Child and Family Services Reviews

Ohio

Final Report

2017

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: Ohio Child and Family Services Review

INTRODUCTION

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

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Department of Job and Family Services (DJFS), Office of Families and Children (OFC), and submitted to the Children's Bureau on February 1, 2017. 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 164 cases (71 foster care and 93 in-home) conducted via a State Conducted Case Review process at Allen, Athens, Clermont, Fairfield, Franklin, Greene, Guernsey, Logan, Lorain, Lucas, Muskingum, Shelby, Summit, Trumbull, and Wood counties, Ohio, between April 1, 2017, and September 30, 2017
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Attorneys representing the agency
  - Child welfare agency senior managers and program managers
  - Child welfare agency caseworkers and supervisors
  - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) staff
  - Foster and adoptive parents
  - Foster and adoptive parent licensing staff
  - Housing providers
  - Information systems staff
  - Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) staff
  - IV-E court administrators

- Judges
- Medical Director
- Members of the Family Law Team
- Parents
- Public Children Services Agency (PCSA) attorneys
- Representatives from the court system and court improvement program (CIP)
- 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 Ohio's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Ohio's performance in Round 2.

I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

Ohio 2017 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

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

The following 4 of the 7 systemic factors were found to be in substantial conformity:

- Statewide Information System
- Quality Assurance System
- Staff and Provider Training
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

Children's Bureau Comments on Ohio Performance

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

In conducting its own CFSR, Ohio invested time and resources into obtaining a better understanding of its organizational system and child welfare practices. The state is committed to using continuous quality improvement (CQI) practices to identify strengths and address areas that need improvement in an evolving child welfare system. The state has undergone a rigorous assessment process, and the Children's Bureau recognizes Ohio's transparency during the CFSR statewide assessment. Building on this effort will have a positive effect on the state's ability to develop effective program improvement through stakeholder involvement and to share data and analysis when implementing program and practice improvements.

The systemic factors of Statewide Information System and Agency Responsiveness to the Community were found to be strengths and functioning within federal CFSR requirements. The Children's Bureau commends Ohio for developing a longstanding and effective quality assurance case review practice and is encouraged by the ongoing progress over the past years in instituting a fully functioning CQI infrastructure for measuring program improvement. The state has provided leadership and guidance to support counties in the statewide assessment and case review process. Overall, Ohio has an operational system in place that provides, supports, and evaluates initial training of agency staff and initial and ongoing training for foster and adoptive parents and child care institution staff. Although Ohio has ongoing staff training requirements in place, the statewide assessment and stakeholders identified barriers that affect its ability to meet requirements.

Both case reviews and stakeholder interviews confirmed that the recent rapid increase in the use of prescription and non-prescription opioids is affecting child welfare services and stressing the capacity of substance abuse services and foster homes to receive children entering foster care as a result. Along with this, many children affected by this crisis are placed in the custody of relatives/fictive kin, and services are not always adequate to meet the needs of these kinship families.

The Ohio CFSR revealed considerable differences in performance among counties participating in the review. Stronger and more consistent practice and resource distribution across the state should lead to more positive outcomes for children and families in Ohio. Major cross-cutting concerns identified during the review include inconsistent safety and assessment practices, inconsistent quality and frequency of caseworker visits with children and parents, insufficient family involvement in case plan development, and a lack of continuity of family relationships and permanency for children who do not remain at home.

The CFSR revealed opportunities to strengthen the effectiveness of safety practices in the state. Statewide data indicators on safety indicate that Ohio's performance is below national performance in both recurrence of maltreatment and maltreatment in foster care. However, there has been improvement on both indicators in the last few years. Consistent safety findings were noted in the Ohio statewide assessment and in the CFSR case review. These findings included late assessment/investigation initiations, alleged child victims not being seen timely, and agencies not meeting the requirement of continued attempts to make face-to-face contact every 5 working days from the acceptance of a report until contact is made or until the report disposition is required. Stronger safety and risk assessment practice that incorporates case history, appropriately targets services, increases access to services, links clients to services, and monitors progress beyond completion of the service could improve the effectiveness of safety practice and reduce the number of children entering foster care. In some instances, cases were closed prematurely upon reunification of the child or upon legal custody being granted to relatives/fictive kin.

Case reviews confirmed that the state has emphasized relative placement, and many examples of strong and stable relative placements were noted. Greater attention to initial placement matching and support to foster caregivers could improve continuity of family relationships for siblings in care. Case reviews identified that numerous siblings were not placed together because of placement-level considerations of individual children. Several cases reviewed documented challenging behaviors of children in sibling groups with subsequent placement moves. The lack of strategies to address these behavioral needs while maintaining the placement affected the ability to keep siblings together. Further attention to addressing barriers to keeping siblings together without individual children being moved to another level of care would contribute to more success in keeping siblings together.

In both in-home and foster care cases, there are substantial concerns about the adequacy of comprehensive assessments of parents and provision of needed services. The CFSR found inconsistent quality and frequency of caseworker visits with children, and particularly with parents, that affected performance on safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes. Case reviews revealed that the agency did not always conduct thorough assessments of individual children and all family members, missing opportunities to identify underlying challenges in families, provide appropriate services, and support parents. Although improvement in assessment and support for parents is needed for both mothers and fathers, a lack of adequate work with fathers, particularly non-custodial fathers who are still involved in their children's lives, affects this well-being outcome. Focus on assessment and service delivery practice for both children and parents in the state's alternative practice model merits attention. Meaningful engagement of families in case planning is also an area needing attention.

The three statewide data indicators on time to permanency indicate that Ohio's performance is above national trends. These statewide data are promising indicators of some strengths in permanency practice in Ohio. Among the case-specific items reviewed, the state demonstrated lowest performance in the area of achieving permanency, particularly with regard to adoption. Some county agencies appeared to lack a clear practice model for permanency related to substance abuse and reunification. An overreliance on

monitoring of substance usage was found in some counties. Drug courts available in other jurisdictions showed promising results for some families. These barriers to permanency, in tandem with a lack of consistent use of concurrent planning, delays between filing for termination of parental rights and related court hearings, and congestion in court calendars and continuances, hinder the achievement of permanency and lengthen the time children spend in foster care.

Recognizing the importance and value of relatives/fictive kin as resources, it is common practice in the state to use relatives and fictive kin as legal placement resources for children in an effort to prevent entry into foster care and transfer of placement and care responsibility to the agency. In the CFSR, these cases were reviewed as in-home cases. Generally, needs of the caretakers were assessed during home visits and resulted in concrete service supports and limited financial support. The Children's Bureau encourages Ohio to further analyze this practice to ensure that legal caregivers and parents clearly understand ongoing visitation and caretaking responsibilities, and the plan for long-term permanency for the children, and that mechanisms are in place for ensuring appropriate decisions about safety, permanency, and well-being for the children once the agency no longer is involved.

Case review results identified strong relationships and coordination between the agencies and local school systems. In the majority of applicable cases, particularly foster care cases, the educational needs of the child were assessed and services were provided to address identified needs. Mental and behavioral health needs of foster children were found to be met for the vast majority of cases. Appropriate oversight of prescription medication to address mental/behavioral health needs was found in nearly all of the applicable foster care cases.

An insufficient array of appropriate services and service providers appears to have negatively affected performance on some of the outcomes for children. Stakeholders reported that transportation of families to visits and services continues to be a significant need in the more rural parts of Ohio. Some counties have copious resources while other counties are struggling to provide very basic services to families. The stakeholder interviews also revealed that there is a lack of psychiatric and substance abuse treatment providers for both children and adults. The availability of both outpatient and inpatient substance abuse services is insufficient to meet the need. Stakeholders and information in the statewide assessment also revealed that there is a lack of domestic violence services for both the perpetrators and the victims. Stakeholders reported that a lack of housing, particularly in rural areas, was a barrier to achieving more positive outcomes. On the broader service continuum, Ohio has numerous services among sister state agencies. However, the knowledge of the availability of these services varies at the caseworker and supervisor levels.

Ohio and its county, court, and community partners have shown their commitment to meet the changing needs of families and children who become involved in the child welfare system. They are well-positioned to improve outcomes in the areas found.

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. Ohio provides an alternative/differential response to, in addition to a traditional investigation of, incoming reports of child maltreatment or children in need of services. Where relevant, we provide

performance summaries that are differentiated between foster care, in-home, and in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

This report provides an overview. Results have been rounded to the nearest whole number. Details on each case rating are available to ODJFS. 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

Ohio is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 56% of the 89 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 for traditional and alternative response, a report assigned as an emergency be initiated by making an attempt to have face-to-face contact with the alleged child victim within 1 hour from the time the referral is screened in. For all other screened-in reports assigned for a traditional response, the agency is required to attempt to make face-to-face contact with the alleged child victim or complete telephone contact within 24 hours with a principal of the report or with a collateral source who has knowledge of the alleged child victim's current condition and information on that child's safety. If face-to-face contact was not attempted within the 24-hour time frame, an attempt to make face-to-face contact with the alleged child victim must be made within 72 hours from the time the report was screened in. For non-emergency reports assigned for an alternative response, the agency must complete one of the following activities within 24 hours from the time the report was screened in with a principal of the report or with a collateral source who has knowledge of the alleged child victim's current condition and information on that child's safety: (1) attempt a face-to-face contact with the parent, child, or collateral source; (2) attempt a telephone contact with the parent or collateral source; or (3) send a letter to the parent/guardian/custodian acknowledging that a report was received and inviting the family to engage with the agency.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 56% of the 89 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

Ohio is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 52% of the 164 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 62% of the 71 foster care cases, 44% of the 79 in-home services cases, and 43% of the 14 in-home services alternative/differential response 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 72% of the 74 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 73% of the 30 applicable foster care cases, 72% of the 36 applicable in-home services cases, and 63% of the 8 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 52% of the 164 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 62% of the 71 applicable foster care cases, 44% of the 79 applicable in-home services cases, and 43% of the 14 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response 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

Ohio is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 41% of the 71 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).

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 76% of the 71 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 73% of the 71 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 56% of the 71 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

Ohio is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 70% of the 71 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 85% of the 52 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 71% of the 63 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 80% of the 25 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 85% of the 61 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 81% of the 31 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 75% of the 71 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

---

[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.

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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 89% of the 65 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 66% of the 62 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 69% of the 61 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 59% 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 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 45% of the 164 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 58% of the 71 foster care cases, 37% of the 79 in-home services cases, and 29% of the 14 in-home services alternative/differential response 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 52% of the 164 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 62% of the 71 foster care cases, 46% of the 79 in-home services cases, and 36% of the 14 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

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

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 79% of the 164 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 89% of the 71 foster care cases, 75% of the 79 in-home services cases, and 57% of the 14 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 52% of the 154 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 57% of the 61 applicable foster care cases, 49% of the 79 applicable in-home services cases, and 43% of the 14 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 66% of the 151 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.

[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.

- In 51% of the 117 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

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

- Ohio received an overall rating of Strength for Item 12C because 95% of the 62 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 66% of the 160 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 75% of the 67 applicable foster care cases, 57% of the 79 applicable in-home services cases, and 71% of the 14 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 72% of the 97 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 81% of the 150 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 69% of the 101 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 68% of the 164 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 85% of the 71 foster care cases, 56% of the 79 in-home services cases, and 57% of the 14 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

---

[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.

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[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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 51% of the 155 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 61% of the 62 applicable foster care cases, 43% of the 79 applicable in-home services cases, and 50% of the 14 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 60% of the 151 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 52% of the 98 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 85% of the 89 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

[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.

the case was opened before the period under review), and whether identified needs were appropriately addressed in case planning and case management activities.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 85% of the 89 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 93% of the 56 applicable foster care cases, 70% of the 30 applicable in-home services cases, and 100% of the 3 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 76% of the 131 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 82% of the 71 applicable foster care cases, 69% of the applicable 54 in-home services cases, and 83% of the applicable 6 in-home services alternative/differential response 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 80% of the 92 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 82% of the 71 foster care cases, 74% of the 19 applicable in-home services cases, and 100% of the 2 in-home services alternative/differential response 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 79% of the 92 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 91% of the 46 applicable foster care cases, 67% of the 42 applicable in-home services cases, and 75% of the 4 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response 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

Ohio is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The one item in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Strength for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data and information in the statewide assessment showed that the Ohio statewide information system can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for the placement of every child who is in foster care. Ohio has implemented real-time online data quality utilities to assist counties and the state with monitoring data quality, and the information is reviewed during the Child Protection Oversight and Evaluation (CPOE) process to ensure accuracy. Stakeholders reported that the system requires users to enter data on certain key items and that required information is updated daily or as information becomes available. The Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) can be shared across counties except when restricted because of a specific issue. The juvenile justice staff also has access to the system.

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

Ohio is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. Three of the 5 items in this systemic factor were 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Strength for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Ohio provided data and information from recent CPOE and IV-E court reviews that showed that case plans are developed jointly with the child's parents on a consistent basis. Ohio uses a variety of methods to ensure that each child and family has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the child's parent(s) and includes the required provisions. Data from SACWIS can be pulled to see what percentage of case plans are completed within the required time frame. The state also uses Family Team Meetings (FTM) to involve the family in case planning and tracks family involvement in FTMs.

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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during stakeholder interviews showed that periodic reviews occur no less frequently than once every 6 months for almost all children. Counties closely track the timeliness of the semiannual administrative review (SAR) or periodic review hearings. The state uses the SACWIS to generate reports and reminders for staff. When reviews are not considered timely, the state identifies barriers and works with the counties to address them.

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.

- Ohio 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 collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that permanency hearings are occurring timely in most cases. However, the state acknowledged challenges in its ability to monitor functioning of this item given the agency's and state Supreme Court's existing limitations with identifying permanency hearings within their data systems. Stakeholders said that continuances and congested court calendars cause delays in permanency hearings. The state uses the CPOE Stage 10 review as an interim approach to assess permanency hearing elements jointly monitored by the courts, but CPOE Stage 10 reviews do not specifically address timeliness of hearings.

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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Strength for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data and information in the statewide assessment showed that termination of parental rights (TPR) petitions were filed timely in most of the cases reviewed. Stakeholders said that the TPR process is closely monitored and tracked at the county level. Stakeholders reported some inconsistencies with a small number of the juvenile justice IV-E cases. Although some counties work very closely with the judges and apply the TPR requirement to these cases, other counties do not, and the process for documenting exceptions or compelling reasons is not consistent.

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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Although information in the statewide assessment showed that caregivers were consistently provided notice in most cases as demonstrated by a specific tool developed for the most recent round of CPOE reviews, some stakeholders reported that they had never received any notice of court proceedings. Stakeholders said that the counties have different ways of notifying caregivers, and some counties are struggling with developing processes. Stakeholders also said that counties differ in

whether caregivers have a right to be heard. In one county, the caseworkers do not want the foster parents to be present for the hearings, and in another county, the foster parents are encouraged not to attend hearings. In a third county, the foster parent can attend the hearing, but the caseworker is considered to be the representative and voice for the child. There is not a specific process in place to notify caretakers of the right to be heard, and ongoing monitoring of this provision is not consistent.

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

Ohio 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Strength for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Data and information in the statement assessment demonstrated that Ohio's Quality Assurance System is functioning statewide. The state provided information and data, including the results of CPOE 10, that is used to evaluate programs and services. The state has a process to address statewide issues and challenges, and to ensure adjustments are made to practice and policy when needed. At the local county practice level, the CPOE review process provides the county a written report of the results, technical assistance, development of a county-specific quality improvement plan, a 5-month self-assessment of quality improvement plan progress, and a 10-month follow-up case review by the state's technical assistance team.

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

Ohio is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. Two of the items in this systemic factor were 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Strength for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders described the Ohio Child Welfare Training Program (OCWTP) and the state's training requirements. The OCWTP is a comprehensive, competency based in-service training system for service staff, managers, and caregivers in Ohio's PCSAs. Private agency caseworkers and supervisors have the same training requirements as public agency caseworkers and supervisors. The state has processes in place to track new worker training and to ensure the accuracy of the information. Data showed that most new workers completed the training requirements timely. Ohio evaluates the effectiveness of new worker training, and most caseworkers and supervisors said that their job performance would improve because of what they learned in 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[6] that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Ohio provided information on the state's ongoing training requirements. The state also provided data showing that the requirements are not being met. A little more than half of the caseworkers meet the ongoing training requirements, and slightly more supervisors were meeting ongoing training requirements. Stakeholders said that barriers included failure to include trainings provided from sources other than OCWTP offerings or university classes in staff training

[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.

records; caseworker and supervisor workloads; and the schedule and location of the trainings. Stakeholders also said that the trainings offered were not aligned with staff needs.

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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Strength for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that foster parents, adoptive parents, and child care institution staff completed initial and ongoing training to satisfy licensing requirements. Standards are in place to outline the number of pre-services and ongoing training hours required for foster parents and pre-adoptive parents. Ohio can track the training and is able to evaluate training to ensure that it adequately meets the needs of foster parents. The state has training requirements for child care institution staff and monitors this training also. Ohio included information in the statewide assessment showing that most child care staff felt that the training they received had prepared them for their job duties.

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

Ohio 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.

- Ohio 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 identified gaps in services throughout the state. For parents, psychotherapy, parenting education and support, domestic violence (particularly for male victims and batterers), substance abuse diagnostics and treatment, and financial services including services to address homelessness are identified as service needs. For children, the lack of psychotherapy and medical services, including behavioral health assessment and treatment services, substance abuse, and services to address teen pregnancy are concerns. Beyond the state's Education and Training Voucher (ETV) Program, services to youth to obtain post-secondary education supports are limited. Many stakeholders said that the current opioid crisis negatively affects the availability of substance abuse services and that there is insufficient capacity of foster homes to receive children entering care. Stakeholders are concerned that services are not adequate to meet the needs of some kinship families. Stakeholders reported that prevention services are lacking, particularly in-home services, and that the gaps in the service array and extensive wait lists are a result of the limited pool of qualified service providers across the state. Stakeholders also reported limited transportation and housing options for families. While Ohio has numerous services among sister state agencies, the knowledge of the availability of these services varies at the caseworker and supervisor levels.

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.

- Ohio 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 confirmed during interviews with stakeholders showed that services are not always individualized or culturally or linguistically appropriate. There are not enough providers to meet the needs of families where English is not their first language. The use of interpreting services has limits and often affects the quality of the interventions. Wraparound service availability has decreased. The state is also challenged in individualizing services to accommodate the developmental needs of children and parents.

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

Ohio is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. Both of the 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Ohio described the involvement of stakeholders in the development of the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) and Annual Progress and Services Report (APSR). The agency was able to demonstrate the involvement of various groups and entities in establishing the agency's strategic direction, and in planning and program development.

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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Ohio identified the various programs with which the agency coordinates in the areas of health and educational services serving the same population. Ohio also described collaborative efforts with various other federally funded programs, the courts, and law enforcement agencies.

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

Ohio 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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the foster and adoptive 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. Ohio provided information on licensing standards and the state's processes for ensuring standards are applied equally across the state. The state has clear policy related to variances or waivers, and a process to ensure the policy is followed for foster care placements.

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.

- Ohio 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 has an effective monitoring process in place for foster and adoptive homes to ensure criminal background check requirements are met, requirements are not consistently met for child care institution staff. The stakeholders said that at times, residential staff interacted with children in the facilities before criminal background checks on those staff were completed. Although the state has instituted a new system to monitor background requirements for child care institution staff, it was not fully operational at the time of the review.

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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Strength for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Ohio described its strong collaboration with public and private agencies to work on statewide recruitment initiatives. A monitoring system is in place to review agencies' recruitment plans and whether child-specific

recruitment efforts are being made. Multiple strategies are used to recruit applicants and increase public awareness of the need for foster and adoptive homes at both the state and local levels.

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.

- Ohio received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data and information in the statewide assessment showed requests for home studies were completed timely in less than half of the cases. Stakeholders believed that the state's performance in this area is better than the data suggest although the state is struggling with data quality for this item. Stakeholders said that barriers to timeliness include the completion of background checks; health or substance abuse concerns in the home being assessed; receipt of case information from other counties; lack of a statewide reminder system to alert counties to due dates; difficulty in obtaining adult child references and fire inspections; county staffing capacity; and the lengthy foster parent licensing process.

Appendix A
Summary of Ohio 2017 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	56% Substantially Achieved
Item 1 Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	56% 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	52% Substantially Achieved
Item 2 Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	72% Strength
Item 3 Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	52% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Ohio 2017 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	41% Substantially Achieved
Item 4 Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	76% Strength
Item 5 Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	73% Strength
Item 6 Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	56% 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	85% Strength
Item 8 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	71% Strength
Item 9 Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	75% Strength
Item 10 Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	89% Strength
Item 11 Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	66% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Ohio 2017 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	45% Substantially Achieved
Item 12 Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	52% Strength
Sub-Item 12A Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	79% Strength
Sub-Item 12B Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	52% Strength
Sub-Item 12C Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Strength	95% Strength
Item 13 Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	66% Strength
Item 14 Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength
Item 15 Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	51% 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	85% Substantially Achieved
Item 16 Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	85% 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	76% Substantially Achieved
Item 17 Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	80% Strength
Item 18 Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	79% 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	Substantial Conformity
Item 19 Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Ohio 2017 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	Strength
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	Strength
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	Substantial Conformity
Item 25 Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment	Strength

STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Staff and Provider Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
Item 26 Initial Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 27 Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 28 Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Statewide Assessment	Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Ohio 2017 CFSR Performance

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	Substantial Conformity
Item 31 State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment	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	Area Needing Improvement
Item 35 Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment	Strength
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[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.

[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 Ohio 2017 CFSR Performance

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	9.8%	9.4%–10.2%	FY14–FY15
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	8.50	Lower	13.43	12.23–14.75	15A–15B, FY15
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	40.5%	Higher	49.5%	48.4%–50.5%	13B–16A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	43.6%	Higher	47.3%	45.6%–49.1%	15B–16A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	30.3%	Higher	30.6%	29.2%–32.1%	15B–16A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.3%	Lower	11.2%	10.2%–12.2%	13B–16A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.12	Lower	3.50	3.41–3.6	15B–16A

* 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 Ohio 2008 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in Ohio in 2008. 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: August 18–22, 2008
Period Under Review: April 1, 2007, through August 22, 2008
Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued: April 7, 2009
Date Program Improvement Plan Due: July 6, 2009
Date Program Improvement Plan Approved: October 1, 2010

Highlights of Findings

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

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	93.5	Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.49	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	118.9	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	98.7	Does Not Meet Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	116.4	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	99.4	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
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

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	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Did Not Achieve 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	Strength
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	Area Needing Improvement
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

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	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	Area Needing Improvement
Item 38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength

Appendix B: Ohio 2008 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	Area Needing Improvement
Item 43. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Area Needing Improvement
Item 44. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Strength
Item 45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength