Child and Family Services Reviews

Indiana

Final Report

2016

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN & FAMILIES
Administration on Children, Youth and Families
Children's Bureau

This page is intentionally blank.

Final Report: Indiana Child and Family Services Review

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the state of Indiana. The CFSRs enable the Children's Bureau to: (1) ensure conformity with certain federal child welfare requirements; (2) determine what is actually happening to children and families as they are engaged in child welfare services; and (3) assist states in enhancing their capacity to help children and families achieve positive outcomes. Federal law and regulations authorize the Children's Bureau, within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families, to administer the review of child and family services programs under titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act. The CFSRs are structured to help states identify strengths and areas needing improvement in their child welfare practices and programs as well as institute systemic changes that will improve child and family outcomes.

The findings for Indiana are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Department of Child Services (DCS), and submitted to the Children's Bureau on April 6, 2016. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes, and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan.
- The results of case reviews of 65 cases (40 foster care and 25 in-home cases) conducted via a Traditional Review process at Marion, Tippecanoe, and Bartholomew counties, Indiana, during the week of June 6, 2016.
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Attorneys representing the agency
  - Attorneys representing parents
  - Attorneys representing children/youth and representatives from Court Appointed Special Advocates
  - Child welfare senior managers and child welfare program managers
  - Child welfare case workers and supervisors
  - Child welfare training director
  - Foster and adoptive parents
  - Judges, representatives from the court system, and Court Improvement Project
  - Information system staff
  - Law enforcement
  - Parents
  - Representatives from Juvenile Justice

- Tribal representatives
- Service providers
- Youth served by the agency

In Round 3, the Children's Bureau suspended the use of the state's performance on the national standards for the 7 statewide data indicators in conformity decisions. For contextual information, Appendix A of this report shows the state's performance on the 7 data indicators. Moving forward, the Children's Bureau will refer to the national standards as "national performance." This national performance represents the performance of the nation on the statewide data indicators for an earlier point in time. For the time periods used to calculate the national performance for each indicator, see 80 Fed. Reg. 27263 (May 13, 2015).

Background Information

The Round 3 CFSR assesses state performance with regard to substantial conformity with 7 child and family outcomes and 7 systemic factors. Each outcome incorporates 1 or more of the 18 items included in the case review, and each item is rated as a Strength or Area Needing Improvement based on an evaluation of certain child welfare practices and processes in the cases reviewed in the state. With two exceptions, an item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 90% or more of the applicable cases reviewed were rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies to those items. For a state to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95% or more of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome.

Eighteen items are considered in assessing the state's substantial conformity with the 7 systemic factors. Each item reflects a key federal program requirement relevant to the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) for that systemic factor. An item is rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement based on how well the item-specific requirement is functioning. A determination of the rating is based on information provided by the state to demonstrate the functioning of the systemic factor in the statewide assessment and, as needed, from interviews with stakeholders and partners. For a state to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factors, no more than 1 of the items associated with the systemic factor can be rated as an Area Needing Improvement. For systemic factors that have only 1 item associated with them, that item must be rated as a Strength for a determination of substantial conformity.

The Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting Indiana's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Indiana's performance in Round 2.

I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

Indiana 2016 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

None of the 7 outcomes was found to be in substantial conformity.

The following 1 of 7 systemic factors was found to be in substantial conformity:

- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

Children's Bureau Comments on Indiana Performance

The following are the Children's Bureau's observations about cross-cutting issues and Indiana's overall performance:

Data provided in the statewide assessment and information collected during stakeholder interviews indicated issues that may affect the provision of child welfare services in the state. These include an increasing number of reports of child maltreatment received and an increase in the foster care population. The state attributes the growth in the foster care population to an increase in the number of cases involving parental substance abuse. The Children's Bureau identified cross-cutting concerns during the review that included high caseworker caseloads, low retention of employees, and a lack of qualified service providers. These, along with the increase in the number of maltreatment reports and the number of children in foster care, could present challenges to assuring child safety and permanency. We encourage Indiana to consider this context in addressing the specific challenges noted in these comments and throughout the Final Report.

