



The Nelson A. Rockefeller Center at Dartmouth College

The Center for Public Policy and the Social Sciences

## Policy Research Shop

---

### CHILD MALTREATMENT IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

---

#### *Assessing the Substantiation Process*

Presented to the New Hampshire Department of Health and  
Human Services, Division for Children Youth and Families

PRS Policy Brief 1314-10

August 28, 2014

Prepared By:

Irene Cofie

Alex St. Romain

Mariel Wallace

Sakina Abu Boakye

*This report was written by undergraduate students at Dartmouth College under the direction of professors in the Rockefeller Center. The Policy Research Shop is supported by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). The PRS reports were developed under FIPSE grant P116B100070 from the U.S. Department of Education. However, the contents of the PRS reports do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.*



*Contact:*

Nelson A. Rockefeller Center, 6082 Rockefeller Hall, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755  
<http://rockefeller.dartmouth.edu/shop/> • Email: [Ronald.G.Shaiko@Dartmouth.edu](mailto:Ronald.G.Shaiko@Dartmouth.edu)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1 AN OVERVIEW OF THE REPORTING PROCESS	1
2.2 AN OVERVIEW OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS	2
2.3 RECENT POLICY CHANGES	3
<b>3. DATA AND METHODS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS</b>	<b>4</b>
4.1 REPORT AND CHILD CHARACTERISTICS	4
4.2 MALTREATMENT TYPE	6
4.3 CHILD RISK FACTORS	6
4.4 CAREGIVER RISK FACTORS	7
4.5 CHANGES OVER TIME	7
<b>5. QUALITATIVE FINDINGS: COMPARATIVE STATE ANALYSIS</b>	<b>8</b>
5.1 INTRODUCTION	8
5.2 SUBSTANTIATION RATES	8
5.3 DEFINITION OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT	9
5.4 INITIAL INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE TO ABUSE OR NEGLECT BY REPORTER	11
5.6 ASSESSMENT PROCESS	13
5.7 TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSMENT	14
5.8 CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	16
<b>6. QUALITATIVE FINDINGS: DCYF INTERVIEWS</b>	<b>17</b>
6.1 FACTORS LEADING TO A LOW SUBSTANTIATION RATE	17
6.2 INVESTIGATION PROCESS	18
<b>7. CONCLUSION</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>8. APPENDICES</b>	<b>20</b>
APPENDIX I. COMPLETE 2010 DATA ANALYSIS	20
APPENDIX II. COMPLETE 2011 DATA ANALYSIS	21
APPENDIX III. COMPLETE 2012 DATA ANALYSIS	23
APPENDIX IV. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS	24
<b>9. REFERENCES</b>	<b>26</b>



## **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report examines the rate of maltreatment substantiation for youths under the age of 18 in New Hampshire. Substantiation rates refer to the proportion of assessments investigated by the Division for Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) deemed to exhibit evidence of abuse or neglect. New Hampshire's substantiation rate is particularly low relative to other states. In New Hampshire, 3 out of every 1,000 children under the age of 18 have had a substantiated assessment of maltreatment. In contrast, the national average is 10 out of every 1,000 children under 18 years of age.<sup>1</sup> The ultimate goal of this report is to determine potential reasons behind New Hampshire's low substantiation rate in order to advise DCYF regarding current practices of identifying abuse and neglect in order to protect children in NH from maltreatment.

To accomplish this goal, this report evaluates policies in New Hampshire related to child maltreatment assessment. Using National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) data from 2010 to 2012, we also examine the demographic, geographic, and family characteristics that potentially contribute to substantiation. The results indicate that assessments that contain one or more risk factors, such as alcohol and drug abuse or disabilities, tend to be substantiated more often. To put New Hampshire's data and legislation in context, we also compare its processing of maltreatment assessments to other Northeastern states. Finally, we conduct interviews of DCYF staff in order to provide further qualitative perspective to the analysis. The findings indicate that the low substantiation rate may result in part from the screening process and the state statute defining abuse rather than specific features of the investigation process. The analysis may help DCYF to identify potential areas for future investigation and improvement of policies.

