2012



The State of Child Welfare



The high-profile events of the past year understandably have put child abuse at the forefront of public policy discussions. This has led to an unprecedented — and long overdue — look at how we can better protect our children from harm and help those who already have suffered abuse or neglect.

Clearly, keeping children safe is every Pennsylvanian's responsibility. Whenever child abuse or neglect is suspected, Pennsylvania's child welfare system has a critical role to respond appropriately. But we must be careful not to mistakenly think a higher volume of abuse reports means we are doing a better job of protecting children. Protecting children should not be simplified to a numbers game that leads to a false sense of accomplishment.

Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children believes any changes meant to better address child abuse reports should not undermine aspects of the child welfare system that already are working to help kids and families. In particular, the commonwealth needs to preserve its "General Protective Services" (GPS) approach, which allows the child welfare system to provide services to families in need, including a broad range of family preservation and prevention services. GPS is, in effect, a "floor" in the child welfare system that must remain so we can effectively address situations that pose harm to children but do not rise to the level of child abuse.

In GPS, the primary goal is identifying family issues that might be impacting child safety and well-being and providing services to address those issues. A counterpart of this approach, "Child Protective Services" (CPS), uses a more urgent timeframe for response — similar to that of a law enforcement investigation — and focuses on whether abuse has occurred and who might have perpetrated it.

Simply put, GPS helps identify and address issues before child abuse might occur — so it's important that we preserve it. While collection of detailed, annual GPS data is only in the early stages, available information from a recent quarter of 2012 indicates nearly four times as many families were served through GPS than CPS. This means the child welfare system is providing extensive services to children and families through GPS to address issues that don't rise to the level of our child abuse definition, all in an effort to keep kids safe in their homes.

If done thoughtfully, Pennsylvania can improve its child protection system without eroding critical elements that we know are working to help keep kids safe. We also must ensure the increased focus on identifying and helping children who suffer from abuse or neglect does not compromise our efforts to improve other facets of the child welfare system, particularly for children living in foster care. Foster care is sometimes necessary to keep children safe, but how children are served when they enter and exit foster care is critical. Pennsylvania must reduce its overreliance on "congregate care" settings (group homes and institutions) and do more to lessen the risk of children re-entering foster care once reunited with their families.

Pennsylvania's family-focused approach to foster care has been reaping beneficial results in recent years:

- The foster care population continues to decline as almost 1,800 fewer children are in out-of-home placement compared to last year.
- The use of family settings for children in foster care a preferred form of placement has been on the rise.

Close examination of the data suggests that Pennsylvania's efforts to safely reduce foster care placement may have plateaued. But our work is far from done.

We are at a critical point in our efforts to improve the child welfare system, and we have the means to continue making progress. State and county leaders are focused on improving child outcomes and strengthening families. Pennsylvania has received permission from the federal government to be more flexible in spending its child welfare funding — enabling greater investments in prevention and strategies that better serve children in their homes so they remain connected to their families and communities.

This newfound funding flexibility, coupled with changes to the child welfare system being considered by state policymakers, can keep Pennsylvania's child welfare achievements moving in the right direction.



The Porch Light Project Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children 116 Pine Street, Suite 430 Harrisburg, PA • 17101-1244 porchlightproject.org 717.236.5680 • 800.257.2030

PENNSYLVANIA

SIGNIFICANCE

Child maltreatment is a serious problem that has grave and costly consequences for the child, his or her family and the community at-large. A child who has experienced abuse and neglect is more likely to have social, emotional and

physical health problems and perform poorly in school.

In-home services are designed to strengthen families by addressing

neglect. The provision of in-home

services helps a child to remain safely in his or her home.

the root causes of abuse and

Foster care is meant to be a

long periods of time in foster

care is more likely than other children to drop out of school, have mental health challenges, experience unemployment and

be homeless as an adult.

temporary intervention to assure the safety and well-being of a child. A child who spends

Child Abuse Reports

INDICATOR

Reported incidents of suspected child abuse through the ChildLine and Abuse Registry. Does not include General Protective Service reports, which include less severe general neglect reports. (Number and rate per 1,000 children age 0-17)

Child Abuse Substantiations

Founded or indicated reports of child abuse. Does not include the number of children determined to need General Protective Services.

Repeated Child Abuse

Children with another substantiated incident of abuse following the first reported incident. (Data may be overstated.)

In-home Services

Children whose families received services in their homes to address concerns related to child safety and well-being during the year.

St	ATE	E STATUS		Rural		l Mix	Urba	n Mix	Urban		
2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	U IAI03	2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT							
24,615	24,378		2,198	2,246	3,733	3,700	5,171	5,265	13,513	13,167	
9.0	8.7		7.2	10.6	12.5	9.1	7.9	9.4	9.1	8.2	

S	ATE	Status	RURAL		RURAL MIX		Urban Mix		Urban	
2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	JIAIUS	2011 Report	Current Report						
14.9%	14.0%		18.1%	19.2%	17.0%	16.6%	13.6%	13.8%	14.2%	12.4%

St/	ATE	Status	Ru	RAL	Rura	l Mix	Urba	n Mix	Uri	BAN
2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	JIAIUS	2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT						
9.0%	7.9%		9.0%	11.6%	8.8%	6.8%	7.1%	6.7%	9.8%	7.9%
1 in 11	1 in 13		1 in 11	1 in 9	1 in 11	1 in 15	1 in 14	1 in 15	1 in 10	1 in 13

S	TATE	Status	RURAL		RURAL MIX		Urba	n M ix	Urban		
2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	JIAIUS	2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT							
168,821	164,842	NO Significant Change	22,325	21,306	32,494	30,712	30,804	29,162	83,198	83,662	

Children Entering Foster Care

All Entries into Foster Care During the Year First Time Entries During the Year

St	ATE	Status	Rural		Rura	l Mix	Urba	n M ix	Urban	
2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	JIAIUS	2011 Report	Current Report						
11,131	10,038	MADE	847	855	1,651	1,538	1,624	1,754	7,009	5,891
68.6%	71.5%	PROGRESS	73.1%	75.3%	74.7%	73.1%	74.8%	78.6%	65.1%	68.4%

This report was made possible in collaboration with Casey Family Programs, whose mission is to provide and improve – and ultimately prevent the need for – foster care. To learn more, visit <u>casey.org</u>. The findings and conclusions presented in this report are those of Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children and do not necessarily reflect the views of Casey Family Programs.

For more information on data reporting periods, citations and sources, visit: <u>porchlightproject.org/socw12.shtml</u>

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's KIDS COUNT project.

grams.



PENNSYLVANIA

SIGNIFICANCE

E INDICATOR

Foster care is meant to be a temporary intervention to assure the safety and well-being of a child. A child who spends long periods of time in foster care is more likely than other children to drop out of school, have mental health challenges, experience unemployment and be homeless as an adult.

