



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC SECURITY

*Your Partner For A Stronger Arizona*

Janice K. Brewer  
Governor

Clarence H. Carter  
Director

JUL 08 2011

The Honorable Janice K. Brewer  
Governor of Arizona  
1700 West Washington  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Governor Brewer:

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 8-526, the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) submits the enclosed semi-annual report on child welfare for the period of October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011. This report provides information relative to reports of child abuse and neglect, investigations, shelter and receiving home services, foster homes, length of care, and adoptions.

We continue to work diligently to improve the quality of services for children and their families. Compiling this report provides us another opportunity to review our work and consider new ways to improve.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (602) 542-5757.

Sincerely,

Clarence H. Carter  
Director

Enclosure

cc: President Russell Pearce, Arizona State Senate  
Speaker Andy Tobin, Arizona State House of Representatives  
Senator Linda Gray, Chairman, Senate Public Safety and Human Services Committee  
Representative Cecil P. Ash, Chairman, House Health and Human Services Committee  
Secretary of State Ken Bennett  
Janet Fisher, Acting Director, Arizona State Library, Archives, and Public Records  
Beth Kohler Lazare, Policy Advisor for Health and Human Services, Office of the Governor  
Leah Koestner, Assistant Policy Advisor, Office of the Governor  
John Arnold, Director, Governor's Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting  
Eileen Klein, Chief of Staff, Office of the Governor  
Nicole Davis, Division Chief Council, Child and Family Protection Division, Office of the Attorney General  
Amber O'Dell, Analyst, Senate Public Safety and Human Services Committee  
Ingrid Garvey, Analyst, House Health and Human Services Committee  
Katy Proctor, Policy Advisor, Senate Majority Caucus  
Wendy Baldo, Chief of Staff, Senate Majority Caucus  
Barbara Guenther, Policy Advisor, Senate Democratic Caucus  
Steve Moortel, Policy Advisor, House Majority Caucus  
Elizabeth Nevran, Policy Advisor, House Democratic Caucus

**CHILD WELFARE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

**SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT**

**FOR THE PERIOD OF**

**OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

**ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES**

**[LAWS 2006, CHAPTER 203]**

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC SECURITY**

**DIVISION OF CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES**

**ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES**

## CHILD WELFARE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Arizona Revised Statute § 8-526, as amended by Laws 2006, Chapter 203 requires the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) to compile information and produce a semi-annual report for the periods ending on March 31 and September 30 of each year regarding Child Welfare Services, including Child Protective Services (CPS). This report, submitted in satisfaction of that mandate, is for the semi-annual reporting period beginning on October 1, 2010 and ending on March 31, 2011.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Reporting period: October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011)

	<u>Page</u>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	4
<b>SEMI-ANNUAL COMPARISONS</b> .....	7
<b>REPORTS OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT</b>	
Reports by reporting period and type of child maltreatment – statewide data.....	8
Sample communications to hotline, not meeting definition of a report.....	10
Reports received by risk level- statewide data.....	11
Number of reports received by risk level – county specific data.....	11
Number of reports received by maltreatment – statewide data.....	12
Number of reports received by maltreatment – county specific data.....	13
<b>ASSIGNMENT OF INVESTIGATIONS</b>	
Reports assigned for investigation by risk level – statewide data.....	14
Reports assigned for investigation by risk level – county specific data.....	14
Reports assigned for investigation by type of maltreatment – statewide data.....	15
Reports assigned for investigation by type of maltreatment – county specific data.....	16
<b>INVESTIGATIONS OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT</b>	
Reports not responded to by risk level – county specific data.....	17
Investigations by risk level – investigation still open – statewide data.....	18
Investigations by risk level – investigation still open – county specific data.....	18
Investigations by type of child maltreatment – investigation still open – statewide data...	19
Investigations by type of child maltreatment – investigation still open – county specific data.....	20
Reports where removal occurred – county specific data.....	21
<b>COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS</b>	
Substantiation rate by reporting period.....	23
Investigations by risk level – proposed substantiated reports – statewide data.....	24
Investigations by risk level – proposed substantiated reports – county specific data.....	24
Investigations by type of child maltreatment – proposed substantiated reports – statewide data.....	25
Investigations by type of child maltreatment – proposed substantiated reports – county specific data.....	26
Investigations by risk level – substantiated reports – statewide data.....	27

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)**  
 (Reporting period: October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011)

	<i>Page</i>
Investigations by risk level – substantiated reports county specific data.....	27
Investigations by type of child maltreatment – substantiated reports – statewide data...	28
Investigations by type of child maltreatment – substantiated reports – county specific data.....	29
Investigations by risk level – unsubstantiated reports – statewide data.....	30
Investigations by risk level – unsubstantiated reports – county specific data.....	30
Investigations by type of child maltreatment – unsubstantiated reports – statewide data..	31
Investigations by type of child maltreatment – unsubstantiated reports – county specific data.....	32
 <b>SAFE HAVEN INFANTS</b>	
Number of Safe Haven infants delivered during reporting period.....	33
 <b>CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE</b>	
New entries by county – children under 18 years voluntary placement.....	34
New entries by county.....	35
New entries – statewide data.....	36
 <b>CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE</b>	
Children in out-of-home care by reporting period.....	37
Children in group homes ages 0-6.....	38
Children in shelter ages 0-3.....	38
The average length of stay in a shelter placement for children ages 0-3 who were in a shelter placement on the last day of the reporting period.....	39
All children in care by age and ethnicity.....	39-40
All children in care by case plan goal and placement type.....	40-41
All children in care by placement type and age.....	42
Children in shelter or receiving homes for more than 21 days.....	43
Children in out-of-home care by length of time in care.....	44
Children in out-of-home care by legal status.....	45
Children receiving required visitation.....	46
 <b>FOSTER HOME LICENSING, CLOSURES, AND VISITATIONS</b>	
Foster homes licensed.....	47
Foster homes closed and reason for closure.....	47
Child bed spaces available.....	47
Number of foster homes receiving the required visitation.....	48
 <b>CHILDREN LEAVING OUT-OF-HOME CARE</b>	
Semi-Annual comparisons of total number leaving care – For all reasons.....	49
Total number leaving care.....	50
Total number leaving care – For reason of reunification with parents.....	51
Total number leaving care – For reason of living with other relatives.....	52
Total number leaving care – For reason of adoption.....	53
Total number leaving care – For reason of guardianship.....	54

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)**  
 (Reporting period: October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011)

	<u>Page</u>
Total number leaving care – For reason of reaching age of majority .....	55
Total number leaving care – For reason of transfer to another agency .....	56
Total number leaving care – For reason of runaway .....	57
Total number leaving care – For reason of death of child .....	58
Total number leaving care – by cause of death .....	59
Total number for reason of death of child – with alleged abuse .....	59
<b>CHILDREN WITH CASE PLAN GOALS OF ADOPTION</b>	
Number of children with a petition for termination of parental rights .....	60
The placement and number of children with case plan goals of adoption by age .....	61
The placement and number of children with case plan goals of adoption by ethnicity .....	62
The placement and number of children with case plan goals of adoption by legal status ..	62
Number of children – length of time from change of case plan goal of adoption to adoptive placement .....	63
<b>ADOPTIVE SERVICES</b>	
Number of children with a finalized adoption by average length of time in out-of-home placement before adoptive placement .....	64
Number of children with a finalized adoption by average length of time in adoptive placement before the final order of adoption .....	64

## Executive Summary

The Arizona Department of Economic Security's Division of Children, Youth and Families (Division) is pleased to publish this semi-annual report for October 2010 through March 2011 in compliance with A.R.S. § 8-526. This report is intended to provide its readers an opportunity to review the Division's progress in implementing systemic improvement strategies as they impact key performance indicators.

The Division has continuously pursued strategies to achieve improved outcomes for children and families. Many of these strategies have been highlighted in previous editions of this report and other Division publications, and have included strengthening of the Division's quality improvement system, increasing staff skill in the application of the Division's integrated child safety assessment and risk assessment tools, and strengthening in-home services to safely avoid removing children from their homes. Current areas of focus and development include conducting targeted case reviews to identify specific opportunities to move toward reunification or other permanency plans in a more timely fashion; enhancing and strengthening Child Protective Services (CPS) clinical supervision through training and coaching experiences; and modifying the Team Decision Making (TDM) process to better incorporate the existing safety decision-making model into child welfare practice.

The data contained within this Semi-Annual Report, when combined with other child welfare-related information in the Department, highlights progress made in certain areas while also helping to identify where continued focus is needed.

### **Child Abuse Hotline and Child Protective Services (CPS) Investigations**

The statewide Child Abuse Hotline received 27,715 calls during this reporting period. Of those, 10,129 – or 36.5 percent – *did not meet* the statutory criteria for a CPS report. Calls that did not meet the criteria for a CPS report included: requests for information or referrals for services; questions about current cases; and allegations of abuse or neglect where the alleged perpetrator was not the child's parent, guardian or custodian (those calls are referred to law enforcement for response). Every call that does not meet the criteria for a CPS report is reviewed within 48 hours by quality assurance staff to ensure the accuracy of that decision.

The statewide Child Abuse Hotline received 17,586 calls during this reporting period that met the statutory criteria for a CPS report. Of those, 208 were referred to other jurisdictions, the military or tribal governments for investigation. This resulted in 17,378 CPS reports being assigned to child welfare specialists for investigation. Compared to the same reporting period last year, this represents an increase of 776 CPS reports assigned for investigation – or 4.7 percent. This increase in CPS reports requiring an investigation has mainly occurred in Maricopa and Pima counties.

Of the 17,378 CPS reports assigned for investigation during this reporting period, 8,481 reports – or 48.8 percent – had investigation closures entered into the Children's Information Library and Data Source (CHILDS) statewide case management information system. Closing a case means that the initial investigation to the original allegations of abuse or neglect has been completed and the appropriate case plan is put in place, as needed. Many factors can impact the closure of investigations, including time needed for child welfare specialists to obtain all information needed to complete an accurate and thorough assessment.

Of the 17,378 CPS reports subject to substantiation during this reporting period, 1,366 – or 7.9 percent – were substantiated. An additional 441 CPS reports – or 2.5 percent – were proposed for substantiation by child welfare specialists and are currently awaiting the results of the appeals process. Over time, the

number of substantiated and proposed substantiated CPS reports associated with this time period will increase as investigation findings are entered into CHILDS. It is sometimes difficult to substantiate allegations of abuse or neglect because current state laws that define child maltreatment do not include many situations related to child neglect or sexual abuse.

### **Children in Out-of-Home Care**

The Division remains committed to working with the community to keep children safe, strengthen families, and prevent the need for children to be removed from their homes. The number of children in out-of-home care increased from 10,514 in the prior reporting period to 10,707 in March 2011. Of the children in out-of-home care, the Division continues its success in placing children in the most family-like setting possible. In March 2011, 8,759 children – or 81.9 percent of all children in out-of-home care – were placed with relatives or licensed foster parents. An additional 20 children were placed with their parents on a trial home visit and 302 youth were residing in independent living settings. Efforts to increase the number of licensed foster parents who are able to meet the needs of children requiring out-of-home placement resulted in 524 new homes being licensed during this reporting period.

The Division continues to focus on the number of young children in shelter and group home care. In March 2011, there were 16 young children ages 0 through 3 in shelter care. This represents a decrease of 15 children – or 48.4 percent – since March 2006. Placement of young children in shelter care continues to be influenced by the need to place some children after regular work hours, such as weekends, as well as the placement of children in a specialized shelter in Pima County for medically fragile children. The Division has also worked diligently to reduce the number of very young children in group homes. In March 2011, there were 2 young children ages 0 to 6 in group homes. This represents a decrease of 34 children – or 94.4 percent – since March 2006. There are times when placement of young children in group homes is in the best interests of the children; for example, when group placement would allow siblings to stay together or when group placement is considered the least restrictive placement for a child with behavioral issues.

The state requires monthly face-to-face visitation with children in foster care. The current report shows that 82.5 percent of the children in foster care received their visitation during the last month of the reporting period. This compares to 84.9 percent receiving their visit during the last month of the reporting period ending September 2010. The Department recognizes a strong correlation between CPS specialist visits with children and positive outcomes for these children, such as achieving permanency and other indicators of child well-being, and continues to make efforts to improve our rate of visitation.

### **Permanency for Children**

The Division continues to work toward achieving permanency for children placed in out-of-home care. The total number of children achieving permanency through family reunification, adoption or legal guardianship was 3,188 this reporting period, compared to 3,124 the same reporting period last year. As evidenced below, the Division increased adoptions by 14.7 percent over the same period a year ago; however, guardianship decreased by 25.3 percent for the same period. The reunification of children with their parents for the same period a year ago decreased by 0.5 percent.

Compared to the same reporting period last year, in this reporting period:

- 1,769 children exited the system to family reunification, a decrease of 9 children – or 0.5 percent.
- 1,186 children exited to adoption, an increase of 152 children – or 14.7 percent.
- 233 children exited to guardianship, a decrease of 79 children – or 25.3 percent.



**Challenges**

The Division continues to face challenges in its efforts to ensure safety and promote permanency for abused and neglected children. Some of the challenges the Division has faced in meeting these goals are:

- Impact of vacancies in CPS specialist positions.
- Hiring and retaining trained and qualified staff.
- Economic factors which create additional stress upon families and increases factors that place children at risk of maltreatment.
- More complex family situations, as noted by child welfare staff who conduct investigations and work with families.
- Recruitment of foster homes for older youth ages 12 to 18 years old.
- Impact of reductions in behavioral health services for both children and adults.
- Increase in the number of Child Abuse Hotline reports in the urban counties.

Despite these challenges, the Division continues to ensure its child welfare staff has the tools they need to do their jobs effectively, and that both state and federal standards are being implemented. The Division continues to work in partnership with the federal government to meet the federal Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) standards to improve outcomes for the children and families we serve.

## Semi-Annual Comparisons

	Apr 2007 through Sep 2007	Oct 2007 through Mar 2008	Apr 2008 through Sep 2008	Oct 2008 through Mar 2009	Apr 2009 through Sep 2009	Oct 2009 through Mar 2010	Apr 2010 through Sep 2010	Oct 2010 through Mar 2011
Number of Reports Received	18,078	17,628	17,493	17,094	16,134	17,110	17,068	17,586
Number of Reports Substantiated <sup>1</sup>	1,413	1,223	1,331	1,238	1,296	2,122	2,264	1,366
Substantiation Rate	10%	8%	9%	9%	9%	13%	13%	8%
Number of Reports Investigated & Closed	12,722	10,760	10,064	10,686	10,397	8,149	8,403	8,481
Number of Reports Responded To	17,876	17,413	17,310	16,820	15,496	16,602	16,853	17,378
Number of new removals	3,924	3,742	4,546	3,889	3,819	3,936	4,010	3,978
Number of new removals with Voluntary under 18	468	408	370	319	148	125	135	192
Number of Children in Out-of-Home Care on the Last Day of Reporting Period	9,701	9,721	10,303	10,404	10,112	10,207	10,514	10,707
Number of Children in Shelter for More than 21 Days	679	626	585	529	450	423	471	534
Number and Percentage of Children Receiving Visitation In the Last Month of Reporting Period	7,283 (75.1%)	7,376 (75.9%)	7,664 (74.4%)	7,247 (69.7%)	8,201 (81.1%)	8,973 (87.9%)	8,930 (84.9%)	8,838 (82.5%)
Number and Percentage of Children not Receiving Visitation	2,418 (24.9%)	2,345 (24.1%)	2,639 (25.6%)	3,157 (30.3%)	1,911 (18.9%)	1,234 (12.1%)	1,584 (15.1%)	1,869 (17.5%)
Number and Percentage of Parents Receiving Visitation	1,241 (63.5%)	1,025 (62.3%)	1,022 (60.2%)	939 (53.6%)	1,364 (59.6%)	1,578 (64.8%)	1,128 (56.4%)	1,144 (57.3%)
Number of Licensed Foster Homes	3,512	3,592	3,615	3,923	3,954	3,932	3,747	3,595
Number of Foster Home Spaces Available to ACYF	6,639	6,283	7,116	8,293	8,625	8,789	8,693	8,483
Number of New Foster Homes	435	794	162	648	107	560	718	524
Number of Foster Homes Closed	100	445	139	340	76	582	903	676
Number and Percentage of Foster Homes Receiving Visitation In the Last Qtr. Of Reporting Period	1,739 (49.5%)	2,137 (59.5%)	2,412 (66.7%)	2,993 (76.3%)	3,224 (81.6%)	3,240 (82.4%)	3,102 (82.8%)	3,182 (88.5%)
Number and Percentage of Foster Homes not Receiving Visitation	1,773 (50.5%)	1,455 (40.5%)	1,203 (33.3%)	930 (23.7%)	730 (18.4%)	692 (17.6%)	645 (17.2%)	413 (11.5%)
Number of Children Leaving DES Custody	3,824	3,512	3,773	3,590	3,894	3,650	3,559	3,649
Number of Children With a Case Plan Goal of Adoption	2,186	1,954	1,856	2,047	2,505	2,411	2,450	2,426
Number of Children With a Finalized Adoption	773	765	797	764	891	1,034	991	1,186

<sup>1</sup> Since the appeals process delays the substantiation of reports, revisions to the substantiation rate for the prior reporting period will occur with every semi-annual report produced.

**Reports of Abuse & Neglect**

Child abuse and neglect are defined in A.R.S. §8-201 and A.R.S. §13-3623 (A). These definitions provide the major categories in this report.

Between October 1, 2010 and March 31, 2011, there were 17,586 incoming communications to the Child Abuse Hotline that met the criteria for a report of abuse or neglect. Of these, 208 were within the jurisdiction of military or tribal governments and were referred to those jurisdictions. This compares to 17,068 incoming communications received during the last reporting period which met the criteria of a report of abuse or neglect.


Table 1 shows the number of reports received by the Department by category of maltreatment for the last eight reporting periods. The table shows that for the current reporting period 10,960 or 62.3 percent of the 17,586 reports of maltreatment were related to allegations of neglect, 5,755 or 32.7 percent of the reports were related to allegations of physical abuse, 712 or 4.1 percent of the reports were related to allegations of sexual abuse, and 159 or 0.9 percent of the reports were related to allegations of emotional abuse.

**TABLE 1  
REPORTS BY REPORTING PERIOD AND TYPE OF MALTREATMENT**

	Neglect	Physical Abuse	Sexual Abuse	Emotional Abuse	Total
April 2007 – September 2007	10,922 60.4%	5,836 32.3%	1,108 6.1%	212 1.2%	18,078 100.0%
October 2007 – March 2008	10,449 59.2%	6,005 34.1%	980 5.6%	194 1.1%	17,628 100.0%
April 2008 – September 2008	10,539 60.2%	5,737 32.8%	1,028 5.9%	189 1.1%	17,493 100.0%
October 2008 – March 2009	9,845 57.6%	6,064 35.5%	975 5.7%	210 1.2%	17,094 100.0%
April 2009 – September 2009	9,666 59.9%	5,372 33.3%	919 5.7%	177 1.1%	16,134 100.0%
October 2009 – March 2010	10,127 59.2%	5,866 34.3%	930 5.4%	187 1.1%	17,110 100.0%
April 2010 – September 2010	10,561 61.8%	5,515 32.3%	812 4.8%	180 1.1%	17,068 100.0%
October 2010 – March 2011	10,960 62.3%	5,755 32.7%	712 4.1%	159 0.9%	17,586 100.0%


Chart 1 shows that the number of CPS reports received by the CPS Hotline has increased over the past year. Comparing the current reporting period to the prior reporting period, the number of reports received increased by 518 reports or 3.0 percent.

**CHART 1  
REPORTS OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT BY REPORTING PERIOD**



In addition to the 17,586 reports during the current reporting period, the Child Abuse Hotline received 10,129 communications that did not meet the statutory criteria of a report of maltreatment. A random sample of these communications is contained in the chart below.

**CHART 2**  
**SAMPLE OF COMMUNICATIONS TO THE CHILD ABUSE HOTLINE THAT DO NOT MEET THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS OF A REPORT OF ABUSE OR NEGLECT**



N=90

- A = Concern Only/No Allegation of Child Abuse or Neglect**
- B = Out of CPS Jurisdiction**
- C = Call Appropriate for Law Enforcement Jurisdiction<sup>2</sup>**
- D = Non-Caretaker Neglect/Child No Longer at Risk**
- E = Insufficient Information**
- F = Truancy/Custody Issues**
- G = Current Case Questions or Referrals**


All communications that do not meet the statutory requirements for a field investigation of abuse or neglect are reviewed within 48 hours by DES quality assurance staff.