Several years ago, Indiana reorganized and the Juvenile Probation Department became part of the DCS. In Indiana, some youth who are involved in the juvenile justice system are in the placement and care responsibility of DCS. While they are placed in foster care, they are primarily served through probation officers. We found that Indiana has more work to do to ensure child welfare systems and child protection requirements are being met for these youth. For example, we noted challenges in systemic factor functioning because of insufficient training for probation workers in child welfare approaches, and a lack of access to information systems. Appropriate placement resources are not as accessible to juvenile justice-involved youth and there is also a lack of adequate case planning and access to services for these probation-managed foster care cases.

An insufficient array of appropriate services and service providers appears to have negatively affected performance on some of the outcomes for all children. Stakeholders indicated that transportation of families to visits and services continues to be a significant need for Indiana. There also continues to be a lack of foster homes that can meet the needs of the children in care. During the stakeholder interviews, there were examples provided of sibling groups not being placed together due to the lack of available foster homes. The Independent Living population—which includes youth 14 years of age and older in addition to youth aging out of care—is another area of concern. It appears that limited work has been done to maintain connections for these youth and link them with the proper resources to prepare for independence.

The review also identified areas of concern regarding assessing and managing safety and risk. As described in the statewide assessment, Indiana has a tiered policy for timely initiation of assessments of 1 hour, 24 hours, and 5 days for face-to-face contact with children who are the subject of a report of child maltreatment. Reviewers found that in some cases these time frames were not met. This was an issue across the different types of maltreatment reports. Reviewers also found that assessments were not always done until after a second report was received. The Children's Bureau urges the state to address these risk and safety practice concerns.

The Children's Bureau is concerned with Indiana's practice of Informal Adjustment (IA). An IA is a written agreement between DCS and the child's parents that outlines what the parents must do to keep their child safe. It may include a multitude of services. Although the court must agree to and monitor the IA, the child is not a Child in Need of Services (CHINS). Depending on the county and the circumstances of the case, the degree of court monitoring varies and families may not have ever attended court. The case review results also showed that these families were receiving services in some cases, while in others very few services were offered or provided.

For Permanency Outcome 1, only 30% of the cases were found to be in substantial conformity. Many of the items relating to permanency were rated as Areas Needing Improvement. Specifically, the case results found that the state is having challenges establishing permanency goals for children timely. The Children's Bureau urges the state to address this and other Permanency Outcome 1 item challenges.

Indiana has implemented the practice of Child and Family Team Meetings. When used appropriately, Child and Family Team Meetings were seen as a definite strength because they support comprehensive case planning focused on family supports. The Child and Family Team Meetings assist the Family Case Manager in identifying and understanding the family's underlying needs. However, the case review results indicated that when the Child and Family Team Meetings are not being used appropriately, a significant barrier to achieving case goals and addressing the issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family results as the needs of the children, parents and foster parents are not comprehensively assessed. In many cases, review results found that the assessment and services provided focus on the presenting problem, but do not identify and address the underlying issues relating to abuse and neglect.

The systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community was found to be functioning in substantial conformity. The Children's Bureau believes that with this system in place and functioning, Indiana can address other program areas and outcomes that need improvement. Indiana's engagement of key stakeholders who share responsibility for systemic improvement and strategic planning will be critical to the success of ongoing work.

II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

For each outcome, we provide performance summaries from the case review findings. The CFSR relies upon a case review of an approved sample of foster care cases and in-home services cases. Where relevant, we provide performance summaries that are differentiated between foster care and in-home services cases.

This report provides an overview. Results have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Details on each case rating are available to the Department of Child Services. The state is encouraged to conduct additional item-specific analysis of the case review findings to better understand areas of practice that are associated with positive outcomes and those that need improvement.

Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Item 1.

State Outcome Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 31% of the 35 applicable cases reviewed.

Safety Outcome 1 Item Performance

Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether responses to all accepted child maltreatment reports received during the period under review were initiated, and face-to-face contact with the child(ren) made, within the time frames established by agency policies or state statutes.

State policy requires that if a child is in imminent danger of serious bodily harm, the department shall initiate an onsite assessment immediately, but no later than 1 hour, after receiving the report. If the safety or well-being of a child appears to be endangered, the assessment shall be initiated regardless of the time of day. If the report alleges a child may be a victim of child abuse, the assessment shall be initiated immediately, but no later than 24 hours after receipt of the report. If reports of child neglect are received, the assessment shall be initiated within a reasonably prompt time, but no later than 5 days after receipt of the report.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 31% of the 35 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the safety statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Safety Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 2 and 3.

State Outcome Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 71% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 75% of the 40 foster care cases, and 64% of the 25 in-home services cases.

Safety Outcome 2 Item Performance

Item 2. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-Entry Into Foster Care

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to provide services to the family to prevent children's entry into foster care or re-entry after a reunification.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 2 because 90% of the 29 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 79% of the 14 applicable foster care cases and 100% of the 15 applicable in-home services cases.

Item 3. Risk and Safety Assessment and Management

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess and address the risk and safety concerns relating to the child(ren) in their own homes or while in foster care.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 71% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 75% of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 64% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.

Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 4, 5, and 6.

State Outcome Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 30% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

Permanency Outcome 1 Item Performance

Item 4. Stability of Foster Care Placement

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether the child in foster care is in a stable placement at the time of the onsite review and that any changes in placement that occurred during the period under review were in the best interests of the child and consistent with achieving the child's permanency goal(s).

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 78% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Item 5. Permanency Goal for Child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether appropriate permanency goals were established for the child in a timely manner.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 60% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Item 6. Achieving Reunification, Guardianship, Adoption, or Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether concerted efforts were made, or are being made, during the period under review to achieve reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 53% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

For performance on the permanency statewide data indicators, see Appendix A.

Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Permanency Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Items 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

State Outcome Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 70% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

Permanency Outcome 2 Item Performance

Item 7. Placement With Siblings

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that siblings in foster care are placed together unless a separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 78% of the 27 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Item 8. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father,[1] and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 67% of the 33 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 56% of the 18 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation with a sibling(s) in foster care who is/was in a different placement setting was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 83% of the 29 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her mother was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 88% of the 16 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her father was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

Item 9. Preserving Connections

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to maintain the child's connections to his or her neighborhood, community, faith, extended family, Tribe, school, and friends.

[1] For Item 8, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification. The persons identified in these roles for the purposes of the review may include individuals who do not meet the legal definitions or conventional meanings of a mother and father.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 65% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Item 10. Relative Placement

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to place the child with relatives when appropriate.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 81% of the 37 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

Item 11. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father[2] or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 63% of the 30 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 68% of the 28 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her mother.
- In 64% of the 14 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to promote, support, and otherwise maintain a positive and nurturing relationship between the child in foster care and his or her father.

Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 1 using the state's performance on Items 12, 13, 14, and 15.

State Outcome Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 38% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 33% of the 40 foster care cases and 48% of the 25 in-home services cases.

[2] For Item 11, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification.

Well-Being Outcome 1 Item Performance

Item 12. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency (1) made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents,[3] and foster parents (both initially, if the child entered foster care or the case was opened during the period under review, and on an ongoing basis) to identify the services necessary to achieve case goals and adequately address the issues relevant to the agency's involvement with the family, and (2) provided the appropriate services.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 40% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 35% of the 40 foster care cases and 48% of the 25 in-home services cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

Sub-Item 12A. Needs Assessment and Services to Children

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 83% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 83% of the 40 foster care cases and 84% of the 25 in-home services cases..

Sub-Item 12B. Needs Assessment and Services to Parents

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 47% of the 57 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 44% of the 32 applicable foster care cases and 52% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 65% of the 55 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 59% of the 49 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

[3] For Sub-Item 12B, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable "mothers" and "fathers" for the period under review in the case.

Sub-Item 12C. Needs Assessment and Services to Foster Parents

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 56% of the 36 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

Item 13. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents[4] and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 48% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 48% of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 48% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 70% of the 40 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 73% of the 55 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 57% of the 49 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve fathers in case planning.

