



# Use of CFSR Statewide Data Indicators in Round 3

**October 13, 2016**

# Context

- For Rd 3, we used preexisting regulatory authority for using statewide data indicators as a factor in determining substantial conformity on outcomes. That authority is for HHS to add, amend, or suspend the use of statewide data indicators when appropriate.
- Two publications announced the final plan for statewide data indicators (October 2014; revisions in May 2015).
- Spring 2016 – Discovered additional errors and problems with the calculations of the statewide data indicators. Realized long lead time to uncover all issues, test and adjust the indicators.



# Discovery of Errors

- In invite attachment, see *List of CFSR Round 3 Statewide Data Indicators Issues as of Publication*
- Some changes will impact states evenly; other changes will impact some states more than others
- Degree of impact unknown until testing is complete

## Examples

- Recurrence of Maltreatment
  - The syntax needs to account for recurrence of maltreatment when a child is identified as a victim of a substantiated or indicated maltreatment in two reports that are over 14 days apart and one record has an incident date, and the other record is **missing** the incident date.

# Discovery of Errors

- Maltreatment in Foster Care
  - States report maltreatment dispositions to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) with varying levels of timeliness. Consequently, using one year of data to monitor this outcome sometimes undercounts victimizations that occurred but were reported in a subsequent year's data file. Including an additional year of NCANDS data in the indicator captures these later reported dispositions and mitigates differences in performance due solely to a state's reporting practices.
  
- Permanency in 12 Months
  - Calculations inadvertently excluded all discharges to permanency during the first week of the 12-month period. The intent was to exclude only children with a discharge date within 7 days from their date of entry into care, as opposed to all permanency discharges during the first week of the 12-month period.

# ACF's Decision and CFSR TB#9

- ACF's decision in light of errors is to use CFSR Statewide Data Indicators for context information for all states in Rd 3 and continue accountability for outcomes based on case review findings. All other aspects of the review process remain in place.
- Decision based on the operational challenges in revising indicators this far into the round and respect for the effort and time needed for states and their partners to make changes in child welfare practice and systems.
- National standards and state performance on the indicators will still be published and used with states as context information for the state and CB in providing guidance and technical assistance.



# Impact and Next Steps – CFSR Process

- **States reviewed in FY 2015:**
  - We will revise and reissue final reports to reflect change in use of statewide data indicators but conformity determinations will not change.
  - We will request changes to PIP measurement plans under development, as appropriate, to reflect TB#9 which requires permanency outcome 1 case review item measurement.
  - CB will move forward with PIP negotiation and approvals.
- **States reviewed in FY 2016 or later:**
  - Final reports will reflect change in use of statewide data indicators.
  - All other parts of CFSR process will proceed timely.
- **States need not revise any other CB requested document or plan in progress to reflect this change – e.g., statewide assessments, APSRs**

# Next Steps – Data Profiles and Statewide Data Indicators

- Going out soon
  - Data profiles (using current syntax) for select Year 1 – 3 states
- To be published by end of 2016
  - Revised syntax, national standards, state-by-state performance, and related materials

# Questions?



Photograph by Liz Banfield/Getty Images