Child and Family Services Reviews

Wisconsin

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: Wisconsin Child and Family Services Review

INTRODUCTION

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

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families (DCF) and submitted to the Children's Bureau on February 16, 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 in Barron, Brown, and Milwaukee counties, Wisconsin, during the week of April 16, 2018
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Attorneys for the agency, children and youth, and parents
  - Child welfare agency caseworkers and supervisors
  - Child welfare agency director and county directors
  - Child welfare agency senior managers and program managers
  - Child welfare agency training staff
  - Children's residential center licensing staff
  - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) staff
  - Court appointed special advocates (CASA)
  - Foster and adoptive parent licensing staff
  - Foster and adoptive parents
  - Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) staff

- Judges
- Law enforcement
- Parents and guardians
- Service providers
- Tribal representatives
- 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.

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

[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.

tables presenting Wisconsin's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Wisconsin's performance in Round 2.

I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

Wisconsin 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 1 of the 7 systemic factors was found to be in substantial conformity:

- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

Children's Bureau Comments on Wisconsin Performance

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

Wisconsin develops its CFSP and Annual Progress and Services Report (APSR) through regular and effective consultation with its partners and stakeholders. The state clearly engages stakeholders and partners, through regular meetings and consultations, in assessing the functioning of state systems and developing solutions to address areas of concern. An example is the state's development of a strong, active Youth Council/Advisory Board, which is supported in providing feedback and information to the agency and participating in legislative hearings related to child welfare issues. Building on these partnerships with continued data sharing and analysis will support the state in developing and implementing practice and program improvements.

Data provided by the state in the statewide assessment, and information collected during stakeholder interviews, indicated trends affecting child welfare in Wisconsin, such as an increase in reports of maltreatment related to parental substance abuse, a shortage of foster homes, and a lack of needed services. These concerns may present challenges in assuring child safety, permanency, and well-being.

While Wisconsin performed well in timely initiation of investigations, a concern is that state policy defines face-to-face contact as contact with anyone in the family, and not necessarily with the alleged child victim. Children may be at risk of harm if not seen timely. The review also identified several cases in which although initial risk and safety assessments were completed, insufficiencies were noted in conducting ongoing safety and risk assessments and assessments at important junctures in the case. Concerns about follow-up on subsequent reports and additional allegations were also noted.

Achieving permanency was affected by a lack of family engagement and an inadequate array of services, including wait lists for inpatient and outpatient substance abuse treatment; housing; transportation; and visitation facilitators, which delayed parents'

engagement in both services and visitation with their children. In some counties, parents are responsible to pay for Guardian Ad Litem services and, according to stakeholder reports, for their own attorneys. These costs can hinder their financial ability to secure housing and meet their children's needs. Other factors affecting permanency include delays in establishing appropriate permanency goals or changing them timely, delays in filing petitions to terminate parental rights, and delays in hearing those petitions. Contributing factors included crowded court dockets and a reluctance to terminate parental rights for older children or a child who did not have a specified adoptive family. The state has demonstrated, however, significant improvement in ensuring timely initial and ongoing permanency hearings that consistently address the required provisions. Continued focus on these improvements may potentially result in more timely permanency for children in care.

The case reviews identified promising practices on which to build in several areas. Children were frequently placed with their siblings unless there were valid reasons for them not to be together. The state does a good job of ensuring that the educational needs of children are assessed and met. In multiple cases, there was a good, effective use of Family Team Meetings. And in almost all cases, the child's placement at the time of the review was stable.

Although Wisconsin has worked to improve practice, review results identify concerns around child and family engagement that affect both assessment and case planning. Stakeholder interviews and case reviews show difficulty in effectively engaging families, especially fathers, in assessing the reasons necessitating involvement in the child welfare system, identifying underlying issues or challenges through comprehensive assessments, and effectively addressing the needs of children and parents with services to meet those needs. A related concern was the frequency and quality of caseworker visits with parents and children.

Regarding services, there were concerns regarding the timeliness of providing mental health services to children, attributed to delays in obtaining parental consent for those services, as required by state policy. Wisconsin has a severe shortage of foster homes. Stakeholders said that on occasion a child has had to stay overnight in a county child welfare office if a placement could not be located. The number of residential beds in Wisconsin to care for children with complex needs has decreased, forcing the state to send children out-of-state for specialized care.

A lack of consistency across the state in both practice performance and the functioning of systemic factors was noted throughout the review. Although consistency in a county-administered child welfare system is challenging, a robust continuous quality improvement (CQI) system could effectively support the ongoing assessment of the strengths and needs of the system and ensure that improvement strategies are monitored and implemented effectively across the state toward measured improvement. DCF has made significant gains in its quality assurance (QA) system and has begun work toward a totally functioning system. Further improvement is needed in identifying a systematic method to follow up and implement adjustments in practice and programs statewide as identified through the QA system. The Children's Bureau encourages the state to build its capacity to conduct case reviews on a continual basis and to continue developing an agency-wide CQI system that includes adjustments of programs and processes statewide.

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. Wisconsin 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 DCF. 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

Wisconsin is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 93% of the 30 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 county agencies complete a screening decision on reports received concerning the safety of a child. Reports that meet the statutory guidelines are assigned for either an initial assessment or an investigation based on the severity of the allegations and the urgency of the response required. The response time (priority level) determines when a Child Protective Services worker will have initial, face-to-face contact with the alleged child victim and/or parent(s). Initiation is defined as the attempted or successful face-to-face contact with anyone in the household associated with the report. In reports where present danger is assessed, an immediate to same-day response is required. For reports where no present danger is identified but possible impending danger is identified, a 24- to 48-hour response is required. Reports of alleged maltreatment in a foster home must be initiated within 3 working days after the receipt of the report when present danger has been assessed by the requesting agency. All other screened reports must include face-to-face contact with a member of the immediate family within 5 working days after the agency's initial receipt of the report.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 93% of the 30 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

Wisconsin is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 35% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 28% of the 40 foster care cases, 48% of the 21 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 4 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 58% of the 24 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 46% of the 13 applicable foster care cases, 78% of the 9 applicable in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 35% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 28% of the 40 foster care cases, 48% of the 21 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 4 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

Wisconsin is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 33% 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).

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 88% 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 59% 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.

- Wisconsin 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

Wisconsin is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 55% 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 83% of the 30 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 66% of the 38 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 57% of the 14 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 78% of the 32 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 59% of the 17 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.

[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 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.

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

Item 10. Relative Placement

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

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 68% of the 38 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 65% of the 34 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 78% of the 32 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 47% of the 17 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

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

[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.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 37% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 35% of the 40 foster care cases, 38% of the 21 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 4 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 43% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 45% of the 40 foster care cases, 38% of the 21 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 4 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

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

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 69% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 70% of the 40 foster care cases, 71% of the 21 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 4 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

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

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 44% of the 59 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

[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.

- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 44% of the 34 applicable foster care cases, 43% of the 21 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 4 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 63% of the 57 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 45% of the 51 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

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 79% of the 38 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 42% of the 62 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 38% of the 37 applicable foster care cases, 48% of the 21 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 4 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 55% of the 38 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 67% of the 57 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 45% of the 49 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve fathers in case planning.

Item 14. Caseworker Visits With Child

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

[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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 55% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 58% of the 40 foster care cases, 52% of the 21 in-home services cases, and 50% of the 4 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.

Item 15. Caseworker Visits With Parents

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

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 41% of the 59 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 35% of the 34 applicable foster care cases, 43% of the 21 in-home services cases, and 75% of the 4 in-home services alternative/differential response cases.
- In 56% of the 57 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 40% of the 48 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with fathers were sufficient.

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

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

State Outcome Performance

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 87% of the 38 applicable cases reviewed.

[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.

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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 87% of the 38 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 83% of the 30 applicable foster care cases, 100% of the 7 applicable in-home services cases, and 100% of the 1 applicable in-home services alternative/differential response case.

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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 59% of the 58 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 48% of the 40 foster care cases, 86% of the 14 applicable in-home services cases, and 75% of the 4 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 72% of the 50 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 70% of the 40 foster care cases, 88% of the 8 applicable in-home services cases, and 50% of the 2 applicable 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 55% of the 38 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 44% of the 27 applicable foster care cases, 78% of the 9 applicable in-home services cases, and 100% of the 2 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

Wisconsin 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.