Item 14. Caseworker Visits With Child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the child(ren) in the case are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 78% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 83% of the 40 foster care cases and 72% of the 25 in-home services cases.

Item 15. Caseworker Visits With Parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the frequency and quality of visits between

[4] For Item 13, in the in-home cases, “Mother” and “Father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, “mother” and “father” are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency’s work with multiple applicable “mothers” and “fathers” for the period under review in the case.

caseworkers and the mothers and fathers[5] of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 32% of the 57 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 28% of the 32 applicable foster care cases and 36% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 61% of the 54 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 33% of the 48 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with fathers were sufficient.

Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 2 using the state's performance on Item 16.

State Outcome Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 74% of the 35 applicable cases reviewed.

Well-Being Outcome 2 Item Performance

Item 16. Educational Needs of the Child

Purpose of Assessment: To assess whether, during the period under review, the agency made concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs at the initial contact with the child (if the case was opened during the period under review) or on an ongoing basis (if the case was opened before the period under review), and whether identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities.

[5] For Item 15, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" is typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable mother and fathers for the period under review in the case.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 74% of the 35 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 74% of the 31 applicable foster care cases and 75% of the 4 applicable in-home services cases.

Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

The Children's Bureau calculates the state's performance on Well-Being Outcome 3 using the state's performance on Items 17 and 18.

State Outcome Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 62% of the 58 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 60% of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 67% of the applicable 18 in-home services cases.

Well-Being Outcome 3 Item Performance

Item 17. Physical Health of the Child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the physical health needs of the children, including dental health needs.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 69% of the 45 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 70% of the 40 foster care cases and 60% of the 5 applicable in-home services cases.

Item 18. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency addressed the mental/behavioral health needs of the children.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 68% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 63% of the 24 applicable foster care cases and 75% of the 16 applicable in-home services cases.

III. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

For each systemic factor below, we provide performance summaries and a determination of whether the state is in substantial conformity with that systemic factor. In addition, we provide ratings for each item and a description of how the rating was determined. The CFSR relies upon a review of information contained in the statewide assessment to assess each item. If an item rating cannot be determined from the information contained in the statewide assessment, the Children's Bureau conducts stakeholder interviews and considers information gathered through the interviews in determining ratings for each item.

Statewide Information System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 19.

State Systemic Factor Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

Statewide Information System Item Performance

Item 19. Statewide Information System

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The statewide information system is functioning statewide to ensure that, at a minimum, the state can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is (or, within the immediately preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment and the stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and obtained during stakeholder interviews showed that Indiana's statewide information system does not have the required data for all children in foster care. Specifically, the required information is not readily available to identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of probation-managed foster care cases. Further, the processes that the state has in place to ensure the timeliness of data entry and data quality for the child welfare-managed foster care cases are not in place for these probation managed cases. The variation among the counties in management of information systems is also noted as a concern.

Case Review System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24.

State Systemic Factor Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. One of the 5 items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

Case Review System Item Performance

Item 20. Written Case Plan

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the child's parent(s) and includes the required provisions.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment. Indiana agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Indiana provided information in the statewide assessment from an internal quality assurance case review showing that case plans are not developed jointly with the child's parents on a consistent basis. In the statewide assessment, Indiana also stated that youth in probation-managed foster care cases lack case plans.

Item 21. Periodic Reviews

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that a periodic review for each child occurs no less frequently than once every 6 months, either by a court or by administrative review.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that periodic reviews are occurring no less frequently than once every 6 months for children in foster care. Stakeholders confirmed this information and also reported that periodic reviews occur every 60 to 90 days for children in probation managed foster care cases.

Item 22. Permanency Hearings

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that each child has a permanency hearing in a qualified court or administrative body that occurs no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care and no less frequently than every 12 months thereafter.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and obtained through stakeholder interviews showed that permanency hearings are occurring timely; however, the state is not able to provide data or information that demonstrates the quality or content of

permanency hearings for probation cases. In interviews, some stakeholders said that permanency hearings are not having a positive impact on assuring timely permanency for children.

Item 23. Termination of Parental Rights

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The case review system is functioning statewide to ensure that the filing of termination of parental rights proceedings occurs in accordance with required provisions.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and obtained through stakeholder interviews could not be reconciled to demonstrate that this systemic factor item is functioning effectively. In the statewide assessment, the state provided data on the median time for filing of termination of parental rights (TPR) petitions for only those cases in which a petition was filed. Stakeholders reported that there is a process to begin filing TPR petitions in advance of 15 of the most recent 22-month time frame. Neither the statewide assessment nor stakeholders provided information regarding the use of exceptions to filing TPR. In addition, case review results demonstrated that timely filing of TPR is an area of challenge for the state.

Item 24. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The case review system is functioning to ensure that foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of children in foster care are notified of, and have a right to be heard in, any review or hearing held with respect to the child.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed in stakeholder interviews indicated that notice is not consistently provided to required individuals and that there is no uniform process in place to ensure notification occurs. Additionally, many resource parents said they are not given the opportunity to be heard during hearings.

Quality Assurance System

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 25.

State Systemic Factor Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as an Area Needing Improvement.

Quality Assurance System Item Performance

Item 25. Quality Assurance System

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The quality assurance system is functioning statewide to ensure that it (1) operating in the jurisdictions where the services included in the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) are provided, (2) has standards to evaluate the quality of services (including standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect their health and safety), (3) identifies strengths and needs of the service delivery system, (4) provides relevant reports, and (5) evaluates implemented program improvement measures.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and received from stakeholders during interviews showed that while Indiana has several components of a Quality Assurance (QA) system, the state is unable to demonstrate that the QA system is fully functioning and integrated into the agency's culture. Field staff lack an understanding of QA and are unclear about how the system results in practice change and ongoing improvement. Additionally, probation does not have an identifiable QA system.

Staff and Provider Training

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 26, 27, and 28.

State Systemic Factor Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. One of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

Staff and Provider Training Item Performance

Item 26. Initial Staff Training

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that initial training is provided to all staff who deliver services pursuant to the CFSP that includes the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed in interviews with stakeholders showed that initial training is of good quality and provides family case managers with the basic skills and knowledge required for their positions. The state has a process for tracking family case managers' completion of initial training. However, probation workers are not similarly trained

to serve children in foster care as there is no training offered for new probation officers with respect to child welfare and no assessment to ensure that these staff are able to gain the skills and knowledge needed for their positions.

Item 27. Ongoing Staff Training

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that ongoing training is provided for staff[6] that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and obtained through stakeholder interviews showed that Indiana is tracking ongoing training and ensuring that the training is of good quality and is meeting the knowledge and basic skills of the family case workers. However, probation workers are not offered training that is relevant to child welfare or family-centered practice on an ongoing basis.

Item 28. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that training is occurring statewide for current or prospective foster parents, adoptive parents, and staff of state licensed or approved facilities (that care for children receiving foster care or adoption assistance under title IV-E) that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to foster and adopted children.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed during interviews with stakeholders indicated that foster parents, adoptive parents, and child care institution staff complete initial and ongoing training. During stakeholder interviews, foster and adoptive parents reported that the initial and ongoing training is effective in providing them with the skills and knowledge they need to carry out their duties.

[6] "Staff," for purposes of assessing this item, includes all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP. "Staff" also includes direct supervisors of all contracted and non-contracted staff who have case management responsibilities in the areas of child protection services, family preservation and support services, foster care services, adoption services, and independent living services pursuant to the state's CFSP.

Service Array and Resource Development

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 29 and 30.

State Systemic Factor Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array and Resource Development. None of the items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

Service Array and Resource Development Item Performance

Item 29. Array of Services

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The service array and resource development system is functioning to ensure that the following array of services is accessible in all political jurisdictions covered by the CFSP: (1) services that assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, (2) services that address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe home environment, (3) services that enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and (4) services that help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and obtained from stakeholders during interviews showed that there are significant gaps in the array of services. Stakeholders reported extensive wait lists due the limited pool of available qualified service providers across the state and also reported limited transportation and housing options. Specific service gaps identified include services for substance abuse and mental health issues, domestic violence services, and services to mentor youth.

