

## Michigan Child and Family Services Review Data Profile

I. CHILD SAFETY PROFILE <i>Michigan</i>	Calendar Year 1998						Calendar Year 1999						Calendar Fiscal Year 2000					
	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. <sup>2</sup>	%	Unique Childn. <sup>2</sup>	%	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. <sup>2</sup>	%	Unique Childn. <sup>2</sup>	%	Reports	%	Duplic. Childn. <sup>2</sup>	%	Unique Childn. <sup>2</sup>	%
<b>I. Total CA/N Reports Disposed<sup>1</sup></b>	63,334		157,908		125,666		62,775		157,916		128,363		64,794		164,369		132,976	
<b>II. Disposition of CA/N Reports<sup>3</sup></b>																		
Substantiated & Indicated	12,673	20.0	22,987	14.6	21,978	17.5	13,343	21.3	23,577	14.9	22,673	17.7	15,210	23.5	26,680	16.2	25,611	19.3
Unsubstantiated	50,661	80.0	134,921	85.4	103,688	82.5	49,432	78.7	134,339	85.1	105,690	82.3	49,584	76.5	137,689	83.8	107,365	80.7
Other																		
<b>III. Child Cases Opened for Services<sup>4</sup></b>			19,828	86.3	19,069	86.8			20,031	85.0	19,394	85.5			22,603	84.7	21,841	85.3
<b>IV. Children Entering Care Based on CA/N Report<sup>5,A</sup></b>			8,046	35.0					8,490	36.0					9,218	34.6		
<b>V. Child Fatalities<sup>6,B</sup></b>					40						48						49	
<b>STATEWIDE AGGREGATE DATA USED TO DETERMINE SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY</b>																		
<b>VI. Recurrence of Maltreatment<sup>7</sup> [Standard: 6.1% or less]</b>					356 of 11,430	3.1					398 of 11,576	3.4					450 of 13,482	3.3
<b>VII. Incidence of Child Abuse and/or Neglect in Foster Care<sup>8</sup> (for Jan-Sept) [Standard: .57% or less]</b>					42 of 22,724	.18					74 of 25,673	.29					85 of 26,044	.33

## Michigan Child and Family Services Review Data Profile

### FOOTNOTES TO DATA ELEMENTS IN CHILD SAFETY PROFILE

Each maltreatment allegation reported to NCANDS is associated with a disposition or finding that is used to derive the counts provided in this safety profile. The safety profile uses three categories. The various terms that are used in NCANDS reporting have been collapsed into these three groups.

Disposition Category	Safety Profile Disposition	NCANDS Disposition Codes Included
A	Substantiated or Indicated (Maltreatment Victim)	“Substantiated,” “Indicated,” and “Alternative Response Disposition Victim”
B	Unsubstantiated	“Unsubstantiated,” “Unsubstantiated, Other than Intentionally False Reporting ” and “Unsubstantiated Due to Intentionally False Reporting”
C	Other	“Closed-No Finding,” “Alternative Response Disposition – Not a Victim,” “Other,” and “Unknown or Missing”

*Alternative Response was added starting with the 2000 data year. The two categories of Unsubstantiated were added starting with the 2000 data year. In earlier years there was only the category of Unsubstantiated*

1. The data element, “Total CA/N Reports Disposed,” is based on the reports received in the State that received a disposition in the reporting period under review. The number shown may include reports received during a previous year that received a disposition in the reporting year. Counts based on “reports,” “duplicated counts of children,” and “unique counts of children” are provided.
2. The duplicated count of children (report-child pairs) counts a child each time that (s)he was reported. The unique count of children counts a child only once during the reporting period, regardless of how many times the child was reported.
3. For the column labeled “Reports,” the data element, “Disposition of CA/N Reports,” is based on upon the highest disposition of any child who was the subject of an investigation in a particular report. For example, if a report investigated two children, and one child is found to be neglected and the other child found not to be maltreated, the report disposition will be substantiated (Group A). The disposition for each child is based on the specific finding related to the maltreatment(s). In other words, of the two children above, one is a victim and is counted under “substantiated” (Group A) and the other is not a victim and is counted under “unsubstantiated” (Group B). In determining the unique counts of children, the highest finding is given priority. If a child is found to be a victim in one report (Group A), but not a victim in a second report (Group B), the unique count of children includes the child only as a victim (Group A). The category of “other” (Group C) includes children whose report may have been “closed without a finding,” children for whom the allegation disposition is “unknown,” and other dispositions that a State is unable to code as substantiated, indicated, alternative response victim, or unsubstantiated.
4. The data element, “Child Cases Opened for Services,” is based on the number of victims (Group A) during the reporting period under review. “Opened for Services” refers to post-investigative services. The duplicated number counts each time a victim’s report is linked to on-going

