

Child and Family Services Reviews

Utah
Final Report
2018



This page is intentionally blank.

Final Report: Utah Child and Family Services Review

INTRODUCTION

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

- The statewide assessment prepared by the Utah Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) and submitted to the Children's Bureau on May 31, 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 Salt Lake, Cache, and Iron Counties, Utah, during the week of July 30, 2018
- Interviews and focus groups with state stakeholders and partners, which included:
 - Attorneys representing parents
 - Child welfare agency caseworkers and supervisors
 - Child welfare agency director, deputy directors, and regional directors
 - Child Welfare Improvement Council (CWIC)
 - DCFS Audit Team
 - Foster parents and adoptive parents
 - Guardians Ad Litem (GALs) and Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA)
 - Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) staff
 - Judges
 - Parents
 - Public and private agency training staff and partners

- Resource Family Consultants (RFC)
- Representatives from the Attorney General's Office
- Representatives from the courts and Court Improvement Program (CIP)
- Youth served by the agency

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

Background Information

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

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

The Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round of reviews and in response to feedback from the child welfare field. As such, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSRs is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round. Appendix A provides tables presenting Utah's overall performance in Round 3. Appendix B provides information about Utah's performance in Round 2.

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

I. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE

Utah 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 6 of the 7 systemic factors were found to be in substantial conformity:

- Statewide Information System
- Case Review System
- Quality Assurance System
- Staff and Provider Training
- Agency Responsiveness to the Community
- Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

Children's Bureau Comments on Utah Performance

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

Utah has a state-administered child welfare system. The DCFS is built on several strong systems that can provide a solid foundation for strong casework practices. DCFS has an active and well-performing Quality Assurance (QA) system and good collaboration with community partners. In addition, DCFS has manageable caseloads and a well-functioning initial and ongoing staff training program that provides caseworkers with the skills and knowledge needed to perform their duties.

The CFSR case review results show that the state performed higher in Safety Outcome 1, Permanency Outcome 2, and Well-Being Outcome 2. DCFS made efforts to initiate investigations on a timely basis, place children with their siblings when possible, preserve connections, and meet the educational needs of children in foster care. The practice areas on which the state will need to focus include assessing relatives, placing children in foster care with relatives, and making efforts to support and maintain nurturing relationships between the children in care and their parents.

The CFSR case review results identified cross-cutting practice concerns that affect the state's achievement of safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes for children and families. The review results found that while DCFS initially assessed risk and safety through both formal and informal processes, ongoing assessments of safety and risk were not occurring at critical junctures in the cases. The lack of ongoing in-depth assessment of risk and safety affected the state's ability to ensure that children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate (Safety Outcome 2). Furthermore, despite the fact that Utah has a strong training program for their caseworkers, there is no practice-oriented training for supervisors. Developing and implementing such a training program would allow supervisors to better support caseworkers in conducting accurate assessments on an ongoing basis and to better manage safety and risk in the families' homes.

Another outcome area on which DCFS will need to focus is enhancing families' capacity to provide for their children's needs (Well-Being Outcome 1). Practice areas that form the basis for this outcome include assessment of needs and provision of services to meet the identified needs of families, concerted efforts to engage family members in case planning, and frequent and quality caseworker visits with children and parents. Family Team Meetings were seen as an effective tool for engaging families. However, DCFS will need to improve how they are assessing family members, specifically parents and foster parents, and the frequency and quality of visits with parents. CFSR results also showed that key services are not available across all jurisdictions of the state. This affects not only timely and appropriate service provision but also the capacity of caseworkers to individualize services for families.

The systemic factor of Case Review System was found to be in substantial conformity, with frequent periodic reviews in court and timely permanency hearings. There is a process in place to terminate parental rights in accordance with Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) requirements. However, the lowest performing outcome for the state was Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations. Children were not stable in their living situations. Although Utah has a concurrent planning process in place, appropriate permanency goals were not established on a timely basis for children in approximately a quarter of the cases reviewed. In about half of the cases reviewed, efforts were not made to achieve timely permanency for children. In addition to the casework practice areas that DCFS will have to address, there were also court-related barriers and challenges identified that affect achievement of timely permanency. The Children's Bureau recommends that DCFS continue collaborating with the legal community to clearly identify the key factors affecting timely and appropriate permanency for children and families in Utah and develop strategies that will effectively address barriers in both DCFS and the courts.