- Wisconsin 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 collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that although the eWiSACWIS, the statewide information system, has the capacity to collect and report information related to the status,

location, demographic characteristics, and goals for placement for every child who is (or within the immediate preceding 12 months, has been) in foster care, Wisconsin does not have a system in place to verify, and ensure, that the information in eWiSACWIS is accurate or entered timely. Information from stakeholder interviews revealed that there is a lack of understanding of state policy regarding time frames for entering information into 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

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

Case Review System Item Performance

Item 20. Written Case Plan

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

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data presented in the statewide assessment demonstrated that a significant number of parents were not well-engaged in developing case plans jointly. Stakeholders agreed that depending on the county, parents are not consistently engaged in developing case plans, and some stakeholders said that case plans were developed without parental participation. In addition, some stakeholders noted that the case plans are developed by the caseworker, not tailored to the families' specific needs, and are presented to the parents for signature.

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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Wisconsin provided data showing that more than a third of the time, periodic reviews or hearings were not occurring timely within 180 days of the child's removal or from the previous review. Information from the stakeholder interviews showed that there is inconsistency in the frequency of periodic reviews from county to county.

Differences in process for periodic reviews were noted. In some counties, administrative panels were responsible for reviews, while in other counties, courts held the periodic hearings. And in some counties there was a combination of court and administrative reviews. Stakeholders reported that the quality of involvement in periodic reviews of required parties differed based on how the review was conducted.

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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that permanency hearings are occurring at least every 12 months and that hearings include the necessary components. Subsequent reviews of the permanency plan are completed within 6 months of the last permanency review or hearing. The state provided data showing that the initial permanency hearing and subsequent permanency hearings were timely in almost all the cases. The state has a system in place to track the 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the filing of termination of parental rights (TPR) proceedings does not consistently occur in accordance with required provisions. Stakeholders said that in some counties, the agency cannot move toward TPR until the child is placed in a pre-adoptive home. Data provided in the statewide assessment showed that the median time from placement to filing exceeds the Adoption and Safe Families Act requirement by several months and that TPR petitions were filed by the 15th month in approximately a third of the cases. Stakeholders said that TPR petitions may not be filed timely in cases involving older youth who have a significant bond to parents or in cases involving parents who have significant drug and alcohol addiction issues and need more time to complete services. In the statewide assessment, Wisconsin described exceptions to the TPR requirement and reasons exceptions are made.

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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Wisconsin provided data showing that notices were sent to caregivers 100% of the time. However, no data were provided on participants' actual involvement during the court process. Stakeholders said that the level of participation varies based on the judge and the county. Key stakeholders said they were not always given the opportunity to be heard. Some stakeholders noted that they were not allowed to speak or had to ask any direct questions through the caseworker.

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

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

Quality Assurance System Item Performance

Item 25. Quality Assurance System

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

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders described how the state collects data from multiple sources but lacks consistent follow-up to ensure that statewide issues and challenges are addressed, program improvement is evaluated, and adjustments to practice and policy are made. DCF's CQI system has been evolving over the years. The state modeled its CQI system after the federal CFSR process and used the OSRI for case-level reviews. The current system has been conducting case record reviews for 2 years to provide a baseline for measuring future improvement. Wisconsin has a CQI advisory board and dedicated state staff, but there does not appear to be staff devoted to CQI at the local level. The CQI process in each county, including how data and information gathered drive change, is unclear. It was also unclear how the feedback loop was closed at the local and state levels.

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

Wisconsin is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. None 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Wisconsin reported that upon hire, caseworkers must complete 15 days of Foundation Training within their first 2 years of employment. Safety training is the only component that is required before a new caseworker can begin working with families, and additional training is required before a caseworker is able to remove a child from the home. Data presented showed that half of the staff completed Foundations Training and approximately one quarter completed neither the courses nor hours. Stakeholders said the location and availability of initial training are often limited, resulting in many new workers assigned caseloads after receiving only the safety training. Stakeholders reported that the curriculum for initial staff training is realistic and includes the basic skills and knowledge required. Stakeholders confirmed that surveys are completed after the training, but pre- and post-tests are not conducted.

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.

[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.

- Wisconsin 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 described how the state's requirement for ongoing training is aligned with the state's social worker licensing rules and that all child protective services caseworkers and supervisors must complete 30 hours of in-service training related to their professional responsibilities during each 2-year licensing period. County-level supervisors are responsible for ensuring that workers comply with the requirement before taking on a full caseload, and a corrective action plan is established if a worker does not attend the required training. Data in the statewide assessment showed that more than a third of staff did not meet the annual ongoing training requirement of 30 hours per year. Wisconsin will be developing quarterly reports to ensure compliance. Stakeholders said that although the trainings cover relevant topics, the trainings are not offered frequently enough or at times when staff are available. Stakeholders reported that much effort has been made regarding supervisory training, which provides supervisors with hands-on tools. There are currently no training requirements for Indian child welfare caseworkers unless the caseworker is a social worker certified by the state of Wisconsin. Each Tribe is responsible for establishing training requirements for its staff.

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.

- Wisconsin 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 outlined the training requirements for each of the four levels of foster care licenses. Training requirements are commensurate with the foster home's level of care certification. Requirements are the same for both the state and private agency licensed homes. Completion of training is tracked using an online system. Data provided in the statewide assessment showed that training was not completed satisfactorily for any of the foster care license levels. Key stakeholders said that the training provided them with the skills and knowledge needed to carry out their duties. Staff of residential treatment facilities must complete both initial and ongoing training. Residential licensing staff review facility training records to verify that staff have met the training requirements. The state did not provide data to demonstrate compliance with residential treatment facility staff training requirements, and stakeholders reported not having the data readily available.

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

Wisconsin 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.

- Wisconsin 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 showed that there are significant gaps in the service array, waiting lists for services, and limited transportation and housing options. Specific service gaps identified include substance abuse, mental health, psychological and psychiatric services, and availability of residential beds for children needing specialized mental health services. Most of the stakeholders interviewed confirmed a lack of resources statewide. There is a statewide Geographical Placement Resource System to support the appropriate placement of children, but not all services are available in all counties. It appears that although counties are trying to address the service gaps within their jurisdictions, there is not a statewide approach to addressing the gaps in each county.

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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the service array and available resources in Wisconsin do not adequately meet the needs of children and families statewide. Stakeholders confirmed that the services are not always culturally or linguistically appropriate and that there are not enough service providers to meet the diverse cultural needs of the populations. Stakeholders provided information on wraparound services programs that were available in several counties and flexible funding that can be used to individualize services for families. However, some stakeholders did not know about the wraparound services or flexible funding. Stakeholders said some individualized services were available in some counties but were not available in others, and some have waitlists.

Stakeholders said that services needed included mental health treatment, services for children with disabilities, and trauma-informed services.

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

Wisconsin 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during stakeholder interviews demonstrated that the state is engaged in ongoing consultation with the required entities. Stakeholders said that a variety of active stakeholder groups inform the agency's strategic direction, planning, and program development. Stakeholders confirmed that input from these consultations is integrated into CFSP goals and the state's APSR and that, based on these consultations, workgroups have been developed to address specific matters. Stakeholders also identified collaborative groups including juvenile justice, county advisory boards, a commission on the courts, and Indian child welfare meetings. These groups meet on a regular basis and the forums provide an opportunity to discuss emerging issues and conduct strategic planning. Key stakeholders felt that Tribal stakeholders have a voice and regular collaboration with the state.

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.

- Wisconsin 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 confirmed during interviews with stakeholders demonstrated that the state coordinates services with other federal or federally assisted programs such as health services, educational services, and collaborative efforts with courts and law enforcement agencies. The state provided memoranda of understanding with several agencies. The state coordinates with other state organizational units responsible for other federal programs to promote the alignment of policies and streamline access to services for families involved in the child welfare system. The statewide assessment described the state's strong collaborative working relationship with other federal programs that affect the child welfare population, such as Medicaid, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children.

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

Wisconsin 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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Strength 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 the state's process for monitoring compliance with licensing requirements and demonstrated that state standards are applied equally to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-B or IV-E funds. Stakeholders confirmed that the state tracks and addresses variances. Stakeholders also confirmed that there are no waivers granted when safety concerns are present, and variances are documented on the foster home license. There are no waivers related to safety for the Residential Center Licensing Staff. DCF holds quarterly trainings on licensing rules and attendance is mandated for licensors. All agencies are monitored at a minimum of twice a year for compliance with licensing rules.

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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Strength for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state complies with federal requirements for criminal background clearances statewide. Criminal background checks occur before the licensure of any foster or adoptive home is issued and at re-licensure. Information in the statewide assessment and supported by stakeholders showed that state protocols to address child safety and report safety concerns for children in foster homes and child care institutions are routinely followed.

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.

- Wisconsin received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that Wisconsin has a severe shortage of foster homes for all children. The local counties and private agencies are responsible for conducting their own recruitment and retention efforts. Stakeholders reported a severe shortage of homes and that there was a shortage of licensed foster homes for children with complex treatment needs. According to some stakeholders, the lack of available homes has resulted in children being placed into higher levels of care or in congregate care because these are the only resources available. Stakeholders reported that in one county, staff have stayed in the office with children because there were no placements available and that in some areas, siblings have had to be separated because of the lack of available placements for sibling groups.

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.

- Wisconsin 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 could not demonstrate that the state completes home study requests from other states timely. Wisconsin reported that it gets about 100 to 150 out-of-state home study requests per month, but no data were available on the length of time it takes to complete home studies. Wisconsin did not have a tracking mechanism for home studies before starting the new electronic system. The state is revamping its system to make information available to the counties.

Appendix A
Summary of Wisconsin 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	93% Substantially Achieved
Item 1 **Timeliness of investigations**	Area Needing Improvement	93% 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	35% Substantially Achieved
Item 2 **Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care**	Area Needing Improvement	58% Strength
Item 3 **Risk and safety assessment and management**	Area Needing Improvement	35% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Wisconsin 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	33% Substantially Achieved
Item 4 Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	88% Strength
Item 5 Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	59% 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	55% Substantially Achieved
Item 7 Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	83% Strength
Item 8 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	66% Strength
Item 9 Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	65% Strength
Item 10 Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength
Item 11 Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	65% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Wisconsin 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	37% Substantially Achieved
Item 12 **Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents**	Area Needing Improvement	43% Strength
Sub-Item 12A **Needs assessment and services to children**	Area Needing Improvement	69% Strength
Sub-Item 12B **Needs assessment and services to parents**	Area Needing Improvement	44% Strength
Sub-Item 12C **Needs assessment and services to foster parents**	Area Needing Improvement	79% Strength
Item 13 **Child and family involvement in case planning**	Area Needing Improvement	42% Strength
Item 14 **Caseworker visits with child**	Area Needing Improvement	55% Strength
Item 15 **Caseworker visits with parents**	Area Needing Improvement	41% 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

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
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	59% Substantially Achieved
Item 17 **Physical health of the child**	Area Needing Improvement	72% Strength
Item 18 **Mental/behavioral health of the child**	Area Needing Improvement	55% 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 Wisconsin 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	Strength
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	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 25 Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

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

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Item 27 Ongoing Staff Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 28 Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	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	Strength
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	Strength
Item 34 Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 35 Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 36 State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment 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.

[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 Wisconsin 2018 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	9.5%	Lower	6.5%	5.7%–7.3%	FY15–16
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	9.67	Lower	4.08	3.28–5.09	15A–15B, FY15–16
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	42.7%	Higher	41.7%	40.3%–43.1%	14B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	45.9%	Higher	40.4%	38.3%–42.5%	16B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	31.8%	Higher	31%	29.4%–32.6%	16B–17A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.1%	Lower	11.6%	10.1%–13.2%	14B–17A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.44	Lower	3.9	3.76–4.04	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 –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 Wisconsin 2010 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in Wisconsin 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: 5
Date of Onsite Review: April 12–16, 2010
Period Under Review: April 1, 2009, through April 16, 2010
Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued: June 16, 2010
Date Program Improvement Plan Due: September 14, 2010
Date Program Improvement Plan Approved: January 1, 2011

Highlights of Findings

Performance Measurements
A. The State met the national standards for **two** of the **six** standards.
B. The State achieved substantial conformity with **none** of the **seven** outcomes.
C. The State achieved substantial conformity with **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	94.3	Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.75	Meets Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	97.4	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	116.9	Meets Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	117.7	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	98.1	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	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Achieved Substantial Conformity

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	Strength
Item 6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 7. Permanency Goal for Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives	Area Needing Improvement
Item 9. Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
Item 10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	Strength
Item 12. Placement With Siblings	Area Needing Improvement
Item 13. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
Item 14. Preserving Connections	Area Needing Improvement
Item 15. Relative Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 16. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
Item 17. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	Area Needing Improvement

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	Area Needing Improvement
Item 33. Ongoing Staff Training	Area Needing Improvement
Item 34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Area Needing Improvement
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: Wisconsin 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	Area Needing Improvement
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