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Executive Summary

The Arizona Department of Economic Security’s Division of Children, Youth and Families (Division) is pleased to publish this semi-annual report for October 2009 through March 2010 in compliance with A.R.S. § 8-526. This report is intended to provide its readers an opportunity to review the Division’s progress in implementing systemic improvement strategies as they impact key performance indicators.

The Division continues to implement the key strategies for (1) enhancing the ability of parents to create safe, stable and nurturing home environments; (2) strengthening families so children can remain safely in their homes; (3) finding more permanent homes more quickly for children; and (4) placing children in the least restrictive, most family-like setting possible.

The improved outcomes for children and families that have resulted from the implementation of those strategies have been highlighted in previous editions of this report and other Division publications. Additional successes are expected as the Division continues the statewide implementation of other continuous improvement strategies, such as embedding the Division’s comprehensive Child Safety Assessment, Strengths and Risk Assessment, and Case Planning (CSA/SRA/CP) process into child welfare practice. This enhanced process assists child welfare specialists in more effectively assessing risk and engaging families in planning for and completing the services that are going to help them to create safe, stable living environments for their children.

The data contained in this *Semi-Annual Report*, when combined with other child welfare-related information in the Department, demonstrate the significant progress made in many of the Division’s areas of focus and identify areas where continued focus is needed.

**Child Abuse Hotline and Child Protective Services (CPS) Investigations**

The statewide Child Abuse Hotline received 28,339 calls during this reporting period. Of those, 11,229 – or 39.6 percent – *did not meet* the statutory criteria for a CPS report. Calls that did not meet the criteria for a CPS report included: requests for information or referrals for services; questions about current cases; and allegations of abuse or neglect where the alleged perpetrator was not the child’s parent, guardian or custodian (those calls are referred to law enforcement for response). Every call that does not meet the criteria for a CPS report is reviewed within 48 hours by quality assurance staff to ensure the accuracy of that decision.

The statewide Child Abuse Hotline received 17,110 calls during this reporting period that met the statutory criteria for a CPS report. Of those, 220 were referred to other jurisdictions, the military or tribal governments for investigation and an additional 288 reports were not assigned for investigation, primarily as a result of the impact of staffing reductions pursuant to budget reduction strategies. This resulted in 16,602 CPS reports being assigned to child welfare specialists for investigation. Compared to the same reporting period last year, this represents a decrease of 218 CPS reports assigned for investigation – or 1.3 percent. This decrease in CPS reports requiring an investigation has mainly occurred in Maricopa and Pima counties.

Of the 16,602 CPS reports assigned for investigation during this reporting period, 8,149 reports – or 49.1 percent – had investigation closures entered into the Children’s Information Library and Data Source (CHILDS) statewide case management information system. Closing a case means that the initial investigation to the original allegations of abuse or neglect has been completed and the appropriate case plan is put in place, as needed. Many factors can impact the closure of investigations, including time
needed for child welfare specialists to obtain all information needed to complete an accurate and thorough assessment.

Of the 16,602 CPS reports subject to substantiation during this reporting period, 1,311 – or 7.9 percent – were substantiated. An additional 447 CPS reports – or 2.7 percent – were proposed for substantiation by child welfare specialists and are currently awaiting the results of the appeals process. Over time, the number of substantiated and proposed substantiated CPS reports associated with this time period will increase as investigation findings are entered into CHILDS. It is sometimes difficult to substantiate allegations of abuse or neglect because current state laws that define child maltreatment do not include many situations related to child neglect or sexual abuse.

**Children in Out-of-Home Care**

The Division remains committed to working with the community to keep children safe, strengthen families, and prevent the need for children to be removed from their homes. The number of children in out-of-home care increased slightly from 10,112 in the prior reporting period to 10,207 in March 2010. Of the children in out-of-home care, the Division continues its success in placing children in the most family-like setting possible. In March 2010, 8,437 children – or 82.6 percent of all children in out-of-home care – were placed with relatives or licensed foster parents. An additional 46 children were placed with their parents on a trial home visit and 293 youth were residing in independent living settings. Efforts to increase the number of licensed foster parents who are able to meet the needs of children requiring out-of-home placement resulted in 560 new homes being licensed during this reporting period.

The Division continues to focus on the number of young children in shelter and group home care. In March 2010, there were 22 young children ages 0 through 3 in shelter care. This represents a decrease of 9 children – or 29.0 percent – since March 2006. Placement of young children in shelter care continues to be influenced by the need to place some children after regular work hours, such as weekends, as well as the placement of children in a specialized shelter in Pima County for medically fragile children. The Division has also worked diligently to reduce the number of very young children in group homes. In March 2010, there were 4 young children ages 0 to 6 in group homes. This represents a decrease of 32 children – or 88.9 percent – since March 2006. There are times when placement of young children in group homes is in the best interests of the children; for example, when group placement would allow siblings to stay together or when group placement is considered the least restrictive placement for a child with behavioral issues.

Since March 2005, the number of children placed in shelter or receiving home care for 21 days or more decreased by 704 children – or 62.5 percent – a significant improvement. Compared to the same reporting period last year, the number of children in these temporary care settings decreased by 106 children – or 20.1 percent.

The state requires monthly face to face visitation with children in foster care. The current report shows that 87.9 percent of the children in foster care received their visitation during the last month of the reporting period. This compares to 81.1 percent receiving their visit during the last month of the reporting period ending September 2009. The Department recognizes a strong correlation between caseworker visits with children and positive outcomes for these children, such as achieving permanency and other indicators of child well-being, and continues to make efforts to improve our rate of visitation.

**Permanency for Children**

The Division continues to work toward achieving permanency for children placed in out-of-home care. The total number of children achieving permanency through family reunification, adoption or legal guardianship was 3,124 this reporting period, compared to 3,027 the same reporting period last year. As evidenced below, the Division increased adoptions by 35.3 percent over the same period a year ago; it also increased
guardianship by 1.3 percent for the same period. The reunification of children with their parents for the same period a year ago decreased by 9.1 percent.

Compared to the same reporting period last year, in this reporting period:

- 1,778 children exited the system to family reunification, a decrease of 177 children – or 9.1 percent.
- 1,034 children exited to adoption, an increase of 270 children – or 35.3 percent.
- 312 children exited to guardianship, an increase of 4 children – or 1.3 percent.

**Challenges**

The Division faces a number of challenges in its efforts to ensure safety and promote permanency for abused and neglected children. Some of the challenges the Division has faced in meeting these goals are:

- Retention of trained and qualified staff.
- Economic factors which create additional stress upon families and increases factors that place children at risk of maltreatment.
- Budget reductions which impacts the array of services available to families and decreases the Division's capacity to contract for family support and prevention services.

Despite these challenges, the Division continues to ensure child welfare staff has the tools they need to do their jobs effectively, and that both state and federal standards are being implemented. The Division continues to work in partnership with the federal government to meet the federal Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) standards to improve outcomes for the children and families we serve.
### Semi-Annual Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reports Received</td>
<td>16,781</td>
<td>16,612</td>
<td>18,078</td>
<td>17,628</td>
<td>17,493</td>
<td>17,094</td>
<td>16,134</td>
<td>17,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reports Substantiated 1</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>1,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantiation Rate</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reports Investigated &amp; Closed</td>
<td>16,256</td>
<td>15,017</td>
<td>12,722</td>
<td>10,760</td>
<td>10,064</td>
<td>10,686</td>
<td>10,397</td>
<td>8,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reports Responded To</td>
<td>16,619</td>
<td>16,422</td>
<td>17,876</td>
<td>17,413</td>
<td>17,310</td>
<td>16,820</td>
<td>15,496</td>
<td>16,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new removals</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>3,683</td>
<td>3,924</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>4,546</td>
<td>3,889</td>
<td>3,819</td>
<td>3,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new removals with Voluntary under 18</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in Out-of-Home Care on the Last Day of Reporting Period</td>
<td>9,833</td>
<td>9,773</td>
<td>9,701</td>
<td>9,721</td>
<td>10,303</td>
<td>10,404</td>
<td>10,112</td>
<td>10,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in Shelter for More than 21 Days</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and Percentage of Children Receiving Visitation In the Last Month of Reporting Period</td>
<td>6,437 (65.5%)</td>
<td>7,610 (77.9%)</td>
<td>7,283 (75.1%)</td>
<td>7,376 (75.9%)</td>
<td>7,664 (74.4%)</td>
<td>7,247 (69.7%)</td>
<td>8,201 (81.1%)</td>
<td>8,973 (87.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and Percentage of Children not Receiving Visitation</td>
<td>3,396 (34.5%)</td>
<td>2,163 (22.1%)</td>
<td>2,418 (24.9%)</td>
<td>2,345 (24.1%)</td>
<td>2,639 (25.6%)</td>
<td>3,157 (30.3%)</td>
<td>1,911 (18.9%)</td>
<td>1,234 (12.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and Percentage of Parents Receiving Visitation</td>
<td>1,131 (51.8%)</td>
<td>1,398 (63.1%)</td>
<td>1,241 (63.5%)</td>
<td>1,025 (62.3%)</td>
<td>1,022 (60.2%)</td>
<td>939 (53.6%)</td>
<td>1,364 (59.6%)</td>
<td>1,578 (64.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Licensed Foster Homes</td>
<td>3,256</td>
<td>3,177</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>3,592</td>
<td>3,615</td>
<td>3,923</td>
<td>3,954</td>
<td>3,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Foster Home Spaces Available to ACYF</td>
<td>6,469</td>
<td>6,498</td>
<td>6,639</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>7,116</td>
<td>8,293</td>
<td>8,625</td>
<td>8,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of New Foster Homes</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Foster Homes Closed</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and Percentage of Foster Homes Receiving Visitation In the Last Qtr. Of Reporting Period</td>
<td>1,790 (55.0%)</td>
<td>2,116 (66.6%)</td>
<td>1,739 (49.5%)</td>
<td>2,137 (59.5%)</td>
<td>2,412 (66.7%)</td>
<td>2,993 (76.3%)</td>
<td>3,224 (81.6%)</td>
<td>3,240 (82.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and Percentage of Foster Homes not Receiving Visitation</td>
<td>1,466 (45.0%)</td>
<td>1,061 (33.4%)</td>
<td>1,773 (50.5%)</td>
<td>1,455 (40.5%)</td>
<td>1,203 (33.3%)</td>
<td>930 (23.7%)</td>
<td>730 (18.4%)</td>
<td>692 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Leaving DES Custody</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>3,553</td>
<td>3,824</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>3,894</td>
<td>3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children With a Case Plan Goal of Adoption</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>2,439</td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>2,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children With a Finalized Adoption</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>1,034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Since the appeals process delays the substantiation of reports, revisions to the substantiation rate for the prior reporting period will occur with every semi-annual report produced.
**Reports of Abuse & Neglect**

Child abuse and neglect are defined in A.R.S. §8-201 and A.R.S. §13-3623 (A). These definitions provide the major categories in this report.

Between October 1, 2009 and March 31, 2010, there were 17,110 incoming communications to the Child Abuse Hotline that met the criteria for a report of abuse or neglect. Of these, 220 were within the jurisdiction of military or tribal governments and were referred to those jurisdictions. This compares to 16,134 incoming communications received during the last reporting period which met the criteria of a report of abuse or neglect.

Table 1 shows the number of reports received by the Department by category of maltreatment for the last eight reporting periods. The table shows that for the current reporting period 10,127 or 59.2 percent of the 17,110 reports of maltreatment were related to allegations of neglect, 5,866 or 34.3 percent of the reports were related to allegations of physical abuse, 930 or 5.4 percent of the reports were related to allegations of sexual abuse, and 187 or 1.1 percent of the reports were related to allegations of emotional abuse.

**TABLE 1**

REPORTS BY REPORTING PERIOD AND TYPE OF MALTREATMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neglect</th>
<th>Physical Abuse</th>
<th>Sexual Abuse</th>
<th>Emotional Abuse</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2006 - Sept 2006</td>
<td>10,201</td>
<td>5,346</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>16,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2006 – March 2007</td>
<td>9,838</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>16,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2007 – Sept 2007</td>
<td>10,922</td>
<td>5,836</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>18,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2007 – March 2008</td>
<td>10,449</td>
<td>6,005</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>17,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2008 – Sept 2008</td>
<td>10,539</td>
<td>5,737</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>17,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2008 – March 2009</td>
<td>9,845</td>
<td>6,064</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>17,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2009 – Sept 2009</td>
<td>9,666</td>
<td>5,372</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>16,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2009 – March 2010</td>
<td>10,127</td>
<td>5,866</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>17,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 1 shows that the number of CPS reports received by the CPS Hotline has increased over the past year. Comparing the current reporting period to the prior reporting period, the number of reports received increased by 976 reports or 6.0 percent.
In addition to the 17,110 reports during the current reporting period, the Child Abuse Hotline received 11,229 communications that did not meet the statutory criteria of a report of maltreatment. A random sample of these communications is contained in the chart below.

**CHART 2**
SAMPLE OF COMMUNICATIONS TO THE CHILD ABUSE HOTLINE THAT DO NOT MEET THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS OF A REPORT OF ABUSE OR NEGLECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A = Concern Only/No Allegation of Child Abuse or Neglect</td>
<td>47 (52.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = Out of CPS Jurisdiction</td>
<td>23 (25.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = Call Appropriate for Law Enforcement Jurisdiction</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = Non-Caretaker Neglect/Child No Longer at Risk</td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E = Insufficient Information</td>
<td>8 (8.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = Truancy/Custody Issues</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G = Current Case Questions or Referrals</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All communications that do not meet the statutory requirements for a field investigation of abuse or neglect are reviewed within 48 hours by DES quality assurance staff.

---

2 The category “Call Appropriate for Law Enforcement Jurisdiction” refers to a situation where the alleged perpetrator is not a parent or primary caretaker and the allegations, if true, would constitute a crime.
For the current reporting period, the CPS Hotline classified 15.2 percent of the reports received as high risk, 29.7 percent as moderate risk, 43.6 percent as low risk, and 11.5 percent as potential risk.

For the current reporting period, the CPS Hotline classified 1.1 percent of CPS reports as emotional abuse, 59.2 percent as neglect, 34.3 percent as physical abuse, and 5.4 percent as sexual abuse.

CHART 3
NUMBER OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY RISK LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>2,924</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>10,012</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>5,082</td>
<td>7,456</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>17,110</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3
NUMBER OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY FOR PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>4,052</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>9,506</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>2,297</td>
<td>5,136</td>
<td>6,942</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>16,134</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHART 4
NUMBER OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT
### TABLE 4

**NUMBER OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND COUNTY FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>NEGLECT</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
<th>SEXUAL ABUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5,846</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>10,012</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>10,127</td>
<td>5,866</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>17,110</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5

**NUMBER OF REPORTS RECEIVED BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND COUNTY FOR PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>NEGLECT</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
<th>SEXUAL ABUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>3,271</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>9,506</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>9,666</td>
<td>5,372</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>16,134</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSIGNMENT OF INVESTIGATIONS

During the reporting period, there were 17,110 calls to the hotline that met the statutory criteria for a report. Of those, 220 reports fell within the jurisdiction of military or tribal governments and 288 reports were not investigated. This left 16,602 reports that were assigned to be investigated by CPS. The following tables and charts in this section provide statewide and county level information on these reports.

CHART 5
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND REPORTING PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>April 2009 - September 2009</th>
<th>October 2009 – March 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>2,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>5,087</td>
<td>5,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>6,847</td>
<td>7,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTENTIAL</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>2,547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>4,293</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>9,810</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>5,021</td>
<td>7,377</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>16,602</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY
FOR PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,042</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>9,229</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>5,087</td>
<td>6,847</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>15,496</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHART 6
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT
AND REPORTING PERIOD

![Chart 6](chart6.png)
### TABLE 8
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT BY COUNTY FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>NEGLECT</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
<th>SEXUAL ABUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5,767</td>
<td>3,377</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>9,810</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navaajo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>9,867</td>
<td>5,632</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>16,602</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 9
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT BY COUNTY FOR PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>NEGLECT</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
<th>SEXUAL ABUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochise</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5,466</td>
<td>3,131</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>9,229</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navaajo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>9,339</td>
<td>5,077</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>15,496</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During this reporting period, there were 16,602 reports assigned for investigation. Of these, CPS completed 8,149 investigations or 49.1 percent. Investigations not completed remain open when the investigation is still in process, when the CPS specialist is waiting for the results of a law enforcement investigation and/or receipt of records that impact the investigation finding, or when the investigation has been completed but is awaiting supervisory review and approval.

INVESTIGATIONS OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF REPORTS NOT RESPOND TO BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By statute, a random sample of reports not responded to for the period is required. For the current reporting period there were 288 reports that were not responded to. A random sample of 55 reports not responded to were reviewed. Chart 7 displays the 55 reports in brief descriptive categories.
CHART 7
NUMBER OF REPORTS NOT RESPONDED TO BY CATEGORY FOR THE PERIOD OF
OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

N=55

A= Adolescent, Past abuse, No current Injuries
B= Inadequate Housekeeping Standards
C= Inappropriate Vehicle Operation
D= No Specific Allegations
E= Past abuse no current injuries

CHART 8
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND
REPORTING PERIOD FOR REPORTS STILL OPEN FOR INVESTIGATION
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### TABLE 11
NUMBER OF REPORTS BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY FOR REPORTS STILL OPEN FOR INVESTIGATION FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>4,472</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>4,314</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>8,453</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 12
NUMBER OF REPORTS BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY FOR REPORTS STILL OPEN FOR INVESTIGATION FOR PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHART 9
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT
FOR REPORTS STILL OPEN FOR INVESTIGATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGLECT</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL ABUSE</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXUAL ABUSE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 13
NUMBER OF REPORTS BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND COUNTY FOR REPORTS
STILL OPEN FOR INVESTIGATION FOR PERIOD OF
OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>NEGLECT</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
<th>SEXUAL ABUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2,408</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>4,472</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHAJJO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4,669</td>
<td>3,163</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>8,453</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14
NUMBER OF REPORTS BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT AND COUNTY FOR REPORTS STILL OPEN FOR INVESTIGATION FOR PERIOD OF
APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>NEGLECT</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
<th>SEXUAL ABUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHART 10
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION WHERE A REMOVAL OCCURRED

April 2009 - September 2009
October 2009 - March 2010
### TABLE 15
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY COUNTY WHERE A REMOVAL OCCURRED FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED WITH A REMOVAL</th>
<th>% OF REPORTS WHERE A CHILD WAS PLACED IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochise</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>9,810</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinal</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>16,602</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 16
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY COUNTY WHERE A REMOVAL OCCURRED FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED WITH A REMOVAL</th>
<th>% OF REPORTS WHERE A CHILD WAS PLACED IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochise</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>9,229</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinal</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>15,496</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS

Substantiated reports are reports where the Department has determined that at least one of the allegations in the report of abuse and neglect is true. The number of reports that are considered substantiated are a subset of the total number of reports that were received, investigated, and closed during the reporting period.

The preliminary number of CPS reports that are substantiated for this reporting period is 1,311. For the prior reporting period, the number of CPS reports that were assigned for investigation that resulted in substantiated findings was revised from 902 to 1,296 to reflect subsequent decisions based on parents’ rights to due process. For the current reporting period, 44.7 percent of substantiated investigative findings were classified as high risk, 30.1 percent as moderate risk, 20.7 percent as low risk, and 4.5 percent as potential risk. Prior to October 1, 2009 potential risk reports were not substantiated by CPS. For the prior reporting period, 29.4 percent of substantiated investigative findings were classified as high risk, 39.6 percent as moderate risk, and 31.0 percent as low risk.

- There were 16,602 reports received during the current reporting period that were subject to substantiation. This results in a preliminary substantiation rate of 8 percent for the current reporting period.
- There were 14,186 reports received during the prior reporting period that were subject to substantiation. This results in a 9 percent substantiation rate for the prior reporting period.

CHART 11
SUBSTANTIATION RATE BY REPORTING PERIOD
CHART 12

NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND REPORTING PERIOD THAT RESULTED IN PROPOSED SUBSTANTIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIGH RISK</th>
<th>MODERATE RISK</th>
<th>LOW RISK</th>
<th>POTENTIAL RISK</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2009 - Sept 2009</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2009 - March 2010</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 17

NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN PROPOSED SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN PROPOSED SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% OF TOTAL 29.8% 42.6% 25.5% 2.1% 100.0%
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### TABLE 19
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT BY COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN PROPOSED SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>NEGLECT</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
<th>SEXUAL ABUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 20
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT BY COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN PROPOSED SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>NEGLECT</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
<th>SEXUAL ABUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND REPORTING PERIOD THAT RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIATION

TABLE 21
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 22
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHART 15
**NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT THAT RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIATION**

- EMOTIONAL ABUSE
- NEGLECT
- PHYSICAL ABUSE
- SEXUAL ABUSE
### TABLE 23
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT
BY COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF
OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>NEGLECT</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
<th>SEXUAL ABUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 24
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT
BY COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN SUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF
APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>NEGLECT</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
<th>SEXUAL ABUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The preliminary number of CPS investigations that resulted in an unsubstantiated finding for this reporting period was 6,391. For the prior reporting period, the number of CPS reports that were unsubstantiated was revised from 9,355 to 12,678 to reflect updated information in the CHILDS case management information system. For the prior reporting period, 13.4 percent of unsubstantiated reports were classified as high risk, 32.4 percent as moderate risk, 45.0 percent as low risk, and 9.2 percent as potential risk. Just over one percent of these unsubstantiated reports related to emotional abuse, 60.8 percent to neglect, 32.6 percent to physical abuse, and 5.4 percent to sexual abuse.

### Chart 16
**Number of Reports Assigned for Investigation by Risk Level and Reporting Period That Resulted in Unsubstantiation**

![Chart showing the number of reports assigned for investigation by risk level and reporting period that resulted in unsubstantiation.](chart.png)

### Table 25
**Number of Reports Assigned for Investigation by Risk Level and County That Resulted in Unsubstantiation for Period of October 1, 2009 Through March 31, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>4,342</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>6,391</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 26

NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY RISK LEVEL AND COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN UNSUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>POTENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>8,227</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>5,702</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>12,678</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHART 17

NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT THAT RESULTED IN UNSUBSTANTIATION BY REPORTING PERIOD
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### TABLE 27
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT
BY COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN UNSUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF
OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>NEGLECT</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
<th>SEXUAL ABUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>4,342</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navao</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3,821</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>6,391</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 28
NUMBER OF REPORTS ASSIGNED FOR INVESTIGATION BY TYPE OF MALTREATMENT
BY COUNTY THAT RESULTED IN UNSUBSTANTIATION FOR PERIOD OF
APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EMOTIONAL ABUSE</th>
<th>NEGLECT</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ABUSE</th>
<th>SEXUAL ABUSE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochise</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>8,227</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navao</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7,704</td>
<td>4,137</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>12,678</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAFE HAVEN INFANTS

There were no newborn infants delivered to Safe Haven providers during the October 2009 – March 2010 reporting period. This compares to two infants being delivered to Safe Haven providers during the April 2009 – September 2009 reporting period.

CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE

During this reporting period, 3,936 children entered care as compared to 3,819 children for the April 2009 through September 2009 reporting period. Chart 18 displays children entering out-of-home care by reporting period.

CHART 18
TOTAL CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY REPORTING PERIOD

The number of children entering out-of-home placement through voluntary foster care agreements for this reporting period was 125, which represents 3.2 percent of the children entering care this reporting period. Table 29 shows the number of children entering out-of-home care through voluntary placements for the current reporting period by county. Voluntary foster care may be provided when the parents or legal guardians of a child have requested such assistance and have signed a legally binding written agreement, not to exceed 90 days, for the temporary placement of the child in foster care while risk factors are addressed to enable the child to live safely at home. A voluntary foster care agreement may be utilized only when the circumstances that brought the child into foster care are likely to be remedied within the 90 day period of time. A.R.S. §8-806 authorizes the Department to provide voluntary foster care placement for children for a period not to exceed 90 days and no more than twice within 24 consecutive months.
### TABLE 29
NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY COUNTY WHO ARE VOLUNTARY PLACEMENTS FOR CHILDREN UNDER THE AGE OF EIGHTEEN FOR THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN REMOVED</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL REMOVALS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE UNDER THE AGE OF EIGHTEEN WHO ARE VOLUNTARY PLACEMENTS</th>
<th>% OF CHILDREN REMOVED WHO ARE VOLUNTARY PLACEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>3,936</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 30

**NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY COUNTY WHO ARE VOLUNTARY PLACEMENTS FOR CHILDREN UNDER THE AGE OF EIGHTEEN FOR THE PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN REMOVED</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL REMOVALS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE UNDER THE AGE OF EIGHTEEN WHO ARE VOLUNTARY PLACEMENTS</th>
<th>% OF CHILDREN REMOVED WHO ARE VOLUNTARY PLACEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>3,819</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Department recognizes that the unwarranted re-entry into foster care is something to be avoided and continues to take steps to ensure that these re-entries are in the best interests of the child and family. In 2005, the Department began collaborating with the Chapin Hall Center for Children on a measure to aid the Department in identifying key factors in re-entry into foster care. This will enable the Department to utilize cohort data and help to identify if changes are needed in policy or practices.

### TABLE 31
NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY COUNTY FOR THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN REMOVED</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL REMOVALS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A PRIOR REMOVAL IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS</th>
<th>% OF CHILDREN WITH A PRIOR REMOVAL IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A REMOVAL IN THE PRIOR 12 TO 24 MONTHS</th>
<th>% OF CHILDREN WITH A PRIOR REMOVAL IN THE PRIOR 12 TO 24 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>3,936</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 32
NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY COUNTY FOR THE PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 2009 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN REMOVED</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL REMOVALS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A PRIOR REMOVAL IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS</th>
<th>% OF CHILDREN WITH A PRIOR REMOVAL IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A REMOVAL IN THE PRIOR 12 TO 24 MONTHS</th>
<th>% OF CHILDREN WITH A PRIOR REMOVAL IN THE PRIOR 12 TO 24 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>3,819</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHART 19
NUMBER OF CHILDREN ENTERING OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY REPORTING PERIOD

![Chart showing the number of children entering out-of-home care by reporting period](image-url)
CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE

On March 31, 2010, there were 10,207 children in out-of-home care as compared to 10,112 children on September 30, 2009, an increase of 95 children. During this reporting period, 8,437 children or 82.6 percent were placed in family settings either with relatives or in foster homes. This compares to 8,293 or 82.0 percent of the children in the prior reporting period.

Chart 20 displays the decrease in the number of children in out-of-home care. Comparing June 2006 to March 2010, the number of children in out-of-home care decreased by 14 children or 77.8 percent.

Chart 21 displays the decrease in the number of young children ages 0-6 placed in group homes. Comparing June 2006 to March 2010, the number of young children in group homes decreased by 14 children or 77.8 percent.

Chart 22 displays the decrease in the number of young children ages 0-3 placed in shelter care. Comparing March 2006 to March 2010, the number of young children in shelters decreased by 9 children or 29.0 percent. Chart 23 shows that the average length of time in shelter care has increased slightly; comparing March 2008 to March 2010, the average length of stay in shelter increased from 103.4 to 111.7 days, an increase of 8.3 days or 8.0 percent.
CHART 21
THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN GROUP HOMES AGES 0 TO 6

CHART 22
THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN SHELTER CARE AGES 0 TO 3

3 Excludes infants placed with their mothers and children placed in foster home group models.
The majority of children in out-of-home care fall within the 1-5 age range (34.0 percent) and the 13-17 age range (24.8 percent). The majority of children in out-of-home care are either Caucasian (37.7 percent) or Hispanic (37.5 percent), followed by African American at 13.8 percent.
For 49.2 percent of the children in out-of-home care, family reunification remains the primary case plan goal. This is followed by: adoption, 23.6 percent; independent living, 10.7 percent; long-term foster care, 2.7 percent; live with other relative, 1.6 percent; and, guardianship at 0.4 percent. For the remaining 11.8 percent of the children, the case plan goal is in the process of development.
CHART 27
THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY PLACEMENT TYPE

Out-of-Home Placement Types

- Relative
- Family Foster Home
- Group Home
- Residential Treatment
- Independent Living
- Runaway
- Trial Home Visit

September 30, 2009, N=10,112
March 31, 2010, N=10,207
### TABLE 33
THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE BY PLACEMENT TYPE AND AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDER</th>
<th>RELATIVE</th>
<th>FAMILY FOSTER</th>
<th>GROUP HOME</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT4</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT LIVING</th>
<th>RUNAWAY</th>
<th>TRIAL HOME VISIT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 AND OLDER</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,492</td>
<td>4,945</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10,207</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 This category includes shelter, detention, and hospital placement types.
During the reporting period 423 children remained in a shelter or receiving home for more than 21 consecutive days. Chart 28 displays children in shelter greater than 21 days for the period of October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010 and shows that 353 or 83.4 percent of the children were six years of age or older. In addition, 7 or 1.7 percent of the children were under one year old.

**CHART 28**
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN IN SHELTER OR RECEIVING HOMES FOR MORE THAN 21 CONSECUTIVE DAYS BY AGE OF CHILD

The chart displays children who spent more than 21 days in shelter during the period. This number differs from the other out-of-home charts as they display children in out-of-home care on the last day of the reporting period.
For the children in out-of-home care on September 30, 2009 the average number of placements was 2.8, the median number of placements was 2.0, and the range for the number of placements was 1 to 39 placements during their current removal episode.

### TABLE 34

| Placement Information for Children in Out-of-Home Care on March 31, 2010 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Placements      |                 |
| Average         | 2.8             |
| Median          | 2.0             |
| Range Minimum   | 1               |
| Range Maximum   | 39⁶             |

---

⁶ Some children are so damaged by the severity of the abuse they have suffered that they become unable to form meaningful relationships or to respond to services. These children tend to go through multiple placements with numerous individuals and agencies.
At the end of the reporting period there were 10,207 children in out-of-home care who required visitation. Of these children, visitation was accurately documented in the automated system for 8,973 children. As displayed in Chart 31, during this reporting period, the percent of children receiving required visits by their CPS specialists increased by 6.8 percent to 87.9 percent.

The required child visitation is performed monthly by DES case managers, contracted case managers, and/or other professionals as approved by a supervisor or as established by policy. The Department has verified that more children received the required visitation than is indicated in Chart 31. This information is clearly documented in the automated case notes. However, the Department is unable to compile and tabulate data based solely upon case note text. The Department continues to issue instructions to all direct service staff regarding the system requirements for capturing all visitations. A child was deemed to have received the required visitation if the child received the visitation during the last month of the reporting period.
According to Administration for Children, Youth and Families policy, case managers shall have face-to-face contact with all parents at least once a month, including any alleged parents and parents residing outside of the child’s home where the case plan goal is family reunification or remain with family. During the reporting period, there were 1,578 parents who had a child with the case plan goal of return home. Of those parents requiring visitation, 1,022 or 64.8 percent received the required visitation. The 64.8 percent visitation rate does not reflect attempted visitation where contact with the parent(s) did not take place.

**CHART 32**
NUMBER OF CHILDREN RECEIVING AND NOT RECEIVING VISITATION BY REPORTING PERIOD
FOSTER HOMES

As of March 31, 2010, there were 3,932 licensed foster homes with 8,789 spaces available for Administration for Children, Youth and Families placements. Licensed foster homes include family foster homes, professional family foster homes, respite foster homes, receiving foster homes, and developmentally disabled homes with DCYF children placed in them.

Foster home licenses specify the age range, gender and maximum number of children that can be placed in a home. Foster parents, in consultation with the licensing worker, decide the type of physical, behavioral, and psychological needs of children they can effectively parent based upon their own skill level, experiences, and desires.

As of March 31, 2010, there were 3,047 unused spaces within these foster homes. Of the unused spaces, a match between the available spaces and children’s needs was not possible.

During the reporting period, 560 new homes were licensed to provide foster care and 582 homes left the system. This compares to 107 new homes being licensed and 76 homes leaving the system for the period covering April 2009 through September 2009. The chart below gives the reasons for foster home closures for the period of October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010.

CHART 33
REASON FOR FOSTER HOME CLOSURE FOR THE PERIOD OF OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closure Reasons</th>
<th>Number of Foster Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A = Adoption / Guardianship Finalized</td>
<td>93 (16.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = Failed to Renew</td>
<td>185 (31.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = Family Request</td>
<td>210 (36.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = Other</td>
<td>67 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E = Relocation</td>
<td>37 (6.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 582

A = Adoption / Guardianship Finalized
B = Failed to Renew
C = Family Request
D = Other
E = Relocation

7 The number of homes cited in this report differs from the official number cited by the Office of Licensing, Certification & Regulation (OLCR) due to the fact that the Division for Children, Youth & Families utilizes foster homes that are licensed for developmental disabilities, licensed by the tribes, etc.
During the reporting period, there were 3,932 foster homes that required visitation. Of the 3,932 foster homes requiring visitation, 3,240 foster homes received their required visitation. This compares to 3,224 or 81.6 percent of the foster homes that received the required visitation for the period April 2009 through September 2009. The Department believes that more foster homes received the required visitation than is indicated in the chart below. The underreporting of foster home visitation is attributable to the lack of automation being used in reporting the foster home visitation process. The Department recognizes this as a problem and is working to correct this issue.

*Required visitations to foster homes, for license monitoring purposes, are performed by licensing case managers.*
CHILDREN EXITING OUT-OF HOME CARE

During the reporting period, 3,650 children left the custody of the Department. This compares to 3,894 children exiting care during the prior reporting period. The comparison between the two reporting periods shows that 6.3 percent fewer children left care this reporting period for a decrease of 244 children exiting care.

**TABLE 35**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTING PERIOD</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHILDREN DISCHARGED</th>
<th>% CHANGE OVER PRIOR PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APRIL 2006 – SEPTEMBER 2006</td>
<td>3,595</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER 2006 – MARCH 2007</td>
<td>3,553</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL 2007 – SEPTEMBER 2007</td>
<td>3,824</td>
<td>+7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER 2007 – MARCH 2008</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL 2008 – SEPTEMBER 2008</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>+7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER 2008 – MARCH 2009</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL 2009 – SEPTEMBER 2009</td>
<td>3,894</td>
<td>+8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER 2009 – MARCH 2010</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following nine tables depict the children who exited out-of-home care by the reason for leaving care. The tables display the following information: reasons the child left custody, their age, their ethnicity, the number of placements each child had, and the length of time in out-of-home care.
### TABLE 36
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY FOR THE END OF THE REPORTING PERIOD ENDING ON MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 1 – 5</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 6 – 8</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 9 – 12</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 13 – 17</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Over</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Number of Placements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Five</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Length of Time in Care</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 Days</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Days to 12 Months</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 24 Months</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 24 Months</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Age</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Number of Placements</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Months of Time in Care</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 37
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY
FOR REASON OF “REUNIFICATION WITH PARENTS OR PRIMARY CARETAKER” FOR
THE REPORTING PERIOD ENDING MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 1 - 5</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 6 – 8</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 9 - 12</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 13 - 17</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,778</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,778</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Number of Placements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Five</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,778</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Length of Time in Care</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 Days</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Days to 12 Months</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 24 Months</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 24 Months</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,778</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Number of Placements</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Months of Time in Care</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 38
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY
FOR REASON OF “LIVING WITH OTHER RELATIVES” FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD
ENDING MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 1 - 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 6 – 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 9 - 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 13 - 17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Number of Placements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Five</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Length of Time in Care</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 Days</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Days to 12 Months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 24 Months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 24 Months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Number of Placements</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Months of Time in Care</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 39  
**NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY FOR REASON OF “ADOPTION” FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD ENDING MARCH 31, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 1 - 5</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 6 - 8</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 9 - 12</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 13 - 17</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,034</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,034</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Number of Placements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Five</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,034</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Length of Time in Care</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 Days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Days to 12 Months</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 24 Months</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 24 Months</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,034</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Number of Placements</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Months of Time in Care</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 40
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY FOR REASON OF “GUARDIANSHIP” FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD ENDING MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 1 - 5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 6 – 8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 9 - 12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 13 - 17</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>312</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>312</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Number of Placements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Five</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>312</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Length of Time in Care</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 Days</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Days to 12 Months</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 24 Months</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 24 Months</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>312</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Age</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Number of Placements</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Months of Time in Care</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 41
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY
FOR REASONS OF “REACHING AGE OF MAJORITY” FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD
ENDING MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 1 - 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 6 – 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 9 - 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 13 - 17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Over</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>304</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>304</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Number of Placements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Five</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>304</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Length of Time in Care</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 Days</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Days to 12 Months</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 24 Months</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 24 Months</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>304</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Age</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Number of Placements</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Months of Time in Care</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 42
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY FOR REASON OF “TRANSFER TO ANOTHER AGENCY” FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD ENDING MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 1 – 5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 6 – 8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 9 – 12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 13 – 17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Number of Placements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Five</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Length of Time in Care</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 Days</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Days to 12 Months</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 24 Months</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 24 Months</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Placements</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months of Time in Care</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Age</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 1 – 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 6 – 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 9 – 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 13 – 17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Number of Placements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Five</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Length of Time in Care</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 Days</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Days to 12 Months</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 24 Months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 24 Months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Age</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Number of Placements</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Months of Time in Care</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 44
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN LEAVING DES CUSTODY FOR REASON OF “DEATH OF CHILD” FOR THE REPORTING PERIOD ENDING MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 1 - 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 6 – 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 9 - 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 13 - 17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Number of Placements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Five</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Length of Time in Care</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 Days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Days to 12 Months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 24 Months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 24 Months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Age</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Number of Placements</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Months of Time in Care</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 45
CHILDREN EXITING CARE FOR REASON OF DEATH BY CAUSE OF DEATH, PLACEMENT TYPE AT TIME OF DEATH, AND COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>CAUSE OF DEATH</th>
<th>TYPE OF PLACEMENT AT TIME OF DEATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>Undetermined at the time of this report.</td>
<td>Family Foster Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>Blunt force trauma - accidental</td>
<td>Family Foster Home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 46
NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN AN OPEN CASE WHO DIED AS A RESULT OF ALLEGED ABUSE AS CATEGORIZED BY THE CUSTODIAL RELATIONSHIP AND COUNTY FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>BIOLOGICAL PARENT(S)</th>
<th>OTHER FAMILY MEMBER</th>
<th>ADOPTIVE PARENT(S)</th>
<th>FOSTER CARE PARENT(S)</th>
<th>OTHER OUT-OF-HOME CARE PROVIDER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Paz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHILDREN WITH ADOPTIVE CASE PLAN GOALS

Of the 10,207 children in out-of-home care on March 31, 2010, 2,411 or 23.6 percent had a case plan goal of adoption. The majority of those children, 46.9 percent, are in the 1-5 year old age range, followed by 19.3 percent in the 9-12 year old age range, and 18.5 percent in the 6-8 year old age range. The remaining children, 368 or 15.3 percent, fall within the under one or 13 and over age range. The majority of these children are Caucasian (940 or 39.0 percent), Hispanic (929 or 38.5 percent), or African American (326 or 13.5 percent). The remaining 216 children or 9.0 percent are American Indian, Asian or other. Eighty-seven percent, or 2,098 of the children free for adoption, are currently placed in their adoptive homes.

TABLE 47
NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A PETITION FOR TERMINATION OF PARENTAL RIGHTS
BY COUNTY FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 2009 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TERMINATION OF RIGHTS GRANTED</th>
<th>TERMINATION OF RIGHTS DENIED</th>
<th>TERMINATION OF RIGHTS GRANTED IN PART/DENIED IN PART</th>
<th>TERMINATION OF RIGHTS WITHDRAWN</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APACHE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCHISE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCONINO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENLEE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA PAZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARICOPA</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAVE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVAJO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMA</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINAL</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAVAPAI</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUMA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEWIDE</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average length of time that a child with a case plan goal of “adoption” has spent in out-of-home care is 2 years, 4 months. There were a total of 2,411 children with case plan goals of adoption during this reporting period. Of this total, 2,098 were placed and 313 were not placed. The population of children with case plan goals of adoption averaged 2.9 placements and had a median placement count of 2.0. Their placement count ranged from 1 to 39.

### TABLE 48
PLACEMENT INFORMATION FOR CHILDREN WITH A CASE PLAN GOAL OF ADOPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Minimum</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Maximum</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHART 36
THE PLACEMENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A CASE PLAN GOAL OF ADOPTION BY AGE

![Chart showing placement and number of children by age category with placed and not placed children indicated.](chart.png)
CHART 37
THE PLACEMENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A CASE PLAN GOAL OF ADOPTION BY ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Am.</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Placed, N=2,098
- Not Placed, N=313

CHART 38
THE PLACEMENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH A CASE PLAN GOAL OF ADOPTION BY LEGAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legally Free</td>
<td>1,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Free</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Free*</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Placed, N=2,098
- Not Placed, N=313

*Partially free refers to a situation where only one of the parent’s rights has been severed.
**About 70 percent of children are adopted by relatives or their foster parents and are already in their prospective adoptive placement at the time the case plan goal changes to adoption.

**ADOPTIVE SERVICES**

There were 1,034 children with a finalized adoption during the reporting period. Chart 41 displays the number of children with a finalized adoption during the reporting period by the average length of time in out-of-home placement before adoptive placement.
CHART 41
THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN WITH A FINALIZED ADOPTION BY AVERAGE LENGTH OF TIME IN OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENT BEFORE ADOPTIVE PLACEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th>April 2009-September 2009, N=891</th>
<th>October 2009-March 2010, N=1,034</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>610 (68.5%)</td>
<td>756 (73.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>154 (17.3%)</td>
<td>138 (13.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 years</td>
<td>50 (5.6%)</td>
<td>66 (6.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 years</td>
<td>77 (8.6%)</td>
<td>74 (7.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below displays the number of children with a finalized adoption by average length of time in adoptive placement before the final order of adoption.

CHART 42
THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN WITH A FINALIZED ADOPTION BY AVERAGE LENGTH OF TIME IN ADOPTIVE PLACEMENT BEFORE THE FINAL ORDER OF ADOPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th>April 2009-September 2009, N=891</th>
<th>October 2009-March 2010, N=1,034</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>162 (18.2%)</td>
<td>232 (22.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>430 (48.2%)</td>
<td>492 (47.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 years</td>
<td>227 (25.5%)</td>
<td>234 (22.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 years</td>
<td>72 (8.1%)</td>
<td>76 (7.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>