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

Utah is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 80% of the 41 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 accepted reports be assigned for a Priority 1, 2, or 3 response. Priority 1 response referrals require a face-to-face meeting with the child victim within 60 minutes of assignment to a child protective services worker or within 3 hours if the alleged child victim is more than 40 miles away. Priority 2 referrals require a face-to-face meeting with the alleged child victim within 24 hours of assignment. Priority 3 referrals require a face-to-face meeting with the alleged child victim within 3 working days of assignment. For referrals involving more than one child victim, the state policy is met when the face-to-face contact occurs with at least one of the alleged child victims. For a referral involving multiple allegations on multiple children, the alleged child victim with the highest priority allegation must be seen within the priority response time frame.

• Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 1 because 80% of the 41 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

Utah is not in substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 60% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 60% 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.

• Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 2 because 55% of the 20 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

• Item 2 was rated as a Strength in 62% of the 13 applicable foster care cases and 43% of the 7 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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 3 because 62% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 3 was rated as a Strength in 63% of the 40 foster care cases and 60% 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

Utah is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 28% 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).

• Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 4 because 48% 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.

• Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 5 because 77% of the 39 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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

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

• Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 6 because 58% 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

Utah is not in substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 80% 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.

• Utah received an overall rating of Strength for Item 7 because 100% of the 26 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.

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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 8 because 80% of the 30 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- In 75% of the 8 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of
 visitation with a sibling(s) in foster care who is/was in a different placement setting was sufficient to maintain and promote the
 continuity of the relationship.
- In 88% of the 24 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 93% of the 15 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.

• Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 9 because 82% 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.

• Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 10 because 72% of the 39 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.

• Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 11 because 76% of the 25 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

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.

- In 78% of the 23 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 71% of the 14 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 45% of the 65 cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 43% of the 40 foster care cases and 48% 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,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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12 because 46% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12 was rated as Strength in 45% of the 40 foster care cases and 48% of the 25 in-home services cases.

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

Item 12 is divided into three sub-items:

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

- Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12A because 82% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12A was rated as a Strength in 85% of the 40 foster care cases and 76% of the 25 in-home services cases.

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

- Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12B because 56% of the 57 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 12B was rated as a Strength in 59% of the 32 applicable foster care cases and 52% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 65% of the 54 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts both to assess and address the needs of mothers.
- In 60% of the 45 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

• Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 12C because 62% of the 39 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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 13 because 81% of the 62 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 13 was rated as a Strength in 89% of the 37 applicable foster care cases and 68% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 94% of the 32 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve child(ren) in case planning.

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.

- In 87% of the 53 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to involve mothers in case planning.
- In 80% of the 41 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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 14 because 80% of the 65 cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 14 was rated as a Strength in 80% of the 40 foster care cases and 80% 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 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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 15 because 66% of the 56 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 15 was rated as a Strength in 68% of the 31 applicable foster care cases and 64% of the 25 in-home services cases.
- In 72% of the 53 applicable cases, the agency made concerted efforts to ensure that both the frequency and quality of caseworker visitation with mothers were sufficient.
- In 63% of the 41 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.

_

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.

State Outcome Performance

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 82% of the 34 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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 16 because 82% of the 34 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 16 was rated as a Strength in 84% of the 31 applicable foster care cases and 67% of the 3 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

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

The outcome was substantially achieved in 55% of the 56 applicable cases reviewed.

The outcome was substantially achieved in 55% of the 40 foster care cases and 56% of the 16 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.

• Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 17 because 73% of the 45 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.

• Item 17 was rated as a Strength in 73% of the 40 foster care cases and 80% of the 5 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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 18 because 60% of the 43 applicable cases were rated as a Strength.
- Item 18 was rated as a Strength in 66% of the 29 applicable foster care cases and 50% of the 14 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

Utah 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.

 Utah received an overall rating of Strength for Item 19 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

• Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that Utah is operating a statewide information system that readily identifies the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for placement of every child in foster care. Stakeholders reported that data are entered on a timely basis.

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

Utah is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. Four 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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Strength for Item 20 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that each child has a written case plan that is developed jointly with the
 child's parents and includes the required provisions. The state uses Child and Family Team Meetings as the primary tool to
 engage parents. Child and Family Team meetings are required before a case plan can be finalized. Stakeholders confirmed
 that parents are engaged in case planning.

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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Strength for Item 21 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment showed that initial periodic reviews occur timely for the majority of children in foster care. Stakeholders said that subsequent periodic reviews occur for most children in foster care every 3 months and that drug court cases are reviewed even more frequently.

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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Strength for Item 22 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data provided in the statewide assessment and confirmed by stakeholders showed that statewide, an initial permanency hearing occurs in a qualified court no later than 12 months from the date the child entered foster care for a substantial majority of children in foster care. Stakeholders also said permanency hearings occur at least annually if not more often thereafter until the child/youth achieves permanency.

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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Strength for Item 23 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Data and information in the statewide assessment showed that Utah has processes in place to ensure that petitions to terminate parental rights (TPR) are filed in accordance with required federal provisions. Stakeholders confirmed that the process is in place and functioning to ensure that a TPR petition is filed at the 15 of 22-month mark unless a compelling reason not to file exists.

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.

- Utah 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 collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that Utah does not have a specific mechanism in place 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

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

Quality Assurance System Item Performance

Item 25. Quality Assurance System

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

- Utah received an overall rating of Strength for Item 25 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed by stakeholders showed that Utah's QA system is operating in all
 jurisdictions. Utah's QA system has standards for quality, identifies strengths and areas needing improvement, provides
 reports to stakeholders, and evaluates improvement measures.

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

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

Staff and Provider Training Item Performance

Item 26. Initial Staff Training

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

• Utah received an overall rating of Strength for Item 26 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.

Information from the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that Utah's training
system functions statewide to ensure that initial training that includes the basic skills and knowledge required for their
positions is provided to all staff who deliver services pursuant to the Child and Family Services Plan. All direct service staff
must complete 120-hour Practice Model Training plus an additional field experience packet. Cases are gradually assigned to
workers after completion of initial training and mentoring. Completion of training is monitored and effectiveness of training is
evaluated.

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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Area Needing Improvement for Item 27 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and collected during interviews with stakeholders showed that Utah does not have a
 way to track completion of the 40 hours of required ongoing training on a statewide basis other than supervisors monitoring
 workers' completion of training. Stakeholders reported that all regions have access to the same array of training and that
 training staff is able to provide training to meet specific needs. Stakeholders concluded that although ongoing training for staff
 is sufficient, only administrative training for supervisors currently exists. The state is in the process of developing practiceoriented training for supervisors.

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.

- Utah 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 collected from stakeholders during interviews showed that there are initial and ongoing training requirements for prospective foster parents, adoptive parents, and staff of state-licensed facilities. Myriad

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.

trainings are available to foster and adoptive parents that address the skills and knowledge base needed to carry out their duties. The state's DCFS Audit Team monitors compliance with training requirements for foster parents certified by child-placing agencies and staff of licensed facilities.

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

Utah 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.

- Utah 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 from stakeholders during interviews showed that although there is an adequate array of services, access to services is limited in some jurisdictions of the state, especially in the rural areas. Stakeholders said that in these areas, there is need for more foster homes, mental health services, substance abuse treatment services, domestic violence services, affordable housing, and public transportation. Additional barriers include waitlists and the distance families have to travel to access services. Stakeholders also said adopted children have had to enter care to receive needed services because post-adoptive services are lacking in some areas of the state.

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.

 Utah 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, Utah described how the state's Practice Model and policies require individualization of services to meet the needs of children and families. Established processes, such as the Child and Family Team meetings, support caseworkers' efforts to tailor services. However, stakeholders reported that in some jurisdictions of the state, individualization of services is difficult due to barriers in accessing some of the services. Stakeholders also reported a lack of culturally competent services for Native Americans or for families who speak languages other than English.

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

Utah 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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Strength for Item 31 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed by stakeholders showed that the agency is responsive to the statewide community system and ensures that the state engages the community in implementing the provision of the CFSP and ongoing developments through the APSR. The state has forums in place to engage in ongoing consultation with Tribal representatives, children and families, service providers, foster care providers, juvenile courts, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies.

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.

• Utah 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 from stakeholders during interviews confirmed that the agency
coordinates with a variety of other agencies that provide services and benefits of other federal or federally assisted programs
serving the same populations including but not limited to Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), the Department of
Health and Early Intervention Programs, Head Start Programs, Medicaid, Division of Services for People with Disabilities,
Women, Infants and Children (WIC) programs, the State Offices of Education and Housing Services, and Substance Abuse
and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA).

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

Utah is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. Three 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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Strength for Item 33 based on information from the statewide assessment and stakeholder interviews.
- Information in the statewide assessment and confirmed by stakeholders showed that standards are applied equally to all licensed or approved foster family homes, child-placing agencies, and 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.

 Utah 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 from stakeholders during interviews showed that Utah has a process in place to ensure that the state complies with federal requirements for criminal background clearances related to licensing foster care and adoptive placements. The state has a case planning process in place that includes provisions for addressing the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

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.

- Utah received an overall rating of Strength for Item 35 based on information from the statewide assessment.
- In the statewide assessment, Utah described the state contracts with Utah Foster Care to provide diligent recruitment of foster and adoptive families. The recruitment process functions well to ensure that there is a statewide comprehensive process for the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families who reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed. Regional recruitment plans are developed based on each region's needs assessment on an annual basis.

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.

- Utah 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 showed that a large percentage of ICPC home studies are not completed on a timely basis. Barriers to timely completion of home studies include delays in receiving ICPC documents from the central office. An additional barrier identified by stakeholders is relatives not following up on requested activities. Utah does effectively use cross-jurisdictional resources, such as the Adoption Exchange, the Heart Gallery, and Wendy's Wonderful Kids, to identify permanent placements for foster children. Additionally, Utah uses the Round Table process to locate permanent placement options for children.

Appendix A Summary of Utah 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	80% Substantially Achieved
Item 1 Timeliness of investigations	Area Needing Improvement	80% 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	60% Substantially Achieved
Item 2 Services to protect child(ren) in home and prevent removal or re-entry into foster care	Area Needing Improvement†	55% Strength
Item 3 Risk and safety assessment and management	Area Needing Improvement	62% 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	28% Substantially Achieved
Item 4 Stability of foster care placement	Area Needing Improvement	48% Strength
Item 5 Permanency goal for child	Area Needing Improvement	77% Strength
Item 6 Achieving reunification, guardianship, adoption, or other planned permanent living arrangement	Area Needing Improvement	58% 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	80% Substantially Achieved
Item 7 Placement with siblings	Strength	100% Strength
Item 8 Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care	Area Needing Improvement	80% Strength
Item 9 Preserving connections	Area Needing Improvement	82% Strength
Item 10 Relative placement	Area Needing Improvement	72% Strength
Item 11 Relationship of child in care with parents	Area Needing Improvement†	76% 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	45% Substantially Achieved
Item 12 Needs and services of child, parents, and foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	46% Strength
Sub-Item 12A Needs assessment and services to children	Area Needing Improvement	82% Strength
Sub-Item 12B Needs assessment and services to parents	Area Needing Improvement	56% Strength
Sub-Item 12C Needs assessment and services to foster parents	Area Needing Improvement	62% Strength
Item 13 Child and family involvement in case planning	Area Needing Improvement	81% Strength
Item 14 Caseworker visits with child	Area Needing Improvement	80% Strength
Item 15 Caseworker visits with parents	Area Needing Improvement	66% 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	82% Substantially Achieved
Item 16 Educational needs of the child	Area Needing Improvement	82% 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	55% Substantially Achieved
Item 17 Physical health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	73% Strength
Item 18 Mental/behavioral health of the child	Area Needing Improvement	60% 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	Substantial Conformity
Item 20 Written Case Plan	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Item 21 Periodic Reviews	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 22 Permanency Hearings	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 23 Termination of Parental Rights	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength
Item 24 Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Area Needing Improvement

QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance
Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Substantial Conformity
Item 25 Quality Assurance System	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	Strength

STAFF AND PROVIDER TRAINING

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

SOTER AND ADDITIVE TARENT EIGENOMO, REGROTIMENT, AND RETERMION				
Data Element	Source of Data and Information	State Performance		
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	Statewide Assessment and Stakeholder Interviews	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	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	9.5%	Lower	13.3%	12.5%–14.1%	FY15–16
Maltreatment in foster care (victimizations per 100,000 days in care)	9.67	Lower	16.88	14.12–20.19	15A-15B, FY15-16

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

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	51.4%	49.2%–53.5%	14B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12-23 months	45.9%	Higher	60.1%	55.5%–64.7%	16B–17A
Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or more	31.8%	Higher	34.6%	29.3%–40.6%	16B–17A
Re-entry to foster care in 12 months	8.1%	Lower	8.1%	6.3%–10.3%	14B–17A
Placement stability (moves per 1,000 days in care)	4.44	Lower	5.81	5.56–6.08	16B–17A

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

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

^{***} Data Period(s) Used for State Performance: Refers to the initial 12-month period and the period(s) of data needed to follow the children to observe their outcomes. The FY or federal fiscal year refers to NCANDS data, which spans the 12-month period October 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 Utah 2010 Key Findings

The Children's Bureau conducted a CFSR in Utah in 2010. Key findings from that review are presented below. Because the Children's Bureau made several changes to the CFSR process and items and indicators relevant for performance based on lessons learned during the second round and in response to feedback from the child welfare field, a state's performance in the third round of the CFSR is not directly comparable to its performance in the second round.

Identifying Information and Review Dates

_		4 .
(ianara	Informa	tion

Children's Bureau Region: 8

Date of Onsite Review: June 21–25, 2010

Period Under Review: April 1, 2009, through June 25, 2010

Date Courtesy Copy of Final Report Issued: September 30, 2010

Date Program Improvement Plan Due: December 29, 2010

Date Program Improvement Plan Approved: October 1, 2011

Highlights of Findings

Performance Measurements

- A. The state met the national standards for **one** 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	93.9	Does Not Meet Standard
Absence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care (data indicator)	99.68 or higher	99.55	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness and permanency of reunifications (Permanency Composite 1)	122.6 or higher	118.1	Does Not Meet Standard
Timeliness of adoptions (Permanency Composite 2)	106.4 or higher	159.0	Meets Standard
Permanency for children and youth in foster care for long periods of time (Permanency Composite 3)	121.7 or higher	120.1	Does Not Meet Standard
Placement stability (Permanency Composite 4)	101.5 or higher	71.9	Does Not Meet Standard

State's Conformance With the Outcomes

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

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

State's Conformance With the Systemic Factors

Systemic Factor	Achieved or Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Statewide Information System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Case Review System	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Quality Assurance System	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Staff and Provider Training	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Service Array and Resource Development	Did Not Achieve Substantial Conformity
Agency Responsiveness to the Community	Achieved Substantial Conformity
Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention	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
3. 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
20. Caseworker Visits With Parents	Area Needing Improvement

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

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	Strength
29. Notice of Hearings and Reviews to Caregivers	Area Needing Improvement
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
40. Coordination of CFSP Services With Other Federal Programs	Strength

Item	Strength or Area Needing Improvement
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