Children in Fester	Corre	ST	ATE	Status	Ru	RAL	Rura	l Mix	Urba	ν Μιχ	Urban	
Children in Foster	Lare	2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	JIAIUS	2011 Report	Current Report						
All Chil	dren in Foster Care	24,229	22,443	MADE	1,636	1,690	3,184	2,958	3,561	3,568	15,848	14,227
(Rate per 1,00	0 children age 0-20)	7.2	6.7	PROGRESS	6.2	6.4	6.6	6.1	5.2	5.2	8.2	7.3
Age	0-1	11.6%	12.0%		10.6%	10.4%	10.6%	12.7%	13.4%	14.8%	11.5%	11.3%
	2-5	21.6%	21.9%		21.1%	22.8%	21.0%	21.3%	21.5%	22.2%	21.8%	21.8%
	6-12	22.8%	22.5%	<u> </u>	25.4%	23.2%	23.6%	21.7%	20.8%	21.3%	22.9%	22.8%
	13-17	33.6%	33.2%	1	36.4%	37.0%	37.7%	37.1%	35.2%	32.8%	32.0%	32.1%
	18-20	10.4%	10.5%		6.5%	6.5%	7.1%	7.3%	9.0%	8.9%	11.8%	12.0%
Race and Ethnicity	White	52.0%	54.6%		92.8%	92.4%	82.1%	82.2%	76.0%	78.3%	36.4%	38.4%
Black or	African-American	46.3%	44.8%		7.4%	6.8%	18.5%	18.6%	27.0%	25.3%	60.2%	59.6%
	Other	3.8%	3.2%		1.3%	2.0%	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	1.1%	5.3%	4.4%
	Hispanic or Latino	11.8%	11.7%		3.1%	3.3%	7.2%	5.8%	18.5%	18.5%	12.1%	12.2%
Placement Setting	Family Setting	71.1%	72.5%		74.8%	74.6%	66.4%	69.6 %	71.3%	74.3%	71.5%	72.4%
F	Pre-adoptive Home	5.8%	3.1%	NO	5.2%	2.4%	6.7%	2.6%	5.4%	2.6%	5.7%	3.3%
Foster Family	Home — Relative	23.5%	24.2%	SIGNIFICANT CHANGE	20.8%	21.5%	13.9%	15.4%	22.2%	23.7%	26.0%	26.5%
Foster Family Hon	ne — Non-relative	41.8%	45.2%		48.7%	50.7%	45.9%	51.6%	43.7%	48.1%	39.8%	42.6%
	Congregate Care	20.1%	21.0%		20.8%	21.2%	20.7%	22.0%	20.7%	19.4%	19.8%	21.2%
	Group Home	10.9%	12.7%	LOST GROUND	14.4%	16.2%	14.3%	15.8%	12.2%	12.1%	9.5%	11.8%
	Institution	9.2%	8.4%	1	6.4%	5.0%	6.4%	6.2%	8.5%	7.3%	10.3%	9.5%
Supervised	Independent Living	2.5%	2.0%		0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%	1.4%	1.0%	3.2%	2.7%
	Runaway	2.3%	1.2%		0.2%	0.2%	1.3%	0.9%	1.3%	1.0%	2.9%	1.4%
	Trial Home Visit	4.1%	3.3%		3.5%	3.3%	10.7%	7.0%	5.3%	4.3%	2.5%	2.2%

A child's separation from his or her parents or relatives is traumatic for all involved. Minimizing the time a child spends in foster care without compromising safety is key to healthy child development.

A child re-entering foster care following a return to his or her family signals a breakdown in the family and a potential failure on the part of the child welfare system to appropriately address family needs. Timely Reunification with Parents or Relatives

Children who entered foster care for the first time who were reunified with their parents or discharged to relatives within the next 12 months.

Re-entry into Foster Care

Children who re-entered foster care in fewer than 12 months following reunification with parents or relatives. (Data may be overstated.)

ST	ATE	Status	Rural		RURAL MIX		Urban Mix		Urban	
2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	U IAIU3	2011 Report	Current Report						
53.8%	52.4%	NO Significant Change	59.0%	62.6%	64.5%	61.9%	53.8%	47.9%	50.7%	49.6%

St.	State		Rural		Rura	l Mix	Urba	n M ix	Urban		
2011 Report	Current Report	Status	2011 Report	Current Report							
26.9%	29.0%	LOST GROUND	22.4%	20.6%	19.3%	21.7%	20.3%	20.6%	31.6%	34.1%	



PENNSYLVANIA

Urban

CURRENT REPOR

34.7%

2011 Report

33.1%

URBAN MIX

Note: Values in the 2011 Report column were updated from those included in the 2011 — The State of Child Welfare Report.

RUBAL MIX

SIGNIFICANCE

INDICATOR A child relies on his or

her family for an array of supports from early childhood through adulthood. Without a permanent family, a child fails to have a sense of security and suffers from a lack of belonging.

Children Leaving Foster Care

Children who exited foster care by discharge reason and how long they were in foster care.

Foster Care Placement Stability

Children who were in foster care and visited

on a monthly basis by a county or private

Children who were in foster care for

placement settings.

Caseworker Visits

agency child welfare worker.