## Michigan Child and Family Services Review Data Profile

services; the unique number counts a victim only once regardless of the number of times services are linked to reports of substantiated maltreatment.

5. The data element, "Children Entering Care Based on CA/N Report," is based on the number of victims (Group A) during the reporting period under review. The duplicated number counts each time a victim's report is linked to a foster care removal date. The unique number counts a victim only once regardless of the number of removals that may be reported.
6. The data element "Child Fatalities" counts the number of children reported to NCANDS as having died as a result of child abuse and/or neglect. Depending upon State practice, this number may count only those children for whom a case record has been opened either prior to or after the death, or may include a number of children whose deaths have been investigated as possibly related to child maltreatment. For example, some States include neglected-related deaths such as those caused by motor vehicle or boating accidents, house fires or access to firearms, under certain circumstances. The percentage is based on a count of unique victims of maltreatment for the reporting period.
7. The data element, "Recurrence of Maltreatment," is defined as follows: Of all children associated with a "substantiated" or "indicated" finding of maltreatment during the first six months of the reporting period, what percentage had another "substantiated" or "indicated" finding of maltreatment within a 6-month period. The number of victims during the first six-month period and the number of these victims who were recurrent victims within six months are provided. This data element is used to determine, in part, the State's substantial conformity with Safety Outcome #1.
8. The data element, "Incidence of Child Abuse and/or Neglect in Foster Care," is defined as follows: Of all children who were served in foster care during the reporting period, what percentage were found to be victims of "substantiated" or "indicated" maltreatment. A child is counted as having been maltreated in foster care if the perpetrator of the maltreatment was identified as a foster parent or residential facility staff. Counts of children maltreated in foster care are derived from NCANDS, while counts of children placed in foster care are derived from AFCARS. The observation period for these measures is January-September because this is the reporting period jointly addressed by both NCANDS and AFCARS. For both measures, the number of children found to be maltreated in foster care and the percentage of all children in foster care are provided. This data element is used to determine, in part, the State's substantial conformity with Safety Outcome #2.

### *Additional Footnotes:*

- A These data come from Michigan's AFCARS data files. These are the total number of removals during the calendar year. It is based upon AFCARS Element 21, Date of Latest Removal. If the date fell within the calendar years shown, it was counted. This does not include Juvenile Justice youth. There is an overstated bias because they cannot separate those that were or were not the result of abuse/neglect, although Michigan has very few voluntary placements. These numbers include duplicates because Michigan cannot separate the data into duplicated and unique counts.
- B These fatalities are from an alternate source, not from the NCANDS submission. They are "the number of deaths as a result of child abuse/neglect" as reported by Michigan's Child Death Review Committee. This information was received by the Children's Bureau in a 1-23-02 email communication from the State.

## Michigan Child and Family Services Review Data Profile

<b>II. POINT-IN-TIME PERMANENCY PROFILE</b> <i>Michigan</i>	Federal FY 1998		Federal FY 1999		Federal FY 2000	
	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
<b>I. Foster Care Population Flow</b>						
Children in foster care on first day of year	13,570		16,111		17,129	
Admissions during year	10,220		10,929		10,707	
Discharges during year	5,207		6,740		7,802	
Children in care on last day of year	18,583		20,300		20,034	
Net change during year	+5,013		+4,189		+2,905	
<b>II. Placement Types for Children in Care</b>						
Pre-Adoptive Homes	825	4.4	965	4.8	1,056	5.3
Foster Family Homes (Relative)	4,981	26.8	5,647	27.8	5,858	29.2
Foster Family Homes (Non-Relative)	8,109	43.6	8,793	43.3	8,818	44.0
Group Homes	70	0.4	64	0.3	68	0.3
Institutions	3,899	21.0	4,085	20.1	3,487	17.4
Supervised Independent Living	458	2.5	515	2.5	534	2.7
Runaway	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trial Home Visit	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missing Placement Information	0	0	1	0.0	2	0.0
Not Applicable (Placement in subsequent year)	241	1.3	230	1	211	1.1
<b>III. Permanency Goals for Children in Care</b>						
Reunification	8,931	48.1	9,632	47.4	9,856	49.2
Live with Other Relatives	736	4.0	928	4.6	1,008	5.0
Adoption	6,719	36.2	7,363	36.3	6,456	32.2
Long Term Foster Care	1,378	7.4	1,505	7.4	1,708	8.5
Emancipation	819	4.4	872	4.3	1,006	5.0
Guardianship	0	0	0	0	0	0
Case Plan Goal Not Established	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missing Goal Information	0	0	0	0	0	0

