

Report on  
DCP Statewide Review, December, 1995  
Draft, January 28, 1996  
Christine George

**Introduction**

In previous reviews of DCP, the monitoring team found that in cases in which there were non-Norman allegations, the Norman issues present were less likely to be addressed and identified as allegations. To further investigate the matter, the monitor and her assistants reviewed a state-side sample of reports investigated by DCP from December, 1995, in which the non-Norman issues of "Inadequate Supervision" and "Subsequent Risk of Injury" were present. According to SCR data the allegation "subsequent risk of injury" is the most frequently coupled allegation. In other words, many reports contain more than one allegation of abuse or neglect. However, this allegation is the one most frequently found with other allegations. The reviewers saw as an anecdote in other reviews that a Norman allegation might be unfounded when there is clear indication in the investigation that Norman condition existed but that the other allegation was indicated. An assumption made in those reviews that maybe the other allegation was considered more serious and therefore, a risk of harm or lack of supervision indication was given rather than the Norman allegation. Laurene Heybach, Supervising Attorney, LAFC, had expressed concern that Norman allegations might not be indicated when the lack of supervision and the subsequent risk of injury allegations were present. Therefore, the monitor conducted this review to determine the validity of this question.

This review found a large percentage of cases with Norman issues were still not being identified and certified.

**Methodology**

The monitor requested that DCFS draw a random sample of 140 CA/N reports from each of Cook County and from the aggregate downstate regions. The monitor received 188 reports for review from DCFS. Two reports had neither of the above mentioned non-Norman allegations, leaving a total of 186 reports for review. One hundred and two reports were from Cook and the remaining 84 were from downstate (see Table 1).

Table 1  
Distributions of Sampled Reports by Region

Unweighted Sample		Weighted Sample	
Regions	Reports	Regions	Reports
COOK		COOK	
North	23	North	23
East	10	East	10
South	21	South	21
West	22	West	22
DCP	23	DCP	23
Other	3	Other	3
subtotal	102	Subtotal	102
ROCKFORD	14	ROCKFORD	24
PEORIA	6	PEORIA	10
AURORA	21	AURORA	35
SPRINGFIELD	5	SPRINGFIELD	8
CHAMPAIGN	12	CHAMPAIGN	20
EAST ST LOUIS	8	EAST ST LOUIS	13
MARION	18	MARION	30
TOTAL	186	TOTAL	243

An adequate number of cases were received to have a reliability of 95% with a precision rate of  $\pm 10\%$  for the Cook sub-sample and the state-wide sample. However, the low return rate for downstate left that sub-sample nine cases short for the sought for reliability. To insure that the statewide results did not reflect the skewing of the sample toward Chicago, the downstate reports were weighted to reflect the distribution of reports to DCFS between the Cook Region and downstate (42% and 58%, respectively).

#### Data Analysis

Cook: The reviewers found twenty-six reports -- 20% of sample -- with Norman allegations. In close to two-thirds of these cases, the DCFS worker had identified a Norman allegation. However, in the remaining third no allegation was made, although the reviewer found evidence of Norman issues. The reviewers determined that 15 cases should have been certified and should have been given an indicated Norman allegation. Only one of these cases was certified by DCFS. This means that 54% of the cases with Norman allegation should have been certified and weren't. It is worthwhile noting that if you include cases with insufficient information, the reviewers questioned DCFS workers in 81% of the cases with Norman issues. (See Table 2)

Table 2

SAMPLE	Cook n=102	Downstate n=84	State-wide n= 186	Weighted State-wide n=243
Reports with Norman issues (Worker identified Reviewer Identified)	26 (17 9)	11 (10 1)	37 (27 10)	45 (34 11)
Insufficient Information to ID	5	0	5	5
Norman Issue Certified	1	2	3	4
Additional cases reviewer thought should be certified	14	5	19	23
Insufficient Information to Evaluate for certification	7	3	10	12
Error Rate: Percentage of Reports with Norman Issues that should have been certified	54%	45%	51%	51%

Downstate: The reviewers found eleven cases that had Norman issues. Of these ten had been identified by the DCFS worker. DCFS had certified two of these cases. The reviewers felt that an additional five should have been certified. This error rate of 45% is lower than Cook's, but not significantly so. In addition, the downstate sample is not sufficiently robust for us to draw definite conclusions about the performance of downstate. (Table 2).

State-wide: As we see in Table 2, the error rate for the state is 51%. About two-thirds of the difference in certification rates between the DCFS workers and the reviewers might be explained by their differences in identifying issues. If all the issues identified by the reviewers were also identified by the workers, 12 more allegations would have been identified. Table 3 shows comparisons of the Norman Issues identified by the DCFS workers and the additional Norman issues identified by the reviewers. The DCFS workers identified 81% of the food allegations, 30% of the shelter allegations, 66% of the clothing allegations, and 92% (all but one) of the environmental neglect allegations.

Table 3  
Types of Norman Issues Identified

Sample	Cook n = 26 reports	Downstate n = 11 reports	Statewide n = 37 reports
Norman Allegations Identified by Reviewers	Food = 3 Shelter = 6 Clothing = 1 En Neglect = 1	Food = 0 Shelter = 1 Clothing = 0 En Neglect = 0	Food = 3 Shelter = 7 Clothing = 1 En Neglect = 1
Norman Allegations Identified by DCFS workers	Food = 8 (1 indicated) Shelter = 2 (2 indicated) Clothing = 6 (2 indicated) En Neglect = 6 (2 indicated)	Food = 5 (0 indicated) Shelter = 1 (1 indicated) Clothing = 0 (0 indicated) En Neglect = 5 (3 indicated)	Food = 13 (1 indicated) Shelter = 3 (3 indicated) Clothing = 6 (2 indicated) En Neglect = 11 (5 indicated)

Yet this non-identification and indication is not the whole picture. Of the 33 allegations identified by DCFS workers, ten were indicated and only three cases were ultimately certified. By contrast, of the 45 allegations either found or concurred with by the reviewer, in 19 cases the reviewer thought the case should be certified. So the DCFS workers both under- and over-certified cases with Norman issues.

1/28/96CG

**Report on  
DCP Statewide Review, December, 1995  
Draft, January 28, 1996  
Christine George**

**Introduction**

In previous reviews of DCP, the monitoring team found that in cases in which there were non-Norman allegations, the Norman issues present were less likely to be addressed and identified as allegations. To further investigate the matter, the monitor and her assistants reviewed a state-side sample of reports investigated by DCP from December, 1995, in which the non-Norman issues of "Inadequate Supervision" and "Subsequent Risk of Injury" were present. According to SCR data the allegation "subsequent risk of injury" is the most frequently coupled allegation. In other words, many reports contain more than one allegation of abuse or neglect. However, this allegation is the one most frequently found with other allegations. The reviewers saw as an anecdote in other reviews that a Norman allegation might be unfounded when there is clear indication in the investigation that Norman condition existed but that the other allegation was indicated. An assumption made in those reviews that maybe the other allegation was considered more serious and therefore, a risk of harm or lack of supervision indication was given rather than the Norman allegation. Laurene Heybach, Supervising Attorney, LAFC, had expressed concern that Norman allegations might not be indicated when the lack of supervision and the subsequent risk of injury allegations were present. Therefore, the monitor conducted this review to determine the validity of this question.

This review found a large percentage of cases with Norman issues were still not being identified and certified.

**Methodology**

The monitor requested that DCFS draw a random sample of 140 CA/N reports from each of Cook County and from the aggregate downstate regions. The monitor received 188 reports for review from DCFS. Two reports had neither of the above mentioned non-Norman allegations, leaving a total of 186 reports for review. One hundred and two reports were from Cook and the remaining 84 were from downstate (see Table 1).

Table 1  
Distributions of Sampled Reports by Region

Unweighted Sample		Weighted Sample	
Regions	Reports	Regions	Reports
COOK		COOK	
North	23	North	23
East	10	East	10
South	21	South	21
West	22	West	22
DCP	23	DCP	23
Other	3	Other	3
subtotal	102	Subtotal	102
ROCKFORD	14	ROCKFORD	24
PEORIA	6	PEORIA	10
AURORA	21	AURORA	35
SPRINGFIELD	5	SPRINGFIELD	8
CHAMPAIGN	12	CHAMPAIGN	20
EAST ST LOUIS	8	EAST ST LOUIS	13
MARION	18	MARION	30
TOTAL	186	TOTAL	243

An adequate number of cases were received to have a reliability of 95% with a precision rate of  $\pm 10\%$  for the Cook sub-sample and the state-wide sample. However, the low return rate for downstate left that sub-sample nine cases short for the sought for reliability. To insure that the statewide results did not reflect the skewing of the sample toward Chicago, the downstate reports were weighted to reflect the distribution of reports to DCFS between the Cook Region and downstate (42% and 58%, respectively).

#### Data Analysis

Cook: The reviewers found twenty-six reports -- 20% of sample -- with Norman allegations. In close to two-thirds of these cases, the DCFS worker had identified a Norman allegation. However, in the remaining third no allegation was made, although the reviewer found evidence of Norman issues. The reviewers determined that 15 cases should have been certified and should have been given an indicated Norman allegation. Only one of these cases was certified by DCFS. This means that 54% of the cases with Norman allegation should have been certified and weren't. It is worthwhile noting that if you include cases with insufficient information, the reviewers questioned DCFS workers in 81% of the cases with Norman issues. (See Table 2)

Table 2

SAMPLE	Cook n=102	Downstate n=84	State-wide n= 186	Weighted State-wide n=243
Reports with Norman issues (Worker identified Reviewer Identified)	26 (17 9)	11 (10 1)	37 (27 10)	45 (34 11)
Insufficient Information to ID	5	0	5	5
Norman Issue Certified	1	2	3	4
Additional cases reviewer thought should be certified	14	5	19	23
Insufficient Information to Evaluate for certification	7	3	10	12
Error Rate: Percentage of Reports with Norman Issues that should have been certified	54%	45%	51%	51%

Downstate: The reviewers found eleven cases that had Norman issues. Of these ten had been identified by the DCFS worker. DCFS had certified two of these cases. The reviewers felt that an additional five should have been certified. This error rate of 45% is lower than Cook's, but not significantly so. In addition, the downstate sample is not sufficiently robust for us to draw definite conclusions about the performance of downstate. (Table 2).

State-wide: As we see in Table 2, the error rate for the state is 51%. About two-thirds of the difference in certification rates between the DCFS workers and the reviewers might be explained by their differences in identifying issues. If all the issues identified by the reviewers were also identified by the workers, 12 more allegations would have been identified. Table 3 shows comparisons of the Norman Issues identified by the DCFS workers and the additional Norman issues identified by the reviewers. The DCFS workers identified 81% of the food allegations, 30% of the shelter allegations, 66% of the clothing allegations, and 92% (all but one) of the environmental neglect allegations.

Table 3  
Types of Norman Issues Identified

Sample	Cook n = 26 reports	Downstate n = 11 reports	Statewide n = 37 reports
Norman Allegations Identified by Reviewers	Food = 3 Shelter = 6 Clothing = 1 En Neglect = 1	Food = 0 Shelter = 1 Clothing = 0 En Neglect = 0	Food = 3 Shelter = 7 Clothing = 1 En Neglect = 1
Norman Allegations Identified by DCFS workers	Food = 8 (1 indicated) Shelter = 2 (2 indicated) Clothing = 6 (2 indicated) En Neglect = 6 (2 indicated)	Food = 5 (0 indicated) Shelter = 1 (1 indicated) Clothing = 0 (0 indicated) En Neglect = 5 (3 indicated)	Food = 13 (1 indicated) Shelter = 3 (3 indicated) Clothing = 6 (2 indicated) En Neglect = 11 (5 indicated)

Yet this non-identification and indication is not the whole picture. Of the 33 allegations identified by DCFS workers, ten were indicated and only three cases were ultimately certified. By contrast, of the 45 allegations either found or concurred with by the reviewer, in 19 cases the reviewer thought the case should be certified. So the DCFS workers both under-indicated and under certified cases with Norman issues.

1/28/96CG



Report on  
DCP Statewide Review, December, 1995  
Draft, January 28, 1996  
Christine George

**Introduction**

In previous reviews of DCP, the monitoring team found that in cases in which there were non-Norman allegations, the Norman issues present were less likely to be addressed and identified as allegations. To further investigate the matter, the monitor and her assistants reviewed a state-side sample of reports investigated by DCP from December, 1995, in which the non-Norman issues of "Inadequate Supervision" and "Subsequent Risk of Injury" were present. According to SCR data the allegation "subsequent risk of injury" is the most frequently coupled allegation. In other words, many reports contain more than one allegation of abuse or neglect. However, this allegation is the one most frequently found with other allegations. The reviewers saw as an anecdote in other reviews that a Norman allegation might be unfounded when there is clear indication in the investigation that Norman condition existed but that the other allegation was indicated. An assumption made in those reviews that maybe the other allegation was considered more serious and therefore, a risk of harm or lack of supervision indication was given rather than the Norman allegation. Laurene Heybach, Supervising Attorney, LAFC, had expressed concern that Norman allegations might not be indicated when the lack of supervision and the subsequent risk of injury allegations were present. Therefore, the monitor conducted this review to determine the validity of this question.

This review found a large percentage of cases with Norman issues were still not being identified and certified.

**Methodology**

The monitor requested that DCFS draw a random sample of 140 CA/N reports from each of Cook County and from the aggregate downstate regions. The monitor received 188 reports for review from DCFS. Two reports had neither of the above mentioned non-Norman allegations, leaving a total of 186 reports for review. One hundred and two reports were from Cook and the remaining 84 were from downstate (see Table 1).

Table 1  
Distributions of Sampled Reports by Region

Unweighted Sample		Weighted Sample	
Regions	Reports	Regions	Reports
COOK		COOK	
North	23	North	23
East	10	East	10
South	21	South	21
West	22	West	22
DCP	23	DCP	23
Other	3	Other	3
subtotal	102	Subtotal	102
ROCKFORD	14	ROCKFORD	24
PEORIA	6	PEORIA	10
AURORA	21	AURORA	35
SPRINGFIELD	5	SPRINGFIELD	8
CHAMPAIGN	12	CHAMPAIGN	20
EAST ST LOUIS	8	EAST ST LOUIS	13
MARION	18	MARION	30
TOTAL	186	TOTAL	243

An adequate number of cases were received to have a reliability of 95% with a precision rate of  $\pm 10\%$  for the Cook sub-sample and the state-wide sample. However, the low return rate for downstate left that sub-sample nine cases short for the sought for reliability. To insure that the statewide results did not reflect the skewing of the sample toward Chicago, the downstate reports were weighted to reflect the distribution of reports to DCFS between the Cook Region and downstate (42% and 58%, respectively).

#### Data Analysis

Cook: The reviewers found twenty-six reports -- 20% of sample -- with Norman allegations. In close to two-thirds of these cases, the DCFS worker had identified a Norman allegation. However, in the remaining third no allegation was made, although the reviewer found evidence of Norman issues. The reviewers determined that 15 cases should have been certified and should have been given an indicated Norman allegation. Only one of these cases was certified by DCFS. This means that 54% of the cases with Norman allegation should have been certified and weren't. It is worthwhile noting that if you include cases with insufficient information, the reviewers questioned DCFS workers in 81% of the cases with Norman issues. (See Table 2)

Table 2

SAMPLE	Cook n=102	Downstate n=84	State-wide n= 186	Weighted State-wide n=243
Reports with Norman issues (Worker identified Reviewer Identified)	26 (17 9)	11 (10 1)	37 (27 10)	45 (34 11)
Insufficient Information to ID	5	0	5	5
Norman Issue Certified	1	2	3	4
Additional cases reviewer thought should be certified	14	5	19	23
Insufficient Information to Evaluate for certification	7	3	10	12
Error Rate: Percentage of Reports with Norman Issues that should have been certified	54%	45%	51%	51%

Downstate: The reviewers found eleven cases that had Norman issues. Of these ten had been identified by the DCFS worker. DCFS had certified two of these cases. The reviewers felt that an additional five should have been certified. This error rate of 45% is lower than Cook's, but not significantly so. In addition, the downstate sample is not sufficiently robust for us to draw definite conclusions about the performance of downstate. (Table 2).

State-wide: As we see in Table 2, the error rate for the state is 51%. About two-thirds of the difference in certification rates between the DCFS workers and the reviewers might be explained by their differences in identifying issues. If all the issues identified by the reviewers were also identified by the workers, 12 more allegations would have been identified. Table 3 shows comparisons of the Norman Issues identified by the DCFS workers and the additional Norman issues identified by the reviewers. The DCFS workers identified 81% of the food allegations, 30% of the shelter allegations, 66% of the clothing allegations, and 92% (all but one) of the environmental neglect allegations.

Table 3  
Types of Norman Issues Identified

Sample	Cook n = 26 reports	Downstate n = 11 reports	Statewide n = 37 reports
Norman Allegations Identified by Reviewers	Food = 3 Shelter = 6 Clothing = 1 En Neglect = 1	Food = 0 Shelter = 1 Clothing = 0 En Neglect = 0	Food = 3 Shelter = 7 Clothing = 1 En Neglect = 1
Norman Allegations Identified by DCFS workers	Food = 8 (1 indicated) Shelter = 2 (2 indicated) Clothing = 6 (2 indicated) En Neglect = 6 (2 indicated)	Food = 5 (0 indicated) Shelter = 1 (1 indicated) Clothing = 0 (0 indicated) En Neglect = 5 (3 indicated)	Food = 13 (1 indicated) Shelter = 3 (3 indicated) Clothing = 6 (2 indicated) En Neglect = 11 (5 indicated)

Yet this non-identification and indication is not the whole picture. Of the 33 allegations identified by DCFS workers, ten were indicated and only three cases were ultimately certified. By contrast, of the 45 allegations either found or concurred with by the reviewer, in 19 cases the reviewer thought the case should be certified. So the DCFS workers both under-indicated and under certified cases with Norman issues.

1/28/96CG