<sup>2</sup> The category “Call Appropriate for Law Enforcement Jurisdiction” refers to a situation where the alleged perpetrator is not a parent or primary caretaker and the allegations, if true, would constitute a crime.

For the current reporting period, the CPS Hotline classified 14.9 percent of the reports received as high risk, 16.7 percent as moderate risk, 47.8 percent as low risk, and 20.6 percent as potential risk.

For the current reporting period, the CPS Hotline classified 0.9 percent of CPS reports as emotional abuse, 62.3 percent as neglect, 32.7 percent as physical abuse, and 4.1 percent as sexual abuse.

**CHART 3  
NUMBER OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY RISK LEVEL**




**TABLE 2  
NUMBER OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY FOR PERIOD OF  
OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	9	11	31	20	71	0.4%
COCHISE	54	65	185	81	385	2.2%
COCONINO	34	47	168	69	318	1.8%
GILA	32	31	76	30	169	1.0%
GRAHAM	13	25	39	21	98	0.6%
GREENLEE	3	3	8	3	17	0.1%
LA PAZ	9	10	18	12	49	0.3%
MARICOPA	1,572	1,703	4,835	2,135	10,245	58.2%
MOHAVE	82	105	255	114	556	3.1%
NAVAJO	44	40	149	39	272	1.6%
PIMA	436	551	1,664	664	3,315	18.8%
PINAL	182	189	527	222	1,120	6.3%
SANTA CRUZ	20	11	33	15	79	0.5%
YAVAPAI	66	86	235	100	487	2.8%
YUMA	61	67	186	91	405	2.3%
STATEWIDE	2,617	2,944	8,409	3,616	17,586	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	14.9%	16.7%	47.8%	20.6%	100.0%	

**TABLE 3**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY FOR PERIOD OF**  
**APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	12	22	36	15	85	0.5%
COCHISE	63	83	170	64	380	2.2%
COCONINO	60	86	118	56	320	1.9%
GILA	13	17	34	9	73	0.4%
GRAHAM	13	32	37	9	91	0.5%
GREENLEE	3	7	10	0	20	0.1%
LA PAZ	11	14	18	12	55	0.3%
MARICOPA	1,598	2,479	4,233	1,649	9,959	58.3%
MOHAVE	103	159	257	79	598	3.5%
NAVAJO	47	56	105	43	251	1.5%
PIMA	424	746	1,405	495	3,070	18.0%
PINAL	150	299	502	218	1,169	6.9%
SANTA CRUZ	21	23	28	15	87	0.5%
YAVAPAI	47	131	265	97	540	3.2%
YUMA	51	79	168	72	370	2.2%
STATEWIDE	2,616	4,233	7,386	2,833	17,068	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	15.3%	24.8%	43.3%	16.6%	100.0%	

**CHART 4**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT**



**TABLE 4**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND COUNTY FOR**  
**PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	EMOTIONAL ABUSE	NEGLECT	PHYSICAL ABUSE	SEXUAL ABUSE	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	47	20	4	71	0.4%
COCHISE	3	235	124	23	385	2.2%
COCONINO	5	185	122	6	318	1.8%
GILA	2	126	38	3	169	1.0%
GRAHAM	0	66	29	3	98	0.6%
GREENLEE	0	11	5	1	17	0.1%
LA PAZ	0	37	10	2	49	0.3%
MARICOPA	91	6,328	3,401	425	10,245	58.2%
MOHAVE	4	370	155	27	556	3.1%
NAVAJO	2	189	73	8	272	1.6%
PIMA	31	2,098	1,076	110	3,315	18.8%
PINAL	14	658	401	47	1,120	6.3%
SANTA CRUZ	0	49	23	7	79	0.5%
YAVAPAI	4	294	161	28	487	2.8%
YUMA	3	267	117	18	405	2.3%
STATEWIDE	159	10,960	5,755	712	17,586	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	0.9%	62.3%	32.7%	4.1%	100.0%	

**TABLE 5**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND COUNTY FOR**  
**PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**


COUNTY	EMOTIONAL ABUSE	NEGLECT	PHYSICAL ABUSE	SEXUAL ABUSE	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	55	26	4	85	0.5%
COCHISE	6	232	125	17	380	2.2%
COCONINO	1	204	100	15	320	1.9%
GILA	0	50	18	5	73	0.4%
GRAHAM	1	59	28	3	91	0.5%
GREENLEE	0	10	8	2	20	0.1%
LA PAZ	1	39	11	4	55	0.3%
MARICOPA	104	6,100	3,263	492	9,959	58.3%
MOHAVE	2	409	163	24	598	3.5%
NAVAJO	3	174	62	12	251	1.5%
PIMA	33	1,961	955	121	3,070	18.0%
PINAL	15	686	405	63	1,169	6.9%
SANTA CRUZ	1	48	30	8	87	0.5%
YAVAPAI	9	319	191	21	540	3.2%
YUMA	4	215	130	21	370	2.2%
STATEWIDE	180	10,561	5,515	812	17,068	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	1.1%	61.8%	32.3%	4.8%	100.0%	



**ASSIGNMENT OF INVESTIGATIONS**

During the reporting period, there were 17,586 calls to the hotline that met the statutory criteria for a report. Of those, 208 reports fell within the jurisdiction of military or tribal governments. This left 17,378 reports that were assigned to be investigated by CPS. The following tables and charts in this section provide statewide and county level information on these reports.

**CHART 5  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND REPORTING PERIOD**




**TABLE 6  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	8	5	25	11	49	0.3%
COCHISE	54	65	184	81	384	2.2%
COCONINO	30	40	143	64	277	1.6%
GILA	28	28	71	30	157	0.9%
GRAHAM	11	25	39	21	96	0.6%
GREENLEE	3	3	8	3	17	0.1%
LA PAZ	4	8	18	7	37	0.2%
MARICOPA	1,563	1,697	4,827	2,129	10,216	58.7%
MOHAVE	79	105	255	112	551	3.2%
NAVAJO	40	37	137	32	246	1.4%
PIMA	432	547	1,656	662	3,297	19.0%
PINAL	166	186	517	217	1,086	6.3%
SANTA CRUZ	18	11	33	15	77	0.4%
YAVAPAI	66	85	234	100	485	2.8%
YUMA	60	67	185	91	403	2.3%
STATEWIDE	2,562	2,909	8,332	3,575	17,378	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	14.7%	16.7%	48.0%	20.6%	100.0%	

**TABLE 7  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY  
FOR PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	9	13	32	10	64	0.4%
COCHISE	62	83	170	63	378	2.2%
COCONINO	46	75	106	47	274	1.6%
GILA	11	17	33	8	69	0.4%
GRAHAM	12	30	36	8	86	0.5%
GREENLEE	3	7	10	0	20	0.1%
LA PAZ	6	12	14	11	43	0.3%
MARICOPA	1,583	2,474	4,225	1,647	9,929	58.9%
MOHAVE	100	157	255	78	590	3.5%
NAVAJO	38	51	93	36	218	1.3%
PIMA	419	745	1,400	491	3,055	18.1%
PINAL	142	295	491	214	1,142	6.8%
SANTA CRUZ	21	23	28	15	87	0.5%
YAVAPAI	46	131	262	95	534	3.2%
YUMA	47	78	168	71	364	2.2%
STATEWIDE	2,545	4,191	7,323	2,794	16,853	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	15.1%	24.9%	43.4%	16.6%	100.0%	

**CHART 6  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT  
AND REPORTING PERIOD**



**TABLE 8**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT**  
**BY COUNTY FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	EMOTIONAL ABUSE	NEGLECT	PHYSICAL ABUSE	SEXUAL ABUSE	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	34	13	2	49	0.3%
COCHISE	3	235	123	23	384	2.2%
COCONINO	3	167	103	4	277	1.6%
GILA	2	118	34	3	157	0.9%
GRAHAM	0	65	28	3	96	0.6%
GREENLEE	0	11	5	1	17	0.1%
LA PAZ	0	26	9	2	37	0.2%
MARICOPA	91	6,306	3,394	425	10,216	58.7%
MOHAVE	4	365	155	27	551	3.2%
NAVAJO	2	168	68	8	246	1.4%
PIMA	30	2,082	1,076	109	3,297	19.0%
PINAL	13	630	396	47	1,086	6.3%
SANTA CRUZ	0	47	23	7	77	0.4%
YAVAPAI	4	293	160	28	485	2.8%
YUMA	3	265	117	18	403	2.3%
STATEWIDE	155	10,812	5,704	707	17,378	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	0.9%	62.2%	32.8%	4.1%	100.0%	

**TABLE 9**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT**  
**BY COUNTY FOR PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	EMOTIONAL ABUSE	NEGLECT	PHYSICAL ABUSE	SEXUAL ABUSE	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	42	21	1	64	0.4%
COCHISE	6	231	124	17	378	2.2%
COCONINO	1	172	87	14	274	1.6%
GILA	0	46	18	5	69	0.4%
GRAHAM	1	57	26	2	86	0.5%
GREENLEE	0	10	8	2	20	0.1%
LA PAZ	0	29	10	4	43	0.3%
MARICOPA	103	6,078	3,257	491	9,929	58.9%
MOHAVE	2	402	162	24	590	3.5%
NAVAJO	3	151	53	11	218	1.3%
PIMA	33	1,951	950	121	3,055	18.1%
PINAL	15	665	399	63	1,142	6.8%
SANTA CRUZ	1	48	30	8	87	0.5%
YAVAPAI	9	314	190	21	534	3.2%
YUMA	4	209	130	21	364	2.2%
STATEWIDE	178	10,405	5,465	805	16,853	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	1.1%	61.7%	32.4%	4.8%	100.0%	

During this reporting period, there were 17,378 reports assigned for investigation. Of these, CPS completed 8,481 investigations or 48.8 percent. Investigations not completed remain open when the investigation is still in process, when the CPS specialist is waiting for the results of a law enforcement investigation and/or receipt of records that impact the investigation finding, or when the investigation has been completed but is awaiting supervisory review and approval.


**INVESTIGATIONS OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT**

**TABLE 10  
NUMBER OF REPORTS NOT RESPONDED TO BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY FOR  
PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
COCHISE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
COCONINO	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GILA	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GRAHAM	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GREENLEE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
MOHAVE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
NAVAJO	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
PIMA	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
PINAL	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
SANTA CRUZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
YAVAPAI	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
YUMA	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STATEWIDE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
% OF TOTAL	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

By statute, a random sample of reports not responded to for the period is required. In addition, short descriptions of these reports are also required. As there were no reports without a response for this reporting period, the sample of reports has been omitted.