Item 30. Individualizing Services

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The service array and resource development system is functioning statewide to ensure that the services in Item 29 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the agency.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during stakeholder interviews indicated that the state's ability to individualize services to meet the cultural, linguistic, and developmental needs of children and families varies across the state. While the state has some good practices in place to support individualization of services such as the use of Child and Family Team Meetings, and comprehensive assessment and case planning, there is varied success statewide. Although there are areas within the state where services are consistently individualized to meet the needs of children and families, individualization is less successful in multiple areas within the state, particularly rural counties. According to stakeholders, flex funding to meet specific needs is not available in all counties. The ability to individualize services is also made more

challenging because services are not available in some jurisdictions. Stakeholders noted that for children or youth involved in the probation system, there is a lack of availability of services to address developmental needs, including children with autism, or to adapt services for families who speak Spanish.

Agency Responsiveness to the Community

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 31 and 32.

State Systemic Factor Performance

Indiana is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Both items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

Agency Responsiveness to the Community Item Performance

Item 31. State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that, in implementing the provisions of the CFSP and developing related APSRs, the state engages in ongoing consultation with Tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals, objectives, and annual updates of the CFSP.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected from stakeholders during interviews demonstrates that the state is engaged in ongoing consultation with the required entities. Stakeholders confirmed that input from these consultations is integrated into CFSP goals and the state's APSR.

Item 32. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state's services under the CFSP are coordinated with services or benefits of other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment demonstrated that the state coordinates services with other federal or federally assisted programs. The state presented examples of coordinating activities with child support, child care, behavioral health, education, and developmental disabilities programs.

Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 33, 34, 35, and 36.

State Systemic Factor Performance

Indiana is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. Two of the four items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention Item Performance

Item 33. Standards Applied Equally

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that state standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Indiana provided information on the state's process for monitoring compliance with licensing requirements and demonstrated that state standards are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds. In addition, the state has a variance procedure in place that is functioning effectively.

Item 34. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning statewide to ensure that the state complies with federal requirements for criminal background clearances as related to licensing or approving foster care and adoptive placements and has in place a case planning process that includes provisions for addressing the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Strength for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed by stakeholders in interviews showed that criminal background check requirements are consistently met. The DSC Licensing Unit monitors for compliance. Stakeholders provided information confirming that all criminal background checks are completed timely with limited exceptions for residential facilities and foster family homes. Stakeholders also verified that safety concerns are addressed, and staff are not allowed to interact with children in residential facilities until criminal background checks have been completed.

Item 35. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the state for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed is occurring statewide.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected through stakeholder interviews showed that while Indiana conducts some ongoing recruitment, the state does not complete a regular review of data on the characteristics of children in foster care compared with the characteristics and availability of foster and adoptive placements and then use that data to guide diligent recruitment efforts.

Item 36. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention system is functioning to ensure that the process for ensuring the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptive or permanent placements for waiting children is occurring statewide.

- Indiana received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that while the state explores and uses cross-jurisdictional resources for children in its care, the state does not meet the requirements for responding to ICPC requests in a timely manner; it meets the requirement in less than 50 percent of cases.

Appendix A
Summary of Indiana 2016 Child and Family Services Review Performance

I. Ratings for Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being Outcomes and Items

Outcome Achievement: Outcomes may be rated as in substantial conformity or not in substantial conformity. 95% of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the state to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

Item Achievement: Items may be rated as a Strength or as an Area Needing Improvement. For an overall rating of Strength, 90% of the cases reviewed for the item (with the exception of Item 1 and Item 16) must be rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies.

