DATA SOURCES:
US Census Bureau
Demographics page 1
Voices for Children
Demographics page 2
Fostering Court Improvement
www.fosteringcourtimprovement.org/ce
Demographics, Entry into Foster Care, and Permanency page 2, 3, 7 & 8
HHS
Demographics, Permanency page 1 & 7
JUSTICE
Case Progression page 4, 5, 6

Since 2008, annual data reports have been developed for local teams. These reports have included demographic data, case progression data, and permanency data. Due to the limitations of JUSTICE, which is the court data system, case progression data was manually collected for these reports. This manner of collection ended with last year’s data reports. From 2013 on, case progression data is being collected through automatic data dumps. However, standardized coding is still not being utilized in all cases. For example, a hearing may still be coded as “Hearing” instead of “Adjudication Hearing.” Therefore, we may not be able to report on certain types of hearings in your jurisdiction because we do not have the data for it. We continue working with JUSTICE staff and county clerks to maximize proper data entry, and expect data entry to improve with subsequent data reports.

One additional change to this year’s data is that we are now “forward-looking” instead of “backward-looking.” In past reports, we analyzed data using cases that have already closed. In this report, we are using cases that opened within a certain time period, regardless of permanency they have closed (except for case closure data). This will allow you to have a more up-to-date view of your team’s case progression.

COMING SOON IN 2014: AN ONLINE DATA DASHBOARD WITH REGULARLY UPDATED CASE PROGRESSION DATA
If you have questions about your data or the data reporting, please contact Kelli Hauptman at khaupman2@unl.edu.
Recent research establishes that chronic neglect is more likely to cause permanent negative outcomes in the child than a single instance of reported abuse.

Non-court involved cases are managed by DHHS in a voluntary or non-court capacity.

Data for the type of reported maltreatment and type of out-of-home care was obtained from the Fostering Court Improvement website. Starting this year, the FCI website is reporting data based on team, in addition to data based on county and district. Data for the court and non-court placements and in-home and out-of-home placements for court cases was obtained from Voices for Children. This data is reported for the entire state.

The proportion of non-court involved cases increased by 6% from 2011 to 2012.

**Type of Reported Maltreatment (2012)**

- State: 84% Neglect, 10% Physical Abuse, 5% Sexual Abuse, 1% Other
- Team: 81% Neglect, 17% Physical Abuse, 2% Sexual Abuse, 1% Other

**Court vs. Non-Court Cases**

- 2011: Court Involved 2164, 37%, Non-Court Involved 3762, 63%
- 2012: Court Involved 2601, 43%, Non-Court Involved 3461, 57%

**Initial Placement for Court Cases:**

- In-Home vs. Out-of-Home 2011: In-home 2501, 66%, Out-of-home 1261, 34%
- 2012: In-home 2614, 76%, Out-of-home 847, 24%

**Type of Out-of-Home Care (2012)**

- State: Non-relative foster care 44%, Relative foster care 18%, Group home/institution 12%, Foster home/Institution 25%, Trial Home Visit 11%, Independent Living 17%, Other 38%
- Team: Non-relative foster care 45%, Relative foster care 17%, Group home/institution 11%, Foster home/Institution 34%, Trial Home Visit 35%, Independent Living 24%, Other 14%

**Data for the type of reported maltreatment and type of out-of-home care was obtained from the Fostering Court Improvement website. Starting this year, the FCI website is reporting data based on team, in addition to data based on county and district. Data for the court and non-court placements and in-home and out-of-home placements for court cases was obtained from Voices for Children. This data is reported for the entire state.**

**Termination of Parental Rights**

- 2012 Number of TPRs: 490 in state, 39 in service area
- Median Months from Removal to TPR (among adoptions)

**Adoptions**

- 2012 Number of adoptions: 493 in state, 39 in service area
- Median Months from TPR to Adoption

**Reunifications**

- 2012 Number of reunifications: 1812 in state, 227 in service area
- Median Months from Removal to Reunification* 84%

**PERMANENCY**

The data for TPR and adoptions were obtained from the FCI website. Each year’s data includes cases from April of the stated year through March of the following year. The data in the graphs for reunification were obtained from HHS.

**Termination of Parental Rights**

- 2012 Number of TPRs: 490 in state, 39 in service area
- Median Months from Removal to TPR (among adoptions)

**Adoptions**

- 2012 Number of adoptions: 493 in state, 39 in service area
- Median Months from TPR to Adoption

**Reunifications**

- 2012 Number of reunifications: 1812 in state, 227 in service area
- Median Months from Removal to Reunification**

---

*Excludes time 30 days after children return home on trial home visit*
The permanency hearing must happen within 12 months of the child entering foster care.

For your team, 46% of removed cases open for more than a year were missing this order date.

For your team, 81% of cases, or 56 cases were not closed or had no jurisdiction terminated date entered as of June 30th, 2013.

Please note: the above medians cannot be compared to the 2012 data because the data samples differ.

For your team, 81% of cases, or 56 cases were not closed or had no jurisdiction terminated date entered as of June 30th, 2013.

Please note: the above medians cannot be compared to the 2012 data because the data samples differ.
REPORTING OF DATA

Historically, the data reports have provided information about case progression for abuse and neglect cases that closed in the prior calendar year. Beginning this year, the data reports give information about cases that opened in a given time frame (in this report the time frame is 7/1/11 through 12/31/12). Data is reported for both removed and non-removed cases (and not just out-of-home cases, as in previous reports). Because of these changes in the case selection process, data from prior years cannot be used as a comparison and is therefore not cited in this section. Some counties report on individual juveniles, while others report on families; due to this, data from the state cannot be reported.

The ex parte order, which is issued prior to the protective custody hearing, is required to be issued within 48 hours of removal. The protective custody hearing is the first hearing in any 3a case in which the child is removed.

The first appearance hearing occurs when the rights advisement is given. These two hearings (protective custody and first appearance) frequently occur at the same time. However, codes are not being entered for both hearing orders in many counties.

The first hearing in every case referred to TPR is a hearing to determine the child’s jurisdiction to TPR. The case is then referred to TPR. (Protective custody hearings for 3b cases are not included in the data reports). The data indicates the percentage of cases that progressed from the starting point to the ending point of the interval within a given length of time. When there are fewer than five documented cases, we omit the bar chart due to insufficient data.

For intervals like the adjudication order to disposition order, the case must have had both order dates reported to be included in the analysis. For example, for the interval shown on the left, the percent missing data indicates the percentage of cases that had either an adjudication order or a disposition order data (or both) missing.

This interval refers to the time period from the disposition order to the first review hearing order.

For your team, 34% of cases were missing this order date.

For your team, 43% of cases were missing at least one of these order dates.

For your team, 53% of cases were missing at least one of these order dates.

For your team, 74% of cases were missing this order date.

For your team, 43% of cases were missing at least one of these order dates.
REPORTING OF DATA | When sufficient case progression data is available for a particular interval, we report three pieces of information: 1) the number of cases that had recorded dates for both the beginning and the end of the interval, 2) the percentage of cases in which the required data was missing, and 3) a vertical bar chart representing the percentage of cases that progressed from the starting point to the ending point of the interval within a given length of time. When there are fewer than five documented cases, we omit the bar chart due to insufficient data.

Historically, the data reports have provided information about case progression for abuse and neglect cases that closed in the prior calendar year. Beginning this year, the data reports give information about cases that opened in a given time frame (in this report the time frame is 7/1/11 through 12/31/12). Data is reported for both removed and non-removed cases (and not just out-of-home cases, as in previous reports). Because of these changes in the case selection process, data from prior years cannot be used as a comparison.

Because of these changes in the case selection process, data from prior years cannot be used as a comparison. However, codes for 3a cases referr to the time period from the disposition order to the first review hearing order. This interval refers to the time period from the disposition order to the first review hearing order. For intervals like the adjudication order to disposition order, the case must have had both order dates reported to be included in the analysis. For example, for the interval shown on the left, the percent missing data indicates the percentage of cases that had either an adjudication order or a disposition order date (or both) missing.

The first appearance hearing occurs when the rights advisement is given. These two hearings (protective custody and first appearance) frequently occur at the same time. However, codes are not being entered for both hearing orders in many counties.

For your team, 74% of cases were missing this order date. For your team, 43% of cases were missing at least one of these order dates. For your team, 34% of cases were missing this order date. For your team, 53% of cases were missing at least one of these order dates.
The permanency hearing must happen within 12 months of the child entering foster care.

**Removal to Permanency Hearing Order**
Number of removed cases with permanency hearing order: 29

- 0-5 months, 11%
- 6-11 months, 11%
- 12-17 months, 45%

**Time to Court Case Closure**

- 0-5 months, 24%
- 6-11 months, 26%
- 12-17 months, 49%

**median months to court case closure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only includes removed cases*

Please note: the above medians cannot be compared to the 2012 data because the data samples differ.

**DATA TIPS on ABUSE/NEGLECT DATA ENTRY**

**ORDER FORMS**
If data entry staff are confused on the type of hearing, consider amending court order forms to have checkbox headings with commonly occurring hearing titles listed (for example, the Protective Custody Hearing, First Appearance, and Adjudication).

**FIRST HEARING**
In every 3a case, the first hearing is a Protective Custody Hearing and should be coded as such, regardless of whether the children reside in-home or out-of-home. It is typically also a First Appearance Hearing if the rights advisory is given. Both types of hearings and orders need to be entered into JUSTICE.

**PERMANENCY HEARING**
Review hearings and permanency hearings often occur during the same time slot and one order is issued. Permanency Hearings are required within 12 months of removal and every 12 months thereafter. If these hearings and orders occur during the same time slot, they must both be entered into JUSTICE.

**CASE CLOSURE**
When a judge closes a case or the case is dismissed, jurisdiction must be terminated. This is a 2-step process that terminates the case of the child and terminates jurisdiction. When multiple juveniles are on a case, jurisdiction must be terminated on each juvenile before the case is terminated.

**ORDER FORMS | If data entry staff are confused on the type of hearing, consider amending court order forms to have checkbox headings with commonly occurring hearing titles listed (for example, the Protective Custody Hearing, First Appearance, and Adjudication).**

**FIRST HEARING | In every 3a case, the first hearing is a Protective Custody Hearing and should be coded as such, regardless of whether the children reside in-home or out-of-home. It is typically also a First Appearance Hearing if the rights advisory is given.**

**PERMANENCY HEARING | Review hearings and permanency hearings often occur during the same time slot and one order is issued. Permanency Hearings are required within 12 months of removal and every 12 months thereafter. If these hearings and orders occur during the same time slot, they must both be entered into JUSTICE.**

**CASE CLOSURE | When a judge closes a case or the case is dismissed, jurisdiction must be terminated. This is a 2-step process that terminates the case of the child and terminates jurisdiction. When multiple juveniles are on a case, jurisdiction must be terminated on each juvenile before the case is terminated.**

**For your team, 46% of removed cases open for more than a year were missing this order date.**

**Rate of Removal to Foster Care**

2008 through 2010 team data not available

**Victims Removed to Foster Care**

**Non-removed Victims Revictimized Within 6 Months**

- 0-5 months, 30%
- 6-11 months, 35%
- 12-17 months, 35%

**Rate of Re-Entry into Foster Care**

- 0-5 months, 25%
- 6-11 months, 38%
- 12-17 months, 38%
Recent research establishes that chronic neglect is more likely to cause permanent negative outcomes in the child than a single instance of reported abuse.

Non-court involved cases are managed by DHHS in a voluntary or non-court capacity.

Data for the type of reported maltreatment and type of out-of-home care was obtained from the Fostering Court Improvement website. Starting this year, the FCI website is reporting data based on team, in addition to data based on county and district. Data for the court and non-court placements and in-home and out-of-home placements for court cases was obtained from Voices for Children. This data is reported for the entire state.

The data for TPR and adoptions were obtained from the FCI website. Each year’s data includes cases from April of the stated year through March of the following year. The data in the graphs for reunification were obtained from HHS.

**PERMANENCY**

**Termination of Parental Rights**

- 2012 Number of TPRs: 490 in state 39 in service area
- Median Months from Removal to TPR (among adoptions)

**Adoptions**

- 2012 Number of adoptions: 493 in state 39 in service area
- Median Months from TPR to Adoption

**Reunifications**

- 2012 Number of reunifications: 1812 in state 227 in service area
- Median Months from Removal to Reunification*

*Excludes time 30 days after children return home on trial home visit
In previous years, we obtained data on the type of discharge from HHS. Starting with this year, we are using the type of discharge as reported by Fostering Court Improvement.

This data shows how quickly children are finding permanency through the children’s, and not the court’s, eyes. The percent placed in a permanent home shows the percent children who were free for adoption or living with family within 15 months of removal. The percent of children adopted within 12 months includes children in care with both TPRs between April 2011 and March 2012.

Permanency Through the Child’s Eyes

- Reunification
- Guardianship
- Adoption
- Independent living
- Other

Prior Years’ Type of Discharge (Team Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reunification</th>
<th>Guardianship</th>
<th>Adoption</th>
<th>Independent Living</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2008, annual data reports have been developed for local teams. These reports have included demographic data, case progression data, and permanency data. Due to the limitations of JUSTICE, which is the court data system, case progression data was manually collected for these reports. This manner of collection ended with last year’s data reports. From 2013 on, case progression data is being collected through automatic data dumps. However, standardized coding is still not being utilized in all cases. For example, a hearing may still be coded as “Hearing” instead of “Adjudication Hearing.” Therefore, we may not be able to report on certain types of hearings in your jurisdiction because we do not have the data for it. We continue working with JUSTICE staff and county clerks to maximize proper data entry, and expect data entry to improve with subsequent data reports.

One additional change to this year’s data is that we are now “forward-looking” instead of “backward-looking.” In past reports, we analyzed data using cases that have already closed. In this report, we are using cases that opened within a certain time period, regardless of permanency they have closed (except for case closure data). This will allow you to have a more up-to-date view of your team’s case progression.

Changes to the Data Collection Process and Data Reporting

Since 2008, annual data reports have been developed for local teams. These reports have included demographic data, case progression data, and permanency data. Due to the limitations of JUSTICE, which is the court data system, case progression data was manually collected for these reports. This manner of collection ended with last year’s data reports. From 2013 on, case progression data is being collected through automatic data dumps. However, standardized coding is still not being utilized in all cases. For example, a hearing may still be coded as “Hearing” instead of “Adjudication Hearing.” Therefore, we may not be able to report on certain types of hearings in your jurisdiction because we do not have the data for it. We continue working with JUSTICE staff and county clerks to maximize proper data entry, and expect data entry to improve with subsequent data reports.

If you have questions about your data or the data reporting, please contact Kelli Hauptman at khauptman2@unl.edu.