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**Premise:** Every child who must be removed from their own home because of abuse or neglect deserves to be placed in an out-of-home care setting that is safe, stable and nurturing. Safe, stable and nurturing out-of-home care settings are critical to achieving optimum outcomes and permanency for children whether the goal is reunification, guardianship, adoption, or another planned permanent living arrangement.

The more likely a child remains in a stable placement while in out-of-home care, the more likely that child will thrive.

**Performance Background:** After failing to meet the targeted improvement in placement stability during the first federal Performance Improvement Plan, Florida was sanctioned $2.4 million. Although that sanction was challenged and ultimately lifted, Florida continues to face federal fiscal sanctions in the future if placement stability targets are not achieved.

The Administration for Children and Families Children’s Bureau tracks the state’s performance for “Placement Stability While in Foster Care” as a composite with three sub-parts.

The 2008 Adoptions and Foster Care Reporting System (AFCARS) data indicate Florida is still not achieving targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite: Placement Stability While in Foster Care</th>
<th>AFCARS 10/07-9/08</th>
<th>AFCARS 10/08-3/09</th>
<th>National Median</th>
<th>National Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of children in care for less than 12 months with 2 or fewer placement settings</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of children in care for 12 to 24 months with 2 or fewer placement settings</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of children in care for at least 24 months with 2 or fewer placement settings</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of Review:** A statewide Quality Assurance review was conducted to compare casework practices with the reported AFCARS data in order to validate the data or provide additional data for consideration when measuring performance in maintaining placement stability. The review protocol was designed to provide a global, high-level view of statewide practices overall.

**Scope and Sampling Methodology:** This special review was incorporated into the existing Quality Assurance quarterly review schedule already in motion for Fiscal Year 2008/2009. The fourth quarter review instrument was modified to include 13 additional...
questions that were specific to placement stability. The Office of Family Safety provided Regions and Community Based Care (CBCs) lead agencies with the review instrument and interpretive guidelines as well as the automated tool for statewide roll-up.

The sample for the fourth quarter review was extracted from Florida Safe Families Network (FSFN) based on all children served during the selection period who were six (6) years of age and older when they entered the child welfare system.

**Note:** An unintended consequence of maintaining the sampling methodology already in place for FY 2008/2009 was that no child under five (5) years of age was included in this special review thereby potentially missing a significant factor in assessing problem areas.

Regions and CBCs were asked to explore the 13 additional questions in all of the cases (from the quarterly sample of 25 each) that involved a child in an out-of-home placement. Eighteen of the 21 CBC lead agencies and each of the Regions participated in the special review.¹

The total statewide sample size for all participating agencies during the fourth quarter was 415, of which 363 cases represented children living in an out-of-home care setting (or 87% of the quarterly sample). Of the 363 children, 40% experienced placement changes during the period under review (the last 12 months from the review date).

The 363 case sample was broken down as follows: 40% of children in licensed foster family homes; 33% of children in relative/non-relative placement; and, 27% children in other out-of-home settings.

**Findings:** The following offers a high-level, statewide view of some characteristics and practices that should assist in building local quality improvement initiatives to better serve children in out-of-home care. Regional and CBC specific findings can be obtained through the local Quality Assurance Managers.

One promising data point was that reviewers found in 73% of the applicable cases reviewed, children had one, but no more than two placement changes during the 12-month period under review. It is also noteworthy that in 75% of the placement disruptions that resulted in placement moves, reviewers found evidence that service interventions were engaged to support the child in an attempt to avoid the disruption. Fifty-eight percent of the placement disruptions were for ungovernable or delinquency behaviors.

**General Demographics**

As noted, given the sampling methodology already prescribed for the fourth quarter, only children in out-of-home care six (6) to 17 years old were included in the sample. The majority of those children were in the 13 to 17 age range (66%).

¹ ChildNet and Our Kids, Inc., were under contract with Chapin Hall and Big Bend Community Based Care East and West did not realize the review included the sample from their Base Reviews.
o Of the total number of children in the sample, 60% of the children were in their current placement for 12 months or less.

o Of the total number of children living in out-of-home placements in the sample, lengths of stay varied within the current removal episodes.

![Length of Stay in Out-of-Home Care for Current Removal Episode](image)

During the child’s current removal episode, twenty-three percent had seven or more placement moves.

![Moves from one Placement to Another during Current Removal Episode](image)

Data collected from 4th quarter (April-June 2009) Base and Side-by-Side Reviews by Regions and 18 of 21 CBC Lead Agencies; rolled up and analyzed by the Office of Family Safety Quality Assurance
Forty-eight percent of the applicable cases involved at least one placement change.

Percentage of Placement Changes during Current Removal Episode
April 2008 – April 2009

Events and Services

For children who had two or more placement changes during the period under review, fifty-three percent of the changes were classified as placement disruptions.

Reason for Placement Change

Note: In a few cases more than one reason was documented for placement moves.

When the child was moved because the placement disrupted, service interventions were engaged to support the out-of-home care provider in an attempt to avoid disruption.

61% Yes   39% No

When the child was moved because the placement disrupted, service interventions were engaged to support the child in an attempt to avoid disruption.

75% Yes   25% No

Data collected from 4th quarter (April-June 2009) Base and Side-by-Side Reviews by Regions and 18 of 21 CBC Lead Agencies; rolled up and analyzed by the Office of Family Safety Quality Assurance
o When a child was not moved, but risk of disruption was imminent, appropriate service interventions were successfully put in place that actually prevented the potential disruption.

94% Yes

o The last placement change could have been avoided if there had been a better match of child needs to caregiver capacities.

20% Yes 80% No

o The frequency and quality of visits clearly impacted the stability of the placement.

91% Yes 9% No

o The following events led to moving the child from the prior placement to the current one. (More than one event may apply per child)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Moved</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/racial/religious differences</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to family of origin</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain in current school</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungovernable behaviors</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse/neglect by out-of-home care giver</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place with siblings</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency behaviors</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing issues</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal relationship issues with other children in the home</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental illness</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical illness or death of caregiver</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of child care services so caregiver could work outside of the home</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of other wrap-around services</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Research:** There are many evidence-based studies that describe the difficulties and challenges child welfare systems face in trying to provide stable, nurturing and long-term care for children living in an out-of-home placement setting. Some of the most prevalent and consistent findings are noted below.

o Children in relative care, regardless of age, have fewer placement moves than those in other licensed or non-relative care settings.

o The first placement decision and the subsequent 6-months are critical to future stability.

o Children who experience more than one placement move during their first year are more likely to experience placement instability in the future as long as they remain in long-term out-of-home care.

o This self-perpetuates in that as the number of previous placements for a child increases the number and likelihood of future placement disruptions also increases.
Child behaviors (disruptive, aggressive or seemingly dangerous behaviors) are the strongest predictor of placement disruption and are cited as one of the most common reasons out-of-home caregivers request a child be removed.

Out-of-home caregivers are often ill trained to deal with difficult behaviors and there is a lack of evidence-based, out-of-home caregiver training curricula showing consistent and positive results for these caregivers.

The relationship between and among case managers, out-of-home caregivers, parents, and the child living in an out-of-home placement and the amount of time the case manager spends with each party directly impacts the stability and success of the placement until permanency is achieved.

Summary and Recommendations: Placement stability or lack thereof is affected by a complex set of variables that impact success. Some of those variables within Florida’s child welfare system may include issues such as:

- a limited number of available out-of-home care beds;
- varying placement matching policies;
- quality of care provided by out-of-home caregivers;
- strict, or not so strict, licensing and relicensing policies;
- quality and frequency of communication and collaboration between out-of-home care providers and case managers; and
- variances in full service arrays to support the child and out-of-home caregivers.

This review was intended to increase awareness so the child welfare system can not only meet federal standards, but more importantly will provide children who cannot remain in their own home, a stable and nurturing environment in an out-of-home setting.

Based on the data gathered through these case file reviews, there are some promising practices directly related to improving placement stability in Florida. Reviewers found in 73% of the applicable cases reviewed, children had one, but no more than two placement changes during the 12-month period under review. Further exploration into these cases would likely offer more details as to why the placements were stable, i.e., was the best placement decision made upon entering care; was a better match made between child and caregiver, were appropriate services provided, etc.

It is noteworthy that in 75% of the placement disruptions that resulted in placement moves, reviewers found evidence that service interventions were engaged to support the child in an attempt to avoid the disruption. Further exploration into these cases would likely offer more details as to what worked and what did not. This population may well be similar to that which is described in the evidence-based studies as youth who have experienced multiple moves and now have behavioral problems.

Placement changes in this study indicate 58% of them were for ungovernable or delinquency behaviors.

The frequency by which out-of-home providers were supported through service interventions was significantly less than the frequency of supports to the child. This is an area that will need further exploration as well. Evidenced-based studies link placement
failures directly to communication, training and relationships. The out-of-home caregiver is key to achieving positive outcomes and he/she must be nurtured as much as the child welfare system expects the caregiver to nurture the child.

If this sample set is representative of the total population of children living in an out-of-home care setting, only one-third of them are being placed with relatives. Given the evidence-based finding that placing the removed child with relatives provides more likelihood that the child will remain in the placement without disruption, additional focus and exploration of relatives for placement purposes is needed.

As stated earlier, the sampling methodology did not include children less than six years of age. It is strongly recommended that Regions and CBCs conduct an additional review of this population in the very near future for additional assessment of the current situation.

Finally, the Office of Family Safety published a “Guide to Analysis of Placement Stability” in September 2006. It is attached for convenient reference. Local leadership may find these guidelines quite helpful in conducting further exploration into placement stability issues at the local level.
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Guide for Analysis of Placement Stability

For children in the custody of the state, placement occurs after removal and is defined as the physical setting in which a child finds himself or herself while in out-of-home care or a substitute care setting, including shelter placements and trial home visits. The term “placement” designates the physical location that a child normally calls “home”. It does not necessarily refer to the place where a child sleeps on a given night. As such, under certain circumstances, a child’s short-term absence from a placement may represent a break – a temporary living condition – not a new placement.

A child may experience multiple placements while in out-of-home care. The federal measure counts the number of placements, or places the child has lived while in out-of-home care during a removal episode, including the current placement setting. A new placement results when the out-of-home care setting changes. For example, a new placement results when a child moves from shelter to a foster family home or to a group home or institution.

Placement stability is comprised of a complex set of variables including (but not limited to) the number of available foster home beds, placement matching policies, quality of care provided by the foster parents, agency licensing and relicensing policies, quality of communication and collaboration between foster parents, agency and caseworkers, services provided to the foster child, services provided to the foster parent, workers’ perception of foster parents role as partners, etc.

In past years, child welfare social workers have depended upon knowledge gained through accumulated years of experience and an extensive knowledge base of the families in the local geographical area. However, in today’s environment where there is an ever-changing workforce and populations are extremely mobile, accurate information cannot be exclusively based upon anecdotal information.

The purpose of this guide is to provide a step-by-step process that will assist in attaining a reliable picture based on data of child placement stability/instability, the quality of care provided to foster children and foster parents, and a picture of the number of foster homes in a specific area related to the number of children being brought into out-of-home care from that same area.

The process is four-phased:
A. information gathering on a random sample of children in out-of-home care,
B. information gathering on a random sample of active/inactive foster homes,
C. interview process (“Appreciative Inquiry”) with agency and child welfare social workers, foster parents and community stakeholders, and
D. analysis of the information gathered

This process is not meant to be conducted on a regular, monthly basis, but may be beneficial on a one-time basis in order to provide baseline data and an overall picture of
placement trends. However, the Local Recruitment and Retention Plans should provide an internal process for quarterly placement stability data analysis.

A. **PHASE 1. Information Gathering on Children in Out-of-Home Care.**

1. **Set child sample size.**
   
   A sample of cases from the statewide automated child welfare information system (SACWIS) client list is used to draw a representative sample of cases for review of children currently in out-of-home placement less than 12 months. Sample size and selection criteria is determined using the random sample size calculator at [http://ewas.def.state.fl.us/asc/monitoring/calc.asp](http://ewas.def.state.fl.us/asc/monitoring/calc.asp) OR an over sample of 5 cases is routinely drawn in the event a case must be dropped from the review. The sample size confidence level tells you how sure you can be that your sample findings represent the whole population. It is expressed as a percentage. For example, a 95% confidence level means you can be 95% confident that the files you have examined represent what is contained in the total population of the files. A Sample Size Calculator is provided that will assist you in your sample size as well as the file number you need to draw for each record you are going to review. A random number table enables you to insure that there were no biases in the selection of files to be reviewed.

2. **Collect child-related information:**
   
   a. **Length of Placements Information.** Create a template that will allow data entry of the total number of placements for each child selected for the review, average number of days of each placement for the child, information on timeframes of each child’s individual placements in the current out-of-home care removal episode, and the specific reasons for the disruptions.

   A sample template attachment has been provided that includes the necessary embedded formulas that allows entry and automatic calculations of the placement information data.

   SEE ATTACHMENT– “Placement Stability Review Tools”, (Child Placements Info. tab located at bottom of the template sheet.)

   b. Accessing several reports will be necessary to build a child placement history that will provide all the needed data.
      
      1. SACWIS Report: *Clients Active in Out-of-Home Care.* Provides number of total placements for each child’s current removal episode, including the current placement.
      2. SACWIS Report: Client placement history screen on child will give length of time in each placement, provider, and reason for
placement end. (Because SACWIS Reason End Codes may be
general, the specific reason for each placement end may need to be
gathered from the foster parent, caseworker interview or the child’s
hard copy file.)

c. Analysis of information gathered in this template should enable the
determination of trends regarding placement changes including the
point in time in the removal episode where placements are most
unstable, stability/instability by placement types, unexpected
trends in placement disruptions (examples - child placements for
ages 0 – 3 are the most unstable; children are having three
placement changes within the first 30 days following the initial
removal, etc.). In addition, trends regarding systemic
implementations necessary to decrease the number of multiple
placements for foster children, (examples - trends regarding foster
parents setting rules for “overnight only” placements; overcapacity
licensing rules creating placement instability, etc.), should become
evident.

3. Collect child demographic information.
This template will provide the following information on children in care:
age, gender, race, county of removal, specific type abuse, child
information provided to foster parents at placement (Yes/No), disabilities
listed at initial removal (Yes/No, emotional, behavioral, learning), current
disabilities (Yes/No, emotional, behavioral, learning), foster parent
supports provided (Yes/No), siblings placed together, sibling/parental
visits occurring regularly (Yes/No), other columns as needed.

Analysis of information gathered in this template should enable the
determination of trends regarding the quality of care the child received
during the removal episode.

SEE ATTACHMENT, Placement Stability Process Review Tools for
sample template – Child Demographics tab located at bottom of template
sheet)

**Available Placement Stability Existing Reports:**

Reference - March 10th 2005 Statewide Memo on Placement Stability from Beth
Englander: Create an Internal Process Plan for local ongoing analysis of placement
changes and identification of trends by geographic area. The data analysis process must
result in descriptors specific to:

- Child’s age, gender, race, ethnicity
- Number of placements by age group
- Placement Type (relative, foster care, non-licensed, group home, shelter,
  therapeutic)
• Reason for placement change. (Due to the general nature of the HSn reason end codes, a process to gather the specific reason should be generated.)

HomeSafenet Reports To track performance:

1. **Placement Change Information.**
   - Provides number of total placements for each child’s current removal episode, including the current placement.
   - Also gives percentage of <2 placements and >3 placements by Units and District average for length of stay (0 months to 48+ months) and median LOS for Unit and District.
   b. Same report, (*Clients Active in Out-of-Home Care*), but printed in Excel, provides child specific listing by Districts.
   - Can be sorted by number of placements for each child, placement providers, age of children, length of stay in current removal episode.


3. **Significant trends or reasons for disruptions/placement changes.** There is no HSn report regarding reasons for disruptions, and the HSn Case Notes often do not reflect the specific reasons. The child’s individual HSn *Placement History* page uses very general codes. Several Districts have designed specific placement reason tracking Excel spreadsheet systems.

In order for “analysis” to take place, the data produced in the reports must be examined for trends, followed by a statement of the findings. Converting the data into graphs and charts is useful in providing a picture of the findings. (Graphs and charts may be produced by selecting the data in the Excel spreadsheet and clicking on the CHARTS icon on the tool bar.) For examples of data analysis of graphs and charts, see pages 9 - 12 of this report.

Please incorporate data placement stability data analysis processes into your local District Recruitment & Retention plans.

II. **Other Useful Reports.**

- **DCF Performance Measure Dashboard.** You may access the Dashboard by going to the DCF Home Page, or [http://www.state.fl.us/ef_web/](http://www.state.fl.us/ef_web/), and clicking on the right hand menu item, DCF Dashboard. From this page, click on Measures by Strategic Plan. From this page, scroll down and click the box to the performance measure - *FS306. Percent of children with no more than 2 placements within 12 months removal.* This site will provide placement stability performance scores by Districts for the State Fiscal Year or Quarter. To see a chart of the data, click on the chart icon at the bottom of the graph. To see a drill down of the lead agencies for each District, click on the icon on the left side of the chart, beside each District.
• Child’s ZIP Code prior to placement. There is not an existing report for this. However, if the licensing/R&R units would like to know this information for your District, you may contact me, and I’ll get our Data Support unit to do an ad-hoc run for you.

III. Stability that Leads to Permanency

Counting moves only reveals instability. To produce the kind of stability that leads to permanence, managers & staff should focus on gathering data on six child-centered objectives.

a. Placements are stable. To track performance: Number of children who move from one placement to another in the last month.

b. Placements that have been stable for long periods must become permanent. To track performance: The number of all children in care whose current placement is a family placement that has lasted 18 months or more.

c. Moves must promote permanency. To track performance: Of those who moved from one placement to another in the last month, the % for whom the new placement was not a progression toward permanency.

d. Children rarely move. To track performance: Of those who moved from one placement to another in the last month, the percent who have already had 3 or more placements.

e. Group Care should be therapeutic & temporary. To track performance: The number of all children in care who have lived continuously in non-therapeutic group care for 6 months or more.

Adapted from:
Kennedy School of Gov’t.
Harvard University.
“Stability in Foster Care Measuring & Promoting Placements that Lead to Permanent Homes”

B. Phase 2: Information Gathering of Active/Inactive Foster Homes.

1. Set foster homes sample size. Suggest a random sample of 10 active family license files and 10 closed family license files within the current year.

2. Collect information regarding foster parent demographics, over/under capacity, reasons for closure, type home, how recruited, has the home been vacant for more than six months over the past year (Yes/No), current status of home (Active/Closed), and any other information you may wish to gather.

3. Create a spreadsheet with a row for each foster parent in the study, and a column for each type of information selected to be gathered by the study.

*Note: Information not available in the licensing files must be provided through personal contact with the foster parents and licensing counselors, or the child.
To track performance: create a spreadsheet that captures each foster family in study, and information collected in **Phase 2: 2.** above.

SEE ATTACHMENT for sample template – Placement Stability Process Review Tools - (Foster Parents Demographics tab located at bottom of template sheet)

4. Information gathered on the number foster homes/beds by Zip Code and on children removed by Zip Code will provide a clear picture of the number of licensed foster beds available in the areas of initial removal for the children coming into care within each geographic area in your local area.

*Note: Information on the number of foster home beds by Zip Codes should be available from the licensing units. However, since there is not a HSn report that provides the number of children removed by Zip Code area, a special ad-hoc report may be requested from DCF Central Office.


C. **PHASE 3: Interview Process.**
Placement stability and retention of foster parents are intricately entwined. If foster parents are appreciated as an important, crucial part of the foster care partnership process, there is a direct impact upon placement stability of the foster children they serve in their foster homes.

A comprehensive analysis of placement stability cannot be discerned solely from data. The information needed for the templates listed above may not be located in the case files, and quality of services and care may not be discernable from reading the files. Sometimes, due to a lack of documentation in SACWIS and the case file, the specific information regarding the reasons for placement end and services provided can be found only through inquiry. Therefore, there may be a need to consult with the case worker, foster parents or the child in order to find some of the missing pertinent information.

A questioning process called “Appreciative Inquiry Questions”, developed by John and Judy McKenzie of the AdoptUsKids National Resource Center is designed to be used in focus group settings comprised of foster parents, agency and department staff including child protective workers and supervisors, caseworkers, licensing and placement personnel, and community stakeholders. The inquiry generates beneficial discussion during the focus group sessions regarding positive practices and processes already working well in an attempt to build a local plan from a position of strength and positive energy that will enhance permanence among the foster parents, thus providing placement stability for the foster children.
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D. **Phase 4. Analysis of Information Gathered.**

Analysis of the information gathered during the “Appreciative Inquiry” focus group discussions, and from data in the templates, or spreadsheets, discussed above can be performed in several ways.

1. **Data Entry.** Data gathered will be recorded by entering the information into the template spreadsheets, or into tables. There are four separate spreadsheet templates provided to help you begin the data recording process.

2. **Data and Information Analysis Examples.**

   Methods of analysis of template/spreadsheet data:
   - Manual calculations of data in the spreadsheet may be utilized to perform the calculations required to analyze the data. However, using standard EXCEL formulas for these calculations is more accurate, and much less work intensive. [Four tools have been provided in an ATTACHMENT that include templates for the data entry of Child Placement Information, Child Demographics, Foster Parent Demographics and Targeted ZIP Code Information. The Child Placement Information template has embedded formulas that will allow for calculation of time periods for length of stay.]
   - Pivot Tables can be created to summarize the data contained in the spreadsheets.
   - Information can also be imported into an ACCESS database, allowing queries, or inventory of the information available, that will allow you to sort, display and print your information in many different formats. For example, information regarding the number of placement changes within the first 30 days of placement can be generated through an ACCESS query.

   a. **Child Placements Information.**

      Examples of analysis that may be created regarding placement stability include the following:
      1.) Reasons for initial removal
      2.) Average number of placements by months, and by age of child
      3.) Average number of placements during the first 30 days of care following initial removal
      4.) End reasons for disrupted relative placements
      5.) Number of placements by placement type

The following are examples of charts and analyses from the Placement Stability Process Review Tools ATTACHMENT that includes the four template data entry tools:

**Example Analysis - Child Placement Information Template: Average Number of Placements by Age**

During the 12 month period youth 13 to 17 years of age experienced an average of 5.9 placements during the first twelve months of care, thus experiencing the greatest level of placement instability. Children 6 - 12 years of age averaged 5.7
placements during the first 12 months of care. Placement stability is just slightly better for children 0 – 5 year of age, who averaged 5.6 placements.

The age breakdown of the children in this study included 39 children ages 0 to 5, 51 children ages 6 to 12, and 40 children ages 13 to 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Children</th>
<th>Average Number of Placements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Number of Placements in First 12 Months by Age of Child 1/04-1/05**
b. Child Demographics.
   Examples of analysis that may be created regarding child demographics include the following:
   1.) Children in care by gender, race, age, special needs
   2.) Number licensed foster homes available by area contrasted with the number of foster children by area
   3.) Percent of siblings not placed together

**Example Analysis – Child Demographics: Children in Care by Special Needs.**
During the course of the year, case notes reflected that children were exhibiting the following breakdown of special needs: 33% behavior, 30% emotional, 21% none, 11% physical and 3% speech. The special needs reflected below were not all diagnosed behaviors, but were reflected in the child’s case notes.
c. Foster Parents Demographics

**Analysis Example 3: Foster Parents By Age Category.**
This example shows that the greatest number of foster parents are in their sixties, followed by foster parents in their fifties. There are 35 foster mothers in the local area and 35 foster fathers.

**EXAMPLE:**

- **FOSTER PARENTS BY AGE CATEGORY**

  ![Chart showing age distribution of foster parents]

  - Foster Fathers’ Ages
  - Foster Mothers’ Ages

  **Example Analysis – Foster Parent Demographics Table: Foster Homes By County, By Race**
  Of the 20 families studied, 10 are Caucasian, and 7 are African American families, and 3 are other races. The breakdown of the Other Families includes 2 Spanish families and 1 Creole family.

  **EXAMPLE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Caucasian Families</th>
<th>African-American Families</th>
<th>Other Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Targeted Recruitment by Zip Codes

Examples of tables that can be created for analysis of foster home demographics include the following:

- Foster parents by recruitment effort types
- Foster parents by over/under capacity
- Foster parents by socio-economic status
- Foster parents by groups (military family, retired)
- Foster parents by race, age
- Specific reasons for closure


- An ad-hoc report was generated in from SACWIS which included all the zip codes in the local district, and the number of children who were removed during the past year from each of the zip code areas. Another report listed all the foster parents of the local district by zip code. The two lists enabled a comparison of the number of children removed from each zip code with the number of foster family homes and available beds from each zip code.

- This type of analysis provides a clear picture of the specific areas where targeted recruitment efforts should be focused.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
<th>Number Licensed Homes</th>
<th>Number of Beds Available in Licensed Homes</th>
<th># Children Removed by ZIP Code Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99438</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99457</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99436</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99455</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99504</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99503</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99502</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99501</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99509</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99506</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99524</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99526</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99531</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99532</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99533</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99354</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99535</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99549</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99548</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>