SAFETY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN ARE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, PROTECTED FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Safety Outcome 1 Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	Not in Substantial Conformity	31% Substantially Achieved
Item 1 Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	31% Strength

SAFETY OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Safety Outcome 2 Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	71% Substantially Achieved
Item 2 Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Strength	90% Strength
Item 3 Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	71% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Indiana 2016 CFSR Performance

PERMANENCY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN HAVE PERMANENCY AND STABILITY IN THEIR LIVING SITUATIONS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Permanency Outcome 1 Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	Not in Substantial Conformity	30% Substantially Achieved
Item 4 Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	78% Strength
Item 5 Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	60% Strength
Item 6 Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	53% Strength

PERMANENCY OUTCOME 2: THE CONTINUITY OF FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS IS PRESERVED FOR CHILDREN.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Permanency Outcome 2 The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children	Not in Substantial Conformity	70% Substantially Achieved
Item 7 Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	78% Strength
Item 8 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	67% Strength
Item 9 Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	65% Strength
Item 10 Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	81% Strength
Item 11 Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement†	63% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Indiana 2016 CFSR Performance

WELL-BEING OUTCOME 1: FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 1 Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	38% Substantially Achieved
Item 12 Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	40% Strength
Sub-Item 12A Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	83% Strength
Sub-Item 12B Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	47% Strength
Sub-Item 12C Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	56% Strength
Item 13 Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	48% Strength
Item 14 Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	78% Strength
Item 15 Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	32% Strength

WELL-BEING OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 2 Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	74% Substantially Achieved
Item 16 Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	74% Strength

WELL-BEING OUTCOME 3: CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 3 Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	62% Strength
Item 17 Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	69% Strength
Item 18 Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength

II. Ratings for Systemic Factors

The Children's Bureau determines whether a state is in substantial conformity with federal requirements for the 7 systemic factors based on the level of functioning of each systemic factor across the state. The Children's Bureau determines substantial conformity with the systemic factors based on ratings for the item or items within each factor. Performance on 5 of the 7 systemic factors is determined on the basis of ratings for multiple items or plan requirements. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with these systemic factors, the Children's Bureau must find that no more than 1 of the required items for that systemic factor fails to function as required. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with the 2 systemic factors that are determined based on the rating of a single item, the Children's Bureau must find that the item is functioning as required.

STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 19 Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

Appendix A: Summary of Indiana 2016 CFSR Performance

CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Case Review System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 20 Written Case Plan	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement
Item 21 Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 22 Permanency Hearings	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 23 Termination of Parental Rights	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 24 Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement

QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 25 Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Staff and Provider Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 26 Initial Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Item 27 Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 28 Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Service Array and Resource Development	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 29 Array of Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 30 Individualizing Services	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	In Substantial Conformity
Item 31 State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 32 Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Statewide Assessment	Strength

FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 33 Standards Applied Equally	Statewide Assessment	Strength
Item 34 Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 35 Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 36 State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement

III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators[7]

The state's performance is considered against the national performance for each statewide data indicator and provides contextual information for considering the findings. This information is not used in conformity decisions. State performance may be statistically above, below, or no different than the national performance. If a state did not provide the required data or did not meet the applicable item data quality limits, the Children's Bureau did not calculate the state's performance for the statewide data indicator.

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.1%	Lower	12.4%	11.9%–12.9%	FY13–14
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	8.50	Lower	16.22	14.92–17.6	14A–14B, FY14

[7] In October 2016, the Children's Bureau issued Technical Bulletin #9 (http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9), which alerted states to the fact that there were technical errors in the syntax used to calculate the national and state performance for the statewide data indicators. The syntax revision is still underway, so performance shown in this table is based on the 2015 Federal Register syntax.

Appendix A: Summary of Indiana 2016 CFSR Performance

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	40.5%	Higher	40.4%	39.4%–41.5%	12B–15A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	43.6%	Higher	35.5%	34%–37.1%	14B–15A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	30.3%	Higher	27.4%	26%–28.8%	14B–15A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.3%	Lower	4.6%	3.9%–5.4%	12B–15A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.12	Lower	3.15	3.06–3.24	14B–15A

*** Risk-Standardized Performance (RSP)** is derived from a multi-level statistical model and reflects the state's performance relative to states with similar children and takes into account the number of children the state served, the age distribution of these children, and, for some indicators, the state's entry rate. It uses risk-adjustment to minimize differences in outcomes due to factors over which the state has little control and provides a more fair comparison of state performance against the national standard.