12 to 23 months and had three or more

Also includes the median length of stay for	ା	AIE	Status	RU	KAL	RURAL IVIIX		URBAN IVIIX		URBAN	
children remaining in foster care.	2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	JIAIUS	2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT
Total Children Leaving Foster Care	14,002	10,578		899	874	1,984	1,502	1,958	1,524	9,161	6,678
Percent of Children Leaving Foster Care	57.8%	47.1%	LOST GROUND	55.0%	51.7%	62.3 %	50.8%	55.0%	42.7%	57.8 %	46.9%
[number of months until leaving]	11.2	11.3		8.6	9.4	7.6	7.0	12.4	11.7	13.1	13.7
Exit to Permanent Arrangements	88.7%	87.4%		91.3 %	91.2%	92.4 %	90.9%	85.6%	86.2 %	88.3 %	86.4%
Reunification	61.7%	59.3%		64.8%	64.1%	66.6%	63.1%	51.1%	53.7%	62.6%	59.0%
[number of months until reunification]	6.5	5.8	1	3.7	3.9	3.5	3.3	6.3	4.4	7.4	7.7
Adoption	16.3%	17.9%		14.5%	16.2%	14.7%	14.2%	23.4%	23.0%	15.2%	17.9%
[number of months until adoption]	30.1	28.6	NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGE	37.0	32.1	33.7	33.7	25.2	25.4	32.0	31.4
Guardianship	6.1%	5.6%	CHANGE	5.9%	6.8%	5.2%	5.5%	5.0%	4.1%	6.5%	5.8%
[number of months until guardianship]	22.3	21.4	1	20.3	19.5	21.1	20.8	21.4	25.6	27.0	31.0
Live with Other Relatives	4.7%	4.6%	1	6.1%	4.1%	5.8%	8.2%	6.1%	5.4%	4.0%	3.7%
[number of months until living with relatives]	2.9	3.1		8.4	8.3	8.9	4.9	4.4	8.7	5.8	4.6
Exit to Non-permanent Arrangements	11.2%	12.5%		8.7%	8.7%	7.5%	8.7%	14.2%	13.8%	11.6%	13.5%
Emancipation	6.3%	7.8%		7.0%	7.3%	5.5%	7.1%	7.3%	10.1%	6.1%	7.5%
[number of months until emancipation]	34.3	38.5		27.9	29.4	37.8	42.5	34.2	41.0	40.7	40.0
Transfer to Another Agency	4.2%	1.9%	LOST GROUND	1.7%	1.4%	1.7%	1.2%	6.2%	3.3%	4.6%	1.8%
[number of months until transfer]	5.4	7.1		2.6	9.6	4.2	6.3	10.2	9.5	13.9	21.5
Runaway	0.7%	2.7%		0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.3%	0.9%	4.1%
[number of months until running away]	13.1	5.0		0.0	0.0	27.1	28.6	25.9	30.7	11.9	46.5
Death of Child	0.1%	0.1%		0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
[number of months until death of a child]	12.7	4.7		0.0	19.9	79.1	7.0	76.7	1.7	9.2	14.4
Total Children Remaining in Foster Care	13,146	13,611	LOST	896	912	1,530	1,650	1,896	2,203	8,824	8,846
[number of months children have been in care]	14.0	12.8	GROUND	14.5	12.5	15.1	11.8	13.8	11.5	15.6	15.8

STATUS

LOST

GROUND

Статг

STATE

2011 REPORT

33.8%

CURRENT REPOR

35.2%

RUBAL

RURAL

CURRENT REPORT

33.5%

2011 Report

32.3%

Every time a child moves, the trauma caused by separation and lack of continuity grows. A child who faces multiple placements struggles to build and maintain healthy relationships and faces academic challenges due to school changes.

The frequency and quality of visitation between the caseworker and a child is a key component to assuring safety, permanency planning and related service delivery.

porchlightproject.org



ST	ATE	Status	Rural		Rural Mix		Urban Mix		URBA2011 REPORT	
2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	J IAIU3	2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT	2011 Report	Current Report	2011 Report	Current Report	2011 Report	CURRENT REPORT
92%	96%	MADE PROGRESS								

2011 Report

37.0%

RURAL MIX

CURRENT REPORT

36.0%

The Porch Light Project • Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children 2012

URBAN MIX

CURRENT REPORT

37.8%

2011 REPORT

34.9%