



Citizens' Review Board for Children

CHILD PROTECTION ANNUAL REPORT CALENDAR YEAR 2004

MARYLAND'S CHILD PROTECTION CITIZENS' REVIEW

In 1996 Congress amended the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) to provide federal grants to states that have citizen review panels meeting quarterly to monitor child protection agencies. Maryland needed at least three (3) panels to comply with federal regulation.

In 1999 Maryland modified Family Law Article 5-539.1, 5-7A-06 and Health Article 5-704 to identify the State Citizens' Review Board for Children (State Board), the State Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (State Council) and the State Fatality Review Team (State Team) as Maryland's three state citizens review panels.

LOCAL CITIZENS' REVIEW BOARDS FOR CHILDREN

The Citizens' Review Board for Children (CRBC) was formerly the Foster Care Review Board. The name was changed to reflect the broadening of the role to include child protection and review of kinship care cases.

Maryland currently has 270 members appointed by the Governor who review the safety, well being, and permanency for children placed in Maryland's out-of-home child welfare system. The State Board of the Citizens' Review Board for Children, which governs the program, consists of ten members elected from the volunteer review board members statewide and one gubernatorial appointee from the Governor's staff.

LOCAL CHILD PROTECTION PANELS

Maryland went a step further than other states by adopting Family Law Article 5-539.2, which encouraged each Maryland jurisdiction to establish a *local* citizens review panel to assist the State Board and the State Council in reviewing local child welfare records and assessing their community's child protection system.

Local governing officials appointed local citizens review panels in all 24 Maryland Jurisdictions.

Local panels receive their authority to review local cases from the State Citizens' Review Board for Children. In addition, the Review Board has a legislative responsibility to set protocols that govern the scope of activities of local citizens review panels to reflect their compliance with CAPTA standards.

Local Child Protection Citizen Review Panels establish case review committees to review child welfare records for the State Board. The Citizens Review Board for Children provides training to all panel members and local staff participating in case reviews. Panel members are certified by the State Board to conduct case reviews. Local Review committees consist of at least three certified panel members, including at least one volunteer.

Local child protection citizen review panels:

- Meet at least quarterly;
- Offer a unique opportunity to review laws, policies, practice and child protection cases to assess how well State and local agencies work together to protect Maryland's children;
- Prepare an annual report of activities, trends and insights; and
- Engage in public outreach to give citizens an avenue to express their opinions of how the system is protecting children.

Child Protection panels must consist of a majority of volunteers; they may include agency representatives and experts in child welfare as long as they maintain a volunteer majority.

Panels illuminate effective practices with positive outcomes for children and families that might beneficially be adopted system-wide and advocate for reforms when children are at risk of suffering further harm by falling through system cracks

Maryland's panels reviewed ten cases in 2001, 41 in 2002 and 75 in 2003. This Child Protection System Annual Report reflects the child protection activities and findings of the State Board for calendar year 2004. It includes data from 86 reviews requested by the State Board to be completed by local review panels.

MARYLAND'S PUBLIC OUTREACH

The Child Abuse Prevention Treatment Act (CAPTA) was amended in 2003 to require citizen review panels to provide "public outreach and comment in order to assess the impact of current procedures and practices upon children and families in the community" and in order to maintain the state's receipt of CAPTA dollars.

A revised Outreach Plan was preliminarily approved by the State Board on December 10, 2004 to include the use of CRBC's website to encourage public comment to the State Board and local panels, surveys for child welfare recipients, an annual statewide public forum, local annual public forums and the use of public service announcements to encourage community participation in public outreach efforts.

2004 STATE OF MARYLAND'S CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM

Two thousand three (2003) was marked by high-profile deaths of children at the hands of their caregivers – the two most noted were Ciara Jobes and Travon Morris, both of whom had had contact with the child protection system. These cases brought a major increase in attention to the child welfare system, largely because of public information provided by the child fatality review teams, which had been created in the same 1999 legislation that established citizen review panels. These events triggered a discussion of both the performance of local departments of social services and the extent of responsibility by other human services agencies and the public in general. Using a 1998 statute, DHR released information relating to cases where children had died following abuse. There were Congressional hearings that included Maryland officials, and the House of Delegates established a Child Welfare Workgroup within its Appropriations Committee.

Child Welfare positions had been frozen by the Glendening Administration since October 2001. In 2003, attention was focused on several jurisdictions that had been particularly hard hit by hiring restrictions. Some relief was provided to these areas in the latter half of calendar year 2003 and early 2004. Working with advocates, including CRBC, the General Assembly included language in the budget bill for fiscal year 2005 requiring DHR to increase hiring of frontline caseworkers and supervisor or face fiscal penalties. Generally, however, hiring continued to be severely restricted through mid-2004. Since that time, well over 150 additional positions have been staffed.

While there has been notable improvement since 2003, we still have a ways to go in keeping children safe.

Also during calendar year 2004, the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) convened the Task Force on Child Welfare Accountability. The Annie E. Casey Foundation met DBM's request to provide leadership and staff. The Task Force was mandated by budget language that was enacted during the 2003 legislative session. More information on the Task Force is provided in the final section of this report.

CHILD PROTECTION PANEL INITIATIVES

TRAINING

The Review Board has had a Certificate of Authorization of Provisional Sponsorship for the State Board of Social Work Examiners since April 2002.

In October 2004, CRBC submitted the last of the five training programs to the Board of Social Work Examiners Continuing Education Regulations to be authorized to sponsor Category I Continuing Education Units (CEU). It is anticipated that the Review Board will be authorized in 2005.

Maryland Child Protection System Citizens Review Panel

CRBC offered the Maryland Child Protection System Citizens Review Panel training in Howard and Wicomico County. Eight participants from four jurisdictions participated. We provided four social workers with six Category I continuing education credits for completing the training.

Child Protection Citizens Review Certification

Fifty-four (54) participants completed the Child Protection Citizen Review Certification training. It was offered in Howard (19 participants), Wicomico (16), Prince George's (10) and Anne Arundel (9) Counties. Twenty (20) social workers received 12 Category I continuing education credits for completing the training.

CHILD PROTECTION CASE REVIEWS

Purpose

The purpose of conducting case reviews is to provide the opportunity for panel members to:

- Assess what happens when a family becomes involved with the child protection system;
- Gather useful information about how evidence and decision-making is documented;
- Provide statistical data measuring legislative compliance;
- Reinforce system strengths, identify weaknesses and develop recommendations to improve the protection of children and prevention of maltreatment;
- Advocate for resources needed to achieve Maryland's goal of keeping children safe; and
- Provide validation of successful system efforts and exceptional staff.

The State Board and local panels utilize case review results to increase community, stakeholder, and government sensitivity, responsibility, and investment in the protection of Maryland's children.

2004 Activity

In 2004, case review committees from 17 jurisdictions evaluated a total of 86 cases at the request of the State Board. The Baltimore City Panel reviewed the most records; they reviewed 13 cases arising from child protection investigations.

Nineteen (19) physical abuse, 12 sexual abuse and 55 neglect cases were the focus investigations for the reviews. CRBC staff found 34 subsequent investigations involving 23 families.

Fifty-seven cases (57) out of the 86 cases reviewed (66%) received continuing in-home services from the local department or the children were placed in out-of-home care. The other 34%, although found to be indicated for some type of maltreatment, did not get continuing services from the local department of social services.

State Board Sample Method

To initiate a case review, the State Board selects completed child abuse and neglect investigations from the state's Client Information System (CIS) database that were found to have been "Indicated" due to credible evidence which had not been satisfactorily refuted that abuse or neglect had occurred.

The local out-of-home placement review boards review records of children that have been in out-of-home placement for six months in most cases. In an effort to capture cases that relate to the activities of the local boards, the State Board oversamples:

- Investigations that resulted in placement of children.
- Cases in which the family has received long-term services from a local department of social services; and
- Children under age 1.

In order to be able to provide some analysis of the different types of investigations, the State Board also oversamples sexual abuse investigations.

Case Review Procedures

The State Board requests all prior and subsequent child welfare files related to the randomly selected investigation so that case review committee members may assess the use of historical data during investigations and overall system

effectiveness. The Case Review Committees evaluate five functions of child protection systems:

- Reporting child abuse and neglect;
- Receiving and screening child abuse and neglect allegations;
- Investigating and assessing child abuse and neglect allegations, including gathering information, assessing children's safety, assessing risk of future maltreatment, and making findings of whether abuse or neglect occurred as alleged;
- Responding to child abuse and neglect, including intra-agency teamwork ("staffings"), multi-disciplinary consultation, service planning and provision, placement, appeals, and several court-related functions; and
- Supervision and administration.

The time frame of the investigations and subsequent service activity that was evaluated in the case reviews conducted in calendar year 2004 was from early 2003 through 2004.

The Case Review Committee's evaluation of the respective functions and sub-functions are recorded on the Case Review Evaluation Form. Results are computed by comparing the number of cases found effective in each functional area to the overall cases rated on that functional area and converting to percentage points.

For any given child protection function, an agency is considered to have performed effectively if it has taken necessary measures to satisfy the criteria listed on the evaluation form and any other necessary measures to protect children. The reviewers may decide which criteria under each function are applicable in a given case. The majority vote is checked for each case function. Panel members make text entries in the Rationale/Recommendation section to provide additional information on why a function was considered effective or ineffective and/or comment on system strengths.

Child Protection System Strengths

The following functions have been rated effective since case reviews began in 2001.

- Reporting Child Maltreatment – Effectiveness Rating 98%
- Receiving/Screening Reports – Effectiveness Rating 89%
- Investigation/Finding – Effectiveness Rating 93%

The sampling method may bias these results toward findings of "effective" since all focus cases were reported, accepted and found "indicated." These results may change if panels begin to review "unsubstantiated", "ruled out" or "screened out" cases. Within the Receiving/Screening function, the Department improved on performing background checks on all family members through the Client Information System (CIS) from 51% effectiveness of all investigations in 2003 to 67% of all investigations in 2004.

The following areas were assessed to have been performed effectively in 90 to 95% of instances, which is the standard used by the federal government in its Child and Family Services Reviews:

Initiation of Investigation: Effectiveness Rating 92%

The Investigators responded effectively to the allegations and child's circumstances 79 out of 86 cases. This is important to securing the child's safety and assessing their well being at the onset of an investigation

Investigators Made Reasonable Efforts to Interview Parties: Effectiveness rating 89%

This area was found in the "Improving Critical Areas" of our 2003 report. Compared to prior years' findings, the panels found in 2004 that more efforts had been made to interview parties, including parents, alleged perpetrators, children, household members and service providers.

Documentation was Concise, Useful, Organized and Relevant: Effectiveness rating 94%

Reviewers found records easier to read, which could be due to familiarity of the reviewers with the record formats.

Information in DSS Records Supported CRBC Out-of-Home Review Boards Records: Overall Effectiveness Rating 100%

In all 12 applicable cases the panels found that information in the record supported the finding of the review boards recommendations.

Child Protection Functions Showing Improvement in 2004

Overall, the number of cases deemed effective increased by 6-23 percentage points in 2004 from 2003 in the various functional areas assessed by local review panels. All areas (except the Appeal Function) improved. We also noted a modest decline in the average caseload of cases reviewed. We recognize that conclusions should be made with an understanding of the limitations of the methodology: the sample is very small and the distribution of cases among the jurisdictions changed considerably since 2003. Table I shows the number of reviews by jurisdiction for 2003 and 2004. Five counties (Baltimore County, Montgomery, Queen Anne's, Washington, Worcester) accounted for 31 reviews in 2004 versus only 11 in 2003. These five had significantly better-than-average effectiveness ratings in nearly all areas.

Child Welfare Caseloads: In 2003, the average child protective services investigation caseload for the reviewed sample was 19.8 cases per worker, while the Child Welfare League of America Standard for investigations is 12 per worker. In 2004, the CPS investigation caseload dropped to an average of 18.8 cases per worker, which is still seven over CWLA standards.

Table I
Number of Reviews Conducted by Jurisdiction and Calendar Year

Jurisdiction	Number 2003	Number 2004	Jurisdiction	Number 2003	Number 2004
Allegany	5	5	Harford	2	1
Anne Arundel	5	6	Howard	2	3
Baltimore City	12	13	Kent	0	0
Baltimore County	2	7	Montgomery	0	2
Calvert	0	1	Prince George's	14	11
Caroline	0	0	Queen Anne's	1	4
Carroll	2	0	Saint Mary's	3	0
Cecil	3	0	Somerset	4	4
Charles	5	5	Talbot	1	0
Dorchester	0	1	Washington	3	10
Frederick	1	2	Wicomico	3	0
Garrett	2	3	Worcester	5	8
			Statewide Total	75	86

Table II
Comparison of Effectiveness Ratings by Functions
Calendars Years 2003 and 2004

Function	2003 Rating	2004 Rating
Reporting	91%	98%
Receiving/Screening	80%	89%
Investigation – Information Gathering	69%	87%
Investigation – Safety Assessment	61%	81%
Investigation – Risk Assessment	69%	82%
Finding	87%	93%
Supervision/Administration	65%	88%
Service Planning	61%	72%
Internal Staffing	58%	76%
Multi-disciplinary Consultation	47%	69%
Placement	58%	76%
Appeal	100%	89%
Court – CINA	76%	82%
Court – Protective Order	88%	88%
Court – Custody	67%	57%
Court – Criminal	44%	67%

Maltreatment Type: Effectiveness of sexual abuse and neglect cases was improved for safety, risk and service provision¹ functions compared to 2003; while physical abuse cases effectiveness remained the same (72%). Effectiveness of safety functions in sexual abuse cases was increased by twenty-two percent (22%).

Seventeen (17) of the 55 neglect cases resulted in 25 subsequent investigations. One case with a subsequent investigation received no services for the focus investigation or for the subsequent investigation. Five neglect cases with subsequent investigations resulted in placement.

Five of the 18 physical abuse cases resulted in subsequent investigations. All cases with subsequent investigations received services. One case resulted in three subsequent investigations, and while the children were finally placed, the panel found the department ineffective in assessing risk and providing services.

One of the 12 sexual abuse cases reviewed had a subsequent Child Protective Services investigation. No services were provided in this case, and it was found to be ineffective in risk and service provision.

Only six of 12 sexual abuse cases and seven of 18 physical abuse cases received follow-up services despite all cases being found indicated for abuse. All of these cases resulted from investigations that took place in calendar year 2003.

Investigation – Information Gathering: Overall Effectiveness rate 87%

The evaluation of the Investigation/Assessment function-Information Gathering includes contacting and questioning individuals, reviewing prior history, and assembling documents. This area was found to be effective in 74 out of 86 cases. The greatest improvement since last year in this area was an increase in “investigators making reasonable efforts to interview parties”. There was also significant improvement in coordination with other agencies and coordinating the investigation process in the best interest of the child and family.

Investigation – Safety: Overall Effectiveness rate 81%

Using an assessment tool called “SAFE-C,” investigators gauge whether a child is safe at the time of the investigation and whenever circumstances change sufficiently to create a significant new possibility of imminent maltreatment. In 2003, the overall effectiveness was 61% and safety determination was listed as an area needing improvement.

Child in Need of Assistance: Overall Effectiveness rate 82%

In 31 of the applicable 32 cases, court action and hearings were completed in a timely manner

¹ References to “services” or “service provision” in this section include services provided by either the local department or another governmental or community agency.

Recommendations for System Improvement in Critical Areas

In the following critical areas, assessed effectiveness was unacceptably low. These functions should be performed effectively in 90 to 95% of instances – a standard that the federal government uses in its Child and Family Services Reviews.

All Individuals Screened for Prior History: Effectiveness rate 67%

It is impossible to fully assess a child's safety and risk of future maltreatment without checking the agency database to determine if any household members have a history of child maltreatment. Panel members noted numerous times that documentation was lacking that fathers, grandparents, mothers, paramours, primary caregivers and many others that the panels deemed important "in order to ensure the safety of the children" were screened for prior history. Our standard expectation is that local departments check the DHR database for prior involvement.

Recommendation: DHR and local departments must ensure that CIS is available at all times of day and is fully utilized for each report.

Safety Assessment: Overall Effectiveness rate 81% As noted earlier, this area has greatly improved; however it still falls below 90% on every criterion. Two critical areas of improvement were noted: addressing all maltreatment issues (79%) and monitoring families' compliance with safety plan (71%). The former item seeks to avoid instances in which a department may address the focus investigation issue of abuse but ignores additional maltreatment issues that are clearly documented in the record and may pose a threat to the child.

Frequently, panel members noted that issues related to parental supervision of child at risk of neglect or sexual abuse were never addressed. Reviewers also indicated that families' histories of domestic violence were not seen as safety issues to the children and were not addressed or referred to another agency for intervention. Also one panel noted that the "DSS worker left the children unattended in a dangerous environment."

In addition, the safety assessment function is closely linked with proper screening of family and household members. Panel members repeatedly noted concern about individuals who posed a threat to the children but were not screened for prior history or household members who were not entered into CIS as case associate, which could result in future screening problems.

Recommendation: A team approach to assessing safety and monitoring plans would bring out more information and perspectives.

Service Planning Function: Overall Effectiveness rate 72%

This function had a dramatic improvement from last year's results but still falls within unacceptable levels. Physical Abuse investigations were less likely to receive services and the overall rating for those investigations was only 50% effective. As noted earlier, three cases with subsequent maltreatment did not receive services, and sixteen (16) out of thirty-one (31) abuse cases did *not* receive any services despite being indicated for abuse. The records rarely document whether services were even offered.

It is not cost effective to merely identify maltreatment; rather, treatment for children, services, and non-maltreating caregivers should be provided to prevent reoccurrences and keep children safe. It is well-known that children who have been abused or neglected have trouble in school, higher delinquency rates, criminal records and lower overall functioning scores. These all cost taxpayer dollars to manage. Early intervention saves money. We see this in the results of our reviews. Reviewers noted strengths when services were provided to family, such as "excellent and comprehensive" and "successful".

Recommendation: All families that become involved with Child Protective Services should be offered services and these attempts should be clearly documented in the record with a confirmation signature by the client.

REVIEW DATA SUPPORTING CRBC LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Develop Quality Assurance Methods for Child Welfare Services that Incorporate Long-Term Outcome Measures.

Unfortunately records rarely include any indication that families were involved in the assessment and planning of services to their families. All of the documents in the record are filled in and signed by the DSS worker or another professional. In 17 out of 72 cases, the family were not offered or provided services to address safety, risk or permanency. And in 12% of the cases the family was apparently not involved in the service plan development despite the existence of procedure to document involvement.

The Task Force on Child Welfare Accountability issued a report on December 1, 2004, with 16 recommendations, including the creation of an entirely new quality assurance system. House Bill 1197 (Child Welfare Accountability Act) is pending in the General Assembly as of this writing and would codify implementation of the recommendations. It would also provide a tighter relationship between the work done by CRBC and DHR's process of evaluating and assessing its performance. We strongly urge enactment of House Bill 1197.

Reform the Placement System to Meet Children's Needs

The placement function overall effectiveness was found to be effective in 31 out of 41 cases (76%) in which the panels felt placement was applicable. In six

cases, siblings were not placed together although they posed no risk to one another. In addition the panels felt the department could have made a greater effort in finding relative placements for children in 24% of the 41 cases in which children were removed from the home.

Every year, the foster care payments budget runs a \$15-35 million deficit as more and more children enter high-cost placements. This process puts great pressure on family support, family preservation, reunification, and kinship/foster family services that can benefit children at lower cost.

Recommendations for children at risk of placement disruption: 1) a thorough and accurate assessment of each child's needs every three months followed by a meeting of DSS and the child placement agency; 2) use of the assessment to select an appropriate placement setting and the correct array of support services; 3) a new system of contracting with placement agencies to promote tailoring support services to the child's needs; 4) a new program of *Enhanced Family Care* to provide "wrap-around" services to children in kinship and foster care families who are at risk of being removed from their placement settings due to behavioral problems or other special needs; 5) a ban on moving a child from an appropriate family for the sole purpose of saving money; 5) checks and balances to assure that the State is not paying for unneeded services.

Investigate Child Abuse and Neglect and Protect Victims

The reviews provide an in-depth look at critical areas of assessing Maryland's child protection system. While we noted substantial improvement in many critical areas, 34 subsequent maltreatment investigations among only 86 cases is a significant number and indicates that Maryland has a ways to go in protecting children that have come to its attention. To fully understand this phenomenon of subsequent investigations, we need to determine for each one whether it is a report of events that occurred prior to or following the index investigation.

Recommendation: DHR should define new standards for 1) what constitutes a thorough investigation of child abuse and neglect allegations and 2) protection of children who are found to be abused and neglected.

Integrate Child Welfare and Substance Abuse Treatment Services

In 13 out of 85 cases panel members felt that substance abuse was not assessed.

Parental substance abuse is the number one cause of child abuse and neglect. In response to HB 7/SB 671 (2000), DHR and DHMH have placed 9 addiction specialists in child welfare offices and initiated a system of referrals for treatment. About 35 people per month have entered treatment, and there is great potential to increase this number if enough addiction specialists and treatment slots

become available. Funds have been cut from \$4.2 million to \$2.6 million. Only 3% of 17,000 treatment slots are tailored to the needs of women or women with children. Cross-training should be restarted. At this writing, House Bill 839 is pending approval by the Senate. The bill would allow more families to get access to treatment and would provide for a formal evaluation of the program for integrating child welfare services with substance abuse treatment.

Recommendation: The General Assembly should enact HB 839, and the Administration should increase funding for integration of child welfare and substance abuse treatment services.

Continue to Implement the Child Welfare Workforce Act of 1998.

The Workforce act was a comprehensive attempt to improve qualifications, training, and retention of frontline casework and supervisory staff. It also focused on reducing caseloads. DHR is close to achieving caseload ratios that meet standards established by the Child Welfare League of America. House Bill 1197 would write those standards into Maryland law.

Recommendation: The General Assembly should enact HB 1197. Training and quality of supervision should be priorities for the DHR and should focus on child protection, permanency, placement reform, substance abuse treatment, and accountability.

SUMMARY

The Citizens' Review Board for Children is very proud to be a voice for children. We appreciate the efforts and commitment of local panel members and are especially grateful to the certified reviewers that put long hours into reviewing records for the State Board. They have provided much valuable data about whether procedures are followed, whether they are accessible, and whether caseloads are too large. Their information and advocacy played a role in the filling of more than 150 positions for child welfare workers and supervisors.

We still have a long way to go until all Maryland children are free from abuse and neglect. In 2005, we will focus on family safety; and we will be strengthening our relationships with stakeholders to improve the quality of services and system accountability.

THE STATE BOARD

Ted Kirk, Chairperson

Representing Frederick and Montgomery Counties

Nettie Anderson-Burrs, Vice-Chairperson

Representing Allegany, Garrett, and Washington Counties

LaDean Barksdale

Representing Anne Arundel, Carroll, and Howard Counties

Deidre Bosley

Representing Baltimore and Harford Counties

Carol Carson

Representing Caroline, Cecil, Kent, Queen Anne's and Talbot Counties

Rev. Cameron Carter

Representing Baltimore City

Deborah Harburger

Representing the Governor

Dorothea Henry

Representing Dorchester, Somerset, Wicomico, and Worcester Counties

Mae Kastor

Representing Baltimore City

Sylvia Smith

Representing Baltimore City

James Trent

Representing Calvert, Charles, Prince George's, and Saint Mary's Counties

APPENDIX

Detailed Data on Panels' Evaluations of Child Protection Functions Calendar Year 2004

Panel Found Effective				Function
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
Reporting				
77	8			Reports were timely
84	2			Reporter provided sufficient info to investigate & locate child
27	4	32	16	Reporter received Child Abuse & Neglect Training
40	25	21		Mandated reporter written report in record
61	7	17		Mandated written report provided info to investigate/locate child
84	2			Overall Reporting Function Effectiveness
Receiving/Screening				
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
85			1	Agency accessible to make report in timely manner
86				Screener solicited sufficient info to investigate/locate child
58	28			All individuals screened for prior history
57	18	10	1	Prior history of maltreatment considered
81	3	1		Screening rationale consistent with law and regulation
77	8			All maltreatment issues accepted for investigation
81	4			Timeliness of agency response consistent with nature of report
76	9			Overall Receiving/Screening Function Effectiveness
Information Gathering				
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
79	7			Investigation initiation consistent w/ allegation/child's circumstance
76	9			Investigators made reasonable efforts to interview parties
46	9	29	1	DSS/police coordinated/shared info during investigation
55	13	16	2	Appropriate coordination with other agencies
59	9			Process was coordinated in the child/family's best interest
61	5	17	2	Appropriate resources available to assess maltreatment
72	1	8	3	Child/family confidentiality maintained
44	29	4		Info re: culture/religion/race/ethnic factors gathered/assessed
74	11	1		Overall Information Gathering Function Effectiveness
Safety Assessment				
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
74	9	2		Safety of all children in maltreater's care was assessed
66	18	2		All maltreatment issues were addressed
56	13	15	2	Prior maltreatment reports considered when assessing children's safety
68	16			Safety Assessment/plan adequately addressed known threats
49	20	15		Family monitored for safety plan compliance
67	16	3		Overall Safety Assessment Effectiveness

Panel Found Effective				Function
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
				Risk Assessment
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
75	10			Parental willingness to protect children/cooperation level considered
72	13			Assessed for presence of domestic violence / substance abuse
59	14	12		Prior maltreatment history considered in assessing risk
68	14	2		Risk assessment assessed potential future maltreatment
70	15	1		Overall Risk Assessment Function Effectiveness
				Finding
82	3			Disposition/Finding rational consistent with Family Law & COMAR
72	13			Investigations completed in a timely manner
78	6	2		Overall Finding Function Effectiveness
				Supervision/Administration
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
65	5	11	2	Organizational resources supported agency functions
81	5			Documentation concise, useful, organized & relevant
64	22			All household members/case associates entered into Client Info System
68	10	2	3	Supervision utilized throughout process
26	31	1	3	Caseload consistent with CWLA standards
72	10	4		Overall Supervision/Administration Effectiveness
				Service Planning
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
53	13	20		Case closed only after maltreatment issues addressed
58	11	15		Service plan based on needs identified in assessments
36	32	5	2	Cultural, religious, ethnic and racial factors addressed
61	8	17		Family involved in service plan development
66	5	14		Timely services/resources available to address maltreatment
55	17	14		Timely services offered/provided to address safety/risk/family unity
49	17	19		Services coordinated with all providers
50	19	17		Overall Service Planning Function Effectiveness
				Intradepartmental Staffing
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
49	17	19	1	Staffing utilized to determined safety, risk , findings
45	16	24		Staffing utilized for service planning / coordination
44	21	19	1	Staffings were documented in case record
44	14	26		Overall Intradepartmental Staffing Function Effectiveness

Panel Found Effective				Function
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
Multi-Disciplinary				
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
17	17	48	1	Multi-D Team utilized to determine safety/risk/finding
17	15	49	2	Multi-D Team utilized for service planning & coordination
18	14	49	2	Multi-D Team provided useful case coordination/service expansion
20	9	55	2	Overall Multi-Disciplinary Function Effectiveness
Placement				
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
31	6	47		Children removed when health/welfare at imminent risk of harm
25	8	50		Attempt to identify/locate/interview/inform relatives for placement
16	21	21		Placement resource Client Info System/ criminal clearance in record
28	4	51		Stablization services provided to children after placement
12		69	1	Record info support Out-of-Home Review Boards recommendations
15	6	62	1	When in their best interest, siblings placed together
23	1	60		Siblings assigned to same caseworker
31	10	44		Overall Placement Function Effectiveness
Appeal				
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
13	1	66	1	Appeal process timely / accessible to family
2		76	1	Records properly amended / expunged
1		76	1	Appeal outcome consistent with CINA court determination
3		73	1	Decisions in child's best interest / safety
8	1	75		Overall Appeal Function Effectiveness
Court – CINA / CINS				
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
28	5	50	1	Child in Need of Assistance/CINS petition filed (if appropriate)
30	1	52		Court actions/hearings completed in a timely manner
25	4	53	1	Appropriate legal representation of parties in court proceedings
25	5	52		Court orders / decisions in child's best interest
28	6	52		Overall CINA / CINS Function Effectiveness
Court – Protective Order				
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
7	2	70		Protective order sought to keep child safe with non-offending family
7		72		Protective order process timely/accessible
5	2	71		Assistance to family was provided
7	1	78		Overall Protective Order Function Effectiveness

Panel Found Effective				Function
Yes	No	N/A	Unk	
Court – Custody				
5	4	71		Custody case sought to keep child safe w/ non-maltreating parent/guard
5		74	1	Custody process was timely/accessible
4	1	72		Assistance to family was provided
4	3	78		Overall Custody Function Effectiveness
Court – Criminal Function				
15	4	59	3	Criminal prosecution was utilized
6	4	67	3	Assistance / support services provided to family during process
9	1	65	3	Criminal Process was timely
6	4	61	2	Criminal process, including probation, protected community
10	5	65		Overall Criminal Function Effectiveness

Child Protection Investigations by Year and Type

Jurisdiction	Calendar Year 2003			Calendar Year 2004		
	Neglect	Physical Abuse	Sexual Abuse	Neglect	Physical Abuse	Sexual Abuse
Allegany	312	205	107	294	238	128
Anne Arundel	1,247	1,121	344	1,244	1,064	386
Baltimore County	934	1,528	493	956	1,418	443
Calvert	169	193	58	154	122	48
Caroline	150	106	38	149	112	32
Carroll	340	295	148	355	259	156
Cecil	226	262	88	286	220	112
Charles	278	292	102	247	292	94
Dorchester	145	73	22	179	70	28
Frederick	898	625	254	509	397	186
Garrett	100	56	30	102	58	25
Harford	568	434	139	670	364	124
Howard	625	494	157	526	383	149
Kent	16	34	13	38	44	20
Montgomery	1,030	856	236	1,194	968	235
Prince George's	967	1,597	373	1,014	1,579	414
Queen Anne's	89	70	32	96	61	24
St. Mary's	155	128	54	178	118	55
Somerset	149	98	47	176	91	32
Talbot	122	72	28	98	61	26
Washington	1,049	382	212	1,015	378	226
Wicomico	570	328	148	516	286	128
Worcester	232	149	85	209	146	64
Baltimore City	3,442	2,221	616	3,485	2,240	584
Statewide²	13,807	11,616	3,811	13,687	10,967	3,715

² Source: Social Services Administration, Monthly Management Reports for December 2003 and 2004. Columns may not add exactly due to rounding errors.