**** 95% Confidence Interval** is the 95% confidence interval estimate for the state's RSP. The values shown are the lower RSP and upper RSP of the interval estimate. The interval accounts for the amount of uncertainty associated with the RSP. For example, the CB is 95% confident that the true value of the RSP is between the lower and upper limit of the interval.

***** Data Period(s) Used for State Performance:** Refers to the initial 12-month period and the period(s) of data needed to follow the children to observe their outcomes. The FY or federal fiscal year refers to NCANDS data, which spans the 12-month period October 1 – September 30. All other periods refer to AFCARS data. "A" refers to the 6-month period October 1 – March 31. "B" refers to the 6-month period April 1 – September 30. The 2-digit year refers to the calendar year in which the period ends.

Appendix B
Summary of CFSR Round 2 Indiana 2007 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in Indiana in 2007. Key findings from that review are presented below. Because the Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round and in response to feedback from the child welfare field, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSR is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round.

Identifying Information and Review Dates

General Information
Children's Bureau Region: 5
Date of Onsite Review: July 9–13, 2007
Period Under Review: April 1, 2006, through July 9, 2007
Date Final Report Issued: April 16, 2008
Date Program Improvement Plan Due: July 15, 2008
Date Program Improvement Plan Approved: June 1, 2009

Highlights of Findings

Performance Measurements
A. The State met the national standards for **one** of the **six** standards.
B. The State achieved substantial conformity for **none** of the **seven** outcomes.
C. The State achieved substantial conformity for **three** of the **seven** systemic factors.

Appendix B: Indiana 2007 CFSR Key Findings

State's Conformance With the National Standards

Data Indicator or Composite	National Standard	State's Score	Meets or Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of maltreatment recurrence (data indicator)	94.6 or higher	92.7	Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.3	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	120.9	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	114.7	Meets Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	119.7	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	95.6	Does Not Meet Standard

State's Conformance With the Outcomes

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

Appendix B: Indiana 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

State's Conformance With the Systemic Factors

Systemic Factor	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Statewide Information System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Case Review System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Quality Assurance System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Achieved Substantial Conformity

Appendix B: Indiana 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Key Findings by Item

Outcomes

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 1. Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child Maltreatment	Area Needing Improvement
Item 2. Repeat Maltreatment	Area Needing Improvement
Item 3. Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-entry Into Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
Item 4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	Area Needing Improvement
Item 5. Foster Care Re-entries	Strength
Item 6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 7. Permanency Goal for Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives	Area Needing Improvement
Item 9. Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
Item 10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	Strength
Item 12. Placement With Siblings	Area Needing Improvement
Item 13. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
Item 14. Preserving Connections	Area Needing Improvement
Item 15. Relative Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 16. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
Item 17. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	Area Needing Improvement

Appendix B: Indiana 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	Area Needing Improvement
Item 19. Caseworker Visits With Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 20. Caseworker Visits With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
Item 21. Educational Needs of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 22. Physical Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

Systemic Factors

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 24. Statewide Information System	Strength
Item 25. Written Case Plan	Area Needing Improvement
Item 26. Periodic Reviews	Strength
Item 27. Permanency Hearings	Area Needing Improvement
Item 28. Termination of Parental Rights	Area Needing Improvement
Item 29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Strength
Item 30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
Item 31. Quality Assurance System	Area Needing Improvement
Item 32. Initial Staff Training	Strength
Item 33. Ongoing Staff Training	Area Needing Improvement
Item 34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Area Needing Improvement
Item 35. Array of Services	Area Needing Improvement
Item 36. Service Accessibility	Area Needing Improvement
Item 37. Individualizing Services	Strength

Appendix B: Indiana 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength
Item 39. Agency Annual Reports Pursuant to CFSP	Strength
Item 40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Strength
Item 41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength
Item 42. Standards Applied Equally	Strength
Item 43. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Strength
Item 44. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Area Needing Improvement
Item 45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength