

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Final Report: Wisconsin Child and Family Services Review

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the State of Wisconsin. The CFSR assesses State child welfare agency performance with regard to seven child welfare outcomes in the areas of safety, permanency, and well-being and seven systemic factors pertaining to child welfare agency operations. The Wisconsin CFSR was conducted the week of August 18, 2003. The findings were derived from the following documents and data collection procedures:

- The Statewide Assessment, prepared by the State child welfare agency – the Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS) of the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services;
- The State Data Profile, prepared by the Children’s Bureau of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which provides State child welfare data for the years 1999 through 2001;
- Reviews of 50 cases at three sites in the State (Milwaukee County, Kenosha County, and Outagamie County - the local child welfare agencies). While four juvenile justice out-of-home care cases were included in the sample of 50 cases to be reviewed, one of these cases was reviewed as a non-juvenile justice case because the child entered out of home care due to neglect.
- Interviews or focus groups (conducted at all three sites and at the State-level) with stakeholders including, but not limited to children, parents, foster parents, all levels of state and local child welfare personnel, collaborating agency personnel, Tribal representatives, service providers, court personnel, and attorneys.

A key finding of the Wisconsin CFSR was that the State was in substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2 (Children receive services to meet their educational needs). The CFSR determined that for the most part, local child welfare agencies make concerted efforts to ensure that children’s educational needs are assessed and identified service needs are met.

However, Wisconsin was not in substantial conformity with the remaining six child welfare outcomes assessed through the CFSR. One of the areas of greatest concern with regard to State performance on the outcomes occurred for Permanency Outcome 2 (The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children). This outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in only 44 percent of the cases reviewed. CFSR findings indicate that, although local agencies make concerted efforts to ensure that children in foster care are placed in close proximity to their parents and communities of origin, the agencies are less consistent in its efforts to place siblings together, establish frequent visitation between children in foster care and their parents and siblings, preserve connections for children in foster care, seek relatives as potential placement resources, and promote or maintain a strong, emotionally-supportive relationship between children in foster care and their parents.

Another area of concern was Permanency Outcome 1 (Children have permanency and stability in their living situations). This outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in only 48 percent of the foster care cases reviewed and all indicators for the outcome were

rated as Areas Needing Improvement. CFSR findings for this outcome indicate that local agencies are not consistent in making diligent efforts to prevent foster care re-entries, ensure placement stability for children in foster care, establish appropriate permanency goals in a timely manner, achieve permanency for children (through adoption, reunification, or permanent placement with relatives) in a timely manner; or ensure that older children in long-term foster care receive appropriate services to assist them in making the transition from foster care to independent living. Stakeholders and case reviewers identified the following barriers to achieving timely permanency: (1) a child welfare agency and court practice of maintaining the goal of reunification when the prognosis for achieving that goal is poor, (2) a reluctance on the part of local agencies to seek termination of parental rights (TPR) until an adoptive resource is found for the child, and (3) delays in the TPR process due to parents' requests for a jury trial and other factors.

Another area of concern identified through the CFSR pertains to the State's performance on Well-Being Outcome 1 (Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs). Only 54 percent of the applicable cases reviewed were determined to have substantially achieved this outcome. Although the CFSR findings indicate that local agencies make concerted efforts to establish frequent contact between caseworkers and the children in their caseloads, agencies are less consistent in their efforts to assess needs and provide services to families, involve parents and children in the case planning process, and ensure that caseworkers establish sufficient contact with the parents in their caseloads.

The State's performance with respect to Well-Being Outcome 3 (Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs) also was an identified concern, with only 68.8 percent of applicable cases rated as having substantially achieved this outcome. A key concern identified was that children are not receiving mental health assessments even when the nature of the maltreatment, the dynamics of the family, and/or the family's and child's history indicate that a mental health assessment is warranted.

With regard to the systemic factors, the CFSR determined that the State was in substantial conformity with the factors of Statewide Information System; Agency Responsiveness to the Community; and Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. The State did not achieve substantial conformity with the systemic factors of Case Review System, Quality Assurance System, Training, and Service Array. A key concern identified was that the State has not made sufficient efforts to ensure that all of the federally recognized Tribes in the State have input into the development of DCFS programs and policies. It also was noted that caseworkers are not adhering to the requirements of the Indian Child Welfare Act on a consistent basis.

The overall findings with regard to the State's performance on the safety and permanency outcomes are presented in table 1 at the end of the Executive Summary. Findings regarding well-being outcomes are presented in table 2. Table 3 presents the State's performance relative to the national standards and table 4 provides information pertaining to the State's substantial conformity with the seven systemic factors assessed through the CFSR. A summary of the major findings is presented below.

I. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES

Safety Outcome 1: Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect

Safety Outcome 1 incorporates two indicators. One pertains to the timeliness of initiating a response to a child maltreatment report (item 1), and the other relates to the recurrence of substantiated or indicated maltreatment for the same children (item 2).

Wisconsin did not achieve substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1. This determination was based on the following findings:

- The outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 79.1 percent of the cases reviewed, which is less than the 90 percent required for a rating of substantial conformity.
- The State did not meet the national standards for (1) the percentage of children experiencing more than one substantiated or indicated child maltreatment report within a 6-month period, or (2) the percentage of children maltreated by foster parents or facility staff.

A key finding of the CFSR case reviews was that local agencies are not consistent in responding to maltreatment reports and establishing face-to-face contact in accordance with the required timeframes established by agency policy. The case reviews found that delays in responding occurred to reports classified as “urgent” as well as to those classified as “moderate to low risk.”

Another case review finding was that although the State’s data for maltreatment recurrence within 6 months (presented in the State Data Profile) does not meet the national standard of 6.1 percent or less, 95 percent of the cases reviewed were rated as a Strength for that indicator based on the assessment criteria established for the CFSR case review for that item (item 2). However, in 25 percent of the 8 cases reviewed in which there was at least one substantiated maltreatment report during the period under review, there was another substantiated report within 6 months that involved the same perpetrator and similar circumstances. In addition, stakeholders and case reviewers reported that maltreatment allegations received on open cases are not routinely reported for a formal investigation. Consequently, the actual rate of maltreatment recurrence within 6 months may be higher than the rate reported in the State Data Profile.

Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes when possible and appropriate

Performance on Safety Outcome 2 is assessed through two indicators. One indicator (item 3) addresses child welfare agency efforts to prevent children’s removal from their homes by providing services to the families that ensure children’s safety while they remain in their homes. The other indicator (item 4) pertains to the child welfare agency’s efforts to reduce risk of harm to children.

A key finding of the CFSR case reviews was that local agencies are not consistently effective in their efforts to maintain children safely in their homes. The primary concern identified in the case reviews was that the services offered were not sufficient to ensure children's safety while they remained in the home and, in some cases, children were not being removed when risk of harm was present. Case reviews determined that agencies were more effective in addressing risk of harm issues by removing children from their homes when appropriate and placing them in foster care.

Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.

There are six indicators incorporated in the assessment of permanency outcome 1, although not all of them are relevant for all children. The indicators pertain to the child welfare agency's efforts to prevent foster care re-entry (item 5), ensure placement stability for children in foster care (item 6), and establish appropriate permanency goals for children in foster care in a timely manner (item 7). Depending on the child's permanency goal, the remaining indicators focus on the child welfare agency's efforts to achieve permanency goals (such as reunification, guardianship, adoption, and permanent placement with relatives) in a timely manner (items 8 and 9), or to ensure that children who have "other planned living arrangements" as a case goal are in stable placements and adequately prepared for eventual independent living (item 10).

Wisconsin did not achieve substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1. This was based on the following findings:

- The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 48.0 percent of the cases, which is less than the 90 percent required for substantial conformity.
- The State Data Profile indicates that for fiscal year (FY) 2001, the State did not meet the national standard for (1) the percentage of children who re-entered foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode, (2) the percentage of children who were reunified within 12 months of entry into foster care; and (3) the percentage of children discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption who were discharged within 24 months of entry into foster care.

However, the State Data Profile indicates that for FY 2001, the State did meet the national standard for the percentage of children in foster care for 12 months or less who experienced no more than 2 placement settings.

Although performance with regard to this outcome was low in all CFSR sites, there was variation across sites. The outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 67 percent of Outagamie County foster care cases, compared to 46 percent of Milwaukee County foster care cases, and 40 percent of Kenosha County foster care cases.

The results of the case reviews and the data provided in the State Data Profile suggest that Wisconsin is not consistently effective with regard to (1) establishing appropriate permanency goals in a timely manner, (2) reunifying children in a timely manner, and (3)

achieving finalized adoptions in a timely manner. In addition, there were eight cases in which the child had been in foster care for 15 of the most recent 22 months, but the agency had not filed for TPR and a reason for “not filing” was not provided in the case file.

Stakeholders and case reviewers identified the following barriers to achieving timely permanency: (1) a child welfare agency and court practice of maintaining the goal of reunification when the prognosis for achieving that goal is poor, (2) a reluctance on the part of local agencies to seek termination of parental rights (TPR) until an adoptive resource is found for the child, and (3) delays in the TPR process due to parents’ requests for a jury trial and other factors.

Permanency Outcome 2. The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

Permanency Outcome 2 incorporates six indicators that assess the child welfare agency’s performance with regard to (1) placing children in foster care in close proximity to their parents and close relatives (item 11); (2) placing siblings together (item 12); (3) ensuring frequent visitation between children and their parents and siblings in foster care (item 13); (4) preserving connections of children in foster care with extended family, community, cultural heritage, religion, and schools (item 14); (5) seeking relatives as potential placement resources (item 15); and (6) promoting the relationship between children and their parents while the children are in foster care (item 16).

Wisconsin did not achieve substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 44.0 percent of the cases, which is less than the 90 percent required for substantial conformity.

Although performance with respect to achieving Permanency Outcome 2 was low in all CFSR sites, there was variation across sites. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 67 percent of Outagamie County cases, compared to 50 percent of Kenosha County cases and only 31 percent of Milwaukee County cases.

CFSR case review findings indicate that although local agencies make concerted efforts to place children in close proximity to their parents or close relatives, the agencies are less consistent in their efforts to place siblings together, ensure frequent visitation between children and parents and siblings in foster care, maintain children’s connections, seek relatives as placement resources, and promote the bond between parents and children while the children are in foster care.

Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs.

Well Being Outcome 1 incorporates four indicators. One pertains to the child welfare agency’s efforts to ensure that the service needs of children, parents, and foster parents are assessed and that the necessary services are provided to meet identified needs (item 17). A second indicator examines the child welfare agency’s efforts to actively involve parents and children (when appropriate) in the case planning process (item 18). The two remaining indicators examine the frequency and quality of caseworker’s contacts with the children in their caseloads (item 19) and the children’s parents (item 20).

Wisconsin did not achieve substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 54.0 percent of the cases reviewed, which is less than the 90 percent required for substantial conformity.

Performance with regard to achieving Well-being Outcome 1 varied across CFSR sites, although none of the sites performed at a high level. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 75 percent of Kenosha County cases, compared to 50 percent of Outagamie County cases and 46 percent of Milwaukee County cases.

CFSR case review findings indicate that local agencies are not consistent with regard to their efforts to (1) assess needs and provide services to children, parents, and foster parents; (2) involve children and parents in case planning; or (3) establish face-to-face contact with parents that is of sufficient frequency and quality to ensure children’s safety and/or promote attainment of case goals. However, in 88 percent of the cases, reviewers determined that the frequency and quality of agency staff contacts with children was sufficient to monitor their safety and promote their well-being.

A key concern identified was that, even when fathers are involved in their children’s lives, local agencies do not make concerted efforts to engage fathers in case planning, assess fathers’ service needs, provide services to fathers, or establish frequent contact with fathers.

Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.

There is only one indicator for Well-Being Outcome 2. It pertains to the child welfare agency’s efforts to assess and provide services that meet the educational needs of children in both foster care and in-home services cases (item 21).

Wisconsin achieved substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2 based on the finding that in 90.9 percent of the cases, reviewers determined that this outcome was substantially achieved. This exceeds the 90 percent required for substantial conformity.

A key CFSR finding was that local agencies make concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs and provide appropriate services to meet those needs. However, State-level and Milwaukee County stakeholders expressed concern about the number of school changes experienced by children in foster care.

Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

This outcome incorporates two indicators that assess the child welfare agency's efforts to meet children's physical health (item 22) and mental health (item 23) needs.

Wisconsin did not achieve substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 68.8 percent of the applicable cases, which is less than the 90 percent required for substantial conformity.

Performance on this outcome varied across CFSR sites. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 100 percent of Kenosha County cases, compared to 60 percent of Milwaukee County cases and 58 percent of Outagamie County cases.

The CFSR case reviews and stakeholder interviews indicate that in Milwaukee County and Outagamie County, the agencies are not consistent in addressing children's mental health or physical health service needs. A key concern identified was that children are not receiving mental health assessments even when the nature of the maltreatment, the dynamics of the family, and the family's and child's history indicate that a mental health assessment is warranted.

II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS

Statewide Information System

Substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System is determined by whether the State is operating a Statewide information system that can identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for children in foster care (item 24).

Wisconsin was determined to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System. The CFSR found that both the State's new SACWIS system (WiSACWIS) and the legacy system (HSRS) can identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and the permanency goals for all children in foster care.

Case Review System

Five indicators are used to assess the State's performance with regard to the systemic factor of Case Review System. The indicators examine the development of case plans and parent involvement in that process (item 25), the consistency and timeliness of 6-month case reviews (item 26) and 12-month permanency hearings (item 27), the implementation of procedures to seek TPR in accordance with the timeframes established in the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) (item 28), and the notification and inclusion of foster and pre-adoptive parents and relative caregivers in case reviews and hearings (item 29).

Wisconsin is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. The CFSR determined that local agencies do not routinely involve both parents in the case planning process and the development of the case plan. The findings indicate that although mothers are almost always involved, fathers are almost always excluded even when their whereabouts are known. The CFSR also determined that the TPR process is not being consistently implemented in accordance with the provisions of ASFA, and that there are court- and agency-related delays with regard to both filing for TPR and attaining TPR. In addition, CFSR findings indicate that the process for notifying foster parents, preadoptive parents, and relative caregivers about reviews and hearings is not being implemented in a consistent manner throughout the State. Stakeholders suggested that the opportunity to be heard varies across court rooms and also depends on how comfortable foster parents are with the process, particularly with court hearings. A key concern noted by stakeholders was the lack of timely notification of the Tribes regarding reviews and hearings.

Despite these concerns, the CFSR found that required 6-month case reviews and 12-month permanency hearings are being held in a timely manner, although stakeholders noted that these reviews may be delayed in a few counties in the State. The stakeholders noted that when delays occurred, they were usually the result of court scheduling problems.

Quality Assurance System

Performance with regard to the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System is based on whether the State has developed standards to ensure the safety and health of children in foster care (item 30), and whether the State is operating a statewide quality assurance system that evaluates the quality and effectiveness of services and measures program strengths and areas needing improvement (item 31).

Wisconsin is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The CFSR found that, although the State has developed and implemented both initial investigative standards and on-going guidelines to ensure the safety of children in foster care, DCFS does not have a quality assurance system that has the capacity to evaluate the quality of services, provide relevant reports, or evaluate the implementation of program improvement measures.

Training

The systemic factor of Training incorporates an assessment of the State's new caseworker training program (item 32), ongoing training for child welfare agency staff (item 33), and training for foster and adoptive parents (item 34).

Wisconsin is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Training. Information obtained during the CFSR indicates that the collaborative approach to training between the State, counties, training partnerships, tribes, and universities does not ensure that newly hired caseworkers in all county child welfare offices receive the initial training necessary to provide services that support the goals and objectives of the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP). In addition, the CFSR found that many newly hired caseworkers are assigned caseloads before completion of a core or foundation training program, and that DCFS does not have statewide requirements for staff to participate in ongoing training. Finally, stakeholders reported that although DCFS has developed a training curriculum for foster parents and makes this curriculum available to the counties, neither pre-placement nor ongoing training for foster parents is State-mandated. Consequently, there are some counties in which foster parents receive minimal training prior to having a child placed in their homes.

Service Array

The assessment of the systemic factor of Service Array addresses three questions: (1) Does the State have in place an array of services to meet the needs of children and families served by the child welfare agency (item 35)? (2) Are these services accessible to families and children throughout the State (item 36)? (3) Can services be individualized to meet the unique needs of the children and family served by the child welfare agency (item 37)?

Wisconsin is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array. The CFSR determined that the State does not have in place an array of services to address the needs of children and families to enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable, and to help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency. The CFSR also found that services are not accessible to families and children in all political jurisdictions. A key concern identified by stakeholders is that the State does not provide the counties with the level of funds necessary to provide an adequate array of child welfare services. Stakeholders reported

that counties that have access to local funds are better able to provide these services, but those that do not have access to sufficient local funds cannot provide the needed array of services.

Despite these concerns, the CFSR determined that Wisconsin has a network of services providers who work in collaboration with the local agencies and the BMCW to individualize services to meet children's and families' unique needs.

Agency Responsiveness to the Community

Performance with regard to the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community incorporates an assessment of the State's consultation with external stakeholders in developing the Child and Family Services Plan (items 38 and 39), and the extent to which the State coordinates child welfare services with services or benefits of other Federal or federally-assisted programs serving the same population.

Wisconsin is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. The CFSR determined that DCFS develops annual reports of progress and services in conjunction with representatives of their Executive Steering Committee (ESC), and that Wisconsin's services under the CFSP are coordinated with services of other Federal or federally assisted programs that serve the child welfare population. However, CFSR findings also indicate that there is a need for a clearly delineated and structured consultation process that allows for Tribal and other stakeholders to provide input into the goals and objectives of the CFSP.

Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention

The assessment of this systemic factor focuses on the State's standards for foster homes and child care institutions (items 41 and 42), the State's compliance with Federal requirements for criminal background checks for foster and adoptive parents (item 43), the State's efforts to recruit foster and adoptive parents that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of foster children (item 44), and the State's activities with regard to using cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate permanent placements for waiting children.

Wisconsin is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor pertaining to Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment and Retention. The CFSR determined that Wisconsin has standards for foster family homes and child care institutions that are in accord with recommended national standards and that are applied to all licensed or approved foster family homes or child care institutions receiving title IV-E or IV-B funds. In addition, CFSR findings indicate that Wisconsin generally enforces the provisions of criminal

background checks to ensure that clearances relating to licensing or approving foster care and adoptive placements address the safety of foster care and adoptive placements for children.

Information from the CFSR also indicates that the State has established a process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the State for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed. However, stakeholders reported that further efforts are needed to develop a process for the effective use of cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate timely adoptions and permanent placements for waiting children.

Table 1. Wisconsin CFSR Ratings for Safety and Permanency Outcomes and Items

Outcomes and Indicators	Outcome Ratings			Item Ratings		
	<i>In Substantial Conformity?</i>	<i>Percent Substantially Achieved*</i>	<i>Met National Standards?</i>	<i>Rating**</i>	<i>Percent Strength</i>	<i>Met National Standards</i>
Safety Outcome 1-Children are first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	No	79.1	No			
Item 1: Timeliness of investigations				ANI	61	
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment				ANI	95	No
Safety Outcome 2 - Children are safely maintained in their homes when possible and appropriate	No	83.3				
Item 3: Services to prevent removal				ANI	84	
Item 4: Risk of harm				Strength	86	
Permanency Outcome 1- Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	No	48.0	Met 1, did not meet 3			
Item 5: Foster care re-entry				ANI	100	No
Item 6: Stability of foster care placements				ANI	76	Yes
Item 7: Permanency goal for child				ANI	60	
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship and placement with relatives				ANI	46	No
Item 9: Adoption				ANI	50	No
Item 10: Other planned living arrangement				ANI	83	
Permanency Outcome 2 - The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved	No	44.0				
Item 11: Proximity of placement				Strength	100	
Item 12: Placement with siblings				ANI	50	
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care				ANI	54	
Item 14: Preserving connections				ANI	62.5	
Item 15: Relative placement				ANI	65	
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents				ANI	62.5	

*90 percent of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the State to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

**Items may be rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement (ANI).

Table 2. Wisconsin CFSR Ratings for Child and Family Well Being Outcomes and Items

Outcomes and Indicators	Outcome Ratings		Item Ratings			
	<i>In Substantial Conformity?</i>	<i>Percent Substantially Achieved*</i>	<i>Met National Standards</i>	<i>Rating**</i>	<i>Percent Strength</i>	<i>Met National Standards</i>
Well Being Outcome 1 - Families have enhanced capacity to provide for children's needs	No	54.0				
Item 17: Needs/services of child, parents, and foster parents				ANI	58	
Item 18: Child/family involvement in case planning				ANI	62	
Item 19: Worker visits with child				Strength	88	
Item 20: Worker visits with parents				ANI	77	
Well Being Outcome 2 - Children receive services to meet their educational needs	Yes	90.9				
Item 21: Educational needs of child				Strength	91	
Well Being Outcome 3 - Children receive services to meet their physical and mental health needs are met	No	68.8				
Item 22: Physical health of child				ANI	83	
Item 23: Mental health of child				ANI	69	

*90 percent of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the State to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

**Items may be rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement (ANI).

Table 3: Wisconsin's Performance on the Six Outcome Measures for Which National Standards have been Established

Outcome Measure	National Standard	Wisconsin Data FY 2001
Of all children who were victims of a substantiated or indicated maltreatment report in the first 6 months of CY 2001, what percent were victims of another substantiated or indicated report within a 6-month period?	6.1% or less	6.9%
Of all children who were in foster care in the first 9 months of CY 2001, what percent experienced maltreatment from foster parents or facility staff members?	0.57% or less	0.61%
Of all children who entered foster care in FY 2001, what percent were re-entering care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode?	8.6% or less	25.5%
Of all children reunified from foster care in FY 2001, what percent were reunified within 12 months of entry into foster care?	76.2% or more	71.0%
Of all children who were adopted from foster care in FY 2001, what percent were adopted within 24 months of their entry into foster care?	32.0% or more	21.2%
Of all children in foster care during FY 2001 for less than 12 months, what percent experienced no more than 2 placement settings?	86.7% or more	93.8%