Child and Family Services Reviews

New Hampshire

Final Report

2018

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: New Hampshire Child and Family Services Review

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the state of New Hampshire. 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 New Hampshire are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services Division for Children, Youth & Families (DCYF), and submitted to the Children's Bureau on February 7, 2018. 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) conducted via a Traditional Review process at Manchester, Conway, and Seacoast, New Hampshire, during the week of April 1, 2018
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Attorneys for the agency
  - Attorneys for children/youth
  - Attorneys for parents
  - Court Appointed Special Advocates
  - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) staff
  - Child welfare agency associate commissioner and director
  - Child welfare agency bureau chiefs
  - Child welfare agency caseworkers and supervisors
  - Child welfare agency field administrators
  - Court system/Court Improvement Project (CIP)
  - Child welfare System Transformation Interagency Team

- Foster/adoptive licensing and recruitment and retention staff
- Foster parents, adoptive parents, and relative caregivers
- Judges
- Juvenile probation and parole supervisors and officers
- Parents and parent advocates
- Public/private agency training staff and partners
- Service providers
- State licensed/approved child care facility staff
- 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).[1]

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.

[1] May 2017 revised syntax (pending final verification) uses 2 years of NCANDS data to calculate performance for the Maltreatment in Foster Care indicator. National performance is based on FY 2013–2014 and 2013AB files. All other indicators use the same time periods identified in the May 2015 Federal Register notice.

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 New Hampshire's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about New Hampshire's performance in Round 2.

I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

New Hampshire 2018 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

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

The following 2 of the 7 systemic factors were found to be in substantial conformity:

- Quality Assurance System
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

Children's Bureau Comments on New Hampshire Performance

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

Leading up to the 2018 CFSR, DCYF had several external reviews of its child welfare system. These external reviews found that DCYF has experienced an increase in the number of assessments overall and in the number of assessments that were overdue, high-profile cases involving child fatalities and critical injuries, significant staff turnover, and a diminished service array. In addition, the number of children in foster care has risen sharply over the past few years. DCYF convened the child welfare Transformation Team, comprising a wide variety of individuals, including birth parents and service providers, to explore these challenges and work together to develop possible solutions.

The CFSR identified several cross-cutting practice areas that affect the state's ability to meet safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes. The Children's Bureau strongly encourages DCYF to focus its Program Improvement Plan (PIP) on the following key issues: conducting quality initial and ongoing safety and risk assessments; achieving timely permanency for children in foster care; frequent, timely, and quality engagement with parents, especially fathers; and appropriate assessment and service delivery to children and families. The CFSR found that DCYF has a highly functioning quality assurance system and strong community engagement, which can serve as foundational elements to assist DCYF in making meaningful advances in achieving positive safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes for children and families, and improving systemic factor functioning.

Stakeholder interviews and case reviews highlighted the significant challenges of high staff caseloads. High caseloads affect the quality of work, and staff's ability to meet monthly with children, parents, and foster parents, conduct risk assessments, conduct

safety planning and monitoring, complete comprehensive needs assessments, and provide services. During the CFSR onsite review week, several of the Assessment Only cases in the review sample were identified for immediate action by DCYF to ensure child safety. The review found that the quality of ongoing formal and informal risk and safety assessments was concerning in both in-home and foster care cases. The agency needs to ensure that children are seen consistently, including observing children in their home environments. Furthermore, DCYF needs to meet with all the children in the family and with all the children's caregivers, especially fathers. The review demonstrated challenges with establishing effective safety plans as many relied on informal agreements with parents on what they would do to keep the children safe. Monitoring of safety plans was also found to be insufficient and lacked adjustments to effectively manage both new and existing safety threats.

The CFSR also found challenges with achieving timely permanency for children with goals of adoption, reunification, and guardianship. DCYF requires caseworkers to establish concurrent goals, but the review found that case goals are often worked on consecutively rather than concurrently, delaying timely achievement of permanency. In addition, the statewide assessment and stakeholders noted concerns in all areas of the case review systemic factor, including timely periodic and permanency hearings, notification to caregivers regarding hearings and their right to be heard, and timely filing for termination of parental rights (TPR) and the appropriate use of compelling reasons not to file TPR. Although stakeholders said they are seeing some improvement with the rollout of new TPR protocols, this was not reflected in the cases reviewed, given the short duration of enactment of the new protocols. These protocols are a result of the work of the Court Improvement Project (CIP) and DCYF and strive to expedite the time frames for filing petitions and providing notifications to parents.

Assessing needs and linking families to services is a critical practice in child welfare. Even when needs and services are appropriately identified, children and families being served by DCYF face a diminished service array. This includes long wait lists, a lack of providers, transportation issues, a lack of drug treatment centers, a lack of community-based mental health services and psychiatric services, insufficient support to kinship families, and a shortage of foster homes. There is no centrally organized foster and adoptive parent recruitment plan in place, and recruitment efforts are left to the local District Offices. This results in inconsistencies across the state. Stakeholders further elaborated that there is also a problem with retention due to a lack of support for foster parents. These concerns illustrate significant barriers to children and families in achieving safety, permanency, and well-being.

While the case review results for DCYF are challenging, the DCFY has opportunity for improvement by leveraging its strength on quality assurance and stakeholder involvement and engagement. The state's quality assurance case review system was noted as foundational in providing needed feedback to the field on case-level findings and systemic issues. The review also highlights strengths in new worker training. Building upon this strength and applying some of the lessons learned to ongoing training would be advantageous to the agency, and ultimately to the children and families being served.

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 DCYF. 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

New Hampshire is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 52% of the 29 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 credible reports of child maltreatment be assigned as requiring a level 1, 2, or 3 response within 24 hours of receipt of the report, excluding holidays and weekends. Assessment of reports of child maltreatment must commence within 72 hours of receipt of the report in the District Office, including weekends and holidays. Commencement is defined as any meaningful action or series of actions taken by the Child Protective Services worker to ensure the child is safe and not in danger. A face-to-face meeting with the alleged child victim must occur in accordance with the assigned level of response. For level 1 reports, the face-to-face meeting must occur within 24 hours. Level 2 reports require face-to-face within 48 hours. Level 3 reports require face-to-face within 72 hours.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 52% of the 29 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

New Hampshire is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 46% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 65% of the 40 foster care cases and 16% 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 41% of the 17 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 63% of the 8 applicable foster care cases and 22% of the 9 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 48% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 68% of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 16% 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

New Hampshire 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).

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 73% 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 69% of the 39 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 48% 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

New Hampshire 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 79% of the 19 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,[2] and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 70% of the 37 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 50% of the 10 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 90% 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 78% of the 23 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 67% of the 39 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

---

[2] 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.

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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 69% of the 29 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[3] or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 85% of the 33 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 93% of the 29 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 87% of the 23 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 29% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 40% of the 40 foster care cases and 12% of the 25 in-home services cases.

[3] 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,[4] 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 29% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as a Strength in 40% of the 40 foster care cases and 12% of the 25 in-home services cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

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

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 63% 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 32% of the 25 in-home services cases.

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

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 30% of the 64 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 41% of the 39 applicable foster care cases and 12% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 43% of the 60 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to both assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 27% of the 52 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to both assess and address the needs of fathers.

[4] 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

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 68% of the 28 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[5] and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- New Hampshire 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 63% of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 24% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 67% of the 46 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 63% of the 59 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 47% of the 51 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 63% 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 32% of the 25 in-home services cases.

[5] 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.

Item 15. Caseworker Visits With Parents

Purpose of Assessment: To determine whether, during the period under review, the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and the mothers and fathers[6] of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 35% of the 63 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 50% of the 38 applicable foster care cases and 12% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 51% of the 59 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 29% of the 49 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 87% of the 46 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.

---

[6] 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 87% of the 46 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 89% of the 35 applicable foster care cases and 82% of the 11 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 62% of the 60 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 73% of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 40% of the 20 applicable 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 78% of the 49 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 80% of the 40 foster care cases and 67% of the 9 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 62% of the 47 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 76% of the 29 applicable foster care cases and 39% of the 18 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

New Hampshire 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed during interviews with stakeholders showed that although the state is operating a statewide information system that captures the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child in foster care, there is no oversight of the accuracy of data entered into the system. Some stakeholders said that staff can't rely on Bridges for accurate locations and that District Offices need to maintain systems outside of Bridges to know where children in placement are located. Information in the statewide assessment and received from stakeholders also said that the entry of placement data was not timely.

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

New Hampshire is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. None 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, New Hampshire presented information from DCYF's Solution Based Casework Fidelity Reviews that showed parent engagement at 87%. However, these reviews do not require that both parents be engaged when both parents are available to the agency. Information from DCYF Quality Case Reviews, which are modeled after the CFSR case review, was also provided in the statewide assessment and showed that DCYF is engaging fathers in the case planning process in about 65% of the cases. Stakeholders confirmed the agency's challenges with engaging fathers. Stakeholders also said that although there are case plans, they were concerned that the plans were generic, and that a true family voice was lacking when generating 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that New Hampshire has a process for the periodic review of the status of each child at least every 6 months. However, stakeholders said that there were inconsistencies with the FAIR (Family Assessment Inclusive Reunification) meetings, including timeliness of the reviews, and a review of the status of the case, the case plan, the child/youth's safety and well-being, and plans for permanency. Stakeholders also noted inconsistencies across the state in scheduling and with including key representatives in the reviews.

