



STATE OF ARIZONA
OFFICE OF THE
AUDITOR GENERAL

DEBRA K. DAVENPORT, CPA
AUDITOR GENERAL

WILLIAM THOMSON
DEPUTY AUDITOR GENERAL

April 15, 2009

Members of the Arizona Legislature

The Honorable Janice K. Brewer, Governor

Linda Blessing, Ph.D., Interim Director
Department of Economic Security

Transmitted herewith is a report of the Auditor General, an Information Brief on the Department of Economic Security, Division of Children, Youth and Families—Child Protective Services—Client Characteristics. This information brief was prepared pursuant to and under the authority vested in the Auditor General by Arizona Revised Statutes §41-1966.

Our information briefs were created at the request of key stakeholders who indicated a need for information on specific issues, but did not want a full audit. We hope that these information briefs will fill a need and provide you with timely and useful information on topics of particular interest.

My staff and I will be pleased to discuss or clarify items in the information brief.

This information brief will be released to the public on April 16, 2009.

Sincerely,

Debbie Davenport
Auditor General

Attachment



OFFICE OF THE
**AUDITOR
GENERAL**

**Department of
Economic Security**
Division of Children, Youth and Families
Child Protective Services

INFORMATION BRIEF

Summary

Arizona's Child Protective Services (CPS) program, administered by the Department of Economic Security's Division of Children, Youth and Families (Division), serves a diverse population of clients. To provide a broad overview of CPS client characteristics, auditors analyzed selected demographic, risk, and public assistance data for a sample of CPS clients. The analyses found that the distribution of CPS clients was generally comparable demographically to the State's overall population, with a few exceptions. Further, children in only a small percentage of reports alleging abuse or neglect were in impending danger of serious or severe harm because of a specific behavior, such as substance abuse, by their parents/guardians. Moreover, almost one-half of the children had been alleged child victims in multiple, separate CPS reports during their lifetimes. Finally, many of the CPS clients received public assistance.



2009

April • Report No. IB-0901

CPS Client Characteristics

CPS program serves diverse population of clients—Each year, CPS serves thousands of Arizona's children and their families by investigating reports alleging child abuse or neglect and by providing or arranging for services for the families to address the issues that brought them to CPS' attention. These children and families represent a diverse group in respect to demographic characteristics, risks, and prior involvement with CPS. For example, alleged child victims range in age from newborn through 17 years old and come from various ethnic backgrounds, including Caucasian, Hispanic, and African American. Some CPS clients have certain behaviors or circumstances that may put them at risk of being a victim or perpetrator of child abuse or neglect, such as having a disability, abusing alcohol or drugs, or being unable to provide for basic needs, such as adequate housing. Prior involvement with CPS also varies for the children, ranging from no previous involvement for 55 percent of the children to a significant history of involvement for others.

To provide an overview of CPS client characteristics, auditors analyzed division data for a sample of CPS reports and the individuals associated with them. Specifically, auditors examined 8,660 reports alleging child abuse and/or neglect that were received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008, and assigned for CPS investigation.¹ These reports contained

information involving 12,179 unduplicated alleged child victims, 13,413 unduplicated parents/guardians, and 10,658 unduplicated alleged perpetrators.²

CPS client demographic characteristics similar to State's overall population, with a few exceptions—Auditors' analyses of CPS clients' distribution by gender, age, and ethnicity found that the distributions were generally comparable to the State's overall population, with a few exceptions. Specifically:

- **Alleged child victims**—As shown in Table 1 on page 2, variations were found in the age and ethnicity distributions of the alleged child victims. In particular, children from birth to 6 years old accounted for 46 percent of the alleged child victims, which is 5 percent higher than the proportion of similarly aged children in the general population. Division management believes this exception represents the public's greater tendency to report alleged abuse or neglect when it involves younger children because they are more vulnerable.

Other exceptions noted were that Hispanic alleged child victims were underrepresented by 10 percent when compared to Hispanic children in the general population, while African American alleged child victims were overrepresented by 8 percent. Although the disproportionate representation of minority children in child welfare is found throughout the nation and has been a major concern for decades, since the early 1980s, the U.S. Health and Human Services National Incidence Study has shown that children of

¹ Arizona's Child Abuse Hotline is a toll-free telephone number that is used to report alleged child abuse and neglect.

² Each report may contain multiple alleged child victims, parents/guardians, and alleged perpetrators. Child victims and perpetrators are considered "alleged" until the investigation has substantiated that the abuse or neglect actually occurred to the child by the perpetrator.

