

# **Child and Family Services Reviews**

# Illinois Final Report 2018



This page is intentionally blank.

### Final Report: Illinois Child and Family Services Review

### INTRODUCTION

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

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and submitted to the Children's Bureau on March 15, 2018. The statewide assessment is the state's analysis of its performance on outcomes and the functioning of systemic factors in relation to title IV-B and IV-E requirements and the title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan.
- The results of case reviews of 65 cases (40 foster care and 25 in-home) conducted via a Traditional Review process at Cook, Franklin and Williamson, and Peoria counties in Illinois during the week of May 14–18, 2018.
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
  - Administrative Review Board
  - Attorneys for the agency, children and youth, and parents
  - Child welfare agency caseworkers and supervisors
  - Child welfare agency director and senior managers
  - Child welfare agency deputy directors, administrators, and program managers
  - Child welfare agency and private agency training staff
  - Children's residential center licensing and monitoring staff
  - Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) staff
  - Court appointed special advocates (CASA)
  - Court system and Court Improvement Program staff
  - Federal and other coordinating agency staff

- Foster and adoptive parent licensing staff
- Foster and adoptive parents
- Judges
- Parents and guardians
- Service providers
- State licensed/approved child care facility staff
- Youth served by the agency

In Round 3, the Children's Bureau suspended the use of the state's performance on the national standards for the 7 statewide data indicators in conformity decisions. For contextual information, Appendix A of this report shows the state's performance on the 7 data indicators. Moving forward, the Children's Bureau will refer to the national standards as "national performance." This national performance represents the performance of the nation on the statewide data indicators for an earlier point in time. For the time periods used to calculate the national performance for each indicator, see 80 Fed. Reg. 27263 (May 13, 2015).

### **Background Information**

The Round 3 CFSR assesses state performance with regard to substantial conformity with 7 child and family outcomes and 7 systemic factors. Each outcome incorporates 1 or more of the 18 items included in the case review, and each item is rated as a Strength or Area Needing Improvement based on an evaluation of certain child welfare practices and processes in the cases reviewed in the state. With two exceptions, an item is assigned an overall rating of Strength if 90% or more of the applicable cases reviewed were rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies to those items. For a state to be in substantial conformity with a particular outcome, 95% or more of the cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome.

Eighteen items are considered in assessing the state's substantial conformity with the 7 systemic factors. Each item reflects a key federal program requirement relevant to the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP) for that systemic factor. An item is rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement based on how well the item-specific requirement is functioning. A determination of the rating is based on information provided by the state to demonstrate the functioning of the systemic factor in the statewide assessment and, as needed, from interviews with stakeholders and partners. For a state to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factors, no more than 1 of the items associated with the systemic factor can be rated as an Area Needing Improvement. For systemic factors that have only 1 item associated with them, that item must be rated as a Strength for a determination of substantial conformity.

The Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state's

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

performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting Illinois' overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Illinois' performance in Round 2.

### I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

### Illinois 2018 CFSR Assessment of Substantial Conformity for Outcomes and Systemic Factors

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

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

- Statewide Information System
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community

### Children's Bureau Comments on Illinois Performance

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

The findings of the 2018 CFSR show the Illinois DCFS is not operating in substantial conformity with the federal requirements across all child welfare outcomes. Illinois has a highly privatized child welfare system in which approximately 80% of foster care cases are served through a network of contract case management providers. As the title IV-E agency, DCFS struggles to ensure that regardless of case management responsibility, basic child welfare casework practices, such as caseworker contact with children and parents, occur routinely statewide at the level required to promote child safety, permanency, and child and family well-being outcomes.

Key statewide systems including caseworker and supervisor training; foster and adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention; court processes and coordination with the child welfare agency to ensure timely permanency for children in foster care; a comprehensive and accessible array of services; and integrated continuous quality improvement (CQI) approaches are also not functioning sufficiently well to promote the achievement of outcomes, despite state initiatives to address these challenges.

The CFSR findings indicate that reports of child maltreatment are often initiated in a timely manner and contact with children subject to such reports occurs pursuant to DCFS policy. However, the review revealed inconsistent practice across both foster care and inhome cases when it came to ensuring ongoing contact with children and families during the early phases of case opening. Caseworker contact with children and parents is a fundamental, significant, and cross-cutting child welfare case management practice requirement that affects the achievement of child safety and permanency, as well as child and family well-being outcomes. Case reviews identified challenges with accurately assessing risk and safety concerns and in providing appropriate safety-related services to prevent children from coming into foster care. Additionally, when safety plans were developed, they were not adequately monitored. This was of particular concern in in-home cases.

Casework challenges associated with contacting and engaging parents was evident across both foster care and in-home cases. Fathers in particular were not routinely engaged in the assessment and case planning processes, even when their whereabouts were known. This affects the ability of caseworkers to individualize services to address the reasons for the agency's involvement with the families and to achieve timely permanency for children in foster care.

DCFS and its court partners continue to experience significant challenges in achieving timely permanency for children in foster care. Case reviews and stakeholder interviews revealed that while initial permanency goals were often appropriate, the agency and the courts were slow to change course and pursue goals that could better meet the permanency needs of children. The review team noted several instances where the goal of reunification was kept in place for years despite the parents' lack of progress. The lack of agreement and coordination of efforts between the agency and courts regarding the filing of termination of parental rights (TPR) petitions also resulted in notable delays in cases, especially with young children where adoption was the goal. DCFS and its court partners also struggled to ensure that the permanency goal of guardianship was achieved in a timely manner. Additionally, while the state does require concurrent planning, the practice is not implemented statewide and goals are often worked sequentially. Other factors noted to affect permanency included caseworker turnover and a lack of concerted efforts to identify and locate relatives.

The review revealed promising casework practices in some areas of the state. These included promoting important family and cultural connections for children in foster care and meeting the educational needs of children in foster care. While these practices were evident in several cases, they were not consistently observed in the review sites. While the agency demonstrated the strong practice in meeting the educational needs of children in foster care, the educational needs of children living in their homes were met to a lesser degree. There is much room for improvement in ensuring that mental, behavioral, medical, and dental health needs are appropriately assessed and addressed for children and older youth, particularly in in-home cases.

A fully integrated, cross-cutting, and statewide child welfare CQI system has not been institutionalized in Illinois. While multiple case review activities exist across the state to monitor compliance with various mandates, the process for using data to inform and monitor the implementation of key initiatives that target casework practice and systemic concerns is uneven and does not routinely occur throughout the state to promote accountability in improving practices and outcomes. Challenges of the CQI system include integrating data and information sourced from state divisions/departments (e.g., staff training; foster/adoptive parent licensing, recruitment, and retention; workforce development), as well as from purchase of service (POS) contracts/agencies and court systems, sufficiently to understand and report performance and alignment across initiatives, and ensuring that contract providers are all in alignment in achieving positive outcomes for children and families. The agency is, however, currently developing a comprehensive framework to fully integrate and streamline the multiple case review processes across both DCFS and POS agencies that will provide opportunities for the state to strengthen its CQI system. Maximizing the involvement of birth parents, youth, courts, foster/adoptive parents, and field-level caseworkers and supervisors in this initiative is strongly encouraged.

Other promising practices underway within the state that have the potential to improve safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes include recent approval of a Medicaid 1115 Waiver, through which DCFS will partner with other human services agencies in Illinois with an aim to transform the behavioral and physical health delivery system by implementing crisis intervention, respite, and in-home services to assist families in need. Additionally, through its title IV-E waiver, the state is testing approaches to strengthening the

service array by working with community partners to develop services that child welfare-involved families need, rather than linking families to the standard set of available services.

As Illinois develops a program improvement plan to address the areas identified in the CFSR Final Report, the Children's Bureau encourages the state to focus on analyzing all relevant information and data to uncover and address the root causes of the casework practice and broader systemic issues identified in the CFSR Final Report as many of these concerns are longstanding. Maximizing stakeholder involvement, to include birth parents, youth, foster and adoptive parents, court personnel, the judiciary, field staff, service providers, and an array of individuals and groups willing to contribute to promoting positive outcomes for children and families in Illinois, will be key.

The Children's Bureau and state stakeholders have noted frequent change in the Illinois state child welfare director position in recent years. The Children's Bureau believes that stability in leadership can support the clear vision and consistent direction needed to achieve positive outcomes for all children and families in Illinois.

### 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 DCFS. 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**

Illinois is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 93% of the 28 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 initiation of response to a child report by meeting one of three conditions within 24 hours of the report: (1) DCFS investigative staff meet face-to-face with all alleged victims; (2) DCFS investigative staff makes a good-faith attempt to meet with alleged victims, and continues to make good-faith attempts at least every 24 hours thereafter; or, (3) law enforcement makes a face-to-face contact with the alleged victim due to exceptional circumstances.

• Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 93% of the 28 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**

Illinois is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 51% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 70% of the 40 foster care cases and 20% 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 31% of the 13 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 100% of the 4 applicable foster care cases and 0% of the 9 applicable in-home services cases.

### Item 3. Risk and Safety Assessment and Management

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

• Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 51% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.

• Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 70% of the 40 foster care cases and 20% of the 25 in-home services cases.

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

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

### **State Outcome Performance**

Illinois is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 3% 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).

• Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 75% 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.

• Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 25% 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.

• Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 15% 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**

Illinois is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 63% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

### Permanency Outcome 2 Item Performance

### **Item 7. Placement With Siblings**

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that siblings in foster care are placed together unless a separation was necessary to meet the needs of one of the siblings.

• Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 7 because 87% of the 30 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 8. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to ensure that visitation between a child in foster care and his or her mother, father, <sup>2</sup> and siblings is of sufficient frequency and quality to promote continuity in the child's relationship with these close family members.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 62% of the 29 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 53% of the 15 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of
  visitation with a sibling(s) in foster care who is/was in a different placement setting was sufficient to maintain and promote the
  continuity of the relationship.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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.

- In 81% of the 21 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of
  visitation between the child in foster care and his or her mother was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the
  relationship.
- In 43% of the 7 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of visitation between the child in foster care and his or her father was sufficient to maintain and promote the continuity of the relationship.

### **Item 9. Preserving Connections**

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

• Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 69% of the 39 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 10. Relative Placement

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

• Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 65% of the 37 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 11. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made to promote, support, and/or maintain positive relationships between the child in foster care and his or her mother and father<sup>3</sup> or other primary caregiver(s) from whom the child had been removed through activities other than just arranging for visitation.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 52% of the 21 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 70% of the 20 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 13% of the 8 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.

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

### Well-Being Outcome 1: 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**

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 28% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 35% of the 40 foster care cases and 16% of the 25 in-home services cases.

### Well-Being Outcome 1 Item Performance

### Item 12. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, the agency (1) made concerted efforts to assess the needs of children, parents,<sup>4</sup> 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 32% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 40% of the 40 foster care cases and 20% of the 25 in-home services cases.

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

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

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 63% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 73% of the 40 foster care cases and 48% of the 25 in-home services cases.

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

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

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 29% of the 52 applicable cases were
  rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 33% of the 27 applicable foster care cases and 24% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 43% of the 47 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 30% of the 37 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of fathers.

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

• Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 72% of the 36 applicable foster care cases were rated as a Strength.

### Item 13. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning

**Purpose of Assessment:** To determine whether, during the period under review, concerted efforts were made (or are being made) to involve parents<sup>5</sup> and children (if developmentally appropriate) in the case planning process on an ongoing basis.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 35% of the 63 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 45% of the 38 applicable foster care cases and 20% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 48% of the 42 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.
- In 55% of the 47 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 23% of the 35 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 55% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 70% of the 40 foster care cases and 32% 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 caseworkers and the mothers and fathers<sup>6</sup> of the child(ren) are sufficient to ensure the safety, permanency, and well-being of the child(ren) and promote achievement of case goals.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 29% of the 52 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 33% of the 27 applicable foster care cases and 24% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 51% of the 47 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 23% of the 35 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**

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 83% of the 40 applicable cases reviewed.

<sup>6</sup> For Item 15, in the in-home cases, "Mother" and "Father" are typically defined as the parents/caregivers with whom the children were living when the agency became involved with the family and with whom the children will remain (for example, biological parents, relatives, guardians, adoptive parents). In the foster care cases, "Mother" and "Father" is typically defined as the parents/caregivers from whom the child was removed and with whom the agency is working toward reunification; however, biological parents who were not the parents from whom the child was removed may also be included, as may adoptive parents if the adoption was finalized during the period under review. A rating could consider the agency's work with multiple applicable mother and fathers for the period under review in the case.

### Well-Being Outcome 2 Item Performance

### Item 16. Educational Needs of the Child

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

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 83% of the 40 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 88% of the 33 applicable foster care cases and 57% of the 7 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**

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 56% of the 57 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 65% of the 40 foster care cases and 35% of the 17 applicable in-home services cases.

### Well-Being Outcome 3 Item Performance

### Item 17. Physical Health of the Child

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

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 63% of the 51 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 65% of the 40 foster care cases and 55% of the 11 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 66% of the 38 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 84% of the 25 applicable foster care cases and 31% of the 13 applicable in-home services cases.

### III. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

For each systemic factor below, we provide performance summaries and a determination of whether the state is in substantial conformity with that systemic factor. In addition, we provide ratings for each item and a description of how the rating was determined. The CFSR relies upon a review of information contained in the statewide assessment to assess each item. If an item rating cannot be determined from the information contained in the statewide assessment, the Children's Bureau conducts stakeholder interviews and considers information gathered through the interviews in determining ratings for each item.

### **Statewide Information System**

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Item 19.

### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

Illinois 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Strength for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- The statewide assessment provided very limited relevant data and information to fully assess this systemic factor item.
   Information collected during stakeholder interviews demonstrated that the multiple components that comprise the Illinois

statewide information system can readily identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for placement of children who are, or within the immediately preceding 12 months have been, in foster care.

### **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**

Illinois 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.

### 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 20 based on information from the statewide
  assessment. Illinois agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would
  not affect the rating.
- Data and information reported in the statewide assessment showed that written case plans for children in the state's foster care system are not routinely developed jointly with parents.

### 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that Illinois is not systematically conducting periodic reviews for a sub-population of children subject to this requirement. The state is not conducting periodic reviews for children for whom the state retains placement and care responsibility during trial home visits.

### **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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information from the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that permanency hearings are routinely occurring across the state, as required.

### 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment. Illinois agreed with this rating and felt that additional information collected during stakeholder interviews would not affect the rating.
- Data and information in the statewide assessment showed that TPR petitions are not routinely filed across the state in a timely manner, as required.

### 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Strength for Item 24 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders identified variation across the state in the notification process. Overall, however, stakeholders reported that the required notice is routinely provided across the state 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.

### **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**

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

### **Quality Assurance System Item Performance**

### **Item 25. Quality Assurance System**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The quality assurance system is functioning statewide to ensure that it (1) is 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders identified a number of case review and data collection processes that are occurring across the state. However, stakeholders said that the use of the resulting quality assurance (QA) data to inform and monitor the implementation of targeted programmatic initiatives to address casework practice challenges is inconsistently occurring across the state. Further, the state collects limited data to demonstrate how well key systems that promote positive outcomes for children and families are functioning across the state. Stakeholders reported promising plans to fully integrate an array of state and contract case management agency QA systems to more clearly use data to promote strengths and address challenges in achieving child safety, permanency, and child and family well-being outcomes across the state.

### **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**

Illinois is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Staff and Provider Training. One of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

### Staff and Provider Training Item Performance

### Item 26. Initial Staff Training

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

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- The statewide assessment provided very limited relevant data and information to fully assess this systemic factor item. Stakeholders reported that while new staff routinely receive initial training in a timely manner, noteworthy delays are associated with the timing of hiring new staff and the established training schedule. Overall, stakeholders said that the skill-based component of training is not sufficient to meet the entry-level training needs of new case managers. Stakeholders reported the need for skill-based training in key areas such as interviewing, case plan development, and navigating the state's information system. Additionally, stakeholders reported that the Child Protective Services (CPS) investigator training component that incorporates simulations and peer feedback should be included in all pre-service training sessions.

### **Item 27. Ongoing Staff Training**

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The staff and provider training system is functioning statewide to ensure that ongoing training is provided for staff<sup>7</sup> that addresses the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties with regard to the services included in the CFSP.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- The statewide assessment provided very limited relevant data and information to fully assess this systemic factor item. Stakeholders reported that while ongoing training is not tracked for compliance with state requirements, staff routinely meet this requirement. Most stakeholders reported that ongoing training routinely provides case managers with the knowledge and skills needed to perform their job duties. Case management supervisors, however, do not routinely receive the ongoing training needed to meet their professional development needs relative to the supervision of casework practice. Stakeholders noted that core supervisory training is currently being offered at the state's title IV-E waiver immersion sites. The state does plan to make the training available to all supervisors in the near future.

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.

### **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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Strength for Item 28 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- The statewide assessment provided very limited relevant data and information to fully assess this systemic factor item. Information collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that foster and pre-adoptive parents routinely receive the Parent Resources for Information, Development, and Education (PRIDE) training as initial training before receiving a license. Overall, stakeholders reported that ongoing training requirements for foster parents are routinely met within the established time frames. Stakeholders said that pre-service training is routinely meeting the needs of foster and adoptive parents, and that the ongoing training routinely provides foster parents with the knowledge and skills needed to perform their caregiving duties. Stakeholders reported that the initial and ongoing training requirements for staff of state-licensed facilities are routinely met and that the initial and ongoing training provides them with the knowledge and skills needed to perform their duties.

### **Service Array and Resource Development**

The Children's Bureau assesses the state's performance on this systemic factor using the state's performance on Items 29 and 30.

### **State Systemic Factor Performance**

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

### Service Array and Resource Development Item Performance

### Item 29. Array of Services

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

• Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 29 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

• Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the availability and accessibility of services is markedly uneven across the state. Although the availability and accessibility of needed services is generally not a significant challenge in the metro areas, waitlists for mental health services for parents and children are not uncommon. Outside of Cook County and its surrounding counties, service availability and accessibility are particularly challenging. This can result in delays in achieving permanency and in the timely provision of needed services to address child and family safety and well-being needs. Stakeholders said that services such as parent and child mental health (e.g., psychological/psychiatric and trauma-informed services) and in- and outpatient adult mental health and substance abuse services had waiting lists of several weeks to months. Other services for which need exceeds availability include mentorship programs, residential treatment and placement resources for older youth; domestic violence services; parent coaching classes; prevention/community-based services; intact family-based services; parent-child visitation resources; and respite services for foster parents. Many stakeholders also reported that limited accessible transportation, distances to needed services, locating providers who accept Medicaid, and high staff/service provider turnover are barriers to accessing services in a timely manner.

### 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 30 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- The statewide assessment provided very limited relevant data and information to fully assess this systemic factor item. Stakeholders provided mixed views about whether services are adequately individualized. Overall, stakeholders said that services are not routinely individualized and tailored to meet the needs of children and parents across the state, referencing particular challenges in addressing the needs of non-English-speaking children and families, LGBTQ and older youth, and services to meet the needs of individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Several stakeholders noted that community-based services, family advocacy centers, wraparound initiatives, and the creative use of flex-funds are promising approaches to individualizing services for children and families. Stakeholders also felt that high caseloads and staff/service provider turnover rates can be a barrier to ensuring services are individualized for children and families.

### **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**

Illinois is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. One of the items in this systemic factor was rated as a Strength.

### Agency Responsiveness to the Community Item Performance

### Item 31. State Engagement and Consultation With Stakeholders Pursuant to CFSP and APSR

**Description of Systemic Factor Item:** The agency responsiveness to the community system is functioning statewide to ensure that, in implementing the provisions of the CFSP and developing related APSRs, the state engages in ongoing consultation with Tribal representatives, consumers, service providers, foster care providers, the juvenile court, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies and includes the major concerns of these representatives in the goals, objectives, and annual updates of the CFSP.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Although DCFS reported in the statewide assessment that the state actively seeks input from an array of individuals and
  groups in the development of CFSP goals, objectives, and annual updates, many stakeholders interviewed had not
  participated in, or were not familiar with, any process whereby input is provided to inform the development of or revisions to
  the CFSR goals and objectives. Stakeholders reported that input from child welfare field staff and the courts to inform the
  development of CFSP goals, objectives, and annual updates is not routinely occurring.

### 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Strength for Item 32 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders provided examples of intergovernmental agreements and other inter-organizational partnerships through which the state coordinates services or benefits with other federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population. Examples include partnerships with Head Start/Early Start; Social Security; Department of Human Services—Drug/Alcohol Abuse Division; Women, Infants, and Children (WIC); housing and education programs; Department of Healthcare and Family Services; and Maternal and Child Health Agency (HealthWorks and medical case management services).

### 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**

Illinois 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- The statewide assessment provided very limited relevant data and information to fully assess this systemic factor item. Stakeholders said that the ongoing supervisory review of licensing files is the primary mechanism to ensure standards are equally applied across foster family homes and child care institutions. Although no data are available to show how well this area of licensing practice is functioning statewide, stakeholders reported that this supervisory review process has not revealed any patterns that indicate standards are not being equally applied across foster family homes and child care institutions across the state. In addition, state child care institution licensing management staff routinely have discussions to address licensing issues across the state and there are no patterns that indicate standards are not being equally applied across child care institutions.

### 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Strength for Item 34 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that criminal background checks occur prior to the licensure of any foster and adoptive home as required. Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed by stakeholders also showed that state protocols to address child safety and reported safety concerns for children in foster homes and child care institutions are routinely applied. The state appears to be moving toward developing a more systematic process to track and monitor the established protocols to ensure the safety of children in child care institutions.

### 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- In the statewide assessment, the state reported that POS agencies have been slow to implement a yearly diligent recruitment plan and that follow-through has been inadequate. No data are available that show how well the diligent recruitment plan is being implemented across the state. Stakeholders reported that an uneven practice of diligent recruitment is occurring across the state. While stakeholders noted progress by the state with implementing a centralized communication network that will positively affect recruitment efforts, they pointed out that a lack of funding to support recruitment represents a key barrier in many areas of the state.

### 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.

- Illinois received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 36 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data provided in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that the state is not
  routinely completing home study requests in a timely manner. Stakeholders were mixed as to whether the state is effectively
  using cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptive or permanent placements for waiting children, and there are
  no statewide data to measure the state's performance in this area. Stakeholders described delays in effectively using crossjurisdictional resources because of staff turnover and a perception that a child cannot be referred to the state's adoption
  listing services until the court changes the goal to adoption.

# Appendix A Summary of Illinois 2018 Child and Family Services Review Performance

### I. Ratings for Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being Outcomes and Items

**Outcome Achievement:** Outcomes may be rated as in substantial conformity or not in substantial conformity. 95% of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the state to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

**Item Achievement:** Items may be rated as a Strength or as an Area Needing Improvement. For an overall rating of Strength, 90% of the cases reviewed for the item (with the exception of Item 1 and Item 16) must be rated as a Strength. Because Item 1 is the only item for Safety Outcome 1 and Item 16 is the only item for Well-Being Outcome 2, the requirement of a 95% Strength rating applies.

### SAFETY OUTCOME 1: CHILDREN ARE, FIRST AND FOREMOST, PROTECTED FROM ABUSE AND NEGLECT.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Safety Outcome 1 Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	Not in Substantial Conformity	93% Substantially Achieved
Item 1 Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	93% Strength

# SAFETY OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN ARE SAFELY MAINTAINED IN THEIR HOMES WHENEVER POSSIBLE AND APPROPRIATE.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Safety Outcome 2 Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate	Not in Substantial Conformity	51% Substantially Achieved
Item 2 Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement	31% Strength
Item 3 Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	51% Strength

### 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	3% Substantially Achieved
Item 4 Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	75% Strength
Item 5 Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	25% Strength
Item 6 Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	15% 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	63% Substantially Achieved
Item 7 Placement with siblings	Area Needing Improvement	87% Strength
Item 8 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	62% Strength
Item 9 Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	69% Strength
Item 10 Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	65% Strength
Item 11 Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement	52% Strength

# WELL-BEING OUTCOME 1: FAMILIES HAVE ENHANCED CAPACITY TO PROVIDE FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 1 Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	28% Substantially Achieved
Item 12 Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	32% Strength
Sub-Item 12A Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	63% Strength
Sub-Item 12B Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	29% Strength
Sub-Item 12C Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	72% Strength
Item 13 Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	35% Strength
Item 14 Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	55% Strength
Item 15 Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	29% Strength

# WELL-BEING OUTCOME 2: CHILDREN RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 2 Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	83% Substantially Achieved
Item 16 Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	83% Strength

# WELL-BEING OUTCOME 3: CHILDREN RECEIVE ADEQUATE SERVICES TO MEET THEIR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS.

Data Element	Overall Determination	State Performance
Well-Being Outcome 3 Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs	Not in Substantial Conformity	56% Substantially Achieved
Item 17 Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	63% Strength
Item 18 Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	66% Strength

### **II. Ratings for Systemic Factors**

The Children's Bureau determines whether a state is in substantial conformity with federal requirements for the 7 systemic factors based on the level of functioning of each systemic factor across the state. The Children's Bureau determines substantial conformity with the systemic factors based on ratings for the item or items within each factor. Performance on 5 of the 7 systemic factors is determined on the basis of ratings for multiple items or plan requirements. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with these systemic factors, the Children's Bureau must find that no more than 1 of the required items for that systemic factor fails to function as required. For a state to be found in substantial conformity with the 2 systemic factors that are determined based on the rating of a single item, the Children's Bureau must find that the item is functioning as required.

### STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
Item 19 Statewide Information System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

### **CASE REVIEW SYSTEM**

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Case Review System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 20 Written Case Plan	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement
Item 21 Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 22 Permanency Hearings	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 23 Termination of Parental Rights	Statewide Assessment	Area Needing Improvement
Item 24 Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

### **QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM**

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 25 Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### **STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING**

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

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

### SERVICE ARRAY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

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

### AGENCY RESPONSIVENESS TO THE COMMUNITY

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

### FOSTER AND ADOPTIVE PARENT LICENSING, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Not in Substantial Conformity
Item 33 Standards Applied Equally	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 34 Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 35 Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement
Item 36 State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

### III. Performance on Statewide Data Indicators<sup>8</sup>

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

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Recurrence of maltreatment	9.5%	Lower	13.9%	13.5%–14.4%	FY15–16
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	9.67	Lower	14.65	13.52–15.87	15A-15B, FY15-16

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> In October 2016, the Children's Bureau issued Technical Bulletin #9 (<a href="http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9">http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9</a>), which alerted states to the fact that there were technical errors in the syntax used to calculate the national and state performance for the statewide data indicators. Performance shown in this table reflects performance based on May 2017 revised syntax that is pending final verification.

Statewide Data Indicator	National Performance	Direction of Desired Performance	RSP*	95% Confidence Interval**	Data Period(s) Used for State Performance***
Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care	42.7%	Higher	14.2%	13.2%–15.3%	14B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12–23 months	45.9%	Higher	19.7%	18.4%–20.9%	16B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	31.8%	Higher	20.7%	19.9%–21.5%	16B–17A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.1%	Lower	3.5%	2.2%–5.5%	14B–17A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.44	Lower	4.96	4.8–5.13	16B–17A

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

<sup>\*\* 95%</sup> 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.

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

# Appendix B Summary of CFSR Round 2 Illinois 2009 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in Illinois in 2009. 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**

ı			
ı	<b>^</b>	I Information	
ı	Linnara	I Intormation	

**Children's Bureau Region:** 5

Date of Onsite Review: August 10–14, 2009

Period Under Review: April 1, 2008, through August 14, 2009

Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued: January 4, 2010

Date Program Improvement Plan Due: April 5, 2010

Date Program Improvement Plan Approved: January 1, 2011

### **Highlights of Findings**

### **Performance Measurements**

- A. The state met the national standards for **none** of the **six** standards.
- B. The state achieved substantial conformity with **none** of the **seven** outcomes.
- C. The state achieved substantial conformity with **five** of the **seven** systemic factors.

### **State's Conformance With the National Standards**

Data Indicator or Composite	National Standard	State's Score	Meets or Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of maltreatment recurrence (data indicator)	94.6 or higher	92.9	Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.47	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	62.3	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	80.0	Does Not Meet Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	103.6	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	99.4	Does Not Meet Standard

### **State's Conformance With the Outcomes**

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity

Outcome	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 1:	Did Not Achieve Substantial
Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.	Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 2:	Did Not Achieve Substantial
Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.	Conformity
Child and Family Well-Being Outcome 3:	Did Not Achieve Substantial
Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.	Conformity

# **State's Conformance With the Systemic Factors**

Systemic Factor	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Statewide Information System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Case Review System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Quality Assurance System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Achieved Substantial Conformity

## **Key Findings by Item**

### Outcomes

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
Timeliness of Initiating Investigations of Reports of Child     Maltreatment	Strength
2. Repeat Maltreatment	Area Needing Improvement
Services to Family to Protect Child(ren) in the Home and Prevent Removal or Re-entry Into Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
4. Risk Assessment and Safety Management	Area Needing Improvement
5. Foster Care Re-entries	Strength
6. Stability of Foster Care Placement	Area Needing Improvement
7. Permanency Goal for Child	Area Needing Improvement
8. Reunification, Guardianship, or Permanent Placement With Relatives	Area Needing Improvement
9. Adoption	Area Needing Improvement
10. Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement	Area Needing Improvement
11. Proximity of Foster Care Placement	Strength
12. Placement With Siblings	Area Needing Improvement
13. Visiting With Parents and Siblings in Foster Care	Area Needing Improvement
14. Preserving Connections	Area Needing Improvement
15. Relative Placement	Area Needing Improvement
16. Relationship of Child in Care With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
17. Needs and Services of Child, Parents, and Foster Parents	Area Needing Improvement
18. Child and Family Involvement in Case Planning	Area Needing Improvement
19. Caseworker Visits With Child	Area Needing Improvement

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
20. Caseworker Visits With Parents	Area Needing Improvement
21. Educational Needs of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
22. Physical Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement
23. Mental/Behavioral Health of the Child	Area Needing Improvement

### **Systemic Factors**

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
24. Statewide Information System	Strength
25. Written Case Plan	Area Needing Improvement
26. Periodic Reviews	Strength
27. Permanency Hearings	Strength
28. Termination of Parental Rights	Area Needing Improvement
29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Strength
30. Standards Ensuring Quality Services	Strength
31. Quality Assurance System	Strength
32. Initial Staff Training	Strength
33. Ongoing Staff Training	Strength
34. Foster and Adoptive Parent Training	Strength
35. Array of Services	Strength
36. Service Accessibility	Area Needing Improvement
37. Individualizing Services	Area Needing Improvement
38. Engagement in Consultation With Stakeholders	Strength
39. Agency Annual Reports Pursuant to CFSP	Strength

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Strength
41. Standards for Foster Homes and Institutions	Strength
42. Standards Applied Equally	Strength
43. Requirements for Criminal Background Checks	Strength
44. Diligent Recruitment of Foster and Adoptive Homes	Strength
45. State Use of Cross-Jurisdictional Resources for Permanent Placements	Strength