### **EXHIBIT F.3**

### Total Number of Investigations from SFY 2007 - SFY 2011

SFY			
A APPLOY		West Line	Care on sound
2007	26,817	20,625	6,192
2008	27,672	21,319	6,353
2009	30,191	23,801	6,390
2010	32,915	26,215	6,700
2011	33,849	27,471	6,378

SFY	Total Cases	FC Cases	PS Cases	Children in PS Cases	SS Cases	Children in SS Cases
2007	17,983	7,194	10,103	22,531	686	1,374
2008	17,921	6,974	10,305	22,469	642	1,282
2009	18,681	7,446	10,385	23,071	850	1,793
2010	20,381	7,491	11,804	26,407	1,086	2,380
2011	21,461	7,959	12,479	29,658	1,023	2,451

For foster care cases, one case equals one child.

SFY	Total Client	Under 30 Days	30-90 Days	3-6 Months	7-12 Months	13-24 Months	25-36 Months	Over 36
2007	7,194	1,396	1,123	831	1,172	1,078	598	865
2008	6,974	1,242	1,101	752	1,092	1,299	642	846
2009	7,446	1,489	1,070	953	1,182	1,232	641	879
2010	7,491	1,287	1,168	928	1,313	1,359	574	862
2011	7,959	1,215	1,099	1,016	1,525	1,560	676	868

### Entries and Exits from Foster Care SFY 2007 - SFY 2011

2007	4,174	3,860
2008	3,754	3,721
2009	4,214	4,050
2010	4,134	3,831
2011	4,126	4,071

### Quality Services Peer Reviews: Evaluating Arkansas' Child Welfare System

Quality Services Peer Reviews (QSPR) are monitoring tools used to evaluate Arkansas' child welfare system. Arkansas' QSPR process mirrors that of the federal Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSR). The tool focuses on the 3 broad goals of child welfare, including child safety, permanency, and well-being. The QSPR measures 7 specific outcomes within these 3 broad goals by rating 23 individual items. The standards outlined in the QSPR support the principles promoted in the other review tools employed by DCFS as well as the Arkansas Practice Model. The QSPR process is qualitative in nature and focuses on quality as opposed to compliance alone.

DCFS conducts the reviews annually in each of the Division's 10 geographic service areas. For an Area to be in substantial conformity with an outcome, 95 percent of cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome. However, an Area would be deemed to "pass" an individual item if 90 percent of its cases passed the item in question. The review process begins with an evaluation of the records contained in the Children's Reporting and Information System (CHRIS), Arkansas' Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information Systems (SACWIS). Quality assurance reviewers are then deployed into the county offices for an onsite review. During the onsite review, the physical case files are reviewed and individuals pertinent to the cases are interviewed, i.e. caseworkers, children, parents, foster parents, ad litems, etc. Following each review, the findings are compiled, and a report is generated to convey the results. Each Area is required to develop a practice improvement plan relating to the two issues on which the Area scored lowest, unless the Area passed all issues.

The QSPR is a report card, of sorts, by which the United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Administration for Children and Families (ACF) evaluates the performance of Arkansas' child welfare system. The State continues to improve its child welfare system, as evidenced by comparing the past three reviews:

- Arkansas' performance has improved on all seven outcomes since the 2008 CFSR.
- The State's performance has improved on 19 of the 23 individual items since the federal review as well.
- Between the 2009 and 2010 round of reviews, Arkansas' performance has improved on five of the 7 outcomes and 13 of the 23 individual items.
- The State's performance remained constant on one additional outcome and two additional items between 2009 and 2010.
- Arkansas' performance with regard to caseworker's visitation of children has steadily increased since the federal review, and the Division has found a direct correlation between that measure and many others.

Statewide QSPR/CFSR Co	omparisons			
		2010 QSPR	2009 QSPR	2008 CFSR
SAFETY 1: Children are first and foremost protected from abuse a	nd neglect	85%	76%	77%
ITEM 1: Timeliness of investigations	(Goal: 85%)	91%	83%	77%
ITEM 2: Repeat maltreatment	<u> </u>	83%	82%	95%
SAFETY 2: Children are safely maintained in their home when pos	sible and appropriate	62%	60%	59%
ITEM 3: Services to prevent removal	(Goal: 65%)	67%	62%	68%
ITEM 4: Risk of harm	(Goal: 63%)	63%	61%	61%
PERMANENCY 1: Children have permanency and stability in their	living situations	66%	62%	41%
ITEM 5: Foster care re-entry		85%	93%	100%
ITEM 6: Stability of foster care placement		69%	74%	64%
ITEM 7: Permanency goal for child	(Goal: 86%)	92%	84%	72%
ITEM 8: Reunification, guardianship, and placement with relatives	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	88%	85%	72%
ITEM 9: Adoption		71%	56%	33%
ITEM 10: Alternative planned permanent living arrangement	(Goal: 77%)	77%	71%	57%
PERMANENCY 2: The continuity of family relationships and conne	ction is preserved	67%	73%	54%
ITEM 11: Proximity of placement		92%	90%	96%
ITEM 12: Placement with siblings		83%	92%	82%
ITEM 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care		69%	69%	59%
ITEM 14: Preserving connections		80%	87%	79%
ITEM 15: Relative placement		68%	84%	67%
ITEM 16: Relationship of child in care with parents		69%	70%	48%
WELL-BEING 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for ch	ildren's needs	45%	45%	28%
ITEM 17: Needs/services of child, parents and foster parents	(Goal: 58%)	56%	56%	37%
ITEM 18: Child//family involvement in case planning	(Goal: 55%)	49%	53%	31%
ITEM 19: Worker visits with child	(Goal: 56%)	60%	54%	46%
ITEM 20: Worker visits with parents	(Goal: 45%)	37%	42%	33%
WELL-BEING 2: Children receive services to meet their educational	l needs	78%	75%	71%
ITEM 21: Educational needs of child		78%	75%	71%
WELL-BEING 3: Children receive services to meet their physical &	mental health needs	75%	69%	62%
ITEM 22: Physical health of child		85%	84%	74%
ITEM 23: Mental health of child		74%	68%	67%

	Measure C1 - 4: Re-entries to foster care care (FC) to reunification in the 12-month p than 12 months from the date of discharge? score is preferable in this measure)	Component B: Permanency of Reunification The permanency component has one measure.	Measure C1 - 3: Entry cohort reunification in < 12 months: Of all children entering foster care (FC) for the first time in the 6 month period just prior to the year shown, and who remained in FC for 8 days or longer, what percent was discharged from FC to reunification in less than 12 months from the date of the latest removal from home? (Includes trial home visit adjustment) [national median = 39.4%, 75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile = 48.4%]	Measure C1 - 2: Exits to reunification, median stay: Of all children discharged from foster care (FC) to reunification in the year shown, who had been in FC for 8 days or longer, what was the median length of stay (in months) from the date of the latest removal from home until the date of discharge to reunification? (This includes trial home visit adjustment) [national median = 6.5 months, 25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile = 5.4 months (lower score is preferable in this measure B)]	Measure C1 - 1: Exits to reunification in less than 12 months: Of all children discharged from foster care to reunification in the year shown, who had been in foster care for 8 days or longer, what percent was reunified in less than 12 months from the date of the latest removal from home? (Includes trial home visit adjustment) [national median = 69.9%, 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile = 75.2%]	Component A: Timeliness of Reunification  The timeliness component is composed of three timeliness individual measures.	National Ranking of State Composite Scores (see footnote A on page 12 for details)	IX. Permanency Composite 1: Timeliness and Permanency of Reunification [standard: 122.6 or higher].  Scaled Scores for this composite incorporate two components		Statewide Aggregate Data Used in Determining Substantial Conformity: Composites 1 through 4
	12.3%		64.6%	Median = 1.5 months	92.1%		1 of 47	State Score = 154.6	Federal FY 2009ab	mity: Compo
	11.1%	,	62.2%	Median = 1.7 months	91.3%		1 of 47	State Score = 155.5	Federal FY 2010ab	sites 1 throug
, X.in	11.3%		62.4%	Median = 1.7 months	91.0%		1 of 47	State Score = 154.7	12-Month Period Ending 03/31/2011 (10B11A)	រុh 4

			[AMPROVING MANAGEMENT TOWN / U) / U TAXABILITY DEFI / U)
66.1%	65.1%	53.4%	Measure C2 - 5: Legally free children adopted in less than 12 months: Of all children who became legally free for adoption in the 12 month period prior to the year shown (i.e., there was a parental rights termination date reported to AFCARS for both mother and father), what percent was discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in less than 12 months of becoming legally free?  [national median = 45.8%, 75th Percentile = 53.7%]
			Component C: Progress Toward Adoption of Children Who Are Legally Free for Adoption. There is one measure for this component. See below.
7.3%	7.4%	5.6%	Measure C2 - 4: Children in care 17+ months achieving legal freedom within 6 months: Of all children in foster care (FC) on the first day of the year shown who were in FC for 17 continuous months or longer, and were not legally free for adoption prior to that day, what percent became legally free for adoption during the first 6 months of the year shown? Legally free means that there was a parental rights termination date reported to AFCARS for both mother and father. This calculation excludes children who, by the end of the first 6 months of the year shown had discharged from FC to "reunification," "live with relative," or "guardianship." [national median = 8.8%, 75th Percentile = 10.9%]
29.5%	28.3%	29.9%	Measure C2 - 3: Children in care 17+ months, adopted by the end of the year: Of all children in foster care (FC) on the first day of the year shown who were in FC for 17 continuous months or longer (and who, by the last day of the year shown, were not discharged from FC with a discharge reason of live with relative, reunify, or guardianship), what percent was discharged from FC to a finalized adoption by the last day of the year shown? [national median = 20.2%, 75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile = 22.7%]
			Component B: Progress Toward Adoption for Children in Foster Care for 17 Months or Longer. There are two individual measures. See below.
Median = 25.6 months	Median = 25.3 months	Median = 26.6 months	Measure C2 - 2: Exits to adoption, median length of stay: Of all children who were discharged from foster care (FC) to a finalized adoption in the year shown, what was the median length of stay in FC (in months) from the date of latest removal from home to the date of discharge to adoption? [national median = 32.4 months, 25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile = 27.3 months(lower score is preferable in this measure)]
43.6%	46.6%	41.0%	Measure C2 - 1: Exits to adoption in less than 24 months: Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption in the year shown, what percent was discharged in less than 24 months from the date of the latest removal from home? [national median = 26.8%, 75th Percentile = 36.6%]
	•		Component A: Timeliness of Adoptions of Children Discharged From Foster Care.  There are two individual measures of this component. See below.
2 of 47	2 of 47	8 of 47	National Ranking of State Composite Scores (see footnote A on page 12 for details)
State Score = 134.3	State Score = 133.9	State Score = 118.4	X. Permanency Composite 2: Timeliness of Adoptions [standard: 106.4 or higher].  Scaled Scores for this composite incorporate three components.
12-Month Period Ending 03/31/2011 (10B11A)	Federal FY 2010ab	Federal FY 2009ab	

			The second of th
36.0%	37.7%	33.7%	Measure C3 - 3: Children Emancipated Who Were in Foster Care for 3 Years or More. Of all children who, during the year shown, either (1) were discharged from foster care prior to age 18 with a discharge reason of emancipation, or (2) reached their 18 <sup>th</sup> birthday while in foster care, what percent were in foster care for 3 years or longer? [national median 47.8%, 25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile = 37.5% (lower score is preferable)]
			Component B: Growing up in foster care. This component has one measure.
96.0%	94.9%	95.5%	Measure C3 - 2: Exits to permanency for children with TPR: Of all children who were discharged from foster care in the year shown, and who were legally free for adoption at the time of discharge (i.e., there was a parental rights termination date reported to AFCARS for both mother and father), what percent was discharged to a permanent home prior to their 18th birthday? A permanent home is defined as having a discharge reason of adoption, guardianship, or reunification (including living with relative) [national median 96.8%, 75th Percentile = 98.0%]
29.5%	28.9%	29.6%	Measure C3 - 1: Exits to permanency prior to 18th birthday for children in care for 24 + months. Of all children in foster care for 24 months or longer on the first day of the year shown, what percent was discharged to a permanent home prior to their 18th birthday and by the end of the fiscal year? A permanent home is defined as having a discharge reason of adoption, guardianship, or reunification (including living with relative). [national median 25.0%, 75th Percentile = 29.1%]
			Component A: Achieving permanency for Children in Foster Care for Long Periods of Time. This component has two measures.
4 of 51	7 of 51	7 of 51	National Ranking of State Composite Scores (see footnote A on page 12 for details)
State Score = 132.0	State Score = 128.2	State Score = 130.0	XI. Permanency Composite 3: Permanency for Children and Youth in Foster Care for Long Periods of Time [standard: 121.7 or higher].  Scaled Scores for this composite incorporate two components
12-Month Period Ending 03/31/2011 (10B11A)	Federal FY 2010ab	Federal FY 2009ab	

20.3%	20.5%	16.8%	Measure C4 - 3) Two or fewer placement settings for children in care for 24+ months. Of all children served in foster care (FC) during the 12 month target period who were in FC for at least 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? [national median = 33.9%, 75th Percentile = 41.8%]
45.0%	45.0%	44.2%	Measure C4 - 2) Two or fewer placement settings for children in care for 12 to 24 months. Of all children served in foster care (FC) during the 12 month target period who were in FC for at least 12 months but less than 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? [national median = 59.9%, 75th Percentile = 65.4%]
75.6%	75.1%	71.7%	Measure C4 - 1) Two or fewer placement settings for children in care for less than 12 months. Of all children served in foster care (FC) during the 12 month target period who were in FC for at least 8 days but less than 12 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? [national median = 83.3%, 75th Percentile = 86.0%]
45 of 51	45 of 51	47 of 51	National Ranking of State Composite Scores (see footnote A on page 12 for details)
State Score = 75.8	State Score = 75.2	State Score = 71.5	XII. Permanency Composite 4: Placement Stability [national standard: 101.5 or higher].  Scaled scored for this composite incorporates no components but three individual measures (below)
12-Month Period Ending 03/31/2011 (10B11A)	Federal FY 2010ab	Federal FY 2009ab	

### Special Footnotes for Composite Measures:

- These National Rankings show your State's performance on the Composites compared to the performance of all the other States that this State performed higher than all the States in 2004. National Standards. The order of ranking goes from 1 to 47 or 51, depending on the measure. For example, "1 of 47" would indicate were included in the 2004 data. The 2004 data were used for establishing the rankings because that is the year used in calculating the
- Ä In most cases, a high score is preferable on the individual measures. In these cases, you will see the 75th percentile listed to indicate are preferable. are reversed so that they can be combined with all the individual scores that are scored in a positive direction, where higher scores strive. Of course, in actual calculation of the total composite scores, these "lower are preferable" scores on the individual measures re-entry to foster care. In these cases, the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile is displayed because that is the target direction for which States will want to that this would be considered a good score. However, in a few instances, a low score is good (shows desirable performance), such as