**CHART 7**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND REPORTING PERIOD FOR REPORTS STILL OPEN FOR INVESTIGATION**




**TABLE 11**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY FOR REPORTS STILL OPEN FOR INVESTIGATION FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	7	3	17	8	35	0.4%
COCHISE	23	29	93	42	187	2.1%
COCONINO	9	10	42	18	79	0.9%
GILA	17	11	42	19	89	1.0%
GRAHAM	7	22	35	18	82	0.9%
GREENLEE	2	3	8	3	16	0.2%
LA PAZ	2	8	18	7	35	0.4%
MARICOPA	542	794	2,534	1,098	4,968	55.8%
MOHAVE	44	68	165	82	359	4.0%
NAVAJO	28	25	117	24	194	2.2%
PIMA	175	258	955	396	1,784	20.1%
PINAL	67	109	312	147	635	7.1%
SANTA CRUZ	15	7	27	10	59	0.7%
YAVAPAI	19	27	105	45	196	2.2%
YUMA	23	25	81	50	179	2.0%
STATEWIDE	980	1,399	4,551	1,967	8,897	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	11.0%	15.7%	51.2%	22.1%	100.0%	

**TABLE 12**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY FOR REPORTS STILL OPEN FOR INVESTIGATION FOR PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	3	10	15	2	30	0.8%
COCHISE	18	26	72	17	133	3.4%
COCONINO	2	1	4	1	8	0.2%
GILA	0	1	1	0	2	0.1%
GRAHAM	8	9	12	4	33	0.9%
GREENLEE	1	4	5	0	10	0.3%
LA PAZ	5	12	13	10	40	1.0%
MARICOPA	189	418	871	355	1,833	47.3%
MOHAVE	18	33	84	31	166	4.3%
NAVAJO	18	32	72	27	149	3.9%
PIMA	86	189	439	159	873	22.5%
PINAL	41	94	182	60	377	9.7%
SANTA CRUZ	12	18	24	9	63	1.6%
YAVAPAI	3	10	27	17	57	1.5%
YUMA	6	19	51	20	96	2.5%
STATEWIDE	410	876	1,872	712	3,870	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	10.6%	22.6%	48.4%	18.4%	100.0%	

**CHART 8**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT FOR REPORTS STILL OPEN FOR INVESTIGATION**




**TABLE 13**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND COUNTY FOR REPORTS**  
**STILL OPEN FOR INVESTIGATION FOR PERIOD OF**  
**OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	EMOTIONAL ABUSE	NEGLECT	PHYSICAL ABUSE	SEXUAL ABUSE	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	24	9	2	35	0.4%
COCHISE	3	108	60	16	187	2.1%
COCONINO	0	52	26	1	79	0.9%
GILA	0	65	22	2	89	1.0%
GRAHAM	0	54	27	1	82	0.9%
GREENLEE	0	11	4	1	16	0.2%
LA PAZ	0	24	9	2	35	0.4%
MARICOPA	49	2,880	1,796	243	4,969	55.8%
MOHAVE	3	238	102	16	359	4.0%
NAVAJO	1	131	56	6	194	2.2%
PIMA	18	1,091	624	51	1,784	20.1%
PINAL	7	355	251	22	635	7.1%
SANTA CRUZ	0	34	20	5	59	0.7%
YAVAPAI	1	111	70	14	196	2.2%
YUMA	2	114	54	9	179	2.0%
STATEWIDE	84	5,292	3,130	391	8,897	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	0.9%	59.5%	35.2%	4.4%	100.0%	

**TABLE 14**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND COUNTY FOR REPORTS**  
**STILL OPEN FOR INVESTIGATION FOR PERIOD OF**  
**APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	EMOTIONAL ABUSE	NEGLECT	PHYSICAL ABUSE	SEXUAL ABUSE	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	21	9	0	30	0.8%
COCHISE	1	84	43	5	133	3.4%
COCONINO	0	7	0	1	8	0.2%
GILA	0	1	1	0	2	0.1%
GRAHAM	1	23	9	0	33	0.8%
GREENLEE	0	5	4	1	10	0.3%
LA PAZ	0	26	10	4	40	1.0%
MARICOPA	17	1,040	670	106	1,833	47.3%
MOHAVE	0	111	48	7	166	4.3%
NAVAJO	3	101	39	6	149	3.9%
PIMA	8	529	310	26	873	22.6%
PINAL	5	197	150	25	377	9.7%
SANTA CRUZ	1	37	20	5	63	1.6%
YAVAPAI	1	30	24	2	57	1.5%
YUMA	0	50	38	8	96	2.5%
STATEWIDE	37	2,262	1,375	196	3,870	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	1.0%	58.4%	35.5%	5.1%	100.0%	

**CHART 9  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION WHERE A REMOVAL OCCURRED**





**TABLE 15**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY COUNTY WHERE A**  
**REMOVAL OCCURRED FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED	NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED WITH A REMOVAL	% OF REPORTS WHERE A CHILD WAS PLACED IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE
APACHE	49	9	18.4%
COCHISE	384	38	9.9%
COCONINO	277	19	6.9%
GILA	157	21	13.4%
GRAHAM	96	8	8.3%
GREENLEE	17	1	5.9%
LA PAZ	37	6	16.2%
MARICOPA	10,216	1,043	10.2%
MOHAVE	551	58	10.5%
NAVAJO	246	25	10.2%
PIMA	3,297	480	14.6%
PINAL	1,086	100	9.2%
SANTA CRUZ	77	5	6.5%
YAVAPAI	485	50	10.3%
YUMA	403	19	4.7%
STATEWIDE	17,379	1,882	10.8%

**TABLE 16**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY COUNTY WHERE A**  
**REMOVAL OCCURRED FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED	NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED WITH A REMOVAL	% OF REPORTS WHERE A CHILD WAS PLACED IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE
APACHE	64	7	10.9%
COCHISE	378	35	9.3%
COCONINO	274	32	11.7%
GILA	69	9	13.0%
GRAHAM	86	4	4.7%
GREENLEE	20	1	5.0%
LA PAZ	43	5	11.6%
MARICOPA	9,929	1,048	10.6%
MOHAVE	590	65	11.0%
NAVAJO	218	23	10.6%
PIMA	3,055	527	17.3%
PINAL	1,142	115	10.1%
SANTA CRUZ	87	10	11.5%
YAVAPAI	534	58	10.9%
YUMA	364	20	5.5%
STATEWIDE	16,853	1,959	11.6%


**COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS**

Substantiated reports are reports where the Department has determined that at least one of the allegations in the report of abuse and neglect is true. The number of reports that are considered substantiated are a subset of the total number of reports that were received, investigated, and closed during the reporting period.


The preliminary number of CPS reports that are substantiated for this reporting period is 1,366. For the prior reporting period, the number of CPS reports that were assigned for investigation that resulted in substantiated findings was revised from 1,500 to 2,264 to reflect subsequent decisions based on parents’ rights to due process. For the current reporting period, 38.8 percent of substantiated investigative findings were classified as high risk, 23.4 percent as moderate risk, 28.6 percent as low risk, and 9.2 percent as potential risk. Prior to October 1, 2009 potential risk reports were not substantiated by CPS. For the prior reporting period, 37.5 percent of substantiated investigative findings were classified as high risk, 27.7 percent as moderate risk, 28.7 percent as low risk, and 6.1 percent as potential risk.

- There were 17,378 reports received during the current reporting period that were subject to substantiation. This results in a preliminary substantiation rate of 8 percent for the current reporting period.
- There were 16,853 reports received during the prior reporting period that were subject to substantiation. This results in a 13 percent substantiation rate for the prior reporting period.

**CHART 10  
SUBSTANTIATION RATE BY REPORTING PERIOD**



**CHART 11  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND REPORTING PERIOD THAT RESULTED IN PROPOSED SUBSTANTIATION**




**TABLE 17  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN PROPOSED SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	0	1	0	1	0.2%
COCHISE	0	3	0	0	3	0.7%
COCONINO	2	2	2	0	6	1.4%
GILA	2	0	2	0	4	0.9%
GRAHAM	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GREENLEE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	134	62	89	44	329	74.6%
MOHAVE	1	3	4	1	9	2.0%
NAVAJO	0	0	1	0	1	0.2%
PIMA	8	7	18	3	36	8.2%
PINAL	17	2	12	0	31	7.0%
SANTA CRUZ	0	1	0	0	1	0.2%
YAVAPAI	4	1	4	1	10	2.3%
YUMA	3	3	3	1	10	2.3%
STATEWIDE	171	84	136	50	441	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	38.8%	19.1%	30.8%	11.3%	100.0%	

**TABLE 18**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY**  
**THAT RESULTED IN PROPOSED SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF**  
**APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
COCHISE	1	1	0	1	3	1.5%
COCONINO	0	1	0	0	1	0.5%
GILA	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GRAHAM	0	0	1	0	1	0.5%
GREENLEE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	52	33	34	28	147	71.6%
MOHAVE	5	1	0	0	6	2.9%
NAVAJO	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
PIMA	1	6	8	0	15	7.3%
PINAL	13	5	6	3	27	13.2%
SANTA CRUZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
YAVAPAI	1	2	1	0	4	2.0%
YUMA	0	1	0	0	1	0.5%
STATEWIDE	73	50	50	32	205	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	35.6%	24.4%	24.4%	15.6%	100.0%	

**CHART 12**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT**  
**THAT RESULTED IN PROPOSED SUBSTANTIATION**




**TABLE 19**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT**  
**BY COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN PROPOSED SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF**  
**OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	EMOTIONAL ABUSE	NEGLECT	PHYSICAL ABUSE	SEXUAL ABUSE	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	1	0	0	1	0.2%
COCHISE	0	3	0	0	3	0.7%
COCONINO	0	4	1	1	6	1.4%
GILA	0	4	0	0	4	0.9%
GRAHAM	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GREENLEE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	1	281	38	9	329	74.6%
MOHAVE	0	7	2	0	9	2.0%
NAVAJO	0	1	0	0	1	0.2%
PIMA	0	30	6	0	36	8.2%
PINAL	0	23	6	2	31	7.0%
SANTA CRUZ	0	1	0	0	1	0.2%
YAVAPAI	0	9	0	1	10	2.3%
YUMA	0	7	3	0	10	2.3%
STATEWIDE	1	371	56	13	441	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	0.2%	84.1%	12.7%	3.0%	100.0%	

**TABLE 20**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT**  
**BY COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN PROPOSED SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF**  
**APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	EMOTIONAL ABUSE	NEGLECT	PHYSICAL ABUSE	SEXUAL ABUSE	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
COCHISE	0	3	0	0	3	1.5%
COCONINO	0	1	0	0	1	0.5%
GILA	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GRAHAM	0	1	0	0	1	0.5%
GREENLEE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	0	121	19	7	147	71.6%
MOHAVE	0	6	0	0	6	2.9%
NAVAJO	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
PIMA	0	11	4	0	15	7.3%
PINAL	0	23	3	1	27	13.2%
SANTA CRUZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
YAVAPAI	0	4	0	0	4	2.0%
YUMA	0	1	0	0	1	0.5%
STATEWIDE	0	171	26	8	205	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	0.0%	83.4%	12.7%	3.9%	100.0%	

**CHART 13  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND  
REPORTING PERIOD THAT RESULTED IN  
SUBSTANTIATION**




**TABLE 21  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY  
THAT RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF  
OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	1	0	2	0	3	0.2%
COCHISE	11	5	4	0	20	1.5%
COCONINO	2	6	9	2	19	1.4%
GILA	0	0	1	0	1	0.1%
GRAHAM	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%
GREENLEE	1	0	0	0	1	0.1%
LA PAZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	324	161	215	89	789	56.7%
MOHAVE	15	6	9	1	31	2.3%
NAVAJO	5	2	0	0	7	0.5%
PIMA	122	100	117	26	365	26.6%
PINAL	24	16	10	4	54	4.0%
SANTA CRUZ	0	3	1	0	4	0.3%
YAVAPAI	15	16	17	2	50	3.7%
YUMA	11	3	5	2	21	1.5%
STATEWIDE	521	319	390	126	1,366	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	38.8%	23.4%	28.6%	9.2%	100.0%	

**TABLE 22  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY  
THAT RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF  
APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	1	0	0	0	1	<0.1%
COCHISE	15	8	7	0	30	1.3%
COCONINO	11	15	11	0	37	1.6%
GILA	2	2	4	0	8	0.4%
GRAHAM	0	0	2	0	2	0.1%
GREENLEE	1	0	0	0	1	<0.1%
LA PAZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	531	304	340	106	1,281	56.7%
MOHAVE	35	20	24	0	79	3.5%
NAVAJO	4	5	5	1	15	0.7%
PIMA	164	193	193	19	569	25.1%
PINAL	37	39	20	7	103	4.6%
SANTA CRUZ	3	0	0	0	3	0.1%
YAVAPAI	26	32	31	3	92	4.1%
YUMA	20	9	11	3	43	1.9%
STATEWIDE	850	627	648	139	2,264	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	37.5%	27.7%	28.7%	6.1%	100.0%	

**CHART 14  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT  
THAT RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIATION**



**TABLE 23**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT**  
**BY COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF**  
**OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	EMOTIONAL ABUSE	NEGLECT	PHYSICAL ABUSE	SEXUAL ABUSE	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	3	0	0	3	0.2%
COCHISE	0	16	4	0	20	1.5%
COCONINO	0	15	4	0	19	1.4%
GILA	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%
GRAHAM	0	1	0	0	1	0.1%
GREENLEE	0	0	1	0	1	0.1%
LA PAZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	2	631	139	17	789	57.7%
MOHAVE	0	29	2	0	31	2.3%
NAVAJO	0	6	1	0	7	0.5%
PIMA	0	285	71	9	365	26.6%
PINAL	0	39	14	1	54	4.0%
SANTA CRUZ	0	4	0	0	4	0.3%
YAVAPAI	1	34	12	3	50	3.7%
YUMA	0	16	4	1	21	1.5%
STATEWIDE	3	1,080	252	31	1,366	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	0.2%	79.0%	18.5%	2.3%	100.0%	


**TABLE 24**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT**  
**BY COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF**  
**APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	EMOTIONAL ABUSE	NEGLECT	PHYSICAL ABUSE	SEXUAL ABUSE	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	0	1	0	1	<0.1%
COCHISE	0	18	9	3	30	1.3%
COCONINO	0	27	7	3	37	1.6%
GILA	0	6	2	0	8	0.4%
GRAHAM	0	0	2	0	2	0.1%
GREENLEE	0	1	0	0	1	<0.1%
LA PAZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	0	998	233	50	1,281	56.6%
MOHAVE	0	62	15	2	79	3.5%
NAVAJO	0	9	5	1	15	0.7%
PIMA	2	454	98	15	569	25.1%
PINAL	1	75	21	6	103	4.6%
SANTA CRUZ	0	1	1	1	3	0.1%
YAVAPAI	0	70	17	5	92	4.1%
YUMA	0	36	7	0	43	1.9%
STATEWIDE	3	1,757	418	86	2,264	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	0.1%	77.6%	18.5%	3.8%	100.0%	



The preliminary number of CPS investigations that resulted in an unsubstantiated finding for this reporting period was 6,674. For the prior reporting period, the number of CPS reports that were unsubstantiated was revised from 6,480 to 10,512 to reflect updated information in the CHILDS case management information system. For the prior reporting period, 11.7 percent of unsubstantiated reports were classified as high risk, 25.3 percent as moderate risk, 45.1 percent as low risk, and 17.9 percent as potential risk. Just over one percent of these unsubstantiated reports related to emotional abuse, 59.2 percent to neglect, 34.6 percent to physical abuse, and 4.9 percent to sexual abuse.

**CHART 15  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND REPORTING PERIOD THAT RESULTED IN UNSUBSTANTIATION**




**TABLE 25  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN UNSUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	2	5	3	10	0.2%
COCHISE	20	28	87	39	174	2.6%
COCONINO	17	22	90	44	173	2.6%
GILA	9	17	26	11	63	0.9%
GRAHAM	4	2	4	3	13	0.2%
GREENLEE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	2	0	0	0	2	<0.1%
MARICOPA	563	680	1,989	898	4,130	61.8%
MOHAVE	19	28	77	28	152	2.3%
NAVAJO	7	10	19	8	44	0.7%
PIMA	127	182	566	237	1,112	16.7%
PINAL	58	59	183	66	366	5.5%
SANTA CRUZ	3	0	5	5	13	0.2%
YAVAPAI	28	41	108	52	229	3.4%
YUMA	23	36	96	38	193	2.9%
STATEWIDE	880	1,107	3,255	1,432	6,674	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	13.2%	16.6%	48.7%	21.5%	100.0%	

**TABLE 26  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY  
THAT RESULTED IN UNSUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF  
APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	POTENTIAL	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	5	4	16	8	33	0.3%
COCHISE	28	49	92	43	212	2.0%
COCONINO	33	58	91	45	227	2.2%
GILA	9	15	28	8	60	0.6%
GRAHAM	5	21	20	4	50	0.5%
GREENLEE	1	3	5	0	9	0.1%
LA PAZ	1	0	1	1	3	<0.1%
MARICOPA	820	1,726	2,976	1,142	6,664	63.4%
MOHAVE	43	104	145	47	339	3.2%
NAVAJO	16	14	16	8	54	0.5%
PIMA	173	361	762	301	1,597	15.2%
PINAL	52	161	282	144	639	6.1%
SANTA CRUZ	7	5	4	5	21	0.2%
YAVAPAI	16	88	203	74	381	3.6%
YUMA	21	49	105	48	223	2.1%
STATEWIDE	1,230	2,658	4,746	1,878	10,512	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	11.7%	25.3%	45.1%	17.9%	100.0%	

**CHART 16  
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT  
THAT RESULTED IN UNSUBSTANTIATION BY REPORTING PERIOD**



**TABLE 27**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT**  
**BY COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN UNSUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF**  
**OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	EMOTIONAL ABUSE	NEGLECT	PHYSICAL ABUSE	SEXUAL ABUSE	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	6	4	0	10	0.2%
COCHISE	0	108	59	7	174	2.6%
COCONINO	3	96	72	2	173	2.6%
GILA	2	48	12	1	63	0.9%
GRAHAM	0	10	1	2	13	0.2%
GREENLEE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	0	2	0	0	2	<0.1%
MARICOPA	39	2,514	1,421	156	4,130	61.8%
MOHAVE	1	91	49	11	152	2.3%
NAVAJO	1	30	11	2	44	0.7%
PIMA	12	676	375	49	1,112	16.7%
PINAL	6	213	125	22	366	5.5%
SANTA CRUZ	0	8	3	2	13	0.2%
YAVAPAI	2	139	78	10	229	3.4%
YUMA	1	128	56	8	193	2.9%
STATEWIDE	67	4,069	2,266	272	6,674	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	1.0%	60.9%	34.0%	4.1%	100.0%	

**TABLE 28**  
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT**  
**BY COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN UNSUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF**  
**APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	EMOTIONAL ABUSE	NEGLECT	PHYSICAL ABUSE	SEXUAL ABUSE	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	21	11	1	33	0.3%
COCHISE	5	127	71	9	212	2.0%
COCONINO	1	138	78	10	227	2.2%
GILA	0	39	16	5	60	0.6%
GRAHAM	0	34	14	2	50	0.5%
GREENLEE	0	4	4	1	9	0.1%
LA PAZ	0	3	0	0	3	<0.1%
MARICOPA	85	3,925	2,327	327	6,664	63.4%
MOHAVE	2	224	98	15	339	3.2%
NAVAJO	0	41	9	4	54	0.5%
PIMA	24	954	539	80	1,597	15.2%
PINAL	10	376	223	30	639	6.1%
SANTA CRUZ	0	10	9	2	21	0.2%
YAVAPAI	8	210	149	14	381	3.6%
YUMA	4	122	84	13	223	2.1%
STATEWIDE	139	6,228	3,632	513	10,512	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	1.3%	59.2%	34.6%	4.9%	100.0%	


**SAFE HAVEN INFANTS**

There was one newborn infant delivered to Safe Haven providers during the October 2010 – March 2011 reporting period. This compares to no infants being delivered to Safe Haven providers during the April 2010 – September 2010 reporting period.

**CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE**

During this reporting period, 3,978 children entered care as compared to 4,010 children for the April 2010 through September 2010 reporting period. Chart 17 displays children entering out-of-home care by reporting period.

**CHART 17  
TOTAL CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY REPORTING PERIOD**



The number of children entering out-of-home placement through voluntary foster care agreements for this reporting period was 192, which represents 4.8 percent of the children entering care this reporting period. Table 29 shows the number of children entering out-of-home care through voluntary placements for the current reporting period by county. Voluntary foster care may be provided when the parents or legal guardians of a child have requested such assistance and have signed a legally binding written agreement, not to exceed 90 days, for the temporary placement of the child in foster care while risk factors are addressed to enable the child to live safely at home. A voluntary foster care agreement may be utilized only when the circumstances that brought the child into foster care are likely to be remedied within the 90 day period of time. A.R.S. § 8-806 authorizes the Department to provide voluntary foster care placement for children for a period not to exceed 90 days and no more than twice within 24 consecutive months.

**TABLE 29**  
**NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY COUNTY WHO ARE**  
**VOLUNTARY PLACEMENTS FOR CHILDREN UNDER THE AGE OF EIGHTEEN FOR THE**  
**PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	NUMBER OF CHILDREN REMOVED	% OF TOTAL REMOVALS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE UNDER THE AGE OF EIGHTEEN WHO ARE VOLUNTARY PLACEMENTS	% OF CHILDREN REMOVED WHO ARE VOLUNTARY PLACEMENTS
APACHE	26	0.7%	0	0.0%
COCHISE	82	2.1%	5	2.6%
COCONINO	55	1.4%	7	3.7%
GILA	40	1.0%	3	1.6%
GRAHAM	27	0.7%	0	0.0%
GREENLEE	4	0.1%	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	12	0.3%	2	1.0%
MARICOPA	2,238	56.2%	74	38.5%
MOHAVE	124	3.1%	7	3.7%
NAVAJO	69	1.7%	4	2.1%
PIMA	923	23.2%	59	30.7%
PINAL	214	5.4%	13	6.8%
SANTA CRUZ	14	0.4%	1	0.5%
YAVAPAI	113	2.8%	11	5.7%
YUMA	37	0.9%	6	3.1%
STATEWIDE	3,978	100.0%	192	100.0%

**TABLE 30**  
**NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY COUNTY WHO ARE**  
**VOLUNTARY PLACEMENTS FOR CHILDREN UNDER THE AGE OF EIGHTEEN FOR THE**  
**PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	NUMBER OF CHILDREN REMOVED	% OF TOTAL REMOVALS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE UNDER THE AGE OF EIGHTEEN WHO ARE VOLUNTARY PLACEMENTS	% OF CHILDREN REMOVED WHO ARE VOLUNTARY PLACEMENTS
APACHE	12	0.3%	2	1.5%
COCHISE	67	1.7%	9	6.7%
COCONINO	64	1.6%	11	8.2%
GILA	19	0.5%	2	1.5%
GRAHAM	9	0.2%	0	0.0%
GREENLEE	1	<0.1%	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	5	0.1%	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	2,203	54.8%	62	45.8%
MOHAVE	135	3.4%	0	0.0%
NAVAJO	60	1.5%	4	3.0%
PIMA	1,002	25.0%	28	20.7%
PINAL	267	6.7%	4	3.0%
SANTA CRUZ	12	0.3%	1	0.7%
YAVAPAI	115	2.9%	11	8.2%
YUMA	39	1.0%	1	0.7%
STATEWIDE	4,010	100.0%	135	100.0%


**TABLE 31**  
**NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY COUNTY FOR THE**  
**PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	NUMBER OF CHILDREN REMOVED	% OF TOTAL REMOVALS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A PRIOR REMOVAL IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS	% OF CHILDREN WITH A PRIOR REMOVAL IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A REMOVAL IN THE PRIOR 12 TO 24 MONTHS	% OF CHILDREN WITH A PRIOR REMOVAL IN THE PRIOR 12 TO 24 MONTHS
APACHE	26	0.7%	2	7.7%	0	0.0%
COCHISE	82	2.1%	3	3.7%	3	3.7%
COCONINO	55	1.4%	5	9.1%	0	0.0%
GILA	40	1.0%	4	10.0%	1	2.5%
GRAHAM	27	0.7%	0	0.0%	2	7.4%
GREENLEE	4	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	12	0.3%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	2,238	56.2%	214	9.6%	93	4.2%
MOHAVE	124	3.1%	4	3.2%	0	0.0%
NAVAJO	69	1.7%	10	14.5%	0	0.0%
PIMA	923	23.2%	95	10.3%	52	5.6%
PINAL	214	5.4%	21	9.8%	8	3.7%
SANTA CRUZ	14	0.4%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%
YAVAPAI	113	2.8%	7	6.2%	10	8.8%
YUMA	37	0.9%	0	0.0%	2	5.4%
STATEWIDE	3,978	100.0%	367	9.2%	171	4.3%

**TABLE 32**  
**NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY COUNTY FOR THE**  
**PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2010 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010**

COUNTY	NUMBER OF CHILDREN REMOVED	% OF TOTAL REMOVALS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A PRIOR REMOVAL IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS	% OF CHILDREN WITH A PRIOR REMOVAL IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS	NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A REMOVAL IN THE PRIOR 12 TO 24 MONTHS	% OF CHILDREN WITH A PRIOR REMOVAL IN THE PRIOR 12 TO 24 MONTHS
APACHE	12	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
COCHISE	67	1.7%	5	7.5%	0	0.0%
COCONINO	64	1.6%	2	3.1%	0	0.0%
GILA	19	0.5%	3	15.8%	8	42.1%
GRAHAM	9	0.2%	3	33.3%	0	0.0%
GREENLEE	1	<0.1%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	5	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	2,203	54.8%	178	8.1%	47	2.1%
MOHAVE	135	3.4%	8	5.9%	4	3.0%
NAVAJO	60	1.5%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%
PIMA	1,002	25.0%	114	11.4%	32	3.2%
PINAL	267	6.7%	15	5.6%	11	4.1%
SANTA CRUZ	12	0.3%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%
YAVAPAI	115	2.9%	11	9.6%	1	0.9%
YUMA	39	1.0%	3	7.7%	0	0.0%
STATEWIDE	4,010	100.0%	345	8.6%	103	2.6%

**CHART 18**  
**NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY REPORTING PERIOD**



**CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE**

On March 31, 2011, there were 10,707 children in out-of-home care as compared to 10,514 children on September 30, 2010, an increase of 193 children. During this reporting period, 8,759 children or 81.9 percent were placed in family settings either with relatives or in foster homes. This compares to 8,628 or 82.1 percent of the children in the prior reporting period.

**CHART 19  
NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE ON THE LAST DAY OF THE REPORTING PERIOD BY REPORTING PERIOD**





Chart 20 displays the decrease in the number of young children ages 0-6 placed in group homes. Comparing June 2006 to March 2011, the number of young children in group homes decreased by 16 children or 88.9 percent.


Chart 21 displays the decrease in the number of young children ages 0-3 placed in shelter care. Comparing March 2006 to March 2011, the number of young children in shelters decreased by 15 children or 48.4 percent. Chart 22 shows that the average length of time in shelter care has decreased slightly; comparing March 2010 to March 2011, the average length of stay in shelter decreased from 111.7 to 97.9 days, an decrease of 13.8 days or 12.4 percent.



**CHART 20**  
**THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN GROUP HOMES AGES 0 TO 6<sup>3</sup>**




**CHART 21**  
**THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN SHELTER CARE AGES 0 TO 3**




<sup>3</sup> Excludes infants placed with their mothers and children placed in foster home group models.

**CHART 22**  
**THE AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY IN A SHELTER PLACEMENT FOR CHILDREN AGES 0 TO 3 IN A SHELTER PLACEMENT ON THE LAST DAY OF THE REPORTING PERIOD**




The majority of children in out-of-home care fall within the 1-5 age range (34.3 percent) and the 13-17 age range (25.2 percent). The majority of children in out-of-home care are either Caucasian (38.9 percent) or Hispanic (36.3 percent), followed by African American at 14.2 percent.

**CHART 23**  
**THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY AGE**




**CHART 24**  
**THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY ETHNICITY**




For 53.4 percent of the children in out-of-home care, family reunification remains the primary case plan goal. This is followed by: adoption, 22.7 percent; independent living, 10.7 percent; long-term foster care, 2.8 percent; live with other relative, 1.6 percent; and, guardianship at 0.4 percent. For the remaining 8.4 percent of the children, the case plan goal is in the process of development.

**CHART 25**  
**THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY CASE PLAN GOAL**



**CHART 26**  
**THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY PLACEMENT TYPE**




**TABLE 33  
THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY PLACEMENT TYPE AND AGE**

	RELATIVE	FAMILY FOSTER	GROUP HOME	RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT <sup>4</sup>	INDEPENDENT LIVING	RUNAWAY	TRIAL HOME VISIT	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
<b>UNDER 1</b>	285	494	0	4	0	0	2	785	7.3%
<b>1</b>	420	519	0	5	0	2	0	946	8.7%
<b>2</b>	360	420	2	7	0	0	0	789	7.3%
<b>3</b>	340	387	1	2	0	2	1	733	6.9%
<b>4</b>	309	336	1	10	0	1	2	659	6.2%
<b>5</b>	256	287	2	6	0	0	1	552	5.2%
<b>6</b>	249	266	2	7	0	0	0	524	4.9%
<b>7</b>	209	256	6	7	0	2	0	480	4.5%
<b>8</b>	194	233	5	6	0	0	2	440	4.1%
<b>9</b>	172	220	11	5	0	0	0	408	3.8%
<b>10</b>	155	176	22	14	0	1	0	368	3.4%
<b>11</b>	131	183	12	12	0	1	0	339	3.2%
<b>12</b>	138	190	36	15	0	1	0	380	3.6%
<b>13</b>	116	187	59	21	0	4	1	388	3.6%
<b>14</b>	114	197	108	47	0	22	1	489	4.6%
<b>15</b>	94	204	137	58	0	31	2	526	4.9%
<b>16</b>	90	197	190	88	0	64	2	631	5.9%
<b>17</b>	83	181	216	98	5	79	3	665	6.2%
<b>18 AND OLDER</b>	23	88	62	103	297	29	3	605	5.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	3,738	5,021	872	515	302	239	20	10,707	100.0%
<b>% OF TOTAL</b>	34.9%	47.0%	8.1%	4.8%	2.8%	2.2%	0.2%	100.0%	

<sup>4</sup> This category includes shelter, detention, and hospital placement types.


During the reporting period 534 children remained in a shelter or receiving home for more than 21 consecutive days. Chart 27 displays children in shelter greater than 21 days for the period of October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011 and shows that 464 or 86.9 percent of the children were six years of age or older. In addition, 15 or 2.8 percent of the children were under one year old.

**CHART 27**  
**NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN IN SHELTER OR RECEIVING HOMES FOR MORE THAN 21 CONSECUTIVE DAYS BY AGE OF CHILD<sup>5</sup>**



<sup>5</sup> The chart displays children who spent more than 21 days in shelter during the period. This number differs from the other out-of-home charts as they display children in out-of-home care on the last day of the reporting period.

**CHART 28**  
**THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY LENGTH OF TIME IN CARE**




For the children in out-of-home care on March 31, 2011 the average number of placements was 2.7, the median number of placements was 2.0, and the range for the number of placements was 1 to 41 placements during their current removal episode.

**TABLE 34**  
**PLACEMENT INFORMATION FOR CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE ON MARCH 31, 2011**

	Placements
<b>Average</b>	2.7
<b>Median</b>	2.0
<b>Range Minimum</b>	1
<b>Range Maximum</b>	41 <sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Some children are so damaged by the severity of the abuse they have suffered that they become unable to form meaningful relationships or to respond to services. These children tend to go through multiple placements with numerous individuals and agencies.

**CHART 29  
CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY LEGAL STATUS**




At the end of the reporting period there were 10,707 children in out-of-home care who required visitation. Of these children, visitation was accurately documented in the automated system for 8,838 children. As displayed in Chart 30, during this reporting period, the percent of children receiving required visits by their CPS specialists decreased by 2.4 percent to 82.5 percent.

The required child visitation is performed monthly by DES CPS specialists, contracted case managers, and/or other professionals as approved by a supervisor or as established by policy. The Department has verified that more children received the required visitation than is indicated in Chart 30. This information is clearly documented in the automated case notes. However, the Department is unable to compile and tabulate data based solely upon case note text. The Department continues to issue instructions to all direct service staff regarding the system requirements for capturing all visitations. A child was deemed to have received the required visitation if the child received the visitation during the last month of the reporting period.




**CHART 30**  
**THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN WHO RECEIVED THE REQUIRED VISITATION**



According to Administration for Children, Youth and Families policy, CPS specialists shall have face-to-face contact with all parents at least once a month, including any alleged parents and parents residing outside of the child’s home where the case plan goal is family reunification or remain with family. During the reporting period, there were 1,996 parents who had a child with the case plan goal of return home. Of those parents requiring visitation, 1,144 or 57.3 percent received the required visitation. The 57.3 percent visitation rate does not reflect attempted visitation where contact with the parent(s) did not take place.

**CHART 31**  
**NUMBER OF CHILDREN RECEIVING AND NOT RECEIVING VISITATION BY REPORTING PERIOD**




**FOSTER HOMES**

As of March 31, 2011, there were 3,595<sup>7</sup> foster homes licensed for a total capacity of 8,981 spaces. Of these, 1,940 are reported by contractors to be unavailable for placements. An additional 2,363 were unused spaces within these foster homes. Of the unused spaces, a match between the available spaces and children’s needs was not possible.

Licensed foster homes include family foster homes, professional family foster homes, respite foster homes, receiving foster homes, and developmentally disabled homes with DCYF children placed in them. Foster home licenses specify the age range, gender and maximum number of children that can be placed in a home. Foster parents, in consultation with the licensing worker, decide the type of physical, behavioral, and psychological needs of children they can effectively parent based upon their own skill level, experiences, and desires.

During the reporting period, 524 new homes were licensed to provide foster care and 676 homes left the system. This compares to 718 new homes being licensed and 903 homes leaving the system for the period covering April 2010 through September 2010. The chart below gives the reasons for foster home closures for the period of October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011.

**CHART 32  
REASON FOR FOSTER HOME CLOSURE FOR THE PERIOD OF  
OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**




N=676

<sup>7</sup> The number of homes cited in this report differs from the official number cited by the Office of Licensing, Certification & Regulation (OLCR) due to the fact that the Division for Children, Youth & Families utilizes foster homes that are licensed for developmental disabilities, licensed by the tribes, etc.

During the reporting period, there were 3,595 foster homes that required visitation. Of the 3,595 foster homes requiring visitation, 3,182 foster homes received their required visitation. This compares to 3,102 or 82.8 percent of the foster homes that received the required visitation for the period April 2010 through September 2010. The Department believes that more foster homes received the required visitation than is indicated in the chart below. The underreporting of foster home visitation is attributable to the lack of automation being used in reporting the foster home visitation process. The Department recognizes this as a problem and is working to correct this issue.

**CHART 33**  
**THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF FOSTER HOMES WHO RECEIVED THE REQUIRED VISITATION\***



\*Required visitations to foster homes, for license monitoring purposes, are performed by licensing case managers.


**CHILDREN EXITING OUT-OF HOME CARE**

During the reporting period, 3,649 children left the custody of the Department. This compares to 3,559 children exiting care during the prior reporting period. The comparison between the two reporting periods shows that 2.5 percent more children left care this reporting period for an increase of 90 children exiting care.

**TABLE 35  
CHILDREN EXITING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY PERIOD**

REPORTING PERIOD	NUMBER OF CHILDREN DISCHARGED	% CHANGE OVER PRIOR PERIOD
APRIL 2007 – SEPTEMBER 2007	3,824	+7.6%
OCTOBER 2007 – MARCH 2008	3,512	-8.2%
APRIL 2008 – SEPTEMBER 2008	3,773	+7.4%
OCTOBER 2008 – MARCH 2009	3,590	-4.9%
APRIL 2009 – SEPTEMBER 2009	3,894	+8.5%
OCTOBER 2009 – MARCH 2010	3,650	-6.3%
APRIL 2010 – SEPTEMBER 2010	3,559	-2.5%
OCTOBER 2010 – MARCH 2011	3,649	+2.5%

**CHART 34  
CHILDREN ENTERING AND EXITING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY REPORTING PERIOD**



The following nine tables depict the children who exited out-of-home care by the reason for leaving care. The tables display the following information: reasons the child left custody, their age, their ethnicity, the number of placements each child had, and the length of time in out-of-home care.

**TABLE 36  
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY FOR THE END OF THE  
REPORTING PERIOD ENDING ON MARCH 31, 2011**

<b>By Age</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Under 1	171	4.7%
Ages 1 – 5	1,427	39.1%
Ages 6 – 8	508	13.9%
Ages 9 – 12	528	14.5%
Ages 13 – 17	685	18.8%
18 and Over	330	9.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,649</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Caucasian	1,454	39.9%
Hispanic	1,316	36.1%
African American	446	12.2%
American Indian	286	7.8%
Asian	33	0.9%
Other	114	3.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,649</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
One	1,891	51.8%
Two	839	23.0%
Three	366	10.0%
Four	208	5.7%
Five	116	3.2%
More than Five	229	6.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,649</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Length of Time in Care</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 30 Days	628	17.2%
31 Days to 12 Months	1,150	31.5%
13 to 24 Months	927	25.4%
More than 24 Months	944	25.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,649</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	<b>Average</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>By Age</b>	8.5	7.2
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	2.3	1.0
<b>By Months of Time in Care</b>	17.2	13.5

**TABLE 37  
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY  
FOR REASON OF "REUNIFICATION WITH PARENTS OR PRIMARY CARETAKER" FOR  
THE REPORTING PERIOD ENDING MARCH 31, 2011**

<b>By Age</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Under 1	137	7.7%
Ages 1 - 5	680	38.5%
Ages 6 - 8	259	14.6%
Ages 9 - 12	273	15.4%
Ages 13 - 17	416	23.6%
18 and Over	4	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,769</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Caucasian	687	38.9%
Hispanic	639	36.2%
African American	220	12.4%
American Indian	124	7.0%
Asian	15	0.8%
Other	84	4.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,769</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
One	1,186	67.0%
Two	349	19.7%
Three	110	6.2%
Four	63	3.6%
Five	28	1.6%
More than Five	33	1.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,769</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Length of Time in Care</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 30 Days	547	30.9%
31 Days to 12 Months	859	48.5%
13 to 24 Months	300	17.0%
More than 24 Months	63	3.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,769</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	<b>Average</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>By Age</b>	7.8	6.6
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	2.9	2.0
<b>By Months of Time in Care</b>	7.3	5.0

**TABLE 38  
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY  
FOR REASON OF "LIVING WITH OTHER RELATIVES" FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD  
ENDING MARCH 31, 2011**

<b>By Age</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Under 1	2	7.4%
Ages 1 - 5	13	48.2%
Ages 6 - 8	1	3.7%
Ages 9 - 12	4	14.8%
Ages 13 - 17	7	25.9%
18 and Over	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Caucasian	20	74.1%
Hispanic	6	22.2%
African American	1	3.7%
American Indian	0	0.0%
Asian	0	0.0%
Other	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
One	26	96.3%
Two	1	3.7%
Three	0	0.0%
Four	0	0.0%
Five	0	0.0%
More than Five	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Length of Time in Care</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 30 Days	24	88.9%
31 Days to 12 Months	3	11.1%
13 to 24 Months	0	0.0%
More than 24 Months	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	<b>Average</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>By Age</b>	7.4	5.2
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	2.9	2.0
<b>By Months of Time in Care</b>	0.4	0.1

**TABLE 39**  
**NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES**  
**CUSTODY FOR REASON OF “ADOPTION” FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD**  
**ENDING MARCH 31, 2011**

<b>By Age</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Under 1	20	1.7%
Ages 1 - 5	642	54.0%
Ages 6 – 8	218	18.4%
Ages 9 - 12	207	17.5%
Ages 13 - 17	98	8.3%
18 and Over	1	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,186</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Caucasian	505	42.7%
Hispanic	456	38.4%
African American	133	11.2%
American Indian	74	6.2%
Asian	8	0.7%
Other	10	0.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,186</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
One	449	37.8%
Two	371	31.3%
Three	189	15.9%
Four	91	7.7%
Five	45	3.8%
More than Five	41	3.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,186</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Length of Time in Care</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 30 Days	0	0.0%
31 Days to 12 Months	83	7.0%
13 to 24 Months	462	39.0%
More than 24 Months	641	54.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,186</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	<b>Average</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>By Age</b>	6.2	5.1
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	1.8	1.5
<b>By Months of Time in Care</b>	26.5	24.7



**TABLE 40  
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY  
FOR REASON OF “GUARDIANSHIP” FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD  
ENDING MARCH 31, 2011**

<b>By Age</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Under 1	5	2.1%
Ages 1 – 5	64	27.5%
Ages 6 – 8	24	10.3%
Ages 9 – 12	38	16.3%
Ages 13 – 17	102	43.8%
18 and Over	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Caucasian	84	36.1%
Hispanic	79	33.8%
African American	24	10.3%
American Indian	35	15.0%
Asian	2	0.9%
Other	9	3.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
One	134	57.5%
Two	45	19.3%
Three	27	11.6%
Four	14	6.0%
Five	6	2.6%
More than Five	7	3.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Length of Time in Care</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 30 Days	7	3.0%
31 Days to 12 Months	100	42.9%
13 to 24 Months	103	44.2%
More than 24 Months	23	9.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	<b>Average</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>By Age</b>	10.3	11.6
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	1.2	1.0
<b>By Months of Time in Care</b>	14.2	13.8

**TABLE 41  
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY  
FOR REASONS OF "REACHING AGE OF MAJORITY" FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD  
ENDING MARCH 31, 2011**

<b>By Age</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Under 1	0	0.0%
Ages 1 - 5	0	0.0%
Ages 6 - 8	0	0.0%
Ages 9 - 12	0	0.0%
Ages 13 - 17	5	1.5%
18 and Over	322	98.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Caucasian	131	40.2%
Hispanic	104	31.8%
African American	59	18.0%
American Indian	19	5.8%
Asian	6	1.8%
Other	8	2.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
One	33	10.1%
Two	52	15.9%
Three	33	10.1%
Four	34	10.4%
Five	30	9.2%
More than Five	145	44.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Length of Time in Care</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 30 Days	3	0.9%
31 Days to 12 Months	68	20.8%
13 to 24 Months	45	13.8%
More than 24 Months	211	64.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	<b>Average</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>By Age</b>	18.9	18.2
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	1.4	1.0
<b>By Months of Time in Care</b>	43.9	43.0

**TABLE 42**  
**NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY**  
**FOR REASON OF “TRANSFER TO ANOTHER AGENCY” FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD**  
**ENDING MARCH 31, 2011**

<b>By Age</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Under 1	7	10.8%
Ages 1 – 5	26	40.0%
Ages 6 – 8	6	9.2%
Ages 9 – 12	5	7.7%
Ages 13 – 17	19	29.2%
18 and Over	2	3.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Caucasian	15	23.1%
Hispanic	14	21.5%
African American	2	3.1%
American Indian	33	50.8%
Asian	1	1.5%
Other	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
One	29	44.7%
Two	16	24.6%
Three	6	9.2%
Four	6	9.2%
Five	7	10.8%
More than Five	1	1.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Length of Time in Care</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 30 Days	20	30.7%
31 Days to 12 Months	29	44.7%
13 to 24 Months	12	18.4%
More than 24 Months	4	6.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	<b>Average</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>By Age</b>	8.1	5.9
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	1.1	1.0
<b>By Months of Time in Care</b>	7.2	3.9

**TABLE 43  
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY  
FOR REASON OF “RUNAWAY” FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD  
ENDING MARCH 31, 2011**

<b>By Age</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Under 1	0	0.0%
Ages 1 – 5	1	2.4%
Ages 6 – 8	0	0.0%
Ages 9 – 12	1	2.4%
Ages 13 – 17	38	92.8%
18 and Over	1	2.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Caucasian	12	29.3%
Hispanic	17	41.5%
African American	7	17.1%
American Indian	1	2.4%
Asian	1	2.4%
Other	3	7.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
One	34	82.9%
Two	4	9.8%
Three	1	2.4%
Four	0	0.0%
Five	0	0.0%
More than Five	2	4.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>By Length of Time in Care</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 30 Days	27	65.8%
31 Days to 12 Months	8	19.5%
13 to 24 Months	4	9.8%
More than 24 Months	2	4.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	<b>Average</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>By Age</b>	15.5	15.7
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	3.3	1.0
<b>By Months of Time in Care</b>	5.5	0.3

**TABLE 44**  
**NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY**  
**FOR REASON OF “DEATH OF CHILD” FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD ENDING**  
**MARCH 31, 2011**

<b>By Age</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Under 1	0	0.0
Ages 1 – 5	1	100.0
Ages 6 – 8	0	0.0
Ages 9 – 12	0	0.0
Ages 13 – 17	0	0.0
18 and Over	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Caucasian	0	0.0
Hispanic	1	100.0
African American	0	0.0
American Indian	0	0.0
Asian	0	0.0
Other	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
One	0	0.0
Two	1	100.0
Three	0	0.0
Four	0	0.0
Five	0	0.0
More than Five	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>By Length of Time in Care</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 30 Days	0	0.0
31 Days to 12 Months	0	0.0
13 to 24 Months	1	100.0
More than 24 Months	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	<b>Average</b>	<b>Median</b>
<b>By Age</b>	1.5	1.5
<b>By Number of Placements</b>	3.0	3.0
<b>By Months of Time in Care</b>	15.4	15.4

**TABLE 45**  
**CHILDREN EXITING CARE FOR REASON OF DEATH BY CAUSE OF DEATH,**  
**PLACEMENT TYPE AT TIME OF DEATH, AND COUNTY**

COUNTY	CAUSE OF DEATH	TYPE OF PLACEMENT AT TIME OF DEATH
Pima	Cardiac arrest as a result of seizure disorder	Family Foster Home

**TABLE 46**  
**NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN AN OPEN CASE WHO DIED AS A RESULT OF ALLEGED**  
**ABUSE AS CATEGORIZED BY THE CUSTODIAL RELATIONSHIP AND COUNTY FOR THE**  
**PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**

COUNTY	BIOLOGICAL PARENT(S)	OTHER FAMILY MEMBER	ADOPTIVE PARENT(S)	FOSTER CARE PARENT(S)	OTHER OUT-OF-HOME CARE PROVIDER	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
COCHISE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
COCONINO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GILA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GRAHAM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GREENLEE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	1	0	0	0	0	1	50.0%
MOHAVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
NAVAJO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
PIMA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
PINAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
SANTA CRUZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
YAVAPAI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
YUMA	1	0	0	0	0	1	50.0%
STATEWIDE	2	0	0	0	0	2	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	

**CHILDREN WITH ADOPTIVE CASE PLAN GOALS**

Of the 10,707 children in out-of-home care on March 31, 2011, 2,426 or 22.7 percent had a case plan goal of adoption. The majority of those children, 49.0 percent, are in the 1-5 year old age range, followed by 17.7 percent in the 9-12 year old age range, and 16.7 percent in the 6-8 year old age range. The remaining children, 403 or 16.6 percent, fall within the under one or 13 and over age range. The majority of these children are Caucasian (872 or 35.9 percent), Hispanic (966 or 39.8 percent), or African American (376 or 15.5 percent). The remaining 212 children or 8.8 percent are American Indian, Asian or other. Seventy and two tenths percent, or 1,455 of the children free for adoption, are currently placed in their adoptive homes.

**TABLE 47  
NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A PETITION FOR TERMINATION OF PARENTAL RIGHTS  
BY COUNTY FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 2010 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2011**


COUNTY	TERMINATION OF RIGHTS GRANTED	TERMINATION OF RIGHTS DENIED	TERMINATION OF RIGHTS GRANTED IN PART/DENIED IN PART	TERMINATION OF RIGHTS WITHDRAWN	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
APACHE	5	0	0	0	5	0.4%
COCHISE	47	0	0	0	47	3.3%
COCONINO	5	0	0	0	5	0.4%
GILA	9	0	0	0	9	0.6%
GRAHAM	3	0	0	0	3	0.2%
GREENLEE	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
LA PAZ	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
MARICOPA	725	0	0	5	730	51.0%
MOHAVE	56	0	0	0	56	3.9%
NAVAJO	11	0	0	1	12	0.8%
PIMA	405	5	0	2	412	28.8%
PINAL	78	2	0	0	80	5.6%
SANTA CRUZ	2	0	0	0	2	0.1%
YAVAPAI	45	0	0	0	45	3.2%
YUMA	24	0	0	0	24	1.7%
STATEWIDE	1,415	7	0	8	1,430	100.0%
% OF TOTAL	98.9%	0.5%	0.0%	0.6%	100.0%	

The average length of time that a child with a case plan goal of “adoption” has spent in out-of-home care is 2 years, 2 months. There were a total of 2,426 children with case plan goals of adoption during this reporting period. Of this total, 2,070 were placed and 356 were not placed. The population of children with case plan goals of adoption averaged 2.7 placements and had a median placement count of 2.0. Their placement count ranged from 1 to 31.

**TABLE 48  
PLACEMENT INFORMATION FOR CHILDREN WITH A CASE PLAN GOAL OF ADOPTION**


	<b>Placements</b>
<b>Average</b>	2.7
<b>Median</b>	2.0
<b>Range Minimum</b>	1
<b>Range Maximum</b>	31

**CHART 35  
THE PLACEMENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A CASE PLAN GOAL OF ADOPTION BY AGE**






**CHART 36**  
**THE PLACEMENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A CASE PLAN GOAL OF ADOPTION BY ETHNICITY**




**CHART 37**  
**THE PLACEMENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A CASE PLAN GOAL OF ADOPTION BY LEGAL STATUS**



\*Partially free refers to a situation where only one of the parent’s rights has been severed.


**CHART 38**  
**THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A CASE PLAN GOAL OF ADOPTION BY LENGTH OF TIME FROM CHANGE OF CASE PLAN GOAL OF ADOPTION TO ADOPTIVE PLACEMENT**



\*\*About 70 percent of children are adopted by relatives or their foster parents and are already in their prospective adoptive placement at the time the case plan goal changes to adoption.


**ADOPTIVE SERVICES**

**CHART 39**  
**THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A FINALIZED ADOPTION**



There were 1,186 children with a finalized adoption during the reporting period. Chart 40 displays the number of children with a finalized adoption during the reporting period by the average length of time in out-of-home placement before adoptive placement.

**CHART 40**  
**THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN WITH A FINALIZED ADOPTION BY**  
**AVERAGE LENGTH OF TIME IN OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENT BEFORE ADOPTIVE**  
**PLACEMENT**



The chart below displays the number of children with a finalized adoption by average length of time in adoptive placement before the final order of adoption.

**CHART 41**  
**THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN WITH A FINALIZED ADOPTION BY**  
**AVERAGE LENGTH OF TIME IN ADOPTIVE PLACEMENT BEFORE THE FINAL ORDER**  
**OF ADOPTION**