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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, New Hampshire provided data showing that 67% of permanency hearings were occurring within 13 to 15 months of children coming into care. Stakeholders were not able to provide additional insight on the percentage of initial permanency hearings held in accordance with the federally required time frame. New Hampshire did provide data and information in the statewide assessment showing that 87% of the children who remained in care longer than 24 months had a subsequent permanency hearing within 12 months of the first permanency hearing.

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.

- New Hampshire 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 collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that filing of TPR petitions and documentation of compelling reasons not to file are not occurring consistently throughout the state. Stakeholders said that the delays in filing TPR petitions are due in part to high caseworker caseloads and caseworker turnover. Stakeholders said that filing TPR petitions does not appear to be a priority. In the statewide assessment, New Hampshire said that the state's information system is unable to monitor and track both filings and petitions.

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.

- New Hampshire 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 during interviews with stakeholders showed that New Hampshire does not have a consistent practice across the state for notifying foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of any reviews or hearings held with respect to children in foster care. Stakeholders noted a lack of consistency throughout the state in providing caregivers an opportunity to be heard when present at court 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

New Hampshire is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Strength for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data and information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders provided evidence of many key aspects of a CQI system. New Hampshire DCYF has an administrative foundational structure that oversees all CQI activities. The state has a case practice review system that mirrors that of the CFSR process in conducting quality case practice reviews throughout the entire state and using the data to inform the local District Office's practice improvement initiatives. DCFY also conducts targeted reviews to ensure fidelity to the case practice model. The CQI process collects and analyzes data. One area that could be strengthened is how the data that are disseminated to stakeholders are organized. Stakeholders noted that various data streams—ROM, Bridges, and Case Practice Reviews—are inconsistent and that makes it hard for staff to ascertain what data points to use to improve practice.

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

New Hampshire 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Strength for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, New Hampshire described initial staff training. DCYF's Core Academy presents its initial training in a tiered process that includes classroom experience along with a field practice advisor for on-the-job training. DCYF tracks completion of the Core Academy and presented data in the statewide assessment that showed that 91% of new hires had completed the initial training. DCYF also presented data from the evaluations of the initial trainings indicating that staff believed they gained a high rate of practice knowledge and skill development through the initial training.

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[7] that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- New Hampshire 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 collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that social workers must complete 30 hours of annual training, and that Juvenile Parole and Probation Officers must complete 40 hours annually. However, the agency is not able to track compliance with these standards. Stakeholders also said that the agency's training partner is planning to make more online training available. However, this conflicts with the wishes of field staff, who are requesting more in-person training. Stakeholders also said that there was not relevant training available for supervisors.

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.

---

[7] "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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that there are different initial training requirements for unlicensed relative caregivers (9 hours) and licensed relative/non-relative caregivers (21 hours). Licensed relative/non-relative providers are also required to receive 9 hours annually of ongoing training. There is no ongoing training requirement for unlicensed relative caregivers. Stakeholders said that the initial *Foster and Adoption Care Essentials (FACES)* and *Relatively Speaking* trainings did not consistently provide the level of support foster parents and relative caregivers need starting out. These trainings did not prepare caregivers for working with biological parents or provide them with the skills needed to effectively address the behavioral challenges of the children placed in their homes. Stakeholders shared that much of the ongoing training is online, and many stakeholders said that in-person training was more valuable to caregivers as it provided an opportunity for support and for group learning. Ongoing training hours are tracked by the foster parents, who collect certificates of completion at the trainings and then present the certificates at the time of re-licensing.

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

New Hampshire is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array and Resource Development. None of the items in this systemic factor was 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.

- New Hampshire 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 collected during interviews with stakeholders confirmed that the agency was unable to provide families with voluntary services that could address safety and well-being for families. Service availability was a challenge across the state, especially in the northern region. Stakeholders said that substance abuse services were not readily available and that there were shortages of counseling services, psychological evaluation and services, in-state

residential treatment programs, parent aides, transportation services, and safety-related services. Waiting lists delayed the availability of services and this affected timely achievement of permanency.

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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- New Hampshire did not provide any data in the statewide assessment on the agency's capacity to individualize services to meet the unique needs of children and families. Stakeholders said that the agency is not able to individualize services due to a lack of services within the state. In addition, stakeholders said that it is incredibly difficult to address the language or cultural needs of children and families in the state.

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

New Hampshire is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. One of the items in this systemic factor was 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state meets with an array of key internal and external stakeholders. However, stakeholders said that a more meaningful collaboration that includes input into agency policies and practices needs to be established with the court system to achieve the agency's overall goals and objectives.