Table 1: Alleged Child Victims Distribution by Gender, Age, and Ethnicity Compared to Arizona's Overall Child Population

Demographic Characteristics	CPS Alleged Child Victims	Arizona Child Population	Difference Between CPS and State
Gender			
Female	50%	49%	1%
Male	50%	51%	-1%
Age			
Birth through 6 years	46%	41%	5%
7 through 12 years	30%	32%	-2%
13 through 17 years	24%	27%	-3%
Ethnicity			
African American	12%	4%	8%
Caucasian	41%	44%	-3%
Hispanic	32%	42%	-10%
Native American	6%	5%	1%
Other ¹	1%	3%	-2%
Unknown ²	8%	2%	—

¹ Includes children with Asian and Pacific Islander ethnicity.

² Includes alleged child victims with undisclosed or unknown ethnicity, and Arizona child population classified as having multiple ethnicity.

Source: Auditor General staff analyses of CPS reports received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008, provided by the Division, and Arizona child population statistics based on U.S. Census 2007 population estimates provided by the Arizona Department of Commerce.

all races and ethnicities are equally likely to be victims of substantiated abuse or neglected.^{1,2}

- **Parents/guardians**—As shown in Table 2 on page 3, some variations were also found in the gender, age, and ethnicity distributions of the parents/guardians, who are morally and legally obligated to protect the children in their care from abuse, when compared to the general population. First, although the State's adult population is evenly split between females and males, the parents/guardians tended to be female at 64 percent. This may be due, in part, to the number of female-headed households in the State. Parents/guardians were also overrepresented in the younger age categories when compared to the general population, with 65 percent of the parents/guardians falling between the ages of 20 and 39 years old. However, this is not unexpected since young and middle-aged adults are more likely than teenagers and older adults

to have children 17 years old and younger living at home. Finally, although Caucasians compose nearly two-thirds of the State's adult population, they accounted for only 48 percent of the parents/guardians.

- **Alleged perpetrators**—Auditors found that 64 percent of the parents/guardians were also identified as the alleged perpetrator. This is to be expected since one of the criteria for a CPS report is that the alleged perpetrator is a parent, guardian, or custodian who has inflicted, may inflict, permitted another person to inflict, or had reason to know another person may inflict abuse or neglect on the child. As such, the gender, age, and ethnicity distributions for the alleged perpetrators were similar to those of the parents/guardians (see Table 2, page 3).

Parents most frequently identified as alleged perpetrators—

Auditors' analyses found that the alleged child victims' parents were most often identified in the role of alleged perpetrator.

Specifically, although data on the alleged perpetrator's relationship to the alleged child victim was missing for 41 percent of the alleged perpetrators, for the remaining alleged perpetrators, 36 percent were identified as mothers, 19 percent as fathers, 2 percent as grandparents, and 2 percent as others, which includes permanent guardians, aunts, uncles, and other relatives.³

Many children involved in multiple CPS reports—

In addition to examining the demographic characteristics of CPS clients, auditors reviewed the children's prior involvement with CPS and found that many of them had been identified as alleged child victims in multiple reports. Specifically, auditors analyzed the 8,660 CPS reports received by the Child Abuse Hotline between January and March

¹ Hill, R.B. (2006). *Synthesis of research on disproportionality in child welfare: An update*. Retrieved January 15, 2009, from http://www.racmattersconsortium.org/docs/BobHillpaper_FINAL

² The National Incidence Study (NIS) is a congressionally mandated, periodic effort of the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect to obtain information about the current incidence of child abuse and neglect in the United States. NIS-1 was published in 1981, NIS-2 was published in 1988, and NIS-3 was published in 1996. The NIS-3 findings are based on a nationally representative sample of more than 5,600 professionals in 842 agencies serving 42 counties in the United States.

³ The category "mother" includes the relationships for mother, adoptive mother, stepmother, and prior stepmother. "Fathers" include the relationships for father, adoptive father, alleged father, stepfather, and prior stepfather. "Grandparents" include the relationships for grandmother, grandfather, great grandmother, great grandfather, great-great grandparents, and great-great-great grandparents.

Table 2: Parents/Guardians Distribution by Gender, Age, and Ethnicity Compared to Arizona’s Overall Adult Population

Demographic Characteristics	CPS Caregivers	Arizona Adult Population	Difference Between CPS and State
Gender			
Female	64%	50%	14%
Male	36%	50%	-14%
Age			
18 through 19 years	3%	4%	-1%
20 through 29 years	29%	19%	10%
30 through 39 years	36%	19%	17%
40 through 49 years	20%	18%	2%
50 years or more	9%	40%	-31%
Other ¹	3%	—	—
Ethnicity			
African American	9%	3%	6%
Caucasian	48%	65%	-17%
Hispanic	28%	25%	3%
Native American	6%	5%	1%
Other ²	1%	2%	-1%
Unknown ³	9%	1%	—

- ¹ Includes parents/guardians with missing or invalid birth dates and less than 18 years old.
- ² Includes adults with Asian and Pacific Islander ethnicity.
- ³ Includes parents/guardians with undisclosed or unknown ethnicity, and Arizona adult population classified as having multiple ethnicity.

Source: Auditor General staff analyses of CPS reports received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008, provided by the Division, and Arizona child population statistics based on U.S. Census 2007 population estimates provided by the Arizona Department of Commerce.

2008, and found that 589, or 5 percent, of the 12,179 children were identified as alleged child victims in more than one report received during the 3-month period. Of these 589 children, 544 were identified in 2 reports, 42 in 3 reports, and 3 in 4 reports. Approximately 2 percent of the alleged child victims did not have sufficient information to determine if prior reports existed for them.

Auditors also examined how many of the 12,179 children were identified during their lifetimes as alleged victims in multiple CPS reports and found that 5,497 children, or 45 percent, were identified in more than one report, with one child being identified in 25 separate reports. Table 3 presents the number of reports in which the 12,179 children were identified as alleged victims over their lifetimes. This information is also presented by the CPS program’s six geographical districts in the Appendix, Table A-1 on page a-ii.

Although auditors did not specifically examine why some children had multiple CPS reports, a number of studies have been conducted to identify factors that influence the rate of re-referral of families and children to Child Protective Services. For example, Connell, Bergeron, Katz, and Tebes (2007) examined the impact of child, family, and case characteristics on re-referral rates and found that children from families facing multiple stressors are at highest risk of re-referral to Child Protective Services. Further, the study found that family poverty was the strongest predictor of re-referral, although a number of child and case characteristics, such as child disability and parental substance abuse, were also significantly related to recurrence. The study also found that, consistent with other research in this area, the initial 6-month period following the disposition of a Child Protective Service’s investigation is the period of greatest risk of re-referral. Specifically, approximately

13 percent of cases experienced a subsequent referral during the first 6-month period; an additional 14 percent over the following 12-month period; and 7 percent during the next 12-month period.¹

Table 3: Alleged Child Victims by Lifetime Frequency of Involvement in CPS Reports

Number of Reports	Alleged Child Victims	
	Number	Percent
1	6,682	55%
2-3	3,617	30%
4-7	1,577	13%
8+	303	2%

Source: Auditor General staff analyses of CPS reports received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008, provided by the Division.

¹ Connell, C.M., Bergeron, N., Katz, K.H., Saunders, L., & Tebes, J.K. (2007). Re-referral to child protective services: The influence of child, family, and case characteristics on risk status [Electronic version]. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 31, 573-588.

Parents'/guardians' substance abuse, criminal activity, and physical/mental health each placed the children in only a small percentage of CPS reports in impending danger of serious or severe harm—Auditors examined the prevalence of three selected factors (threats) that placed children in impending danger of serious or severe harm.

Auditors examined the prevalence of three selected factors (threats) that placed children in impending danger of serious or severe harm. These factors and others are identified through the Division's child safety assessment process, which is initiated when a CPS investigator first makes contact with a family. The assessment is used to determine first whether any child in the home is unsafe because of present danger that is immediate, significant, clearly observable, and will likely result in serious or severe harm to a child. If such a danger is present, the CPS investigator will take immediate action to control the threat and protect the child, such as having the individual abusing the child leave the home or taking temporary custody of the child. Once the assessment of present danger is complete, the investigator will continue with the child safety assessment to determine whether any child is unsafe because of impending danger, which is likely to occur in the immediate or near future. This part of the assessment is based on identifying whether or not specific factors, such as parent/guardian substance abuse, are present and whether they are manifested in such a way that they may become a threat to the child. To complete this part of the assessment, the investigator must gather sufficient, relevant information through observations; interviews with family members and others knowledgeable about the family; and reviews of documents, including school and criminal history records, medical and police reports, and court orders. If any factors are identified as threats, a safety plan is developed, implemented, and monitored by the investigator to control the impending danger and ensure the child's safety. The child safety assessment is implemented at specific points in the case and must be

completed within 21 days of initiation. However, it may also be implemented any time there is suspicion that a child may be unsafe.

Auditors analyzed the 8,660 reports that the Child Abuse Hotline received between January and March 2008 to determine whether the CPS investigator identified parent/guardian substance abuse, criminal activity, or physical/mental health as being an impending danger to child safety. As shown in Table 4, parent/guardian substance abuse was identified in 6 percent of the CPS reports, while parent/guardian physical/mental health and criminal activity was identified in 2 and 1 percent of the reports, respectively. Information on the three child safety assessment factors was missing for 26 percent of the reports because it was either not entered into the CPS automated case management system as of September 2008 or because CPS was unable to locate the family to complete the investigation. There was slight variation among the districts in the incidence of the three child safety assessment factors (see Appendix, Table A-2 on page a-iii).

Available studies report wide variance in the estimates of the percentage of substance-affected families in child welfare. This variance is attributed to several factors, including differences in the population studied and the method used to determine substance involvement. According to a U.S. Department of Health and Human Services report, greater prevalence is generally found among parents of children in foster care than among parents of children reported to child protective services. The report also indicated that studies surveying child welfare administrators on their perceptions of parental substance abuse prevalence in their agencies' caseloads routinely generate higher figures than studies interviewing caseworkers or examining case files.¹ Young, Boles, and Otero (2007) reviewed existing preva-

Table 4: Frequency of Selected Child Safety Assessment Factors In CPS Reports Received from January through March 2008

Child Safety Factors	Yes		No		Unknown		Unable to Locate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Drug/alcohol abuse	516	6%	5,843	68%	2,027	23%	274	3%
Criminal involvement	64	1%	6,295	73%	2,027	23%	274	3%
Physical/mental health	152	2%	6,207	72%	2,027	23%	274	3%

Source: Auditor General staff analyses of child safety assessment data for the 8,660 CPS reports received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008, provided by the Division.

¹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1999). *Blending perspectives and building common ground: A report to Congress on substance abuse and child protection*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

lence data from some of the more rigorous studies and found that the estimated percentage of parents in the child welfare system with substance abuse problems varied considerably, ranging from as low as 11 percent to as high as 79 percent.¹

Selected factors associated with risk of future child abuse and neglect each affected only a small or modest percentage of parents/guardians and alleged child victims—

Auditors also examined the prevalence of selected factors associated with risk of future child abuse and neglect. These factors and others are identified through the Division's strength and risk assessment process. The CPS investigator completes the strength and risk assessment for each parent/guardian and child in the family using open-ended, nonconfrontational questions and active listening. The assessment is intended to identify a family's risks, protective capacities, and strengths.² This information, in conjunction with the findings of the child safety assessment (see page 4), serves as the basis to evaluate risk of future harm to the child and identify types of interventions/services required by the family or a specific family member. The strength and risk assessment must be completed within 45 days of the case's opening or prior to closing the case at investigation, whichever comes first. It may also be implemented whenever evidence or case circumstances suggest an increase in level of risk for abuse or neglect.

- **Parents/Guardians**—Auditors analyzed the incidence of five risk factors that might contribute to parents'/guardians' abuse or neglect of their children—alcohol abuse, drug abuse, physical/emotional illness, abuse/neglect as a child, and inadequate housing. For example, parents'/guardians' drug or

alcohol abuse may impair their ability to appropriately care for and protect their children. Similarly, their homelessness or lack of adequate housing may leave their children vulnerable to illness and abuse by others. Auditors found that each risk factor impacted only a small or modest percentage of the 13,413 parents/guardians. As shown in Table 5, drug abuse was the most often cited risk factor for the parents/guardians at 13 percent. The least cited of the five factors was abuse and/or neglect as a child at 4 percent. Information on the five risk factors was missing for about 20 percent of the parents/guardians because it was either not entered into the CPS automated case management system as of September 2008 or because CPS was unable to locate the family to complete the investigation. There was some slight variation among districts in the percentages of parents/guardians with the various risk factors (see Appendix, Table A-3 on page a-iv).

- **Alleged Child Victims**—Similar to the personal risk factors for the parents/guardians, auditors found that only a small percentage of the 12,179 alleged child victims were impacted by each of three personal risk factors examined—alcohol abuse, drug abuse, and child disability. All of these child risk factors can result in increased stress within the family if the parents/guardians or others in the home lack the temperament, skills, and/or resources to adequately cope with them. This, in turn, may contribute to parents'/guardians' neglecting or abusing the child. For example, if a family has a severely physically and mentally disabled child, but the parents/guardians lack the knowledge and ability to adequately care for him/her, the parents/guardians may neglect the child. Further, if the parents/guardians are extremely frustrated with the child's behavior, they may even physically abuse the child. As shown in Table 6 (see page 6,) child disability was the most frequently cited of the

Table 5: Frequency of Selected Risk Factors Impacting Parents/Guardians

Risk Factors	Yes		No		Unknown		Unable to Locate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Alcohol abuse	779	6%	9,919	74%	2,382	18%	333	2%
Drug abuse	1,733	13%	8,964	67%	2,383	18%	333	2%
Physical/emotional illness	1,040	8%	9,657	72%	2,383	18%	333	2%
Abused/neglected as a child	482	4%	10,188	76%	2,410	18%	333	2%
Inadequate housing	1,260	9%	9,726	73%	2,094	16%	333	2%

Source: Auditor General staff analyses of strength and risk assessment data for the 13,413 unduplicated parents/guardians identified in CPS reports received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008, provided by the Division.

¹ Young, N.K., Boles, S.M., & Otero, C. (2007). Parental substance use disorders and child maltreatment: Overlap, gaps, and opportunities. *Child Maltreatment*, 12(2). Retrieved March 5, 2009, from Sage Criminology database.

² Strengths are those positive qualities or resources present in every family. Protective capacities are the resources and characteristics of the family members that can directly contribute to the protection and development of the children. Protective factors must offset the risks related to abuse and neglect.

Table 6: Frequency of Selected Risk Factors Impacting Alleged Child Victims

Risk Factors	Yes		No		Unknown		Unable to Locate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Alcohol abuse	112	1%	8,010	66%	3,612	29%	445	4%
Drug abuse	289	2%	7,833	65%	3,612	29%	445	4%
Child disability	563	5%	7,559	62%	3,612	29%	445	4%

Source: Auditor General staff analyses of strength and risk assessment data for the 12,179 unduplicated alleged child victims identified in CPS reports received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008, provided by the Division.

three risk factors at 5 percent, while alcohol abuse was the least cited factor at 1 percent. Information on these risk factors was missing for approximately one-third of the alleged child victims because it was either not entered into the CPS automated case management system as of September 2008 or because CPS was unable to locate the family to complete the investigation. This information is also presented by the CPS program's six geographical districts in the Appendix, Table A-4 on page a-v.

Division management expressed concern that the prevalence of substance abuse as a risk factor for future harm may be underreported in auditors' analysis. There were several reasons offered for this concern. First, as previously stated, assessment data for 20 percent of the parents/guardians and 33 percent of the alleged child victims was not included in the analysis because of missing information. Missing assessment data occurred for various reasons, including failure on the part of CPS staff to enter the data into the automated case management system in a timely manner, and some staff's not receiving training on the automated assessment tool until January 2008 and being permitted to use a nonautomated version until they were trained. The training occurred between November 2007 and January 2008. Another reason management cited was that some CPS staff were mistakenly failing to indicate substance abuse as a future risk factor if the alleged child victims or parents/guardians were participating in treatment services. Finally, management

indicated that some staff may not have been completing the substance abuse indicators on the assessment unless a child was removed from the home. However, according to the Division's assessment coordinator, all staff are trained to complete these indicators regardless of whether or not a child has been removed from the home. Division management related that because of the complexity of the automated assessment tool, staff required field practice in addition to classroom training to gain full proficiency in the use of the automated tool. Division management reported that to improve substance abuse documentation and respond to Executive Order 2008-01, Enhance Availability of Substance Abuse Treatment Services for Families Involved with Child Protective Services, revisions were made to the automated assessment tool effective December 13, 2008, and information on the appropriate documentation of substance abuse was added to the Division's assessment refresher training.

Many CPS clients receive public assistance—To assess whether poverty was a risk factor for CPS clients, auditors analyzed data on clients' use of public assistance as a proxy measure for poverty and found that a significant percentage of CPS clients received aid in the form of cash assistance, food stamps, and/or medical assistance.^{1,2} Specifically, auditors analyzed the receipt of cash assistance, food stamps, and/or medical assistance at any time between January and March

¹ Persons eligible for cash assistance receive an electronic benefits transfer (EBT) card. The card works similarly to a debit card, and there are no restrictions on what may be purchased. Each month, the cash assistance is credited to the card. The Food Stamp Program also uses EBT cards; however, food stamp purchases are restricted to approved items at authorized merchants. Similar to cash assistance, authorized food stamp amounts are credited to the card each month. Persons eligible for medical assistance receive care through Arizona's Medicaid program, known as the Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System.

² Although auditors' analysis uses receipt of public assistance as a proxy for poverty, not all children receiving public assistance come from poor families. According to the Department, almost one-half of its TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) caseload consists of child-only cases in which only a child or children are receiving assistance. A variety of circumstances can result in a child-only case. For example, the child lives with a relative who chooses not to be included in the assistance group or whose income and assets preclude him/her from receiving cash assistance, or the child lives with a parent, but the parent is receiving supplemental security income or is otherwise disqualified from receiving cash assistance. In these situations, a child's income rather than his/her family's income is used to determine eligibility for cash assistance.

2008 by the alleged child victims, their parents/guardians, and the alleged perpetrators. As indicated in Table 7, the children were the greatest users of public assistance with more than one-half receiving medical assistance and just under one-half receiving food stamps. In addition, 13 percent of the children received cash assistance.

Parents/guardians and alleged perpetrator use of public assistance was similar, with approximately 40 percent receiving medical assistance, one-third receiving food stamps, and less than 10 percent receiving cash assistance. A further breakout of this information by district is presented in the Appendix, Table A-5 on page a-vi.

According to Hill (2006), although poverty and child maltreatment appear to be associated, poverty does not cause maltreatment. Rather, the effects of poverty appear to interact with other risk factors, such as depression, isolation, teenage pregnancy, unemployment, substance abuse, and domestic violence, to increase the likelihood of maltreatment. In part, poor children may be overrepresented in child welfare because CPS reports alleging abuse and neglect come from community professionals who disproportionately serve low-income groups.¹ For example, the top three sources of reports to child protective services hotlines nation-wide in 2006 were educational staff, law enforcement officials, and social service personnel.²

Table 7: Utilization of Cash Assistance, Food Stamps, and Medical Assistance
By Alleged Child Victims, Parents/Guardians, and Alleged Perpetrators

Recipient Type	Cash Assistance		Food Stamps		Medical Assistance	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Alleged child victims	1,624	13%	5,776	47%	6,992	57%
Parents/guardians	995	7%	4,446	33%	5,160	38%
Alleged perpetrators	860	8%	3,660	34%	4,188	39%

Source: Auditor General staff analyses of financial assistance data provided by the Department's Family Assistance Administration for the 12,179 alleged child victims, 13,413 parents/guardians, and 10,658 alleged perpetrators associated with the CPS reports received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008.

¹ Hill, 2006

² United States Department of Health and Human Services. (2008). *Child Maltreatment 2006*. Retrieved on June 26, 2008, from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/stats_research/index.htm#can.



CPS Client Characteristics Data by District

APPENDIX

Table A-1: Alleged Child Victims by Lifetime Frequency of Involvement in CPS Reports by District

Table A-2: Frequency of Selected Child Safety Assessment Factors in CPS Reports Received from January through March 2008 by District

Table A-3: Frequency of Selected Risk Factors Impacting Parents/Guardians by District

Table A-4: Frequency of Selected Risk Factors Impacting Alleged Child Victims by District

Table A-5: Utilization of Cash Assistance, Food Stamps, and Medical Assistance by Alleged Child Victims, Parents/Guardians, and Alleged Perpetrators by District

This appendix includes tables presenting information on CPS clients—alleged child victims, parents/guardians, and alleged perpetrators—associated with 8,660 CPS reports alleging child abuse or neglect received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008. The table information is reported for the CPS program's six geographical districts and state-wide.

Table A-1: Alleged Child Victims by Lifetime Frequency of Involvement in CPS Reports by District

District (County)	N=	1 Report		2-3 Reports		4-7 Reports		8+ Reports	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 (Maricopa)	7,082	3,891	55%	2,078	29%	932	13%	181	3%
2 (Pima)	2,233	1,162	52%	713	32%	311	14%	47	2%
3 (Apache, Coconino, Navajo, Yavapai)	830	446	54%	242	29%	125	15%	17	2%
4 (La Paz, Mohave, Yuma)	786	461	59%	244	31%	63	8%	18	2%
5 (Gila, Pinal)	531	471	57%	241	29%	98	12%	21	2%
6 (Graham, Greenlee, Santa Cruz, Cochise)	417	251	60%	99	24%	48	11%	19	5%
State-wide	12,179	6,682	55%	3,617	30%	1,577	13%	303	2%

Source: Auditor General staff analysis of data for 12,179 unduplicated child victims in CPS reports received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008, provided by the Division.

Table A-2: Frequency of Selected Child Safety Assessment Factors
In CPS Reports Received from January through March 2008 by District

District (County) and Child Safety Risk Factors	Number of Reports	Yes		No		Unknown		Unable to Locate	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 (Maricopa)	N= 5,094								
Drug/alcohol abuse		245	5%	3,519	69%	1,133	22%	197	4%
Criminal involvement		17	0%	3,747	74%	1,133	22%	197	4%
Physical/mental health		60	1%	3,704	73%	1,133	22%	197	4%
2 (Pima)	N= 1,597								
Drug/alcohol abuse		171	11%	949	59%	449	28%	28	2%
Criminal involvement		33	2%	1,087	68%	449	28%	28	2%
Physical/mental health		57	4%	1,063	66%	449	28%	28	2%
3 (Apache, Coconino, Navajo, Yavapai)	N= 571								
Drug/alcohol abuse		41	7%	413	72%	101	18%	16	3%
Criminal involvement		4	1%	450	78%	101	18%	16	3%
Physical/mental health		12	2%	442	77%	101	18%	16	3%
4 (La Paz, Mohave, Yuma)	N= 538								
Drug/alcohol abuse		22	4%	324	60%	178	33%	14	3%
Criminal involvement		4	1%	342	63%	178	33%	14	3%
Physical/mental health		10	2%	336	62%	178	33%	14	3%
5 (Gila, Pinal)	N= 554								
Drug/alcohol abuse		25	5%	426	77%	96	17%	7	1%
Criminal involvement		5	1%	446	81%	96	17%	7	1%
Physical/mental health		8	2%	443	80%	96	17%	7	1%
6 (Graham, Greenlee, Santa Cruz, Cochise)	N= 306								
Drug/alcohol abuse		12	4%	212	69%	70	23%	12	4%
Criminal involvement		1	0%	223	73%	70	23%	12	4%
Physical/mental health		5	2%	219	71%	70	23%	12	4%
State-wide	N= 8,660								
Drug/alcohol abuse		516	6%	5,843	68%	2,027	23%	274	3%
Criminal involvement		64	1%	6,295	73%	2,027	23%	274	3%
Physical/mental health		152	2%	6,207	72%	2,027	23%	274	3%

Source: Auditor General staff analysis of child safety assessment data for the 8,660 CPS reports received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008, provided by the Division.

Table A-3: Frequency of Selected Risk Factors Impacting Parents/Guardians by District

District (County) and Risk Factors	Number of Caregivers	Yes		No		Unknown/Other		Unable to Locate	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 (Maricopa)	N= 7,839								
Alcohol abuse		310	4%	5,980	76%	1,299	17%	250	3%
Drug abuse		930	12%	5,359	68%	1,300	17%	250	3%
Physical/emotional illness		513	6%	5,776	74%	1,300	17%	250	3%
Abused/neglected as child		224	3%	6,053	77%	1,312	17%	250	3%
Inadequate housing		673	9%	5,786	74%	1,130	14%	250	3%
2 (Pima)	N= 2,464								
Alcohol abuse		222	9%	1,685	68%	529	22%	28	1%
Drug abuse		418	17%	1,489	60%	529	22%	28	1%
Physical/emotional illness		250	10%	1,657	67%	529	22%	28	1%
Abused/neglected as child		140	6%	1,762	71%	534	22%	28	1%
Inadequate housing		301	12%	1,646	67%	489	20%	28	1%
3 (Apache, Coconino, Navajo, Yavapai)	N= 913								
Alcohol abuse		105	12%	653	71%	136	15%	19	2%
Drug abuse		116	13%	642	70%	136	15%	19	2%
Physical/emotional illness		92	10%	666	73%	136	15%	19	2%
Abused/neglected as child		49	5%	708	78%	137	15%	19	2%
Inadequate housing		114	12%	663	73%	117	13%	19	2%
4 (La Paz, Mohave, Yuma)	N= 799								
Alcohol abuse		52	7%	546	68%	185	23%	16	2%
Drug abuse		99	12%	499	63%	185	23%	16	2%
Physical/emotional illness		68	9%	530	66%	185	23%	16	2%
Abused/neglected as child		30	4%	564	70%	189	24%	16	2%
Inadequate housing		65	8%	545	68%	173	22%	16	2%
5 (Gila, Pinal)	N= 931								
Alcohol abuse		60	6%	717	77%	147	16%	7	1%
Drug abuse		116	12%	661	71%	147	16%	7	1%
Physical/emotional illness		76	8%	701	75%	147	16%	7	1%
Abused/neglected as child		24	3%	749	80%	151	16%	7	1%
Inadequate housing		79	9%	739	79%	106	11%	7	1%
6 (Graham, Greenlee, Santa Cruz, Cochise)	N= 467								
Alcohol abuse		30	6%	338	73%	86	18%	13	3%
Drug abuse		54	12%	314	67%	86	18%	13	3%
Physical/emotional illness		41	9%	327	70%	86	18%	13	3%
Abused/neglected as child		15	3%	352	75%	87	19%	13	3%
Inadequate housing		28	6%	347	74%	79	17%	13	3%
State-wide	N= 13,413								
Alcohol abuse		779	6%	9,919	74%	2,382	18%	333	2%
Drug abuse		1,733	13%	8,964	67%	2,383	18%	333	2%
Physical/emotional illness		1,040	8%	9,657	72%	2,383	18%	333	2%
Abused/neglected as child		482	4%	10,188	76%	2,410	18%	333	2%
Inadequate housing		1,260	9%	9,726	73%	2,094	16%	333	2%

Source: Auditor General staff analysis of strength and risk assessment data for the 13,413 unduplicated parents/guardians identified in CPS reports received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008, provided by the Division.

Table A-4: Frequency of Selected Risk Factors Impacting Alleged Child Victims by District

District (County) and Risk Factors	Number of Child Victims	Yes		No		Unknown		Unable to Locate	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 (Maricopa)	N= 7,082								
Alcohol abuse		58	1%	4,725	66%	1,963	28%	336	5%
Drug abuse		177	2%	4,606	65%	1,963	28%	336	5%
Child disability		318	4%	4,465	63%	1,963	28%	336	5%
2 (Pima)	N= 2,233								
Alcohol abuse		20	1%	1,382	62%	794	35%	37	2%
Drug abuse		53	2%	1,349	61%	794	35%	37	2%
Child disability		106	5%	1,296	58%	794	35%	37	2%
3 (Apache, Coconino, Navajo, Yavapai)	N= 830								
Alcohol abuse		17	2%	574	69%	218	26%	21	3%
Drug abuse		18	2%	573	69%	218	26%	21	3%
Child disability		40	5%	551	66%	218	26%	21	3%
4 (La Paz, Mohave, Yuma)	N= 786								
Alcohol abuse		6	1%	477	61%	278	35%	25	3%
Drug abuse		15	2%	468	60%	278	35%	25	3%
Child disability		30	4%	453	58%	278	35%	25	3%
5 (Gila, Pinal)	N= 831								
Alcohol abuse		5	1%	577	69%	237	29%	12	1%
Drug abuse		18	2%	564	68%	237	29%	12	1%
Child disability		45	5%	537	65%	237	29%	12	1%
6 (Graham, Greenlee, Santa Cruz, Cochise)	N= 417								
Alcohol abuse		6	2%	275	66%	122	29%	14	3%
Drug abuse		8	2%	273	66%	122	29%	14	3%
Child disability		24	6%	257	62%	122	29%	14	3%
State-wide	N= 12,179								
Alcohol abuse		112	1%	8,010	66%	3,612	29%	445	4%
Drug abuse		289	2%	7,833	65%	3,612	29%	445	4%
Child disability		563	5%	7,559	62%	3,612	29%	445	4%

Source: Auditor General staff analysis of strength and risk assessment data for the 12,179 unduplicated alleged child victims identified in CPS reports received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008, provided by the Division.

Table A-5: Utilization of Cash Assistance, Food Stamps, and Medical Assistance
By Alleged Child Victims, Parents/Guardians, and Alleged Perpetrators by District

District (County) and Public Assistance Recipient Type		Cash Assistance		Food Stamps		Medical Assistance	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 (Maricopa)							
Alleged child victims	N= 7,082	915	13%	3,136	44%	3,815	54%
Caregivers	N= 7,839	578	7%	2,314	30%	2,776	35%
Alleged perpetrators	N= 6,198	488	8%	1,888	30%	2,225	36%
2 (Pima)							
Alleged child victims	N= 2,233	344	15%	1,171	52%	1,437	64%
Caregivers	N= 2,464	214	9%	897	36%	1,040	42%
Alleged perpetrators	N= 1,964	190	10%	754	38%	854	43%
3 (Apache, Coconino, Navajo, Yavapai)							
Alleged child victims	N= 830	81	10%	410	49%	502	60%
Caregivers	N= 913	41	4%	351	38%	400	44%
Alleged perpetrators	N= 736	39	5%	292	40%	333	45%
4 (La Paz, Mohave, Yuma)							
Alleged child victims	N= 786	143	18%	482	61%	563	72%
Caregivers	N= 799	83	10%	384	48%	402	50%
Alleged perpetrators	N= 690	74	11%	325	47%	346	50%
5 (Gila, Pinal)							
Alleged child victims	N= 831	83	10%	359	43%	429	52%
Caregivers	N= 931	37	4%	311	33%	348	37%
Alleged perpetrators	N= 695	32	5%	242	35%	269	39%
6 (Graham, Greenlee, Santa Cruz, Cochise)							
Alleged child victims	N= 417	58	14%	218	52%	246	59%
Caregivers	N= 467	42	9%	189	40%	194	42%
Alleged perpetrators	N= 375	37	10%	159	42%	161	43%
State-wide							
Alleged child victims	N= 12,179	1,624	13%	5,776	47%	6,992	57%
Caregivers	N= 13,413	995	7%	4,446	33%	5,160	38%
Alleged perpetrators	N= 10,658	860	8%	3,660	34%	4,188	39%

Source: Auditor General staff analysis of financial assistance data provided by the Department's Family Assistance Administration for the 12,179 alleged child victims, 13,413 parents/guardians, and 10,658 alleged perpetrators associated with the CPS reports received by the Arizona Child Abuse Hotline between January 1, 2008 and March 31, 2008.





Office of the Auditor General
(602) 553-0333
www.azauditor.gov
Contact person: Catherine Dahlquist

INFORMATION
BRIEF
April 2009 • No. IB-0901