	13.0%	698	12.4%	653	11.8%	693	12.2%	754	12.8%
6 to 8	570	11.9%	587	12.3%	547	11.6%	539	11.9%	501	11.3%	543	11.9%	606	12.3%
9 to 11	425	11.9%	446	11.6%	393	10.6%	398	10.8%	370	10.3%	385	10.2%	376	9.8%
12 to 14	290	9.5%	306	9.5%	270	8.9%	246	8.5%	280	9.5%	293	9.4%	317	9.6%
15 and Older	165	7.6%	163	7.6%	174	7.7%	155	7.2%	157	7.4%	163	7.9%	207	9.0%

African American	948	10.6%	1,052	11.3%	950	10.5%	826	9.6%	838	10.2%	892	10.4%	1,127	12.2%
Hispanic	175	8.1%	158	7.1%	147	7.2%	151	8.1%	148	8.1%	190	8.9%	162	7.9%
White	1,881	12.9%	1,941	12.6%	1,839	12.1%	1,849	12.1%	1,755	11.9%	1,724	11.8%	1,792	11.6%
Other Ethnicity	69	7.3%	108	9.8%	114	9.2%	104	7.8%	95	7.2%	103	8.3%	80	5.9%

Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children in Intact Family Cases

Indicator 1.B	Of all children served at home in intact family cases, what percentage had a substantiated report within 12 months?						
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Children in intact family cases	16,441	15,640	15,899	14,555	16,602	17,403	10,533
Children with substantiated reports	1,877	1,837	1,726	1,671	1,703	1,744	1,273
Percent	11.4%	11.7%	10.9%	11.5%	10.3%	10.0%	12.1%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	504	7.0%	484	7.6%	450	6.7%	426	7.0%	448	6.4%	484	7.0%	394	8.1%
Northern	310	12.8%	459	14.9%	351	10.9%	334	12.1%	359	10.6%	410	11.1%	216	12.8%
Central	675	14.9%	521	13.5%	571	15.3%	517	14.8%	553	14.7%	490	11.5%	424	15.4%
Southern	388	16.8%	373	15.9%	354	16.0%	394	17.7%	343	13.9%	360	14.5%	239	19.1%

Female	900	11.1%	842	11.1%	847	10.9%	829	11.5%	818	10.1%	874	10.3%	623	11.9%
Male	975	11.7%	991	12.3%	877	10.8%	842	11.4%	884	10.4%	870	9.8%	650	12.2%

Under 3	655	15.7%	683	17.1%	619	15.4%	565	15.1%	622	15.4%	569	13.8%	430	15.5%
3 to 5	396	12.3%	406	13.6%	415	13.6%	418	14.7%	388	12.1%	395	11.8%	312	14.2%
6 to 8	350	11.9%	308	10.6%	295	10.3%	300	12.1%	278	10.2%	308	10.5%	234	12.8%
9 to 11	246	11.2%	223	10.6%	203	9.4%	182	9.0%	189	7.5%	219	8.1%	141	9.8%
12 to 14	168	8.3%	152	8.1%	131	7.2%	138	8.0%	164	8.2%	170	7.8%	111	9.3%
15 and Older	62	3.3%	65	3.7%	63	3.2%	68	3.9%	62	2.9%	83	3.9%	45	4.1%

African American	718	9.8%	639	9.8%	579	8.7%	505	8.5%	503	7.7%	550	8.0%	490	10.5%
Hispanic	127	8.1%	149	9.3%	94	5.9%	127	9.1%	136	7.1%	182	8.8%	127	10.7%
White	1,007	14.3%	1,004	14.2%	1,004	14.4%	999	14.9%	1,027	13.8%	976	12.4%	627	14.6%
Other Ethnicity	25	5.1%	45	9.6%	49	7.4%	40	7.2%	37	5.2%	36	6.3%	29	7.5%

Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children Receiving No Services

Indicator 1.C	Of all children in a substantiated report who did not receive intact family or substitute care services, what percentage had another substantiated report within 12 months?						
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Children receiving no services	16,279	16,900	16,641	16,651	16,361	17,410	19,481
Children with substantiated reports	1,792	1,909	1,839	1,688	1,676	1,911	2,184
Percent	11.0%	11.3%	11.1%	10.1%	10.2%	11.0%	11.2%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	347	7.8%	402	9.0%	352	8.3%	398	8.9%	384	8.6%	543	10.2%	546	9.7%
Northern	446	9.2%	528	9.9%	522	9.9%	411	8.2%	381	8.2%	403	8.3%	507	9.0%
Central	692	14.5%	700	13.9%	695	13.4%	634	12.4%	609	12.1%	679	13.5%	737	13.1%
Southern	307	14.1%	279	13.5%	270	13.7%	245	11.6%	302	13.7%	280	13.4%	394	15.4%

Female	885	10.7%	978	11.1%	921	10.7%	830	9.7%	821	9.8%	934	10.7%	1,080	10.8%
Male	893	11.5%	915	11.5%	896	11.4%	842	10.7%	831	10.7%	962	11.3%	1,082	11.6%

Under 3	574	14.1%	649	14.5%	634	14.4%	584	13.1%	557	13.3%	601	13.9%	677	14.2%
3 to 5	395	11.8%	413	12.0%	421	12.4%	363	10.5%	359	10.5%	429	11.6%	511	12.5%
6 to 8	314	10.5%	356	12.0%	289	10.1%	283	10.0%	278	10.0%	328	10.7%	400	11.5%
9 to 11	226	10.0%	239	10.0%	231	9.8%	214	9.0%	219	9.2%	257	9.9%	252	8.8%
12 to 14	183	9.0%	168	7.9%	183	8.9%	151	7.6%	166	8.1%	208	9.4%	218	8.8%
15 and Older	94	6.2%	82	5.5%	77	5.0%	89	5.9%	94	6.3%	84	5.7%	121	7.0%

African American	524	10.3%	626	12.2%	568	11.3%	441	8.9%	494	10.3%	589	11.1%	763	12.5%
Hispanic	116	7.8%	95	6.4%	98	7.5%	107	8.3%	83	6.4%	145	9.2%	113	7.2%
White	1,106	12.2%	1,124	11.8%	1,097	11.5%	1,079	11.3%	1,045	11.1%	1,097	11.4%	1,257	11.6%
Other Ethnicity	46	7.0%	64	8.5%	76	9.6%	61	7.0%	54	6.1%	80	8.8%	51	5.2%

Maltreatment in Substitute Care

Indicator 2.A	Of all children placed in substitute care during the year, what percentage had a substantiated report during placement?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children ever in substitute care	22,315	21,945	21,766	21,410	21,454	20,895	20,838
Children with substantiated reports	414	412	387	440	403	403	433
Percent	1.9%	1.9%	1.8%	2.1%	1.9%	1.9%	2.1%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	102	1.0%	110	1.2%	80	0.9%	87	1.1%	112	1.4%	98	1.3%	133	1.7%
Northern	95	2.6%	102	2.6%	85	2.1%	94	2.4%	84	2.0%	89	2.1%	105	2.4%
Central	128	2.1%	144	2.4%	146	2.4%	186	3.1%	108	1.9%	139	2.5%	125	2.2%
Southern	89	3.3%	56	2.0%	76	2.5%	73	2.3%	99	3.0%	76	2.4%	69	2.2%

Female	225	2.1%	226	2.2%	175	1.7%	202	2.0%	202	2.0%	220	2.2%	229	2.3%
Male	187	1.6%	185	1.6%	212	1.9%	238	2.1%	201	1.8%	183	1.7%	204	1.9%

Under 3	144	1.7%	147	1.7%	151	1.8%	163	1.9%	153	1.8%	127	1.6%	134	1.7%
3 to 5	85	2.2%	83	2.2%	91	2.5%	99	2.8%	92	2.5%	92	2.6%	82	2.4%
6 to 8	85	2.7%	71	2.3%	63	2.2%	78	2.8%	67	2.5%	69	2.7%	92	3.4%
9 to 11	54	2.1%	58	2.4%	42	1.8%	48	2.1%	43	1.9%	54	2.5%	53	2.4%
12 to 14	37	1.4%	43	1.7%	31	1.2%	38	1.5%	34	1.4%	41	1.6%	52	2.0%
15 and Older	9	0.6%	10	0.6%	9	0.5%	14	0.7%	14	0.7%	20	1.0%	20	1.0%

African American	207	1.6%	206	1.7%	194	1.6%	233	2.0%	192	1.7%	212	2.0%	192	1.8%
Hispanic	29	2.1%	21	1.6%	24	1.9%	20	1.6%	28	2.3%	9	0.7%	37	2.9%
White	172	2.2%	180	2.3%	167	2.0%	181	2.1%	176	2.0%	177	2.1%	195	2.3%
Other Ethnicity	6	1.4%	5	1.3%	2	0.5%	6	1.7%	7	1.8%	5	1.1%	9	1.9%

Initial Placement: Traditional Foster Home

Indicator 2.B.1	Of all children entering substitute care, what percentage is placed in a traditional foster home in their first placement?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children entering substitute care	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855	4,942	4,842	4,960
Children placed in traditional foster homes	1,609	1,442	1,261	1,301	1,275	1,263	1,267
Percent	30.3%	29.4%	24.9%	26.8%	25.8%	26.1%	25.5%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	323	20.5%	218	17.2%	213	15.3%	178	14.2%	134	9.5%	172	12.7%	268	18.8%
Northern	331	31.7%	307	27.4%	279	27.3%	335	32.7%	366	32.3%	339	27.7%	288	26.2%
Central	597	32.9%	610	36.9%	559	32.8%	570	35.1%	555	37.9%	581	38.6%	525	33.2%
Southern	358	42.0%	307	36.2%	210	22.3%	218	23.0%	218	23.7%	171	22.9%	186	22.2%

Female	787	30.8%	728	29.9%	616	25.5%	652	27.8%	644	26.6%	619	26.4%	640	26.3%
Male	820	29.9%	713	28.9%	645	24.3%	649	25.8%	631	25.1%	644	25.8%	627	24.9%

Under 3	731	35.4%	697	36.0%	648	31.9%	637	33.8%	629	33.4%	655	34.8%	665	36.6%
3 to 5	227	26.6%	208	27.6%	196	24.3%	208	25.4%	212	24.5%	202	25.1%	195	24.5%
6 to 8	177	28.2%	165	27.8%	111	18.4%	142	24.7%	157	26.4%	141	24.2%	136	19.7%
9 to 11	145	28.4%	130	26.9%	87	19.1%	116	25.6%	88	19.4%	101	21.9%	100	19.5%
12 to 14	161	27.1%	124	22.0%	117	20.8%	106	21.2%	94	18.1%	80	14.7%	88	15.9%
15 and Older	168	25.6%	118	20.6%	102	16.5%	92	14.7%	95	15.1%	84	14.8%	83	14.1%

African American	716	28.8%	623	28.3%	523	23.8%	498	23.5%	486	22.8%	509	24.3%	592	26.9%
Hispanic	81	26.1%	65	23.1%	56	21.1%	77	32.4%	47	17.8%	77	22.1%	82	24.0%
White	769	32.2%	726	31.5%	666	26.6%	706	29.7%	716	29.6%	628	27.8%	555	24.3%
Other Ethnicity	43	35.0%	28	23.3%	16	14.5%	20	16.5%	26	20.5%	49	35.3%	38	27.9%

Initial Placement: Specialized Foster Home

Indicator 2.B.2	Of all children entering substitute care, what percentage is placed in a specialized foster home in their first placement?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children entering substitute care	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855	4,942	4,842	4,960
Children placed in specialized foster homes	136	145	127	119	86	120	130
Percent	2.6%	3.0%	2.5%	2.5%	1.7%	2.5%	2.6%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	59	3.8%	51	4.0%	40	2.9%	47	3.7%	40	2.8%	61	4.5%	72	5.0%
Northern	21	2.0%	22	2.0%	20	2.0%	10	1.0%	12	1.1%	15	1.2%	15	1.4%
Central	30	1.7%	48	2.9%	46	2.7%	51	3.1%	17	1.2%	30	2.0%	23	1.5%
Southern	26	3.1%	24	2.8%	21	2.2%	11	1.2%	16	1.7%	10	1.3%	14	1.7%

Female	65	2.5%	68	2.8%	59	2.4%	57	2.4%	42	1.7%	58	2.5%	69	2.8%
Male	71	2.6%	77	3.1%	68	2.6%	62	2.5%	44	1.7%	62	2.5%	61	2.4%

Under 3	44	2.1%	41	2.1%	49	2.4%	32	1.7%	26	1.4%	39	2.1%	46	2.5%
3 to 5	7	0.8%	8	1.1%	3	0.4%	14	1.7%	7	0.8%	13	1.6%	16	2.0%
6 to 8	9	1.4%	14	2.4%	10	1.7%	9	1.6%	8	1.3%	11	1.9%	8	1.2%
9 to 11	19	3.7%	21	4.3%	11	2.4%	18	4.0%	11	2.4%	13	2.8%	11	2.1%
12 to 14	30	5.0%	33	5.9%	31	5.5%	25	5.0%	12	2.3%	22	4.0%	19	3.4%
15 and Older	27	4.1%	28	4.9%	23	3.7%	21	3.4%	22	3.5%	22	3.9%	30	5.1%

African American	66	2.7%	66	3.0%	50	2.3%	63	3.0%	41	1.9%	71	3.4%	72	3.3%
Hispanic	13	4.2%	5	1.8%	4	1.5%	3	1.3%	6	2.3%	6	1.7%	9	2.6%
White	55	2.3%	67	2.9%	70	2.8%	49	2.1%	34	1.4%	40	1.8%	43	1.9%
Other Ethnicity	2	1.6%	7	5.8%	3	2.7%	4	3.3%	5	3.9%	3	2.2%	6	4.4%

Initial Placement: Kinship Foster Home

Indicator 2.B.3	Of all children entering substitute care, what percentage is placed in a kinship foster home in their first placement?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children entering substitute care	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855	4,942	4,842	4,960
Children placed in kinship foster homes	2,646	2,483	2,697	2,431	2,516	2,530	2,681
Percent	49.9%	50.6%	53.2%	50.1%	50.9%	52.3%	54.1%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	531	33.8%	411	32.5%	522	37.5%	413	32.9%	527	37.4%	539	39.9%	585	41.0%
Northern	606	58.1%	700	62.4%	639	62.5%	590	57.5%	657	58.0%	760	62.1%	688	62.7%
Central	1,082	59.6%	895	54.1%	996	58.5%	888	54.7%	797	54.4%	807	53.6%	940	59.5%
Southern	427	50.1%	477	56.3%	540	57.4%	540	57.1%	535	58.3%	424	56.7%	468	55.8%

Female	1,307	51.1%	1,284	52.8%	1,311	54.3%	1,193	50.9%	1,276	52.6%	1,275	54.3%	1,366	56.0%
Male	1,332	48.6%	1,197	48.5%	1,385	52.1%	1,238	49.3%	1,239	49.2%	1,255	50.3%	1,315	52.1%

Under 3	1,067	51.7%	1,017	52.5%	1,108	54.6%	1,018	54.1%	1,008	53.6%	1,007	53.6%	1,001	55.2%
3 to 5	541	63.4%	464	61.6%	516	63.9%	483	59.0%	532	61.5%	496	61.7%	517	64.9%
6 to 8	377	60.1%	364	61.3%	387	64.3%	346	60.3%	355	59.7%	378	64.8%	475	68.6%
9 to 11	267	52.4%	269	55.6%	270	59.3%	256	56.5%	259	57.2%	275	59.7%	305	59.6%
12 to 14	226	38.0%	212	37.7%	241	42.8%	177	35.3%	215	41.4%	228	41.8%	224	40.4%
15 and Older	168	25.6%	157	27.4%	175	28.4%	151	24.2%	147	23.4%	146	25.7%	159	26.9%

African American	1,111	44.7%	997	45.3%	1,101	50.1%	996	46.9%	994	46.6%	1,015	48.5%	1,046	47.5%
Hispanic	145	46.8%	132	47.0%	129	48.7%	85	35.7%	131	49.6%	177	50.9%	174	51.0%
White	1,357	56.8%	1,299	56.4%	1,410	56.4%	1,285	54.1%	1,339	55.4%	1,284	56.8%	1,396	61.2%
Other Ethnicity	33	26.8%	55	45.8%	57	51.8%	65	53.7%	52	40.9%	54	38.8%	65	47.8%

Initial Placement: Group Home/Institution

Indicator 2.B.4	Of all children entering substitute care, what percentage is placed in a group home or institution in their first placement?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children entering substitute care	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855	4,942	4,842	4,960
Children placed in group homes or institutions	874	792	946	934	1,022	883	835
Percent	16.5%	16.2%	18.6%	19.2%	20.7%	18.2%	16.8%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	630	40.1%	564	44.5%	580	41.7%	565	45.0%	677	48.0%	538	39.8%	456	32.0%
Northern	85	8.1%	93	8.3%	84	8.2%	91	8.9%	97	8.6%	108	8.8%	107	9.7%
Central	94	5.2%	83	5.0%	98	5.8%	96	5.9%	89	6.1%	85	5.6%	92	5.8%
Southern	41	4.8%	39	4.6%	169	18.0%	176	18.6%	147	16.0%	143	19.1%	170	20.3%

Female	365	14.3%	331	13.6%	400	16.6%	399	17.0%	435	17.9%	370	15.8%	333	13.7%
Male	509	18.6%	460	18.6%	546	20.5%	535	21.3%	587	23.3%	513	20.6%	502	19.9%

Under 3	221	10.7%	181	9.3%	224	11.0%	196	10.4%	219	11.6%	179	9.5%	103	5.7%
3 to 5	78	9.1%	73	9.7%	92	11.4%	114	13.9%	114	13.2%	93	11.6%	69	8.7%
6 to 8	64	10.2%	51	8.6%	94	15.6%	77	13.4%	75	12.6%	53	9.1%	73	10.5%
9 to 11	79	15.5%	64	13.2%	87	19.1%	63	13.9%	95	21.0%	72	15.6%	96	18.8%
12 to 14	176	29.6%	193	34.3%	174	30.9%	193	38.5%	198	38.2%	216	39.6%	223	40.3%
15 and Older	256	39.0%	230	40.1%	275	44.6%	291	46.6%	321	51.1%	269	47.4%	271	45.9%

African American	565	22.8%	488	22.2%	496	22.6%	521	24.6%	590	27.7%	477	22.8%	465	21.1%
Hispanic	70	22.6%	76	27.0%	74	27.9%	71	29.8%	79	29.9%	87	25.0%	73	21.4%
White	194	8.1%	199	8.6%	342	13.7%	310	13.1%	309	12.8%	286	12.6%	271	11.9%
Other Ethnicity	45	36.6%	29	24.2%	34	30.9%	32	26.4%	44	34.6%	33	23.7%	26	19.1%

End of Year Placement: Traditional Foster Home

Indicator 2.C.1	Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed in traditional foster homes?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children in substitute care	17,385	16,914	16,517	16,552	16,020	15,894	15,982
Children living in traditional foster homes	4,776	4,704	4,351	4,354	4,171	4,187	4,230
Percent	27.5%	27.8%	26.3%	26.3%	26.0%	26.3%	26.5%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	1,969	24.5%	1,718	23.3%	1,466	20.8%	1,403	20.8%	1,327	20.9%	1,369	21.9%	1,449	23.2%
Northern	853	30.9%	888	30.1%	849	29.2%	883	29.5%	873	28.3%	851	26.0%	874	26.7%
Central	1,227	26.5%	1,334	29.9%	1,296	30.3%	1,311	29.7%	1,234	29.4%	1,262	30.6%	1,214	29.1%
Southern	727	37.6%	764	36.5%	740	32.5%	757	31.5%	737	30.9%	705	31.2%	693	30.4%

Female	2,376	28.8%	2,394	29.7%	2,227	28.3%	2,177	27.9%	2,115	27.7%	2,126	28.1%	2,172	28.4%
Male	2,391	26.3%	2,302	26.1%	2,120	24.5%	2,174	24.9%	2,056	24.5%	2,060	24.7%	2,057	24.7%

Under 3	1,339	42.1%	1,352	43.0%	1,324	41.7%	1,286	41.8%	1,293	43.1%	1,332	44.0%	1,322	43.8%
3 to 5	1,091	38.4%	1,141	39.3%	1,098	37.1%	1,167	36.8%	1,103	35.8%	1,128	37.4%	1,082	36.7%
6 to 8	723	32.9%	755	34.9%	686	32.1%	729	33.3%	697	32.2%	680	30.9%	731	31.2%
9 to 11	537	29.8%	486	27.5%	446	25.8%	455	26.0%	402	24.5%	406	24.7%	445	25.8%
12 to 14	480	24.7%	419	23.1%	359	21.1%	321	19.3%	305	18.2%	296	17.6%	298	17.9%
15 and Older	606	11.2%	551	10.8%	438	9.1%	396	8.4%	371	8.3%	345	8.0%	352	8.2%

African American	2,668	25.6%	2,517	25.8%	2,208	23.9%	2,157	24.0%	2,042	24.0%	2,019	24.1%	2,066	25.0%
Hispanic	315	30.7%	295	29.7%	284	29.7%	265	28.1%	231	25.5%	238	24.4%	281	26.8%
White	1,708	30.2%	1,800	30.6%	1,785	29.2%	1,859	29.2%	1,803	28.6%	1,823	29.3%	1,769	28.0%
Other Ethnicity	85	31.1%	92	33.9%	74	31.4%	73	28.1%	95	32.2%	107	32.6%	114	31.9%

End of Year Placement: Specialized Foster Home

Indicator 2.C.2	Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed in specialized foster homes?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children in substitute care	17,385	16,914	16,517	16,552	16,020	15,894	15,982
Children living in specialized foster homes	2,882	2,971	2,839	2,838	2,712	2,659	2,565
Percent	16.6%	17.6%	17.2%	17.1%	16.9%	16.7%	16.0%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	1,698	21.1%	1,711	23.2%	1,590	22.6%	1,542	22.9%	1,418	22.4%	1,356	21.7%	1,316	21.1%
Northern	326	11.8%	370	12.6%	360	12.4%	378	12.6%	410	13.3%	427	13.0%	420	12.8%
Central	596	12.9%	622	13.9%	631	14.7%	657	14.9%	637	15.2%	635	15.4%	603	14.4%
Southern	262	13.5%	268	12.8%	258	11.3%	261	10.9%	246	10.3%	238	10.5%	223	9.8%

Female	1,210	14.6%	1,267	15.7%	1,197	15.2%	1,181	15.1%	1,131	14.8%	1,094	14.5%	1,081	14.1%
Male	1,672	18.4%	1,703	19.3%	1,641	19.0%	1,656	19.0%	1,580	18.8%	1,565	18.8%	1,483	17.8%

Under 3	230	7.2%	216	6.9%	222	7.0%	187	6.1%	153	5.1%	149	4.9%	177	5.9%
3 to 5	321	11.3%	338	11.6%	327	11.1%	356	11.2%	317	10.3%	290	9.6%	247	8.4%
6 to 8	411	18.7%	395	18.3%	395	18.5%	383	17.5%	391	18.1%	389	17.7%	351	15.0%
9 to 11	392	21.8%	436	24.7%	431	24.9%	461	26.3%	405	24.7%	401	24.4%	396	22.9%
12 to 14	513	26.4%	499	27.5%	446	26.3%	440	26.5%	468	28.0%	472	28.1%	444	26.6%
15 and Older	1,015	18.7%	1,087	21.2%	1,018	21.1%	1,011	21.5%	978	21.9%	958	22.1%	950	22.2%

African American	1,907	18.3%	1,913	19.6%	1,790	19.4%	1,779	19.8%	1,659	19.5%	1,621	19.4%	1,522	18.4%
Hispanic	159	15.5%	188	18.9%	179	18.7%	191	20.2%	173	19.1%	173	17.7%	175	16.7%
White	782	13.8%	832	14.1%	830	13.6%	828	13.0%	835	13.2%	818	13.1%	817	12.9%
Other Ethnicity	34	12.5%	38	14.0%	40	16.9%	40	15.4%	45	15.3%	47	14.3%	51	14.3%

End of Year Placement: Kinship Foster Home

Indicator 2.C.3	Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed in kinship foster homes?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children in substitute care	17,385	16,914	16,517	16,552	16,020	15,894	15,982
Children living in kinship foster homes	6,299	6,071	6,235	6,283	6,191	6,251	6,356
Percent	36.2%	35.9%	37.7%	38.0%	38.6%	39.3%	39.8%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	2,440	30.4%	2,088	28.3%	2,025	28.8%	1,944	28.8%	1,920	30.3%	1,998	32.0%	2,068	33.1%
Northern	1,243	45.0%	1,340	45.5%	1,335	45.9%	1,345	45.0%	1,413	45.8%	1,565	47.8%	1,505	46.0%
Central	1,873	40.5%	1,795	40.2%	1,847	43.2%	1,896	43.0%	1,754	41.8%	1,656	40.2%	1,745	41.8%
Southern	743	38.4%	848	40.5%	1,028	45.2%	1,098	45.8%	1,102	46.2%	1,032	45.7%	1,038	45.6%

Female	3,083	37.3%	3,006	37.2%	3,062	38.9%	3,105	39.8%	3,075	40.3%	3,121	41.3%	3,174	41.5%
Male	3,202	35.2%	3,058	34.6%	3,170	36.7%	3,175	36.3%	3,114	37.1%	3,129	37.6%	3,181	38.2%

Under 3	1,604	50.4%	1,563	49.8%	1,616	50.9%	1,597	51.9%	1,540	51.4%	1,536	50.8%	1,505	49.9%
3 to 5	1,416	49.9%	1,416	48.7%	1,523	51.5%	1,640	51.7%	1,646	53.4%	1,586	52.6%	1,613	54.7%
6 to 8	1,023	46.5%	980	45.3%	1,016	47.6%	1,031	47.2%	1,030	47.6%	1,097	49.9%	1,200	51.2%
9 to 11	750	41.7%	726	41.1%	728	42.1%	731	41.7%	714	43.5%	719	43.7%	769	44.6%
12 to 14	616	31.8%	554	30.6%	558	32.9%	555	33.4%	561	33.5%	575	34.2%	550	33.0%
15 and Older	890	16.4%	832	16.2%	794	16.5%	729	15.5%	700	15.7%	738	17.0%	719	16.8%

African American	3,498	33.5%	3,206	32.8%	3,169	34.4%	3,033	33.8%	2,917	34.3%	2,949	35.2%	2,925	35.4%
Hispanic	372	36.3%	329	33.1%	338	35.4%	331	35.1%	360	39.7%	417	42.8%	456	43.4%
White	2,331	41.2%	2,436	41.4%	2,641	43.3%	2,804	44.0%	2,794	44.3%	2,749	44.2%	2,829	44.8%
Other Ethnicity	98	35.9%	100	36.9%	87	36.9%	115	44.2%	120	40.7%	136	41.5%	146	40.9%

End of Year Placement: Group Home

Indicator 2.C.4	Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed in group homes?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children in substitute care	17,385	16,914	16,517	16,552	16,020	15,894	15,982
Children living in group homes	276	266	253	257	242	232	220
Percent	1.6%	1.6%	1.5%	1.6%	1.5%	1.5%	1.4%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	165	2.1%	174	2.4%	155	2.2%	133	2.0%	126	2.0%	101	1.6%	92	1.5%
Northern	40	1.4%	38	1.3%	47	1.6%	53	1.8%	44	1.4%	59	1.8%	55	1.7%
Central	53	1.1%	43	1.0%	39	0.9%	57	1.3%	53	1.3%	53	1.3%	52	1.2%
Southern	17	0.9%	10	0.5%	11	0.5%	14	0.6%	19	0.8%	19	0.8%	21	0.9%

Female	87	1.1%	89	1.1%	91	1.2%	89	1.1%	75	1.0%	79	1.0%	77	1.0%
Male	189	2.1%	177	2.0%	162	1.9%	168	1.9%	167	2.0%	153	1.8%	143	1.7%

Under 3	4	0.1%	3	0.1%	0	0.0%	3	0.1%	3	0.1%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%
3 to 5	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%
6 to 8	7	0.3%	7	0.3%	5	0.2%	4	0.2%	6	0.3%	6	0.3%	7	0.3%
9 to 11	7	0.4%	10	0.6%	13	0.8%	12	0.7%	7	0.4%	11	0.7%	8	0.5%
12 to 14	42	2.2%	40	2.2%	31	1.8%	38	2.3%	30	1.8%	33	2.0%	33	2.0%
15 and Older	215	4.0%	205	4.0%	204	4.2%	199	4.2%	195	4.4%	180	4.2%	171	4.0%

African American	172	1.6%	174	1.8%	156	1.7%	151	1.7%	140	1.6%	127	1.5%	127	1.5%
Hispanic	15	1.5%	18	1.8%	16	1.7%	17	1.8%	22	2.4%	17	1.7%	9	0.9%
White	87	1.5%	73	1.2%	80	1.3%	87	1.4%	77	1.2%	85	1.4%	77	1.2%
Other Ethnicity	2	0.7%	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	2	0.8%	3	1.0%	3	0.9%	7	2.0%

End of Year Placement: Institution

Indicator 2.C.5	Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed in institutions?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children in substitute care	17,385	16,914	16,517	16,552	16,020	15,894	15,982
Children living in institutions	1,449	1,491	1,530	1,521	1,481	1,389	1,439
Percent	8.3%	8.8%	9.3%	9.2%	9.2%	8.7%	9.0%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	778	9.7%	761	10.3%	740	10.5%	711	10.5%	652	10.3%	596	9.6%	588	9.4%
Northern	217	7.9%	238	8.1%	238	8.2%	245	8.2%	238	7.7%	241	7.4%	260	7.9%
Central	316	6.8%	324	7.3%	354	8.3%	355	8.0%	374	8.9%	363	8.8%	378	9.0%
Southern	118	6.1%	146	7.0%	181	8.0%	200	8.3%	211	8.8%	188	8.3%	211	9.3%

Female	459	5.6%	475	5.9%	487	6.2%	472	6.0%	470	6.2%	444	5.9%	464	6.1%
Male	990	10.9%	1,016	11.5%	1,043	12.1%	1,049	12.0%	1,011	12.1%	944	11.3%	975	11.7%

Under 3	7	0.2%	7	0.2%	10	0.3%	7	0.2%	10	0.3%	6	0.2%	10	0.3%
3 to 5	10	0.4%	9	0.3%	9	0.3%	10	0.3%	13	0.4%	9	0.3%	7	0.2%
6 to 8	34	1.5%	27	1.2%	34	1.6%	39	1.8%	38	1.8%	28	1.3%	53	2.3%
9 to 11	113	6.3%	110	6.2%	111	6.4%	93	5.3%	115	7.0%	108	6.6%	108	6.3%
12 to 14	288	14.8%	299	16.5%	304	17.9%	309	18.6%	309	18.5%	304	18.1%	342	20.5%
15 and Older	997	18.4%	1,039	20.3%	1,062	22.0%	1,063	22.6%	996	22.3%	934	21.6%	919	21.5%

African American	913	8.7%	914	9.4%	911	9.9%	910	10.1%	853	10.0%	801	9.6%	813	9.8%
Hispanic	72	7.0%	75	7.5%	72	7.5%	67	7.1%	66	7.3%	56	5.7%	67	6.4%
White	425	7.5%	475	8.1%	527	8.6%	525	8.2%	540	8.6%	506	8.1%	531	8.4%
Other Ethnicity	39	14.3%	27	10.0%	20	8.5%	19	7.3%	22	7.5%	26	7.9%	28	7.8%

End of Year Placement: Independent Living

Indicator 2.C.6	Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed in independent living?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children in substitute care	17,385	16,914	16,517	16,552	16,020	15,894	15,982
Children living in independent living	1,703	1,411	1,309	1,299	1,223	1,176	1,172
Percent	9.8%	8.3%	7.9%	7.8%	7.6%	7.4%	7.3%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	988	12.3%	934	12.6%	1,059	15.1%	1,008	15.0%	898	14.2%	818	13.1%	734	11.7%
Northern	85	3.1%	72	2.4%	82	2.8%	86	2.9%	108	3.5%	130	4.0%	159	4.9%
Central	563	12.2%	345	7.7%	111	2.6%	135	3.1%	146	3.5%	153	3.7%	187	4.5%
Southern	67	3.5%	60	2.9%	57	2.5%	70	2.9%	71	3.0%	75	3.3%	92	4.0%

Female	1,048	12.7%	840	10.4%	802	10.2%	785	10.1%	767	10.0%	695	9.2%	685	9.0%
Male	654	7.2%	571	6.5%	507	5.9%	514	5.9%	456	5.4%	481	5.8%	487	5.8%

12 to 14	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
15 and Older	1,702	31.4%	1,410	27.5%	1,309	27.1%	1,299	27.7%	1,223	27.4%	1,176	27.2%	1,172	27.4%

African American	1,277	12.2%	1,042	10.7%	986	10.7%	945	10.5%	897	10.5%	849	10.1%	809	9.8%
Hispanic	93	9.1%	89	9.0%	67	7.0%	73	7.7%	55	6.1%	74	7.6%	62	5.9%
White	318	5.6%	267	4.5%	242	4.0%	270	4.2%	261	4.1%	244	3.9%	290	4.6%
Other Ethnicity	15	5.5%	13	4.8%	14	5.9%	11	4.2%	10	3.4%	9	2.7%	11	3.1%

Initial Placement with Siblings

Indicator 2.D	Of all children entering substitute care, what percentage is placed with their siblings in their first placement?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
TRADITIONAL FOSTER CARE	1-2 SIBLINGS						
Children with 1-2 siblings	640	583	504	525	556	464	452
Children placed with all siblings	417	410	358	332	362	309	276
Percent	65.2%	70.3%	71.0%	63.2%	65.1%	66.6%	61.1%
KINSHIP FOSTER CARE	1-2 SIBLINGS						
Children with 1-2 siblings	1,379	1,169	1,272	1,150	1,229	1,185	1,367
Children placed with all siblings	1,148	936	1,063	943	1,000	946	1,116
Percent	83.2%	80.1%	83.6%	82.0%	81.4%	79.8%	81.6%
TRADITIONAL FOSTER CARE	3 OR MORE SIBLINGS						
Children with 3 or more siblings	299	245	176	232	167	225	239
Children placed with all siblings	67	34	27	28	0	4	13
Percent	22.4%	13.9%	15.3%	12.1%	0.0%	1.8%	5.4%
KINSHIP FOSTER CARE	3 OR MORE SIBLINGS						
Children with 3 or more siblings	541	531	609	496	510	537	545
Children placed with all siblings	313	315	334	241	280	290	315
Percent	57.9%	59.3%	54.8%	48.6%	54.9%	54.0%	57.8%

End of Year Placement with Siblings

Indicator 2.E	Of all children in substitute care at the end of the year, what percentage is placed with their siblings?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
TRADITIONAL FOSTER CARE	1-2 SIBLINGS						
Children with 1-2 siblings	2,366	2,304	2,142	2,229	2,075	2,044	2,064
Children placed with all siblings	1,373	1,321	1,277	1,297	1,221	1,184	1,144
Percent	58.0%	57.3%	59.6%	58.2%	58.8%	57.9%	55.4%
KINSHIP FOSTER CARE	1-2 SIBLINGS						
Children with 1-2 siblings	3,176	3,016	3,100	3,153	3,250	3,209	3,269
Children placed with all siblings	2,190	2,096	2,185	2,248	2,315	2,256	2,352
Percent	69.0%	69.5%	70.5%	71.3%	71.2%	70.3%	71.9%
TRADITIONAL FOSTER CARE	3 OR MORE SIBLINGS						
Children with 3 or more siblings	1,065	1,135	1,021	1,020	1,046	1,055	1,150
Children placed with all siblings	198	177	132	98	132	127	128
Percent	18.6%	15.6%	12.9%	9.6%	12.6%	12.0%	11.1%
KINSHIP FOSTER CARE	3 OR MORE SIBLINGS						
Children with 3 or more siblings	1,353	1,305	1,412	1,388	1,280	1,376	1,503
Children placed with all siblings	565	552	558	536	433	519	505
Percent	41.8%	42.3%	39.5%	38.6%	33.8%	37.7%	33.6%

Placing Children Close to Home - Initial Placement

Indicator 2.F	Of all children entering substitute care, what is the median* distance from their home of origin to their initial placement?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children entering substitute care	5,265	4,862	5,031	4,785	4,899	4,796	4,913
Median miles from home	8.8	8.0	9.0	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.6

	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES
Cook	1,543	7.5	1,244	6.9	1,355	7.6	1,203	7.7	1,378	8.5	1,310	8.4	1,381	8.5
Northern	1,043	14.1	1,122	11.3	1,022	11.4	1,026	12.6	1,132	14.3	1,222	15.5	1,098	13.2
Central	1,803	7.2	1,636	6.5	1,699	10.6	1,605	12.2	1,458	10.1	1,503	11.7	1,580	10.5
Southern	852	11.1	847	12.5	940	14.1	945	16.1	916	19.2	748	14.0	838	21.8

Female	2,524	9.0	2,411	7.4	2,386	8.5	2,301	9.8	2,397	10.5	2,322	9.8	2,408	10.9
Male	2,732	8.6	2,447	8.4	2,644	10.2	2,484	10.4	2,501	9.9	2,474	10.7	2,505	10.6

Under 3	2,063	7.5	1,936	7.6	2,029	7.4	1,883	7.9	1,882	8.2	1,880	9.3	1,815	9.2
3 to 5	853	7.7	753	6.9	807	7.5	819	9.4	865	8.5	804	10.0	797	12.8
6 to 8	627	7.5	594	5.5	602	6.8	574	11.0	595	10.5	583	7.1	692	7.7
9 to 11	510	8.4	484	6.1	455	11.2	453	14.7	453	11.4	461	13.2	512	9.9
12 to 14	593	12.7	562	11.6	563	16.4	501	15.0	519	14.1	546	14.4	554	16.8
15 and Older	619	12.7	533	11.5	575	17.7	555	12.3	585	14.5	521	12.1	543	15.4

African American	2,458	6.8	2,174	5.8	2,170	6.8	2,078	6.6	2,111	7.9	2,072	7.3	2,175	8.5
Hispanic	309	9.6	278	5.2	263	8.6	236	12.0	263	9.3	347	11.1	338	8.9
White	2,375	12.1	2,291	15.0	2,488	13.6	2,350	15.1	2,398	15.7	2,238	16.0	2,265	16.1
Other Ethnicity	123	14.0	119	7.6	110	10.2	121	10.8	127	11.0	139	8.0	135	14.4

*Median only includes children with valid address information.

Placing Children Close to Home - End of Year Placement

Indicator 2.G	Of all children in substitute care at the end of the fiscal year, what is the median* distance from their home of origin?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children in substitute care at the end of the year	17,385	16,914	16,517	16,552	16,020	15,894	15,982
Median miles from home	9.3	9.1	9.3	9.8	11.3	10.5	10.6

	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES
Cook	8,038	9.3	7,386	9.5	7,035	9.5	6,741	9.6	6,341	10.0	6,238	9.4	6,247	9.3
Northern	2,764	11.4	2,946	10.5	2,911	11.0	2,990	12.6	3,086	14.8	3,273	12.3	3,273	13.1
Central	4,628	6.9	4,463	6.3	4,278	6.7	4,411	8.7	4,198	11.8	4,122	12.7	4,179	10.6
Southern	1,934	9.8	2,096	9.4	2,275	9.4	2,400	9.7	2,386	13.7	2,257	12.3	2,278	15.5

Female	8,263	8.7	8,071	8.4	7,866	8.5	7,809	8.9	7,633	10.4	7,559	9.8	7,653	10.0
Male	9,098	9.7	8,827	9.8	8,643	9.9	8,736	10.7	8,384	12.2	8,332	11.3	8,326	11.4

Under 3	3,184	6.3	3,141	6.5	3,172	6.6	3,080	7.0	2,999	7.9	3,024	7.8	3,015	8.0
3 to 5	2,839	6.7	2,905	6.7	2,957	6.7	3,174	6.5	3,080	7.4	3,014	8.2	2,949	7.9
6 to 8	2,198	8.8	2,164	7.9	2,136	7.7	2,186	8.6	2,162	8.3	2,200	8.1	2,342	7.7
9 to 11	1,799	8.3	1,768	8.5	1,729	8.4	1,752	9.8	1,643	11.8	1,645	11.0	1,726	10.8
12 to 14	1,940	11.5	1,812	11.1	1,698	12.1	1,663	12.3	1,673	15.9	1,680	13.4	1,667	15.7
15 and Older	5,425	12.4	5,124	12.8	4,825	14.2	4,697	15.3	4,463	16.2	4,331	15.9	4,283	16.8

African American	10,435	8.4	9,766	8.4	9,220	8.5	8,975	9.0	8,508	9.8	8,366	9.5	8,262	9.9
Hispanic	1,026	7.9	994	7.2	956	7.6	944	8.0	907	8.1	975	7.6	1,050	7.6
White	5,651	12.2	5,883	12.1	6,105	11.7	6,373	12.8	6,310	15.9	6,225	13.5	6,313	13.4
Other Ethnicity	273	9.7	271	6.7	236	8.3	260	7.3	295	12.0	328	8.0	357	10.1

*Median only includes children with valid address information.

Stability in Substitute Care

Indicator 2.H	Of all children entering substitute care and staying for at least one year, what percentage had two or fewer placements within their first year of removal?						
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Children entering substitute care and staying one year	3,748	4,356	3,864	3,987	3,846	3,934	3,979
Children with two or fewer placements in their first year	2,915	3,338	3,017	3,117	2,979	3,033	3,148
Percent	77.8%	76.6%	78.1%	78.2%	77.5%	77.1%	79.1%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	699	71.4%	860	66.2%	667	70.9%	778	73.9%	663	69.6%	745	67.7%	810	74.1%
Northern	506	79.2%	706	80.3%	733	80.5%	648	79.0%	600	77.4%	755	81.0%	806	80.0%
Central	1,184	82.9%	1,254	82.6%	1,092	80.6%	1,117	81.5%	1,115	82.7%	991	83.2%	1,067	82.5%
Southern	515	74.5%	507	78.2%	518	79.7%	568	77.0%	601	78.0%	540	76.2%	464	79.6%

Female	1,419	77.5%	1,598	75.7%	1,494	78.0%	1,484	79.1%	1,471	78.1%	1,495	78.1%	1,529	78.5%
Male	1,495	78.1%	1,732	77.5%	1,521	78.2%	1,632	77.3%	1,508	76.8%	1,537	76.2%	1,619	79.8%

Under 3	1,334	84.7%	1,504	82.7%	1,398	84.7%	1,469	84.1%	1,364	85.2%	1,361	84.2%	1,360	83.7%
3 to 5	448	79.3%	561	78.8%	459	78.3%	486	77.8%	496	76.9%	511	75.1%	495	77.1%
6 to 8	357	79.0%	392	76.7%	361	76.2%	341	76.6%	318	75.5%	361	78.1%	377	81.4%
9 to 11	259	72.1%	295	72.3%	261	76.3%	249	76.4%	262	73.2%	245	69.2%	273	75.0%
12 to 14	266	64.7%	317	69.2%	285	68.7%	270	66.2%	245	66.0%	291	72.0%	333	73.7%
15 and Older	251	65.0%	269	59.9%	253	63.9%	302	69.1%	294	65.3%	264	63.3%	309	71.5%

African American	1,345	75.6%	1,484	72.2%	1,275	75.2%	1,313	76.0%	1,182	73.5%	1,245	72.6%	1,285	74.4%
Hispanic	151	73.3%	174	69.3%	181	85.0%	163	78.0%	126	65.6%	140	68.6%	226	77.1%
White	1,359	80.3%	1,610	81.9%	1,481	79.7%	1,582	80.0%	1,596	81.7%	1,572	82.0%	1,562	84.4%
Other Ethnicity	60	85.7%	70	83.3%	80	82.5%	59	81.9%	75	81.5%	76	77.6%	75	69.4%

Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care

Indicator 2.1	Of all children ages 12 to 17 entering substitute care, what percentage ran away from a substitute care placement during their first year?						
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Children entering substitute care between age 12 to 17	1,080	1,207	1,097	1,131	1,046	1,084	1,059
Children who ran away during their first year	195	216	203	242	236	256	204
Percent	18.1%	17.9%	18.5%	21.4%	22.6%	23.6%	19.3%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	86	20.5%	88	18.1%	107	26.9%	127	30.9%	141	34.5%	148	33.6%	119	30.9%
Northern	30	19.0%	44	23.8%	35	16.2%	37	17.7%	35	17.9%	32	14.2%	45	18.4%
Central	49	17.8%	49	15.2%	36	11.4%	46	13.6%	31	11.5%	52	19.8%	21	7.5%
Southern	26	13.8%	31	16.4%	23	14.8%	27	17.2%	29	17.5%	24	16.7%	17	12.3%

Female	119	21.0%	106	17.6%	95	17.7%	116	21.4%	108	20.9%	117	22.2%	118	21.8%
Male	76	14.8%	110	18.2%	108	19.3%	126	21.4%	128	24.2%	139	25.0%	86	16.6%

12 to 14	70	12.8%	51	8.6%	80	14.2%	91	16.2%	75	15.0%	70	13.5%	63	11.5%
15 and Older	125	23.5%	165	26.8%	123	23.1%	151	26.5%	161	29.5%	186	32.9%	141	27.5%

African American	121	21.1%	129	19.7%	131	23.7%	159	27.4%	148	26.5%	164	29.5%	129	25.0%
Hispanic	14	26.9%	9	14.8%	8	14.5%	9	17.0%	18	29.5%	9	13.8%	15	20.8%
White	54	13.3%	72	16.2%	61	13.5%	69	14.8%	64	15.8%	76	17.6%	53	12.1%
Other Ethnicity	6	12.2%	6	12.8%	3	8.1%	5	16.7%	6	26.1%	7	22.6%	7	21.9%

Median Length of Stay in Substitute Care

Indicator 2.J	Of all children entering substitute care for the first time during the fiscal year, what is the median length of stay in substitute care?						
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Median length of stay (in months)	31	29	28	31	29	30	30

	MONTHS	MONTHS	MONTHS	MONTHS	MONTHS	MONTHS	MONTHS
Cook	45	41	43	48	43	44	41
Northern	28	31	31	30	28	27	24
Central	24	24	25	26	24	25	26
Southern	18	20	22	24	23	28	26

Female	30	29	28	31	28	30	30
Male	31	28	28	32	29	30	29

Under 3	31	31	29	32	30	31	31
3 to 5	29	29	28	31	24	28	25
6 to 8	27	29	25	30	28	27	24
9 to 11	26	26	26	28	27	23	24
12 to 14	37	26	33	36	25	36	39
15 and Older	36	26	24	30	31	33	38

African American	37	35	32	38	32	35	36
Hispanic	39	36	28	36	29	35	31
White	23	24	26	25	26	26	26
Other Ethnicity	33	24	12	17	22	20	26

Permanence Within 12 Months: Reunification

Indicator 3.A.1	Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage was reunified with their parents within 12 months of their date of entry into substitute care?						
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Children entering substitute care	4,627	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855	4,942	4,842
Children reunified within 12 months	985	1,011	1,047	1,061	995	993	981
Percent	21.3%	19.1%	21.3%	20.9%	20.5%	20.1%	20.3%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	101	8.3%	135	8.6%	111	8.8%	124	8.9%	100	8.0%	121	8.6%	134	9.8%
Northern	147	18.4%	221	21.2%	261	23.3%	251	24.5%	291	28.4%	282	24.7%	281	23.1%
Central	423	24.7%	393	21.6%	417	25.2%	447	26.2%	346	21.3%	317	21.6%	359	23.8%
Southern	282	33.4%	253	29.8%	257	30.3%	233	24.8%	257	27.1%	266	29.0%	200	26.7%

Female	461	20.4%	496	19.4%	522	21.5%	505	20.9%	464	19.8%	515	21.2%	462	19.7%
Male	523	22.1%	513	18.7%	523	21.2%	556	20.9%	531	21.1%	478	19.0%	519	20.8%

Under 3	335	18.9%	359	17.4%	364	18.8%	372	18.4%	326	17.3%	335	17.8%	351	18.7%
3 to 5	178	25.6%	182	21.3%	213	28.2%	189	23.4%	205	25.0%	216	24.9%	198	24.7%
6 to 8	145	25.8%	146	23.3%	149	25.1%	163	27.0%	160	27.9%	147	24.7%	145	24.8%
9 to 11	110	24.0%	102	20.0%	118	24.4%	133	29.2%	118	25.9%	111	24.4%	124	26.9%
12 to 14	98	17.9%	110	18.6%	113	20.0%	106	18.9%	90	18.0%	90	17.4%	91	16.7%
15 and Older	119	20.2%	112	16.9%	90	15.7%	98	15.9%	96	15.4%	94	14.9%	72	12.7%

African American	354	16.0%	325	13.1%	387	17.6%	343	15.6%	375	17.7%	332	15.6%	366	17.5%
Hispanic	55	22.0%	69	22.3%	46	16.4%	46	17.4%	49	20.6%	53	20.1%	59	17.0%
White	522	25.4%	574	24.0%	583	25.3%	639	25.5%	543	22.9%	584	24.1%	519	22.9%
Other Ethnicity	54	46.2%	43	35.0%	31	25.8%	33	30.0%	28	23.1%	24	18.9%	37	26.6%

Permanence Within 24 Months: Reunification

Indicator 3.A.2	Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage was reunified with their parents within 24 months from their date of entry into substitute care?						
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Children entering substitute care	4,817	4,627	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855	4,942
Children reunified within 24 months	1,437	1,507	1,635	1,748	1,724	1,651	1,627
Percent	29.8%	32.6%	30.8%	35.6%	34.0%	34.0%	32.9%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	178	12.7%	191	15.6%	242	15.4%	238	18.8%	251	18.1%	209	16.7%	238	17.0%
Northern	322	33.0%	248	31.1%	370	35.5%	443	39.6%	419	40.9%	454	44.2%	445	39.0%
Central	557	35.4%	674	39.3%	653	35.9%	677	40.9%	682	40.0%	600	37.0%	550	37.5%
Southern	380	44.0%	359	42.5%	354	41.6%	384	45.3%	362	38.5%	387	40.9%	383	41.7%

Female	673	28.3%	702	31.1%	808	31.6%	903	37.1%	816	33.8%	785	33.5%	806	33.3%
Male	764	31.4%	803	33.9%	825	30.1%	843	34.2%	908	34.2%	866	34.5%	821	32.6%

Under 3	485	25.5%	522	29.5%	594	28.8%	641	33.1%	641	31.6%	575	30.6%	579	30.8%
3 to 5	294	38.1%	272	39.1%	305	35.7%	355	47.0%	332	41.1%	352	43.0%	349	40.2%
6 to 8	212	36.7%	230	40.9%	245	39.1%	241	40.6%	253	42.0%	271	47.3%	244	41.1%
9 to 11	152	34.1%	178	38.8%	181	35.4%	192	39.8%	199	43.6%	183	40.2%	167	36.7%
12 to 14	195	31.4%	159	29.0%	159	26.9%	195	34.5%	163	29.0%	149	29.7%	162	31.3%
15 and Older	99	19.8%	146	24.8%	151	22.8%	124	21.6%	136	22.0%	121	19.4%	126	20.0%

African American	529	22.4%	579	26.2%	536	21.6%	673	30.6%	571	26.0%	615	29.0%	568	26.6%
Hispanic	51	21.1%	86	34.4%	97	31.3%	96	34.2%	86	32.5%	93	39.1%	96	36.4%
White	825	38.7%	781	38.1%	940	39.3%	920	40.0%	1015	40.6%	896	37.7%	925	38.2%
Other Ethnicity	32	37.6%	61	52.1%	62	50.4%	59	49.2%	52	47.3%	47	38.8%	38	29.9%

Permanence within 36 Months: Reunification

Indicator 3.A.3	Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage was reunified with their parents within 36 months of date of entry into substitute care?						
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Children entering substitute care	5,335	4,817	4,627	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855
Children reunified within 36 months	1,892	1,697	1,751	1,987	2,064	2,012	1,913
Percent	35.5%	35.2%	37.8%	37.5%	42.1%	39.7%	39.4%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	350	18.1%	257	18.3%	239	19.5%	336	21.4%	313	24.7%	331	23.8%	270	21.5%
Northern	410	43.6%	394	40.4%	308	38.6%	442	42.4%	538	48.0%	479	46.8%	505	49.2%
Central	688	43.3%	635	40.3%	776	45.2%	809	44.5%	770	46.5%	772	45.3%	696	42.9%
Southern	444	50.9%	411	47.6%	393	46.6%	382	44.9%	437	51.5%	419	44.6%	441	46.6%

Female	957	36.5%	802	33.8%	822	36.4%	973	38.1%	1,051	43.2%	953	39.5%	901	38.5%
Male	929	34.4%	895	36.8%	927	39.2%	1,009	36.8%	1,011	41.0%	1,059	39.8%	1,012	40.3%

Under 3	638	31.2%	586	30.9%	611	34.5%	730	35.4%	762	39.4%	761	37.5%	682	36.2%
3 to 5	349	43.0%	352	45.6%	327	47.0%	386	45.1%	420	55.6%	391	48.5%	408	49.8%
6 to 8	284	43.2%	247	42.7%	267	47.4%	295	47.0%	297	50.1%	299	49.6%	302	52.7%
9 to 11	258	43.1%	182	40.8%	206	44.9%	223	43.6%	228	47.2%	227	49.8%	210	46.2%
12 to 14	217	32.6%	224	36.1%	185	33.7%	191	32.3%	224	39.6%	191	34.0%	176	35.1%
15 and Older	146	26.4%	106	21.2%	155	26.4%	162	24.5%	133	23.2%	143	23.1%	135	21.6%

African American	729	27.0%	654	27.7%	684	31.0%	733	29.5%	810	36.8%	689	31.4%	722	34.0%
Hispanic	123	38.3%	72	29.8%	104	41.6%	112	36.1%	131	46.6%	121	45.7%	98	41.2%
White	999	45.4%	934	43.8%	900	43.9%	1,064	44.5%	1,062	46.1%	1,142	45.6%	1,037	43.7%
Other Ethnicity	41	38.0%	37	43.5%	63	53.8%	78	63.4%	61	50.8%	60	54.5%	56	46.3%

B

Stability of Permanence at One Year: Reunification

Indicator 3.B.1	Of all children who were reunified during the year, what percentage remained with their family at one year?						
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Children reunified	2,042	2,042	2,161	2,322	2,292	2,225	2,153
Children stable at one year	1,715	1,726	1,835	1,962	1,918	1,859	1,773
Percent	84.0%	84.5%	84.9%	84.5%	83.7%	83.6%	82.4%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	379	86.9%	332	88.1%	443	91.2%	331	84.2%	369	85.8%	381	85.0%	314	85.6%
Northern	341	81.8%	310	83.8%	438	83.6%	449	81.9%	485	83.2%	434	82.5%	482	83.4%
Central	619	83.9%	704	84.6%	672	86.0%	815	88.2%	681	84.6%	613	82.5%	596	79.5%
Southern	349	82.3%	372	81.8%	277	76.1%	358	79.9%	373	80.4%	424	85.0%	371	83.2%

Female	813	84.7%	823	83.7%	869	84.5%	964	86.3%	953	85.7%	913	84.5%	831	81.5%
Male	901	83.4%	899	85.2%	961	85.3%	995	82.8%	965	81.8%	944	82.6%	942	83.1%

Under 3	374	84.2%	392	83.1%	443	84.1%	472	83.4%	444	83.5%	420	82.8%	410	81.5%
3 to 5	379	85.6%	410	89.5%	399	88.9%	454	86.5%	467	87.9%	471	85.6%	438	83.1%
6 to 8	264	83.5%	296	84.3%	319	86.9%	351	84.0%	330	83.5%	349	85.3%	326	83.2%
9 to 11	255	85.9%	217	85.4%	283	84.7%	272	90.1%	260	85.0%	238	85.3%	231	83.1%
12 to 14	200	80.3%	196	82.0%	197	82.4%	209	81.6%	184	79.0%	178	84.4%	171	78.4%
15 and Older	243	82.9%	215	80.2%	194	79.2%	204	80.0%	233	79.0%	203	75.5%	197	83.8%

African American	776	84.6%	605	82.1%	787	87.8%	767	85.4%	811	84.3%	693	80.0%	644	81.4%
Hispanic	81	82.7%	126	90.6%	140	88.6%	94	85.5%	124	91.9%	126	92.6%	125	85.6%
White	795	83.1%	932	85.0%	862	81.9%	1,020	83.0%	931	82.0%	995	84.8%	947	82.2%
Other Ethnicity	63	90.0%	63	91.3%	46	83.6%	81	95.3%	52	88.1%	45	90.0%	57	89.1%

Stability of Permanence at Two Years: Reunification

Indicator 3.B.2	Of all children who were reunified during the year, what percentage remained with their family at two years?						
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Children reunified	2,039	2,042	2,042	2,161	2,322	2,292	2,225
Children stable at two years	1,672	1,646	1,656	1,774	1,913	1,845	1,810
Percent	82.0%	80.6%	81.1%	82.1%	82.4%	80.5%	81.3%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	443	85.4%	369	84.6%	320	84.9%	434	89.3%	320	81.4%	357	83.0%	375	83.7%
Northern	322	81.5%	330	79.1%	302	81.6%	422	80.5%	443	80.8%	450	77.2%	417	79.3%
Central	516	78.9%	585	79.3%	672	80.8%	651	83.4%	799	86.5%	660	82.0%	599	80.6%
Southern	391	83.0%	335	79.0%	354	77.8%	262	72.0%	342	76.3%	368	79.3%	412	82.6%

Female	830	83.3%	781	81.4%	786	80.0%	845	82.1%	935	83.7%	919	82.6%	885	81.9%
Male	841	80.7%	865	80.1%	866	82.1%	925	82.1%	975	81.1%	926	78.5%	923	80.8%

Under 3	356	82.0%	355	80.0%	374	79.2%	422	80.1%	460	81.3%	432	81.2%	405	79.9%
3 to 5	349	81.5%	365	82.4%	392	85.6%	389	86.6%	441	84.0%	452	85.1%	459	83.5%
6 to 8	320	89.1%	251	79.4%	284	80.9%	312	85.0%	343	82.1%	315	79.7%	339	82.9%
9 to 11	254	85.5%	246	82.8%	209	82.3%	273	81.7%	265	87.7%	248	81.0%	232	83.2%
12 to 14	215	73.9%	192	77.1%	186	77.8%	187	78.2%	206	80.5%	177	76.0%	173	82.0%
15 and Older	178	77.4%	237	80.9%	211	78.7%	191	78.0%	198	77.6%	221	74.9%	202	75.1%

African American	696	81.9%	743	81.0%	578	78.4%	767	85.6%	751	83.6%	774	80.5%	674	77.8%
Hispanic	96	86.5%	81	82.7%	126	90.6%	139	88.0%	92	83.6%	123	91.1%	120	88.2%
White	851	81.7%	759	79.3%	889	81.0%	822	78.1%	989	80.5%	897	79.0%	973	82.9%
Other Ethnicity	29	78.4%	63	90.0%	63	91.3%	46	83.6%	81	95.3%	51	86.4%	43	86.0%

Stability of Permanence at Five Years: Reunification

Indicator 3.B.3	Of all children who were reunified during the year, what percentage remained with their family at five years?						
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Children reunified	2,464	2,099	2,168	2,039	2,042	2,042	2,161
Children stable at five years	1,840	1,558	1,627	1,592	1,579	1,560	1,676
Percent	74.7%	74.2%	75.0%	78.1%	77.3%	76.4%	77.6%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	658	82.3%	509	82.1%	440	81.0%	430	82.9%	362	83.0%	307	81.4%	410	84.4%
Northern	320	74.4%	265	72.6%	299	73.3%	304	77.0%	310	74.3%	293	79.2%	387	73.9%
Central	586	69.8%	506	69.6%	553	72.9%	496	75.8%	559	75.7%	621	74.6%	624	79.9%
Southern	276	69.9%	278	71.8%	335	73.1%	362	76.9%	321	75.7%	331	72.7%	250	68.7%

Female	871	75.5%	737	74.4%	769	76.1%	790	79.3%	747	77.8%	743	75.6%	796	77.4%
Male	967	73.9%	820	74.0%	855	74.0%	801	76.9%	832	77.0%	813	77.1%	876	77.7%

Under 3	361	73.2%	324	73.6%	334	73.2%	339	78.1%	331	74.5%	346	73.3%	399	75.7%
3 to 5	346	74.2%	286	70.8%	337	73.9%	330	77.1%	351	79.2%	363	79.3%	356	79.3%
6 to 8	336	78.5%	249	75.7%	267	75.9%	301	83.8%	238	75.3%	264	75.2%	296	80.7%
9 to 11	294	77.6%	231	77.3%	256	82.1%	238	80.1%	238	80.1%	197	77.6%	257	76.9%
12 to 14	240	68.2%	242	71.6%	224	72.7%	206	70.8%	185	74.3%	180	75.3%	177	74.1%
15 and Older	263	76.0%	226	78.2%	209	73.6%	178	77.4%	236	80.5%	210	78.4%	191	78.0%

African American	911	77.0%	657	74.2%	674	72.6%	668	78.6%	708	77.2%	532	72.2%	712	79.5%
Hispanic	149	80.5%	96	78.0%	126	85.1%	85	76.6%	80	81.6%	118	84.9%	135	85.4%
White	720	71.1%	752	72.9%	785	75.3%	813	78.1%	729	76.2%	848	77.3%	785	74.6%
Other Ethnicity	60	72.3%	53	91.4%	42	85.7%	26	70.3%	62	88.6%	62	89.9%	44	80.0%

Stability of Permanence at Ten Years: Reunification

Indicator 3.B.4	Of all children who were reunified during the year, what percentage remained with their family at ten years?						
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Children reunified	4,298	4,197	3,487	2,863	2,765	2,464	2,099
Children stable at ten years	3,098	3,168	2,535	2,124	2,048	1,782	1,506
Percent	72.1%	75.5%	72.7%	74.2%	74.1%	72.3%	71.7%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	1,711	81.7%	1,801	83.3%	1,374	81.4%	888	83.9%	762	80.3%	647	80.9%	503	81.1%
Northern	432	66.1%	410	68.1%	339	64.3%	349	69.9%	359	71.9%	314	73.0%	253	69.3%
Central	672	59.4%	655	65.3%	596	65.0%	635	68.4%	643	69.8%	554	66.0%	496	68.2%
Southern	283	67.5%	302	70.1%	226	63.7%	252	66.8%	284	71.7%	267	67.6%	254	65.6%

Female	1,588	73.0%	1,554	75.3%	1,227	72.9%	1,048	75.9%	969	75.9%	842	73.0%	715	72.2%
Male	1,507	71.1%	1,612	75.7%	1,304	72.4%	1,075	72.5%	1,079	72.5%	938	71.7%	790	71.3%

Under 3	508	69.6%	462	69.4%	376	66.2%	367	72.7%	362	68.8%	343	69.6%	306	69.5%
3 to 5	619	70.7%	646	79.2%	489	72.0%	379	71.0%	353	74.2%	330	70.8%	269	66.6%
6 to 8	581	73.7%	619	78.4%	502	76.6%	364	75.8%	361	75.5%	320	74.8%	239	72.6%
9 to 11	527	75.3%	552	76.7%	437	73.9%	353	76.2%	337	77.8%	287	75.7%	224	74.9%
12 to 14	398	65.6%	410	67.5%	369	69.4%	313	73.8%	286	69.4%	239	67.9%	242	71.6%
15 and Older	465	77.8%	479	80.1%	362	78.4%	348	76.1%	349	79.3%	263	76.0%	226	78.2%

African American	1,815	73.8%	1,816	78.6%	1,492	74.2%	1,107	75.8%	1,010	75.4%	888	75.1%	628	70.9%
Hispanic	237	83.7%	272	85.0%	196	83.1%	142	87.1%	152	79.6%	149	80.5%	95	77.2%
White	973	67.3%	996	69.0%	791	68.4%	813	70.5%	811	71.3%	686	67.7%	732	70.9%
Other Ethnicity	73	66.4%	84	68.3%	56	66.7%	62	72.1%	75	77.3%	59	71.1%	51	87.9%

Permanence Within 24 Months: Adoption

Indicator 3.C.1	Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage was adopted within 24 months of date of entry into substitute care?						
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Children entering substitute care	4,817	4,627	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855	4,942
Children adopted within 24 months	317	253	225	159	177	202	156
Percent	6.6%	5.5%	4.2%	3.2%	3.5%	4.2%	3.2%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	94	6.7%	57	4.7%	36	2.3%	34	2.7%	34	2.4%	38	3.0%	33	2.4%
Northern	41	4.2%	41	5.1%	38	3.6%	25	2.2%	20	2.0%	17	1.7%	28	2.5%
Central	140	8.9%	121	7.1%	125	6.9%	85	5.1%	95	5.6%	105	6.5%	51	3.5%
Southern	42	4.9%	34	4.0%	26	3.1%	15	1.8%	28	3.0%	42	4.4%	44	4.8%

Female	165	6.9%	126	5.6%	112	4.4%	81	3.3%	89	3.7%	97	4.1%	83	3.4%
Male	151	6.2%	127	5.4%	113	4.1%	78	3.2%	88	3.3%	105	4.2%	73	2.9%

Under 3	210	11.1%	171	9.7%	157	7.6%	108	5.6%	112	5.5%	134	7.1%	103	5.5%
3 to 5	25	3.2%	25	3.6%	21	2.5%	14	1.9%	28	3.5%	17	2.1%	19	2.2%
6 to 8	24	4.2%	18	3.2%	10	1.6%	11	1.9%	17	2.8%	12	2.1%	9	1.5%
9 to 11	19	4.3%	12	2.6%	16	3.1%	12	2.5%	6	1.3%	15	3.3%	10	2.2%
12 to 14	25	4.0%	19	3.5%	15	2.5%	9	1.6%	12	2.1%	15	3.0%	5	1.0%
15 and Older	14	2.8%	8	1.4%	6	0.9%	5	0.9%	2	0.3%	9	1.4%	10	1.6%

African American	159	6.7%	115	5.2%	93	3.7%	58	2.6%	59	2.7%	68	3.2%	42	2.0%
Hispanic	13	5.4%	5	2.0%	7	2.3%	5	1.8%	4	1.5%	5	2.1%	4	1.5%
White	142	6.7%	126	6.1%	120	5.0%	94	4.1%	112	4.5%	124	5.2%	96	4.0%
Other Ethnicity	3	3.5%	7	6.0%	5	4.1%	2	1.7%	2	1.8%	5	4.1%	14	11.0%

Permanence within 36 Months: Adoption

Indicator 3.C.2	Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage was adopted within 36 months of date of entry into substitute care?						
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Children entering substitute care	5,335	4,817	4,627	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855
Children adopted within 36 months	719	691	599	518	458	551	537
Percent	13.5%	14.3%	12.9%	9.8%	9.3%	10.9%	11.1%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	179	9.3%	171	12.2%	115	9.4%	83	5.3%	73	5.8%	84	6.0%	68	5.4%
Northern	127	13.5%	118	12.1%	109	13.7%	97	9.3%	77	6.9%	85	8.3%	91	8.9%
Central	304	19.1%	296	18.8%	296	17.2%	271	14.9%	240	14.5%	278	16.3%	263	16.2%
Southern	109	12.5%	106	12.3%	79	9.4%	67	7.9%	68	8.0%	104	11.1%	115	12.1%

Female	341	13.0%	346	14.6%	310	13.7%	261	10.2%	224	9.2%	271	11.2%	264	11.3%
Male	377	14.0%	340	14.0%	289	12.2%	257	9.4%	232	9.4%	280	10.5%	273	10.9%

Under 3	503	24.6%	463	24.4%	420	23.7%	359	17.4%	323	16.7%	389	19.2%	363	19.3%
3 to 5	97	12.0%	90	11.7%	72	10.3%	65	7.6%	52	6.9%	76	9.4%	65	7.9%
6 to 8	63	9.6%	57	9.9%	46	8.2%	35	5.6%	43	7.3%	44	7.3%	41	7.2%
9 to 11	30	5.0%	34	7.6%	24	5.2%	28	5.5%	22	4.6%	19	4.2%	40	8.8%
12 to 14	15	2.3%	32	5.2%	29	5.3%	24	4.1%	13	2.3%	19	3.4%	17	3.4%
15 and Older	11	2.0%	15	3.0%	8	1.4%	7	1.1%	5	0.9%	4	0.6%	11	1.8%

African American	319	11.8%	318	13.5%	265	12.0%	199	8.0%	152	6.9%	199	9.1%	161	7.6%
Hispanic	29	9.0%	27	11.2%	31	12.4%	20	6.5%	11	3.9%	16	6.0%	9	3.8%
White	354	16.1%	331	15.5%	289	14.1%	289	12.1%	287	12.5%	325	13.0%	356	15.0%
Other Ethnicity	17	15.7%	15	17.6%	14	12.0%	10	8.1%	8	6.7%	11	10.0%	11	9.1%

Stability of Permanence at Two Years: Adoption

Indicator 3.D.1	Of all children who were adopted during the year, what percentage remained with their family at two years?						
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Children adopted	1,816	1,845	1,650	1,515	1,420	1,287	1,780
Children stable at two years	1,775	1,801	1,622	1,498	1,397	1,262	1,743
Percent	97.7%	97.6%	98.3%	98.9%	98.4%	98.1%	97.9%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	869	97.2%	752	96.9%	650	97.9%	563	98.3%	488	98.4%	373	98.4%	445	98.7%
Northern	249	96.1%	306	97.5%	280	98.6%	238	99.6%	301	96.8%	220	98.7%	376	98.9%
Central	458	99.1%	541	98.2%	517	98.9%	491	99.2%	438	99.3%	456	98.5%	647	98.3%
Southern	199	99.0%	202	99.0%	175	97.8%	206	99.0%	170	98.8%	213	95.9%	275	94.5%

Female	868	97.4%	880	97.6%	797	98.2%	757	99.2%	683	98.7%	664	98.2%	839	98.0%
Male	906	98.1%	921	97.7%	825	98.4%	741	98.5%	714	98.1%	598	97.9%	903	97.8%

Under 3	315	99.1%	339	99.1%	310	99.4%	280	99.6%	240	100.0%	184	98.9%	238	97.5%
3 to 5	568	98.8%	632	98.4%	518	99.4%	490	99.2%	485	99.2%	434	98.9%	617	98.7%
6 to 8	331	97.9%	357	98.3%	349	99.1%	328	98.5%	293	99.3%	256	98.5%	377	98.4%
9 to 11	278	97.2%	224	97.8%	213	96.4%	191	99.0%	197	95.6%	187	97.4%	287	97.6%
12 to 14	184	92.9%	160	92.5%	137	95.8%	132	97.8%	120	95.2%	128	96.2%	156	96.3%
15 and Older	99	98.0%	89	92.7%	95	94.1%	77	97.5%	62	96.9%	73	94.8%	68	94.4%

African American	1,072	97.2%	1,021	97.4%	894	98.0%	859	98.6%	759	97.8%	606	97.6%	842	97.9%
Hispanic	79	98.8%	91	95.8%	96	99.0%	84	100.0%	75	100.0%	95	100.0%	99	98.0%
White	596	98.5%	672	98.2%	608	98.5%	539	99.1%	559	98.9%	558	98.2%	797	97.9%
Other Ethnicity	28	100.0%	17	94.4%	24	100.0%	16	100.0%	4	100.0%	3	100.0%	5	100.0%

Stability of Permanence at Five Years: Adoption

Indicator 3.D.2	Of all children who were adopted during the year, what percentage remained with their family at five years?						
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Children adopted	3,085	2,420	2,051	1,816	1,845	1,650	1,515
Children stable at five years	2,932	2,297	1,947	1,717	1,748	1,567	1,458
Percent	95.0%	94.9%	94.9%	94.5%	94.7%	95.0%	96.2%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	1,881	94.1%	1,386	94.8%	1,074	94.2%	850	95.1%	728	93.8%	627	94.4%	551	96.2%
Northern	397	97.1%	261	95.6%	241	96.0%	239	92.3%	298	94.9%	277	97.5%	230	96.2%
Central	478	96.8%	476	95.0%	427	95.1%	434	93.9%	524	95.1%	494	94.5%	479	96.8%
Southern	176	96.7%	174	94.6%	205	97.2%	194	96.5%	198	97.1%	169	94.4%	198	95.2%

Female	1,450	95.5%	1,149	95.1%	931	94.1%	847	95.1%	861	95.5%	776	95.6%	737	96.6%
Male	1,482	94.6%	1,148	94.7%	1,014	95.7%	869	94.0%	887	94.1%	791	94.4%	721	95.9%

Under 3	458	97.7%	399	97.8%	348	98.0%	311	97.8%	330	96.5%	306	98.1%	277	98.6%
3 to 5	844	97.7%	643	97.9%	577	96.0%	552	96.0%	622	96.9%	508	97.5%	483	97.8%
6 to 8	613	95.6%	448	96.3%	419	95.9%	322	95.3%	347	95.6%	336	95.5%	315	94.6%
9 to 11	551	92.4%	384	90.8%	303	91.5%	260	90.9%	209	91.3%	197	89.1%	178	92.2%
12 to 14	345	88.9%	286	88.5%	203	91.0%	173	87.4%	152	87.9%	125	87.4%	128	94.8%
15 and Older	121	95.3%	137	95.1%	97	93.3%	99	98.0%	88	91.7%	95	94.1%	77	97.5%

African American	2,047	94.2%	1,603	94.7%	1,242	93.7%	1,041	94.4%	983	93.8%	861	94.4%	837	96.1%
Hispanic	152	93.8%	91	96.8%	103	98.1%	78	97.5%	90	94.7%	96	99.0%	82	97.6%
White	676	97.7%	562	95.1%	566	97.3%	570	94.2%	658	96.2%	587	95.1%	523	96.1%
Other Ethnicity	57	98.3%	41	95.3%	36	94.7%	28	100.0%	17	94.4%	23	95.8%	16	100.0%

Stability of Permanence at Ten Years: Adoption

Indicator 3.D.3	Of all children who were adopted during the year, what percentage remained with their family at ten years?						
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Children adopted	4,880	7,192	6,211	4,401	3,608	3,085	2,420
Children stable at ten years	4,386	6,412	5,558	3,923	3,208	2,723	2,159
Percent	89.9%	89.2%	89.5%	89.1%	88.9%	88.3%	89.2%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	3,429	90.2%	5,144	89.5%	4,294	89.9%	2,780	89.2%	2,161	88.6%	1,741	87.1%	1,304	89.2%
Northern	324	90.3%	412	88.2%	371	87.7%	422	88.8%	345	91.0%	369	90.2%	254	93.0%
Central	446	89.4%	599	88.1%	655	89.0%	543	90.0%	561	89.5%	451	91.3%	433	86.4%
Southern	187	84.6%	257	87.1%	238	86.9%	178	86.8%	141	86.0%	162	89.0%	168	91.3%

Female	2,224	89.9%	3,262	89.2%	2,823	89.4%	1,911	88.1%	1,564	88.6%	1,345	88.5%	1,077	89.2%
Male	2,162	89.9%	3,150	89.1%	2,732	89.6%	2,012	90.1%	1,644	89.3%	1,378	88.0%	1,082	89.3%

Under 3	334	91.0%	515	94.3%	490	91.2%	412	91.4%	517	96.5%	432	92.1%	380	93.1%
3 to 5	1,398	92.3%	1,893	89.5%	1,707	91.4%	1,130	90.3%	878	89.7%	783	90.6%	606	92.2%
6 to 8	1,196	86.9%	1,690	86.7%	1,426	86.1%	919	85.2%	632	84.5%	543	84.7%	400	86.0%
9 to 11	842	88.3%	1,280	87.0%	1,130	88.0%	808	88.0%	638	86.7%	499	83.7%	350	82.7%
12 to 14	458	90.3%	754	92.1%	590	90.6%	469	92.1%	388	87.2%	345	88.9%	286	88.5%
15 and Older	158	98.1%	280	95.9%	214	99.5%	185	96.4%	155	94.5%	121	95.3%	137	95.1%

African American	3,401	89.3%	5,184	88.8%	4,410	89.1%	3,078	88.4%	2,347	87.7%	1,888	86.9%	1,490	88.1%
Hispanic	257	93.5%	266	91.4%	278	94.6%	189	91.3%	184	92.0%	139	85.8%	91	96.8%
White	689	91.1%	918	90.7%	797	89.6%	598	92.0%	617	92.1%	642	92.8%	539	91.2%
Other Ethnicity	39	100.0%	44	84.6%	73	96.1%	58	92.1%	60	98.4%	54	93.1%	39	90.7%

Permanence Within 24 Months: Subsidized Guardianship

Indicator 3.E.1	Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage attained subsidized guardianship within 24 months of date of entry into substitute care?						
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Children entering substitute care	4,817	4,627	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855	4,942
Children attaining subsidized guardianship within 24 months	79	67	119	54	29	44	37
Percent	1.6%	1.4%	2.2%	1.1%	0.6%	0.9%	0.7%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	30	2.1%	36	2.9%	47	3.0%	40	3.2%	5	0.4%	9	0.7%	8	0.6%
Northern	14	1.4%	11	1.4%	21	2.0%	7	0.6%	4	0.4%	8	0.8%	8	0.7%
Central	30	1.9%	14	0.8%	41	2.3%	5	0.3%	19	1.1%	19	1.2%	5	0.3%
Southern	5	0.6%	6	0.7%	10	1.2%	2	0.2%	1	0.1%	8	0.8%	16	1.7%

Female	37	1.6%	31	1.4%	64	2.5%	24	1.0%	9	0.4%	21	0.9%	15	0.6%
Male	42	1.7%	36	1.5%	55	2.0%	30	1.2%	20	0.8%	23	0.9%	22	0.9%

Under 3	15	0.8%	10	0.6%	17	0.8%	6	0.3%	10	0.5%	15	0.8%	10	0.5%
3 to 5	6	0.8%	6	0.9%	18	2.1%	0	0.0%	6	0.7%	4	0.5%	3	0.3%
6 to 8	15	2.6%	5	0.9%	15	2.4%	2	0.3%	6	1.0%	6	1.0%	11	1.9%
9 to 11	15	3.4%	16	3.5%	19	3.7%	12	2.5%	3	0.7%	8	1.8%	1	0.2%
12 to 14	21	3.4%	22	4.0%	30	5.1%	17	3.0%	3	0.5%	11	2.2%	10	1.9%
15 and Older	7	1.4%	8	1.4%	20	3.0%	17	3.0%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	0.3%

African American	39	1.7%	44	2.0%	69	2.8%	42	1.9%	9	0.4%	16	0.8%	8	0.4%
Hispanic	3	1.2%	2	0.8%	5	1.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	4	1.7%	1	0.4%
White	37	1.7%	20	1.0%	39	1.6%	12	0.5%	19	0.8%	24	1.0%	27	1.1%
Other Ethnicity	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	6	4.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%

Permanence Within 36 Months: Subsidized Guardianship

Indicator 3.E.2	Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage attained subsidized guardianship within 36 months of date of entry into substitute care?						
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Children entering substitute care	5,335	4,817	4,627	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855
Children attaining subsidized guardianship within 36 months	219	174	179	175	118	121	118
Percent	4.1%	3.6%	3.9%	3.3%	2.4%	2.4%	2.4%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	110	5.7%	54	3.8%	70	5.7%	75	4.8%	64	5.0%	42	3.0%	34	2.7%
Northern	21	2.2%	38	3.9%	34	4.3%	34	3.3%	22	2.0%	13	1.3%	23	2.2%
Central	69	4.3%	64	4.1%	55	3.2%	51	2.8%	26	1.6%	53	3.1%	46	2.8%
Southern	19	2.2%	18	2.1%	20	2.4%	15	1.8%	6	0.7%	13	1.4%	15	1.6%

Female	110	4.2%	88	3.7%	88	3.9%	90	3.5%	61	2.5%	57	2.4%	61	2.6%
Male	109	4.0%	86	3.5%	91	3.8%	85	3.1%	57	2.3%	64	2.4%	57	2.3%

Under 3	54	2.6%	50	2.6%	44	2.5%	41	2.0%	29	1.5%	39	1.9%	44	2.3%
3 to 5	36	4.4%	20	2.6%	20	2.9%	32	3.7%	11	1.5%	24	3.0%	24	2.9%
6 to 8	38	5.8%	27	4.7%	22	3.9%	22	3.5%	13	2.2%	28	4.6%	17	3.0%
9 to 11	40	6.7%	35	7.8%	45	9.8%	27	5.3%	25	5.2%	16	3.5%	18	4.0%
12 to 14	39	5.9%	34	5.5%	39	7.1%	32	5.4%	22	3.9%	12	2.1%	14	2.8%
15 and Older	12	2.2%	8	1.6%	9	1.5%	21	3.2%	18	3.1%	2	0.3%	1	0.2%

African American	131	4.8%	82	3.5%	93	4.2%	106	4.3%	72	3.3%	50	2.3%	47	2.2%
Hispanic	4	1.2%	8	3.3%	12	4.8%	12	3.9%	4	1.4%	6	2.3%	8	3.4%
White	80	3.6%	83	3.9%	73	3.6%	50	2.1%	39	1.7%	65	2.6%	60	2.5%
Other Ethnicity	4	3.7%	1	1.2%	1	0.9%	7	5.7%	3	2.5%	0	0.0%	3	2.5%

Stability of Permanence at Two Years: Subsidized Guardianship

Indicator 3.F.1	Of all children who attained subsidized guardianship during the year, what percentage remained with their family at two years?						
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Children attaining subsidized guardianship	579	583	475	519	543	206	310
Children stable at two years	564	560	444	502	513	197	295
Percent	97.4%	96.1%	93.5%	96.7%	94.5%	95.6%	95.2%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	377	98.4%	308	95.1%	258	93.5%	308	96.3%	264	97.1%	112	95.7%	131	95.6%
Northern	57	98.3%	73	97.3%	63	90.0%	69	94.5%	98	91.6%	46	95.8%	56	94.9%
Central	78	90.7%	130	98.5%	76	93.8%	96	100.0%	110	92.4%	29	96.7%	94	95.9%
Southern	52	100.0%	49	94.2%	47	97.9%	29	96.7%	41	91.1%	10	90.9%	14	87.5%

Female	259	97.0%	268	96.8%	215	93.9%	243	98.0%	241	94.9%	96	96.0%	136	97.1%
Male	305	97.8%	292	95.4%	228	93.1%	259	95.6%	272	94.1%	101	95.3%	159	93.5%

Under 3	27	96.4%	27	100.0%	19	100.0%	18	100.0%	19	100.0%	12	100.0%	19	100.0%
3 to 5	79	97.5%	84	95.5%	63	96.9%	82	98.8%	75	96.2%	43	97.7%	69	97.2%
6 to 8	94	97.9%	87	95.6%	63	91.3%	70	97.2%	96	97.0%	41	100.0%	50	94.3%
9 to 11	131	99.2%	110	98.2%	86	92.5%	102	99.0%	94	94.9%	48	96.0%	57	96.6%
12 to 14	143	97.3%	124	95.4%	102	91.1%	122	95.3%	130	90.3%	35	92.1%	57	95.0%
15 and Older	90	94.7%	128	94.8%	111	94.9%	108	93.9%	99	95.2%	18	85.7%	43	89.6%

African American	415	97.9%	365	96.1%	313	93.7%	325	95.9%	312	94.0%	130	95.6%	156	95.1%
Hispanic	23	100.0%	11	100.0%	22	100.0%	18	100.0%	34	94.4%	8	100.0%	15	93.8%
White	124	95.4%	174	95.6%	104	92.9%	152	98.1%	152	95.0%	54	94.7%	123	95.3%
Other Ethnicity	2	100.0%	10	100.0%	5	71.4%	7	100.0%	15	100.0%	5	100.0%	1	100.0%

Stability of Permanence at Five Years: Subsidized Guardianship

Indicator 3.F.2	Of all children who attained subsidized guardianship during the year, what percentage remained with their family at five years?						
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Children attaining subsidized guardianship	914	670	651	579	583	475	519
Children stable at five years	789	598	562	502	523	412	467
Percent	86.3%	89.3%	86.3%	86.7%	89.7%	86.7%	90.0%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	518	88.1%	404	91.8%	398	85.4%	335	87.5%	291	89.8%	243	88.0%	288	90.0%
Northern	102	82.3%	78	83.0%	43	78.2%	49	84.5%	71	94.7%	57	81.4%	65	89.0%
Central	128	82.6%	82	88.2%	83	93.3%	72	83.7%	113	85.6%	68	84.0%	85	88.5%
Southern	41	87.2%	34	79.1%	38	92.7%	46	88.5%	48	92.3%	44	91.7%	29	96.7%

Female	352	82.2%	328	88.6%	303	87.8%	227	85.0%	247	89.2%	200	87.3%	229	92.3%
Male	437	89.9%	270	90.0%	259	84.6%	275	88.1%	276	90.2%	211	86.1%	238	87.8%

Under 3	22	88.0%	20	100.0%	22	100.0%	25	89.3%	27	100.0%	17	89.5%	18	100.0%
3 to 5	118	93.7%	90	97.8%	70	86.4%	71	87.7%	81	92.0%	61	93.8%	76	91.6%
6 to 8	127	83.6%	93	90.3%	95	89.6%	80	83.3%	81	89.0%	61	88.4%	66	91.7%
9 to 11	148	82.7%	97	86.6%	103	80.5%	112	84.8%	93	83.0%	78	83.9%	92	89.3%
12 to 14	208	83.2%	159	82.0%	151	82.1%	124	84.4%	113	86.9%	85	75.9%	108	84.4%
15 and Older	166	91.2%	139	93.3%	121	93.1%	90	94.7%	128	94.8%	110	94.0%	107	93.0%

African American	575	86.5%	443	89.0%	404	87.1%	364	85.8%	344	90.5%	286	85.6%	299	88.2%
Hispanic	31	81.6%	20	95.2%	31	75.6%	20	87.0%	10	90.9%	22	100.0%	18	100.0%
White	165	86.8%	129	90.8%	122	86.5%	116	89.2%	160	87.9%	99	88.4%	143	92.3%
Other Ethnicity	18	85.7%	6	66.7%	5	100.0%	2	100.0%	9	90.0%	5	71.4%	7	100.0%

Stability of Permanence at Ten Years: Subsidized Guardianship

Indicator 3.F.3	Of all children who attained subsidized guardianship during the year, what percentage remained with their family at ten years?						
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Children attaining subsidized guardianship	1,279	2,059	1,634	1,135	1,079	914	670
Children stable at ten years	1,065	1,739	1,396	922	914	721	557
Percent	83.3%	84.5%	85.4%	81.2%	84.7%	78.9%	83.1%

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook	862	85.0%	1,411	85.6%	1,068	85.9%	704	81.6%	712	86.8%	467	79.4%	378	85.9%
Northern	118	76.6%	176	76.9%	163	83.6%	79	73.1%	71	74.7%	97	78.2%	72	76.6%
Central	56	73.7%	115	85.2%	129	84.9%	104	83.9%	122	79.2%	118	76.1%	75	80.6%
Southern	29	82.9%	37	80.4%	36	83.7%	35	87.5%	9	90.0%	39	83.0%	32	74.4%

Female	533	82.6%	876	85.0%	738	85.1%	440	80.1%	449	84.9%	321	75.0%	305	82.4%
Male	531	84.0%	863	83.9%	656	85.8%	482	82.3%	465	84.5%	400	82.3%	252	84.0%

Under 3	14	77.8%	16	84.2%	21	100.0%	12	92.3%	16	72.7%	20	80.0%	19	95.0%
3 to 5	143	83.1%	224	83.6%	144	83.2%	96	75.6%	116	85.3%	98	77.8%	82	89.1%
6 to 8	207	79.0%	366	79.9%	264	78.6%	138	70.4%	139	83.2%	101	66.4%	78	75.7%
9 to 11	256	80.3%	429	81.1%	335	82.7%	200	76.6%	195	79.3%	128	71.5%	80	71.4%
12 to 14	264	83.5%	424	86.5%	389	88.0%	289	84.3%	258	84.3%	208	83.2%	159	82.0%
15 and Older	181	94.8%	280	94.9%	243	94.6%	187	95.9%	190	94.1%	166	91.2%	139	93.3%

African American	965	83.5%	1,529	84.9%	1,171	86.0%	724	80.1%	730	84.5%	515	77.4%	413	82.9%
Hispanic	7	70.0%	23	65.7%	31	79.5%	36	90.0%	39	100.0%	31	81.6%	20	95.2%
White	87	82.9%	185	83.7%	183	83.2%	153	85.5%	129	82.7%	157	82.6%	118	83.1%
Other Ethnicity	6	75.0%	2	100.0%	11	84.6%	9	75.0%	16	80.0%	18	85.7%	6	66.7%



APPENDIX C

Outcome Data by Sub-Region

Appendix C provides data for those outcome indicators that were analyzed at the sub-regional level in Chapters 1, 2, and 3. For each indicator in this appendix, data are presented for the state as whole and each sub-region for the past seven state fiscal years.

The data used to compute these indicators come from the September 30, 2014 data extract of the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services Integrated Database, which is maintained by Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago. Indicator data is available online at <http://www.cfrc.illinois.edu/outcomeindicators.php>

Maltreatment Recurrence Within 12 Months

Indicator 1.A	Of all children with a substantiated report, what percentage had another substantiated report within 12 months?						
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Children with substantiated reports	26,652	27,998	27,498	26,989	26,104	26,566	28,078
Children with another substantiated report within 12 months	3,073	3,259	3,050	2,930	2,836	2,909	3,161
Percent	11.5%	11.6%	11.1%	10.9%	10.9%	11.0%	11.3%

SUB-REGION	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook North	153	7.8%	197	9.5%	211	9.7%	190	8.3%	218	11.1%	186	8.3%	176	8.4%
Cook Central	253	8.1%	233	8.2%	179	7.0%	213	8.5%	192	7.6%	261	8.7%	300	9.2%
Cook South	218	8.9%	242	8.4%	240	9.0%	251	9.8%	219	8.5%	280	11.2%	277	11.0%
Aurora	410	9.0%	510	9.5%	441	8.4%	420	8.5%	430	8.9%	459	9.0%	462	8.3%
Rockford	284	12.5%	383	15.5%	340	12.9%	242	10.2%	212	9.7%	183	9.0%	248	11.3%
Champaign	364	12.2%	371	12.5%	394	13.4%	354	11.9%	368	13.1%	373	13.1%	348	11.3%
Peoria	416	13.1%	400	12.6%	433	13.3%	381	11.5%	359	11.6%	363	12.3%	411	12.9%
Springfield	380	18.1%	335	15.2%	258	11.8%	289	14.4%	283	13.3%	293	14.4%	315	14.7%
East St. Louis	235	13.2%	176	10.2%	170	10.6%	212	12.4%	164	10.7%	140	10.5%	190	12.6%
Marion	360	16.1%	412	17.9%	384	17.6%	378	16.5%	388	16.0%	364	15.4%	434	17.3%

Maltreatment Recurrence Among Children in Intact Family Cases

Indicator 1.B	Of all children served at home in intact family cases, what percentage had a substantiated report within 12 months?						
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Children in intact family cases	16,441	15,640	15,899	14,555	16,602	17,403	10,533
Children with substantiated reports	1,877	1,837	1,726	1,671	1,703	1,744	1,273
Percent	11.4%	11.7%	10.9%	11.5%	10.3%	10.0%	12.1%

SUB-REGION	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook North	109	8.4%	115	9.4%	110	7.8%	96	8.7%	93	8.5%	98	9.0%	84	9.9%
Cook Central	220	5.9%	198	6.3%	170	5.5%	165	5.4%	159	4.6%	236	6.3%	180	6.7%
Cook South	175	8.1%	171	8.6%	170	7.7%	165	8.6%	196	8.1%	150	7.1%	130	10.1%
Aurora	197	12.6%	248	13.3%	227	10.4%	229	11.8%	271	11.4%	292	11.2%	150	11.6%
Rockford	113	13.1%	211	17.3%	124	11.7%	105	12.9%	88	8.6%	118	10.7%	66	16.8%
Champaign	253	15.2%	189	13.9%	211	15.4%	200	16.4%	214	15.0%	187	14.8%	121	15.4%
Peoria	245	13.5%	216	13.2%	205	14.0%	186	13.1%	195	13.7%	178	9.0%	194	15.7%
Springfield	177	16.8%	116	13.7%	155	17.2%	131	15.2%	144	15.9%	125	12.2%	109	14.9%
East St. Louis	178	14.8%	157	12.6%	121	10.9%	178	15.3%	106	11.1%	113	10.6%	80	14.8%
Marion	210	19.0%	216	19.5%	233	21.1%	216	20.5%	237	15.6%	247	17.3%	159	22.3%

Maltreatment in Substitute Care

Indicator 2.A	Of all children placed in substitute care during the year, what percentage had a substantiated report during placement?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children ever in substitute care	22,315	21,945	21,766	21,410	21,454	20,895	20,838
Children with substantiated reports	414	412	387	440	403	403	433
Percent	1.9%	1.9%	1.8%	2.1%	1.9%	1.9%	2.1%

SUB-REGION	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook North	20	0.8%	31	1.2%	20	0.8%	21	0.9%	21	1.0%	12	0.6%	22	1.3%
Cook Central	40	1.0%	35	0.9%	26	0.8%	21	0.7%	35	1.1%	38	1.3%	67	2.3%
Cook South	42	1.3%	44	1.4%	34	1.2%	45	1.6%	56	1.9%	48	1.7%	44	1.5%
Aurora	41	1.8%	43	1.8%	30	1.3%	50	2.2%	40	1.7%	37	1.6%	35	1.6%
Rockford	54	4.1%	59	3.9%	55	3.4%	44	2.6%	44	2.5%	52	2.6%	70	3.3%
Champaign	49	2.3%	56	2.6%	56	2.6%	65	3.1%	39	1.9%	45	2.3%	53	2.6%
Peoria	57	2.0%	61	2.3%	60	2.3%	82	3.2%	55	2.2%	66	2.8%	41	1.8%
Springfield	22	1.8%	27	2.2%	30	2.5%	39	3.1%	14	1.1%	28	2.2%	31	2.3%
East St. Louis	43	3.1%	23	1.6%	24	1.5%	29	1.7%	37	2.3%	31	2.1%	33	2.4%
Marion	46	3.6%	33	2.5%	52	3.5%	44	2.8%	62	3.7%	45	2.8%	36	2.1%

Placing Children Close to Home - Initial Placement

Indicator 2.F	For all children entering substitute care, what is the median* distance from their home of origin to their initial placement?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Children entering substitute care	5,265	4,862	5,031	4,785	4,899	4,796	4,913
Median miles from home	8.8	8.0	9.0	10.1	10.1	10.1	10.6

SUB-REGION	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES
Cook North	417	7.7	285	8.9	376	7.6	264	10.7	316	11.2	270	10.7	269	8.8
Cook Central	585	7.7	479	7.8	493	8.0	436	8.7	501	7.9	555	7.9	528	8.0
Cook South	541	7.4	480	5.7	486	7.4	503	6.7	561	7.4	485	8.4	584	9.3
Aurora	651	15.3	622	12.0	530	14.3	558	14.4	638	15.6	581	16.7	529	16.8
Rockford	392	10.8	500	9.1	492	7.9	468	6.8	494	11.2	641	11.6	569	6.8
Champaign	725	5.6	667	3.6	682	13.9	583	16.1	531	10.0	576	11.0	663	15.2
Peoria	712	5.9	624	5.8	707	6.6	698	9.5	602	8.4	612	9.6	542	6.3
Springfield	366	18.7	345	17.7	310	16.4	324	16.0	325	17.6	315	24.6	375	15.6
East St. Louis	397	9.3	389	8.4	442	10.7	451	9.5	352	14.1	276	7.1	279	11.2
Marion	455	20.8	458	22.5	498	19.3	494	23.3	564	23.5	472	24.5	559	30.0

*Median only includes children with valid address information.

Placing Children Close to Home - End of Year Placement

Indicator 2.G	For all children in substitute care at the end of the fiscal year, what is the median* distance from their home of origin?						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
In substitute care at the end of the year	17,385	16,914	16,517	16,552	16,020	15,894	15,982
Median miles from home	9.3	9.1	9.3	9.8	11.3	10.5	10.6

SUB-REGION	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES	N	MILES
Cook North	2,201	9.9	2,025	10.1	1,931	10.3	1,752	10.5	1,615	10.8	1,452	10.8	1,366	11.4
Cook Central	3,206	9.6	2,938	9.5	2,802	9.5	2,620	9.5	2,371	9.9	2,375	9.0	2,363	8.6
Cook South	2,631	8.6	2,423	8.7	2,302	8.6	2,369	9.2	2,355	9.7	2,411	9.1	2,518	9.3
Aurora	1,756	15.3	1,808	13.7	1,666	13.4	1,678	14.7	1,696	17.1	1,696	16.8	1,661	17.1
Rockford	1,008	5.4	1,138	5.6	1,245	6.6	1,312	9.5	1,390	12.1	1,577	7.7	1,612	8.5
Champaign	1,523	5.6	1,509	5.8	1,549	6.7	1,533	12.3	1,445	15.6	1,421	17.6	1,510	13.7
Peoria	2,247	6.4	2,047	5.6	1,787	5.7	1,903	6.2	1,793	8.2	1,751	9.2	1,684	8.7
Springfield	858	16.1	907	20.9	942	18.4	975	20.9	960	20.3	950	18.9	985	18.2
East St. Louis	1,052	7.7	1,116	7.7	1,209	7.7	1,278	8.3	1,210	9.4	1,098	8.0	1,023	8.6
Marion	882	20.7	980	18.6	1,066	16.0	1,122	19.5	1,176	26.4	1,159	22.3	1,255	25.3

*Median only includes children with valid address information.

Stability in Substitute Care

Indicator 2.H	Of all children entering substitute care and staying for at least one year, what percentage had two or fewer placements within their first year of removal?						
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Children entering substitute care and staying one year	3,748	4,356	3,864	3,987	3,846	3,934	3,979
Children with two or fewer placements in first year	2,915	3,338	3,017	3,117	2,979	3,033	3,148
Percent	77.8%	76.6%	78.1%	78.2%	77.5%	77.1%	79.1%

SUB-REGION	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook North	183	68.3%	244	62.9%	161	73.5%	217	76.4%	158	76.0%	174	67.7%	155	73.1%
Cook Central	274	73.7%	297	70.5%	268	77.2%	278	72.0%	268	72.6%	257	65.2%	362	75.7%
Cook South	242	71.4%	319	65.0%	238	63.5%	283	73.9%	237	63.2%	314	69.9%	293	72.7%
Aurora	327	80.1%	431	81.3%	400	83.0%	348	81.3%	333	79.5%	435	84.6%	375	81.0%
Rockford	179	77.5%	275	78.8%	333	77.6%	300	76.5%	267	75.0%	320	76.6%	431	79.1%
Champaign	485	86.5%	533	88.1%	430	81.3%	428	80.0%	376	83.4%	367	83.2%	408	81.3%
Peoria	491	81.8%	482	80.6%	421	81.1%	482	84.6%	523	83.5%	428	85.6%	437	84.0%
Springfield	208	77.9%	239	75.9%	241	78.5%	207	78.1%	216	79.7%	196	78.4%	222	81.6%
East St. Louis	279	73.0%	233	78.7%	244	79.0%	309	82.8%	302	79.7%	239	84.8%	189	80.8%
Marion	236	76.4%	274	77.8%	274	80.4%	259	71.0%	299	76.3%	301	70.5%	275	78.8%

Permanence within 36 Months: Reunification

Indicator 3.A.3	Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage was reunified with their parents within 36 months of date of entry into substitute care?						
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Children entering substitute care	5,335	4,817	4,627	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855
Children reunified within 36 months	1,892	1,697	1,751	1,987	2,064	2,012	1,913
Percent	35.5%	35.2%	37.8%	37.5%	42.1%	39.7%	39.4%

SUB-REGION	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook North	105	21.1%	70	21.9%	55	19.1%	89	21.3%	71	24.6%	127	34.2%	82	30.7%
Cook Central	119	15.1%	91	14.2%	76	13.9%	103	16.9%	124	24.8%	106	20.1%	89	18.4%
Cook South	126	19.5%	96	21.6%	108	27.8%	144	26.4%	118	24.6%	98	20.0%	99	19.6%
Aurora	242	43.3%	212	37.3%	195	39.2%	287	44.1%	303	48.9%	232	43.6%	296	53.0%
Rockford	168	44.0%	182	44.6%	113	37.7%	155	39.5%	235	47.0%	247	50.2%	209	44.7%
Champaign	240	42.6%	246	43.6%	339	49.1%	337	46.4%	321	48.0%	296	43.3%	258	44.3%
Peoria	255	39.3%	246	36.3%	293	41.8%	327	45.3%	296	46.1%	354	49.9%	304	42.6%
Springfield	193	51.3%	143	42.8%	144	44.4%	145	39.3%	153	44.5%	122	39.2%	134	41.4%
East St. Louis	196	46.2%	201	44.8%	204	45.3%	178	44.9%	193	49.5%	188	42.5%	208	46.1%
Marion	248	55.2%	210	50.7%	189	48.0%	204	44.9%	244	53.3%	231	46.4%	233	47.0%

Permanence within 36 Months: Adoption

Indicator 3.C.2	Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage was adopted within 36 months of date of entry into substitute care?						
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Children entering substitute care	5,335	4,817	4,627	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855
Children adopted within 36 months	719	691	599	518	458	551	537
Percent	13.5%	14.3%	12.9%	9.8%	9.3%	10.9%	11.1%

SUB-REGION	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook North	51	10.2%	24	7.5%	22	7.6%	23	5.5%	16	5.5%	18	4.9%	9	3.4%
Cook Central	71	9.0%	104	16.3%	67	12.2%	32	5.3%	38	7.6%	40	7.6%	38	7.9%
Cook South	57	8.8%	43	9.7%	26	6.7%	28	5.1%	19	4.0%	26	5.3%	21	4.2%
Aurora	49	8.8%	63	11.1%	68	13.7%	61	9.4%	38	6.1%	46	8.6%	42	7.5%
Rockford	78	20.4%	55	13.5%	41	13.7%	36	9.2%	39	7.8%	39	7.9%	49	10.5%
Champaign	135	23.9%	129	22.9%	162	23.4%	142	19.6%	121	18.1%	145	21.2%	134	23.0%
Peoria	97	14.9%	108	16.0%	83	11.8%	74	10.2%	69	10.7%	81	11.4%	84	11.8%
Springfield	72	19.1%	59	17.7%	51	15.7%	55	14.9%	50	14.5%	52	16.7%	45	13.9%
East St. Louis	68	16.0%	48	10.7%	42	9.3%	21	5.3%	26	6.7%	41	9.3%	38	8.4%
Marion	41	9.1%	58	14.0%	37	9.4%	46	10.1%	42	9.2%	63	12.7%	77	15.5%

Permanence within 36 Months: Subsidized Guardianship

Indicator 3.E.2	Of all children who entered substitute care during the year, what percentage attained subsidized guardianship within 36 months of date of entry into substitute care?						
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Children entering substitute care	5,335	4,817	4,627	5,305	4,904	5,073	4,855
Children attaining subsidized guardianship within 36 months	219	174	179	175	118	121	118
Percent	4.1%	3.6%	3.9%	3.3%	2.4%	2.4%	2.4%

SUB-REGION	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cook North	13	2.6%	2	0.6%	5	1.7%	3	0.7%	1	0.3%	5	1.3%	6	2.2%
Cook Central	62	7.9%	41	6.4%	57	10.4%	55	9.0%	52	10.4%	6	1.1%	20	4.1%
Cook South	35	5.4%	11	2.5%	8	2.1%	17	3.1%	11	2.3%	31	6.3%	8	1.6%
Aurora	16	2.9%	32	5.6%	23	4.6%	30	4.6%	20	3.2%	12	2.3%	20	3.6%
Rockford	5	1.3%	6	1.5%	11	3.7%	4	1.0%	2	0.4%	1	0.2%	3	0.6%
Champaign	17	3.0%	30	5.3%	14	2.0%	18	2.5%	6	0.9%	16	2.3%	7	1.2%
Peoria	41	6.3%	31	4.6%	34	4.9%	27	3.7%	18	2.8%	34	4.8%	38	5.3%
Springfield	11	2.9%	3	0.9%	7	2.2%	6	1.6%	2	0.6%	3	1.0%	1	0.3%
East St. Louis	3	0.7%	1	0.2%	4	0.9%	2	0.5%	0	—	0	—	3	0.7%
Marion	16	3.6%	17	4.1%	16	4.1%	13	2.9%	6	1.3%	13	2.6%	12	2.4%



APPENDIX D

Julie Q. v. Department of Children and Family Services:

What Implications Does it Have for Outcome Monitoring in Illinois?

Appendix D provides technical details about the *Julie Q.* court decision and its effects on data used in the *B.H.* report.

On March 21, 2013, the Illinois Supreme Court issued a ruling in the case of *Julie Q. v. Department of Children and Family Services* (2013 IL 113783), holding that the Department exceeded its statutory authority by adding an allegation of neglect to its allegation system that included the term “environment injurious” to a child’s health and welfare; more specifically, when it added Allegation #60 – Substantial Risk of Physical Injury/Environment Injurious to Health and Welfare – to its allegation system in October 2001. At the time that the incidents in question in the *Julie Q.* case took place (2009), the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act (the Act) provided a definition of a “neglected child” that included the following four circumstances:

1. a child not receiving adequate medical care or “other care necessary for his or her well-being including adequate food, clothing, or shelter;”
2. a child abandoned by his or her parents,
3. a child who has been provided with interim crisis intervention services under the juvenile Court Act of 1987 and whose parents refuse to allow the child to return home, and
4. a newborn born with a controlled substance in his or her system.

Prior to 1980, the Act had included in its definition of neglect “an environment injurious to the child’s welfare,” but this language was deleted in 1980 due to concerns that the language was too ambiguous (Public Act 81-1077). Although the legislature removed the language with the intent to create a clearer, more concise definition of this type of neglect, at the time the *Julie Q.* case was filed (2009), such additional language had *not* been reinserted into the Act. Therefore, the Illinois Supreme Court ruled that when DCFS added Allegation 60 (Substantial Risk of Physical Injury/Environment Injurious to Health and Welfare) to its administrative rule and procedure in October 2001, it did so without authority, and that Allegation 60 was therefore “void.”

In 2012, the legislature reinserted language into the Act that included the “environment injurious” definition of neglect. The legislature amended section 3 of the Act to extend the definition of a neglected child to include a child “who is subjected to an environment which is injurious insofar as (i) the child’s environment creates a likelihood of harm to the child’s health, physical well-being, or welfare and (ii) the likely harm to the child is the result of a blatant disregard of parent or caretaker responsibilities” (Public Act 97-803, effective July 13, 2012).

The *Julie Q.* ruling impacted outcome monitoring in Illinois in a number of ways. Individuals who were indicated for Allegation 60 prior to July 13, 2012 were to be removed from the State Central Register and Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS), and the indicated findings were to be changed to unfounded. Once these indicated reports were removed from SACWIS, the total number of children with indicated reports of maltreatment in Illinois through FY2012 was reduced. Table D.1 compares the total number of children with indicated reports using administrative data before and after the removal of indicated Allegation 60. Once the indicated reports of Allegation 60 are removed, the overall number of indicated reports each year decreases between 23-36%.

In addition to decreasing the overall number of indicated reports each year, the removal of indicated Allegation 60 reports may influence maltreatment recurrence rates *if* Allegation 60 is more or less likely to recur than other allegation types. Table D.2 compares the 12-month recurrence rates of children with initial indicated reports of allegation 60 only and those with initial indicated reports of all other allegations. Results show that in each year except 2012, children with indicated reports of Allegation 60 were more likely to experience a maltreatment recurrence (of any type) than those with indicated reports of other allegation types.

Because recurrence rates are higher for children with indicated reports of Allegation 60, it stands to reason

Table D.1 Number of Children with Indicated Reports Before and After *Julie Q.*

FISCAL YEAR	Number of Children with Indicated Reports (Pre-Julie Q)	Number of Children with Indicated Reports (Post-Julie Q)	DIFFERENCE	
			N	%
2005	26,020	20,047	5,973	23.0%
2006	24,947	18,379	6,568	26.3%
2007	26,617	19,352	7,265	27.3%
2008	27,957	19,754	8,203	29.3%
2009	27,452	18,745	8,707	31.7%
2010	26,959	17,847	9,112	33.8%
2011	26,058	16,768	9,290	35.7%
2012	26,520	19,711	6,809	25.7%

Table D.2 12-Month Recurrence for Indicated Reports of Allegation 60 Versus Other Allegations

FISCAL YEAR	Children with Indicated Reports (Pre-Julie Q)	Indicated Report Type	N	% RECURRENT WITHIN 12 MONTHS
2005	26,020	ALLEGATION 60	6,770	12.94
		OTHER ALLEGATIONS	19,250	10.91
2006	24,947	ALLEGATION 60	7,315	12.71
		OTHER ALLEGATIONS	17,632	11.01
2007	26,617	ALLEGATION 60	8,016	12.82
		OTHER ALLEGATIONS	18,601	10.98
2008	27,957	ALLEGATION 60	8,864	12.36
		OTHER ALLEGATIONS	19,093	11.30
2009	27,452	ALLEGATION 60	9,365	11.88
		OTHER ALLEGATIONS	18,087	10.70
2010	26,959	ALLEGATION 60	9,705	11.68
		OTHER ALLEGATIONS	17,254	10.37
2011	26,058	ALLEGATION 60	9,788	11.70
		OTHER ALLEGATIONS	16,270	10.38
2012	26,520	ALLEGATION 60	7,437	10.19
		OTHER ALLEGATIONS	19,083	11.24

Table D.3 12-Month Recurrence Rates Before and After *Julie Q.*

FISCAL YEAR	<i>Pre-Julie Q.</i> data		<i>Post-Julie Q.</i> data	
	CHILDREN WITH INDICATED REPORTS	% RECURRENT WITHIN 12 MONTHS	CHILDREN WITH INDICATED REPORTS	% RECURRENT WITHIN 12 MONTHS
2005	26,020	11.4	20,047	9.0
2006	24,947	11.5	18,379	9.0
2007	26,617	11.5	19,352	8.8
2008	27,957	11.6	19,754	8.8
2009	27,452	11.1	18,745	8.3
2010	26,959	10.9	17,847	7.9
2011	26,058	10.9	16,768	8.0
2012	26,520	10.9	19,711	10.2

that removing these reports from the overall population from which recurrence rates are calculated will reduce the overall recurrence rates. Table D.3 compares the 12-month recurrence rates using administrative data before and after the indicated Allegation 60 reports have been removed and confirms this pattern.

For the *B.H.* report, CFRC had to decide whether or not to use pre-*Julie Q.* data or post-*Julie Q.* data to calculate all indicators involving maltreatment recurrence (Indicators 1.A, 1.B, 1.C, and 2.A). It was ultimately decided that consistency with prior *B.H.* reports was important enough to justify using measures that include indicated Allegation 60 reports during the years prior to 2012, even though they have been removed from the administrative data. Since Allegation 60 was reinserted into the Act as of July 13, 2012, indicated Allegation 60 reports will be included in all future data sets used to calculate indicators in future *B.H.* reports.



**CHILDREN AND FAMILY
| RESEARCH | CENTER**

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

www.cfrc.illinois.edu