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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders confirmed that the agency coordinates with a variety of other agencies that provide services and benefits of other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population. There is collaboration with the Department of Public Health for substance abuse services, Project First Step and Head Start, the Department of Education, and with DCYF family violence prevention specialists for domestic violence services. Within the state's Department of Health and Human Services, DCYF has cooperative relationships with Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Medicaid, Developmental Services, and Housing.

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

New Hampshire is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. None of the four items in this systemic factor was 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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders described situations in which placements did not conform to the home's license standards. For example, in some homes, the number of children placed exceeded the license capacity of the home, and in other homes, children were placed who did not meet the age ranges specified. Stakeholders also said that the fire code requirements for licensure varied across the state as did the application of those standards by the fire marshals.

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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that, although the state requires criminal background clearances for foster and adoptive families prior to placement and requires fingerprint-based clearances prior to licensure, the process is not consistent for relative caregivers. Stakeholders also said that the Live Scan Fingerprinting System, which is newly administered, is not easily available to prospective foster parents consistently throughout the state. This can result in licensing delays as prospective foster parents attempt to obtain the required background checks.

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.

- New Hampshire 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 showed that consistent recruitment is not occurring and that recruitment is generally left to the local districts. There is no centrally organized recruitment plan for the state. Stakeholders said that there is a problem with retention due to a lack of support for foster parents.

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.

- New Hampshire received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state does not have an effective process to ensure that cross-jurisdictional resources are used to facilitate timely adoptive and permanent placements for waiting children. The state does not have the ability to complete home studies on Interstate Compact on the

Placement of Children (ICPC) cases within the 60-day timeline. Data in the statewide assessment showed that 59% of ICPC home studies are completed within 60 days.

Appendix A
Summary of New Hampshire 2018 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	52% Substantially Achieved
Item 1 Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	52% 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	46% Substantially Achieved
Item 2 Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	41% Strength
Item 3 Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	48% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of New Hampshire 2018 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	73% Strength
Item 5 Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	69% Strength
Item 6 Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	48% 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	79% Strength
Item 8 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	70% Strength
Item 9 Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	67% Strength
Item 10 Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	69% Strength
Item 11 Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	85% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of New Hampshire 2018 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	29% Substantially Achieved
Item 12 Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	29% Strength
Sub-Item 12A Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	63% Strength
Sub-Item 12B Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	30% Strength
Sub-Item 12C Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength
Item 13 Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	48% Strength
Item 14 Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	63% Strength
Item 15 Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	35% 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	87% Substantially Achieved
Item 16 Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	87% 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% Substantially Achieved
Item 17 Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	78% Strength
Item 18 Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	62% 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 New Hampshire 2018 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 and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 21 Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
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 and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
Item 25 Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

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	Strength
Item 27 Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

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

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	Substantial Conformity
Item 31 State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 32 Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	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 and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 34 Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
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 and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators[8]

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	9.5%	Lower	5.1%	3.7%–6.9%	FY15–16
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	9.67	Lower	11.19	7.91–15.83	15A–15B, FY15–16

[8] 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. Performance shown in this table reflects performance based on May 2017 revised syntax that is pending final verification.

Appendix A: Summary of New Hampshire 2018 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	42.7%	Higher	35.1%	31.0%–39.5%	14B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	45.9%	Higher	40.8%	35.1%–46.8%	16B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	31.8%	Higher	31.5%	26.7%–36.6%	16B–17A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.1%	Lower	4.5%	2.4%–8.2%	14B–17A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.44	Lower	3.30	3.01–3.62	16B–17A

* 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 national performance.

** 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 New Hampshire 2010 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in New Hampshire in 2010. 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: 1
Date of Onsite Review: August 2–6, 2010
Period Under Review: April 1, 2009, through August 6, 2010
Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued: November 2, 2010
Date Program Improvement Plan Due: February 2, 2011
Date Program Improvement Plan Approved: August 1, 2011

Highlights of Findings

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

Appendix B: New Hampshire 2010 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	95.8	Meets Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.88	Meets Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	101.1	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	125.7	Meets Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	107.2	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	101.6	Meets 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
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

Appendix B: New Hampshire 2010 CFSR Key Findings

Outcome	Achieved or 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	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Achieved Substantial Conformity

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	Strength
Item 14. Preserving Connections	Strength
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: New Hampshire 2010 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	Strength
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	Strength
Item 28. Termination of Parental Rights	Strength
Item 29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Area Needing Improvement
Item 30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
Item 31. Quality Assurance System	Strength
Item 32. Initial Staff Training	Strength
Item 33. Ongoing Staff Training	Strength
Item 34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Strength
Item 35. Array of Services	Strength
Item 36. Service Accessibility	Area Needing Improvement
Item 37. Individualizing Services	Strength
Item 38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength

Appendix B: New Hampshire 2010 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
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	Strength
Item 45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength