



Child and Family Services Reviews

Arizona

Final Report

December 2015

Reissued 2017



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

This page is intentionally blank.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

Final Report: Arizona Child and Family Services Review Report Re-Issued: 2017

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the state of Arizona.¹ 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 Arizona are based on:

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Arizona Department of Child Safety (DCS), and submitted to the Children's Bureau on March 17, 2015. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes, and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan
- The results of case reviews of 65 cases (40 foster care and 25 in-home cases) conducted via a State Conducted Case Review process at Maricopa, Pinal, and Yuma counties, Arizona, between April 1, 2015, and September 30, 2015
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
 - Attorneys representing the agency
 - Attorneys representing parents
 - Child care institution staff
 - Child welfare agency caseworkers and supervisors
 - Child welfare agency program managers, senior managers, and leadership
 - Guardians ad litem and children's legal representatives
 - Foster and adoptive parents and representatives from the state's foster and adoptive parent association
 - Licensing staff

¹ 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. This re-issued report does not contain changes to the case review and systemic factor functioning results issued in the prior version of the state's Final Report.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

- Members of Arizona Service Array Committee
- Parents served by the agency
- Representatives from administrative review boards
- Representatives from the court system and Court Improvement Project
- Representatives from state agencies managing other federal programs
- Service providers, including contract service providers
- Technical data specialists and individuals knowledgeable about data/information pertaining to child safety/health
- Training staff
- Tribal leaders and Tribal child welfare program administrators
- 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 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). As a result, Arizona's Final Report is being reissued (see footnote 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 one 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

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

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

I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

Arizona 2015 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

The following 1 of the 7 outcomes was found to be in substantial conformity:

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

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

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

Children's Bureau Comments on Arizona Performance

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

The systemic factors of Statewide Information System, Quality Assurance System, Staff and Provider Training, and Agency Responsiveness to the Community were all found to be functioning in substantial conformity. The Children's Bureau believes that with these systems in place and functioning, Arizona's capacity for data analysis, combined with a functioning continuous quality improvement (CQI) system, can be leveraged to address other program areas and outcomes that need improvement. Arizona's engagement of key stakeholders who share responsibility for system improvement and strategic planning will be critical to the success of ongoing work.

Cross-cutting concerns identified during the review include resource constraints and high caseworker caseloads. Data provided by the state in its statewide assessment and information collected from stakeholders interviewed indicated that barriers to assuring child safety and expediting permanency include a growing number of reports of child maltreatment, a growing number of children in foster care, and a backlog of pending investigations of reports of child maltreatment combined with a reduction in resources (placement, service, and caseworker resources) to manage them. Resource constraints and an insufficient array of appropriate services and service providers appear to have negatively affected performance on some of the outcomes. Stakeholders indicated that high caseworker caseloads prevent caseworkers from taking appropriate time to conduct high-quality investigations and assessments, monitor the safety of placements, effectively engage parents in case planning and visitation, and file termination of parental rights (TPR) petitions in a timely manner.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

The review identified areas of concern pertaining to assessing and managing safety and risk. Arizona indicated in the statewide assessment that there is no specific time frame for completing face-to-face contact with children who are the subject of a report of child maltreatment. Reviewers found that in some cases investigations were kept open for long periods of time. Stakeholders interviewed reported, and case record reviews revealed, that children were staying overnight multiple days in DCS offices due to the lack of licensed providers. The Children's Bureau urges the state to address the many risk and safety concerns for children that this practice presents while it continues its efforts to secure additional resource families and appropriate placements for children.

Arizona uses a well-established model for assessing safety; however, the state's process is not clear for assessing risk and determining when in-home services should be provided or when safety concerns require removal. This review identified several contradictory results that warrant the state's further attention. The case review item focused on services to the family to protect children in the home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care was rated as a Strength overall. In some cases, reviewers indicated that there were no appropriate services available to protect the children and prevent their entry into foster care, and stakeholders interviewed confirmed that there were insufficient resources available to support in-home services. In several in-home services cases in which the agency provided services, there were no documented risk or safety concerns. Stakeholders interviewed and case review findings noted a lack of formal safety plans when circumstances would seem to warrant them. Overall it appears that the state maintains a high threshold for identifying "safety-related" concerns that does not consistently link to DCS interventions with the family.

Despite the relatively high percentage of strength ratings on the item related to assessing the needs of children, the assessments conducted indicated that a relatively low percentage of children were determined to have needs requiring services, which is unusual for children in foster care. The Children's Bureau is concerned that this low percentage of children in need of services may reflect on the quality of the assessment. In several cases, reviewers noted that caseworkers relied on informal observation or on children and parents to self-report their needs, rather than conducting independent needs assessments using professional judgment.

The case review results indicated overall areas needing improvement in the items related to setting appropriate goals for children in foster care and achieving permanency. Adoption was the goal in over half of the cases reviewed, and a significant barrier to achieving timely adoption included the failure to file TPR petitions in a timely manner.

The review results also found that relevant parents and caregivers were not always engaged in casework efforts. Engaging and working with appropriate parents and caregivers is critical to maintaining safety, achieving permanency, helping the child maintain connections, and promoting well-being. Review results indicated that the state's efforts to engage and work with parents are areas needing improvement, particularly for parents of children in foster care. The review results identified connections between the state's challenges in making concerted efforts to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her parents; assessing the needs of parents and providing appropriate services; involving parents in the case planning process; and ensuring that the frequency and quality of visits between caseworkers and parents were sufficient to meet family needs.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

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

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

Arizona is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 75% of the 32 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 the agency respond within specific time frames based on the most severe allegation in the report. Arizona has four priority levels: the standard response time for a report assigned as a Priority 1 is 2 hours; the standard response time for a report assigned as a Priority 2 is 48 hours; the standard response time for a report assigned as a Priority 3 is 72 hours; and the standard response time for a report assigned as Priority 4 is 7 days. The DCS supervisor may aggravate or mitigate the response time for Priority 1-3 reports: the maximum mitigated response time for a Priority 1 report is 24 hours; for a Priority 2 report, 72 hours; for a Priority 3 report, 96 hours. The initial response is defined as an action taken by the agency, Office of Child Welfare Investigations (OCWI), law enforcement, or other emergency personnel to determine whether a child victim is currently safe. State policy does not provide a time frame for face-to-face contact with the alleged child victim(s). If the report is closed at investigation, reasonable efforts to interview the child must be made before case closure; if the report transfers to ongoing status, reasonable efforts to interview the child must be made before the case transfers to the ongoing caseworker or before the case transfers to ongoing status if it remains with the same caseworker. An investigation is considered to be closed or transferred on the date that a DCS supervisor approves the Child Safety and Risk Assessment (CSRA) document for the report/ investigation.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 75% of the 32 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

Arizona is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 75% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 85% of the 40 foster care cases and 60% of the 25 in-home services cases.

Safety Outcome 2 Item Performance

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

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 2 because 100% of the 30 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 100% of the 10 applicable foster care cases and 100% of the 20 applicable in-home services cases.

Item 3. Risk and Safety Assessment and Management

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 75% of the 65 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 85% of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 60% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.

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

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

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

State Outcome Performance

Arizona is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 38% 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).

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 83% 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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 68% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 55% 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

Arizona is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 48% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 68% of the 34 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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 73% of the 33 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 76% of the 21 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 were sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 78% of the 27 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 were sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.
- In 91% of the 11 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 were sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

Item 9. Preserving Connections

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 60% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

² For Item 8, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification. The persons identified in these roles for the purposes of the review may include individuals who do not meet the legal definitions or conventional meanings of a mother and father.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 83% of the 40 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 father³ or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 39% of the 28 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 44% of the 27 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 45% of the 11 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 52% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 45% of the 40 foster care cases and 64% of the 25 in-home services cases.

³ For Item 11, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 60% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 55% of the 40 foster care cases and 68% of the 25 in-home services cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 12A because 92% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 95% of the 40 foster care cases and 88% of the 25 in-home services cases.

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 61% of the 56 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 52% of the 31 applicable foster care cases and 72% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 73% of the 51 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 54% of the 39 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

⁴ For Sub-Item 12B, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable "mothers" and "fathers" for the period under review in the case.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 86% of the 37 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 parents⁵ and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 59% of the 61 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 50% of the 36 applicable foster care cases and 72% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 78% of the 46 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 60% of the 48 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 61% of the 38 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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 72% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 73% of the 40 foster care cases and 72% of the 25 in-home services cases.

Item 15. Caseworker Visits With Parents

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

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.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

caseworkers and the mothers and fathers⁶ of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 47% of the 55 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 33% of the 30 applicable foster care cases and 64% of the 25 applicable in-home services cases.
- In 58% of the 48 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 39% of the 38 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

Arizona is in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 95% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

Well-Being Outcome 2 Item Performance

Item 16. Educational Needs of the Child

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 16 because 95% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 94% of the 36 applicable foster care cases and 100% of the 4 applicable in-home services cases.

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

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

State Outcome Performance

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 52% of the 58 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 43% of the 40 applicable foster care cases and 72% of the applicable 18 in-home services cases.

Well-Being Outcome 3 Item Performance

Item 17. Physical Health of the Child

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 54% of the 46 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 50% of the 40 foster care cases and 83% of the 6 applicable in-home services cases.

Item 18. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 76% of the 46 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 82% of the 33 applicable foster care cases and 62% of the 13 applicable in-home services cases.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

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

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

Statewide Information System Item Performance

Item 19. Statewide Information System

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that the relevant data are readily available and accurately reflect the placement, status, goal, and demographic information for children in foster care. The state measures data quality and accuracy. Data errors and timeliness of data entry were within acceptable levels.

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

Arizona is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. Two of the 5 items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Arizona provided results of internal quality assurance case reviews that showed case plans are not developed jointly with the child's parent(s) on a consistent basis. Stakeholders confirmed that parents are not consistently involved in case plan development, and that although some parents receive a copy of the completed plan, written case plans for children in foster care are not routinely presented to the court for review. Some stakeholders suggested that high caseworker caseloads and turnover prevent the agency from effectively engaging parents in case planning and developing written case plans timely.

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Arizona reported recent data showing that the vast majority of children that had been in foster care for a 7-month period have had periodic reviews within the last 6 months.

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Arizona provided recent data from the Administrative Office of the Courts showing that initial and subsequent permanency hearings for most children who were the subject of a dependency petition were occurring timely.

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

- In the statewide assessment, Arizona presented recent results of an internal quality assurance case review showing that a significant portion of cases sampled did not meet the federal requirements for termination of parent rights (TPR) petitions and noted that improvement is needed to ensure timely filing or documentation of the compelling reason. Stakeholders confirmed that TPR petitions are not filed according to required timelines and suggested that education is needed regarding TPR filing requirements. Stakeholders noted that barriers to timely filing practices include delays related to attorney or court requests for the agency to name grounds for termination, and the need to find a permanent home for the child before TPR proceedings are initiated. Some stakeholders suggested that high caseloads prevent caseworkers from preparing TPR petitions timely.

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed during stakeholder interviews indicated that notice is not provided to required individuals consistently and that there is no uniform process in place to provide the required notification. At times, the court may not receive timely information on placement changes to provide notice to the new caregiver. Many stakeholders reported that judges provided caregivers with the right to be heard, when the caregivers were present at hearings.

Quality Assurance System

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

State Systemic Factor Performance

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

Quality Assurance System Item Performance

Item 25. Quality Assurance System

Description of Systemic Factor Item: The quality assurance system is functioning statewide to ensure that it is (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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

- In the statewide assessment, Arizona provided information showing how each of the five required quality assurance elements were functioning as intended across the state. The Children's Bureau determined that the state's quality assurance system contained procedures and safeguards sufficient to support its use during the case review component of the CFSR.

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

Arizona is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. Two of the three items in this systemic factor were rated as a Strength.

Staff and Provider Training Item Performance

Item 26. Initial Staff Training

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Arizona reported that the vast majority of recently hired specialists completed core training within 6 months. Stakeholders clarified that a substantial majority of new employees completed core training in the expected time frame. Information in the statewide assessment indicated that newly trained employees generally found training to be relevant to their jobs and said it provided them with confidence to use the knowledge and skills gained from the training. Stakeholders interviewed agreed that initial training provided caseworkers with the skills and knowledge needed to assume caseworker duties.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

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 staff⁷ that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- Arizona 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 confirmed during stakeholder interviews indicated that Arizona requires 24 hours of ongoing training annually but has no statewide tracking system to monitor compliance with this requirement. Stakeholders reported that caseworkers do not routinely complete ongoing training, with some stakeholders unaware of the annual training requirement. The state reported that a significant number of supervisors do not complete core supervisor training within the required 12-month time frame. Stakeholders noted that ongoing training does not provide staff with skills and knowledge needed to perform their duties. Barriers identified to completing ongoing training include budget constraints, caseload demands, and lack of a statewide tracking system.

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed during stakeholder interviews showed that foster parents and child care institution staff completed initial and ongoing training to satisfy licensing requirements. The state provided results of a recent sample of foster parents who indicated that initial and ongoing training provided them the skills and knowledge needed to carry out their duties, which was confirmed by stakeholders interviewed. Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed during stakeholder interviews showed that although there is no training requirement for prospective adoptive parents, an orientation is required, and many prospective adoptive families complete foster parent training.

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.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

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

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

Service Array and Resource Development Item Performance

Item 29. Array of Services

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

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Arizona indicated that the four required service areas are addressed across the state. However, the state noted that a state-convened Service Array Design Team reported gaps in accessibility to an extensive range of services including in-home services, foster family homes, mentoring programs, trauma-informed services, substance abuse services, therapy, parent aides, transportation, and residential treatment services. Stakeholders interviewed confirmed that there are significant gaps in the service array and extensive wait lists for services due in part to significant budget reductions in recent years, the limited pool of qualified service providers across the state, and a complicated coordination and approval process with Regional Behavioral Health Administration offices.

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Arizona acknowledged that the state needed to strengthen the system to individualize services that address the unique needs of families. Stakeholders interviewed confirmed that case plans offer insufficient individualization of services to address the needs of families, particularly the needs of youth and individuals requiring culturally or linguistically tailored services. Stakeholders suggested that barriers to tailoring services to the needs of families

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

include resource constraints, an insufficient array of appropriate services and service providers, insufficient additional training for caseworkers in how to individualize services, and high caseworker caseloads.

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

Arizona 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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Arizona presented information about a variety of active stakeholder groups that inform the agency's strategic direction, planning, and program development with all required entities. The state indicated that stakeholder consultation is engaged and integrated into CFSP goals on an ongoing basis.

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Arizona described coordinating activities with programs supporting economic security, child support, child care, education, juvenile courts, behavioral health, developmental disabilities, Tribal services, and Medicaid. Although some stakeholders noted that budget reductions and resource constraints have compromised the ability of the state to coordinate services effectively to meet the needs of families, other stakeholders noted that communication has improved among agencies and confirmed the description and effective implementation of service coordination presented in the statewide assessment.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

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

Arizona 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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Arizona provided information on the state's process for monitoring compliance with licensing requirements each month through a review of a random sample of cases. Results of a recent review and the state's use of a standardized checklist for licensure renewal indicate that standards were in place and applied consistently statewide.

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information reported in the statewide assessment and confirmed in stakeholder interviews indicated that criminal background check requirements are consistently met. The state indicated that the case plan and Team Decision-Making Meetings provide a structured method to monitor and assure safety in placement. However, stakeholders expressed concerns about the safety of children that are the subject of open investigations of alleged child maltreatment in foster homes or child care institutions when there are delays in these investigations. Stakeholders said that there is an insufficient number of foster placements and that at times children remain in placements that are unsafe. Stakeholders also noted that the lack of placement options results in children staying overnight in offices, which are unlicensed situations. Stakeholders suggested that barriers to assuring child safety include a growing number of child maltreatment reports and a large number of children in foster care combined with a reduction in resources (placement, service, and caseworker resources) to manage them.

Arizona 2015 CFSR Final Report

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Strength for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Arizona reported that the statewide diligent recruitment plan includes a regular review of data on the characteristics of children in foster care compared with the characteristics and availability of foster placements. The state noted that a focused recruitment effort is a part of the state's strategic plan.

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.

- Arizona received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, Arizona reported the use of cross-jurisdictional placement resources and timely completion of almost all home study requests. However, the state also noted concerns that the data available through CHILDS do not show the number of children who are free for adoption and do not identify a permanent placement resource. Stakeholders expressed concern about the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources, given the lack of data available regarding the scale of the need and the ability to identify specific children who need permanent placements.

Appendix A: Summary of Arizona 2015 CFSR Performance

Summary of Arizona 2015 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	75% Substantially Achieved
Item 1 Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	75% 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 when possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	75% Substantially Achieved
Item 2 Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Strength	100% Strength
Item 3 Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	75% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Arizona 2015 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	38% Substantially Achieved
Item 4 Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	83% Strength
Item 5 Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength
Item 6 Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	55% 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	48% Substantially Achieved
Item 7 Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	68% Strength
Item 8 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	73% Strength
Item 9 Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	60% Strength
Item 10 Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	83% Strength
Item 11 Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	39% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Arizona 2015 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 children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	52% Substantially Achieved
Item 12 Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	60% Strength
Sub-Item 12A Needs assessment and services to children	Strength	92% Strength
Sub-Item 12B Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	61% Strength
Sub-Item 12C Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	86% Strength
Item 13 Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	59% Strength
Item 14 Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	72% Strength
Item 15 Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	47% 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	In Substantial Conformity	95% Substantially Achieved
Item 16 Educational needs of the child	Strength	95% Strength

Appendix A: Summary of Arizona 2015 CFSR Performance

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	52% Substantially Achieved
Item 17 Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	54% Strength
Item 18 Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	76% 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	In Substantial Conformity
Item 19 Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment	Strength

CASE REVIEW SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Case Review System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not In Substantial Conformity

Appendix A: Summary of Arizona 2015 CFSR Performance

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Item 20 Written Case Plan	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 21 Periodic Review	Statewide Assessment	Strength
Item 22 Permanency Hearing	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	In Substantial Conformity
Item 25 Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment	Strength

STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

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

Appendix A: Summary of Arizona 2015 CFSR Performance

SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

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

AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	In Substantial Conformity
Item 31 State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR	Statewide Assessment	Strength
Item 32 Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Statewide Assessment 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	Strength
Item 34 Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

Appendix A: Summary of Arizona 2015 CFSR Performance

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Item 35 Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment	Strength
Item 36 State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators⁸

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

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.1%	Lower	6.9%	6.4%–7.4%	FY12–13
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	8.50	Lower	3.36	2.81–4.01	13A–13B, FY13
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	40.5%	Higher	28.5%	27.6%–29.4%	11B–14A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	43.6%	Higher	50.9%	49.4%–52.4%	13B–14A

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. The syntax revision is still underway, so performance shown in this table is based on the 2015 Federal Register syntax.

Appendix A: Summary of Arizona 2015 CFSR Performance

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	30.3%	Higher	37.7%	35.9%–39.5%	13B–14A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.3%	Lower	7.9%	6.9%–9%	11B–14A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.12	Lower	3.53	3.44–3.63	13B–14A

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

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

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

Appendix B: Arizona 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Appendix B: Summary of CFSR Round 2 Arizona 2007 Key Findings

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

Identifying Information and Review Dates

General Information
Children's Bureau Region: 9
Date of Onsite Review: August 6–10, 2007
Period Under Review: April 1, 2006, through August 6, 2007
Date Final Report Issued: February 21, 2008
Date Program Improvement Plan Due: February 18, 2008
Date Program Improvement Plan Approved: October 1, 2008

Highlights of Findings

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

Appendix B: Arizona 2007 CFSR Key Findings

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	97.5	Meets Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.82	Meets Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	104.3	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	121.3	Meets Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	123.6	Meets Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	90.5	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

Appendix B: Arizona 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Outcome	Achieved or 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
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

Appendix B: Arizona 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Systemic Factor	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Quality Assurance System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	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	Area Needing Improvement
Item 4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	Area Needing Improvement
Item 5. Foster Care Re-entries	Strength

Appendix B: Arizona 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 7. Permanency Goal for Child	Area Needing Improvement
Item 8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives	Area Needing Improvement
Item 9. Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
Item 10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Area Needing Improvement
Item 11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	Strength
Item 12. Placement With Siblings	Strength
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 18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	Area Needing Improvement

Appendix B: Arizona 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or 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	Strength
Item 28. Termination of Parental Rights	Area Needing Improvement
Item 29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Area Needing Improvement

Appendix B: Arizona 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Item 30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
Item 31. Quality Assurance System	Strength
Item 32. Initial Staff Training	Strength
Item 33. Ongoing Staff Training	Strength
Item 34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Strength
Item 35. Array of Services	Area Needing Improvement
Item 36. Service Accessibility	Area Needing Improvement
Item 37. Individualizing Services	Strength
Item 38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength
Item 39. Agency Annual Reports Pursuant to CFSP	Strength
Item 40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Strength
Item 41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength
Item 42. Standards Applied Equally	Strength

Appendix B: Arizona 2007 CFSR Key Findings

Item	Strength or 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