Michigan Child and Family Services Review Data Profile

<b>II. POINT-IN-TIME PERMANENCY PROFILE (continued)</b> <i>Michigan</i>	<b>Federal FY 1998</b>		<b>Federal FY 1999</b>		<b>Federal FY 2000</b>	
	<b># of Children</b>	<b>% of Children</b>	<b># of Children</b>	<b>% of Children</b>	<b># of Children</b>	<b>% of Children</b>
<b>IV. Number of Placement Settings in Current Placement</b>						
One	7,681	41.3	8,205	40.4	8,500	42.4
Two	5,049	27.2	5,604	27.6	5,214	26.0
Three	2,674	14.4	2,966	14.6	2,771	13.8
Four	1,355	7.3	1,526	7.5	1,467	7.3
Five	706	3.8	759	3.7	758	3.8
Six or more	1,118	6.0	1,240	6.1	1,324	6.6
Missing placement settings	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>V. Number of Removal Episodes</b>						
One	17,012	91.5	18,618	91.7	18,414	91.9
Two	1,398	7.5	1,506	7.4	1,428	7.1
Three	140	0.8	142	0.7	161	0.8
Four	24	0.1	27	0.1	19	0.1
Five	5	0.0	3	0.0	8	0.0
Six or more	4	0.0	4	0.0	4	0.0
Missing removal episodes	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>VI. Number of children in care 17 of the most recent 22 months<sup>2</sup> (percent based on cases with sufficient information for computation)</b>	3,075	33.4	3029	31.6	3,003	33.4
	<b>Number of Months</b>		<b>Number of Months</b>		<b>Number of Months</b>	
<b>VII. Median Length of Stay in Foster Care (of children in care on last day of FY)</b>	13.5		14.4		14.7	

## Michigan Child and Family Services Review Data Profile

<b>II. POINT-IN-TIME PERMANENCY PROFILE (continued)</b> <i>Michigan</i>	Federal FY 1998		Federal FY 1999		Federal FY 2000	
	# of Children Discharged	Median Months to Discharge	# of Children Discharged	Median Months to Discharge	# of Children Discharged	Median Months to Discharge
<b>VIII. Length of Time to Achieve Perm. Goal</b>						
Reunification/Relative Placement	2,876	10.2	3,825	9.4	4,087	10.4
Adoption	1,041	12.8	1,330	27.1	1,695	29.6
Guardianship	37	7.0	68	10.4	91	10.6
Other	1,008	27.5	1,181	28.3	1,507	23.5
Missing Discharge Reason	7	14.7	11	24.6	17	16.9
Missing Date of Latest Removal or Date Error <sup>3</sup>	238	NA	325	NA	405	0
<b>Statewide Aggregate Data Used in Determining Substantial Conformity</b>	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
<b>IX.</b> Of all children who were reunified with their parents or caretakers at the time of discharge from foster care, what percentage was reunified in less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home? (4.1) <b>[Standard: 76.2% or more]</b>	1,625	53.8	2,349	58.1	2,317	52.9
<b>X.</b> Of all children who exited care to a finalized adoption, what percentage exited care in less than 24 months from the time of the latest removal from home? (5.1) <b>[Standard: 32% or more]</b>	719	68.6	545	40.9	595	35.0
<b>XI.</b> Of all children served who have been in foster care less than 12 months from the time of the latest removal from home, what percentage have had no more than two placement settings? (6.1) <b>[Standard: 86.7% or more]</b>	9,359	85.2	9,977	84.9	9,991	86.2
<b>XII.</b> Of all children who entered care during the year, what percentage re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode? (4.2) <b>[Standard: 8.6% or less]</b>	483	4.7 (90% new entry)	534	4.9 (90% new entry)	531	5.0 (90% new entry)

## Michigan Child and Family Services Review Data Profile

<b>III. PERMANENCY PROFILE FIRST-TIME ENTRY COHORT GROUP</b> <i>Michigan</i>	Federal FY 1998		Federal FY 1999		Federal FY 2000	
	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children	# of Children	% of Children
<b>I. Number of children entering care for the first time in cohort group</b> (% = 1 <sup>st</sup> time entry of all entering within first 6 months)	4,144	89.9	4,734	91.0	4,509	89.6
<b>II. Most Recent Placement Types</b>						
Pre-Adoptive Homes	259	6.3	145	3.1	130	2.9
Foster Family Homes (Relative)	1,159	28.0	1,432	30.2	1,438	31.9
Foster Family Homes (Non-Relative)	1,717	41.4	2,090	44.1	2,069	45.9
Group Homes	14	0.3	6	0.1	11	0.2
Institutions	869	21.0	920	19.4	739	16.4
Supervised Independent Living	35	0.8	28	0.6	27	0.6
Runaway	60	1.4	81	1.7	74	1.6
Trial Home Visit	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missing Placement Information	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not Applicable (Placement in subsequent yr)	31	0.7	32	0.7	21	0.5
<b>III. Most Recent Permanency Goal</b>						
Reunification	2,518	60.8	3,079	65.0	3,079	68.3
Live with Other Relatives	110	2.7	136	2.9	135	3.0
Adoption	1,217	29.4	1,196	25.3	982	21.8
Long-Term Foster Care	181	4.4	205	4.3	228	5.1
Emancipation	118	2.8	118	2.5	85	1.9
Guardianship	0	0	0	0	0	0
Case Plan Goal Not Established	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missing Goal Information	0	0	0	0	0	0



## Michigan Child and Family Services Review Data Profile

### FOOTNOTES TO DATA ELEMENTS IN THE PERMANENCY PROFILE

<sup>1</sup>The FY98, FY99, and FY00 counts of children in care at the start of the year do not exclude any children. In some submissions, there are children who are excluded from this count to avoid counting them twice. That is, although they were actually in care on the first day, they also qualify as new entries because they left and re-entered again at some point during the same reporting period. To avoid counting them as both "in care on the first day" and "entries," the Children's Bureau selects only the most recent record. That means they get counted as "entries," not "in care on the first day." In Michigan's case, this did not occur, but it could in future submissions.

<sup>2</sup>We designated the indicator, *17 of the most recent 22 months*, rather than the statutory time frame for initiating termination of parental rights proceedings at *15 of the most 22 months*, since the AFCARS system cannot determine the *date the child is considered to have entered foster care* as defined in the regulation. We used the outside date for determining the *date the child is considered to have entered foster care*, which is 60 days from the actual removal date.

<sup>3</sup>Dates necessary for calculation of length of time in care in these records are chronologically incorrect. N/A = Not Applicable

<sup>4</sup> First-Time Entry Cohort median length of stay was 29.5 months for FY98. This includes 72 children who entered and exited the same day. Because these "same day children" do not really fit the Federal definition of having been in care at least 24 hours, we also calculate for the State what the median length of stay would have been if these children were excluded (even though we do use them for all other calculations because the State did submit them as part of the file). If these 72 children had been excluded, the median length of stay would have been 30.2 months.

<sup>5</sup> First-Time Entry Cohort median length of stay was 25.5 months for FY99. This includes 104 children who entered and exited the same day (see comment on "same day" children in footnote 4, above). If these children were excluded, the median length of stay would have been 26.7 months.

<sup>6</sup> The First-Time Entry Cohort median length of stay is "not yet reached" for FY00. This happens when fewer than half of the first-time entry cohort have left care, making it impossible to calculate the median stay for the group, as a whole. This includes 146 children who had a zero length of stay (they entered and exited the same day). See explanation of "same day" children in footnote 4, above. In this particular instance, excluding these children from the calculation still results in a median length of stay of "not yet reached."