## **2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Since the substantiation rate is a ratio of the number of assessments investigated and the number of assessments deemed to have evidence of abuse or neglect, changes that affect either factor will alter the overall substantiation rate.<sup>2</sup>

### *2.1 An Overview of the Reporting Process*

The New Hampshire Child Protection Act obligates any member of the community to report suspected abuse or neglect. This pertains to health care, educational and religious workers, and anyone who would logically come into contact with an abused child. State law defines an "abused child" as any child who has been sexually abused, intentionally physically injured, psychologically injured, or physically injured by other means<sup>3</sup>. However, the state also defines "neglected child" as any child who has been abandoned by his parent, guardian or custodian or is without proper parental care or control.<sup>4</sup> The legislation itself does not specify examples of child maltreatment or potential warning



signs, but the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services (NHDHHS) has posted a list of warning signs on their website.<sup>5</sup>

To report potential child maltreatment, one must call DCYF Central Intake. The DCYF website provides more specific information on what reporters should include when making a report of child maltreatment and prominently displays the DCYF Intake telephone number. If the report is screened in for an assessment, the assessment will be sent to the District Office in that area to be investigated.

After the case has been investigated and substantiation has been made then DCYF will file a petition(s) with the court within their catchment area, describing the extent and nature of the child's injuries and who caused the injuries.<sup>6</sup> The petition also includes the name, birth date, and address of the child in question, as well as the name and address of the custodial parent or of any individual or agency that has custody of the child. While this does not form part of the referral process, it constitutes the next steps of the assessment.

After a petition has been filed, the court issues a summons to everyone named in the petition, which requires those with custody of the child to appear in court at a preliminary hearing.<sup>7</sup> Parents who are the subjects of an abuse or neglect petition, except for sexual abuse, may request a medical examination of the child performed by a licensed physician of their choice at the parent's expense within 72 hours of receiving the complaint.<sup>8</sup> The burden of proof falls on the state of New Hampshire to prove the validity of these allegations of maltreatment.<sup>9</sup> This hearing serves to ascertain whether there is "reasonable cause" to believe child abuse or neglect occurred.<sup>10</sup> If the court fails to find evidence of abuse or neglect, it dismisses the petition.

## *2.2 An Overview of the Assessment Process*

New Hampshire state law requires DCYF to begin assessing reports of child abuse or neglect within 72 hours of receiving the report.<sup>11</sup> Additionally, workers are responsible to see a child face-to-face within 24 hours for Level 1 assessments, within 48 hours for Level 2 assessments, and within 72 hours for Level 3 assessments. A DCYF assessment seeks to determine:

- Composition of the family or household
- Probable cause of abuse or neglect—determination of harm or threatened harm to the child, the nature and extent of injuries/abuse/ neglect, and the person responsible for the maltreatment
- Immediate and long-term risk to each child
- Necessary protective treatments to improve the situation<sup>12</sup>

Any agency of New Hampshire can assist DCYF in conducting this assessment.<sup>13</sup>



DCYF may work to improve the situation for children and families without going through the court process.<sup>14</sup> DCYF can make referrals for the family to community agencies or offer services to families without filing in court. These cases do not factor into the substantiation rate.

Any DCYF worker investigating reports of child maltreatment must verbally notify the parents of a potentially abused child of the nature of the charges and of their right to not allow a state employee to enter their homes or interview their children. New Hampshire state law also requires DHHS to refer all assessments in which a child may have been sexually molested or exploited, intentionally physically injured, or the victim of a crime to law enforcement.<sup>15</sup> If an assessment involves intentional physical injury or sexual abuse, law enforcement and DCYF have the ability to enter any public place to conduct interviews with a child victim without parental consent. New Hampshire state law also stipulates that interviews in a public place be videotaped or audio recorded if possible.<sup>16</sup>

In carrying out the assessment, DHHS may form “multidisciplinary child protection teams [MDTs] to assist with the assessment and evaluation of reports of abuse and neglect.”<sup>17</sup> DHHS usually utilizes these teams when cases of sexual abuse or severe physical abuse are brought to the Child Advocacy Centers. Multidisciplinary teams may include, but are not limited to: licensed physical and mental health practitioners, law enforcement officers, and social workers.<sup>18</sup>

### *2.3 Recent Policy Changes*

In 1989, The New Hampshire Attorney General established the Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect with the mission of “improving the identification, assessment, prosecution and treatment of child maltreatment cases.”<sup>19</sup> The New Hampshire Legislature and the Task Force has addressed three more recent pieces of legislation that may provide a reason for the decreases in substantiation rates since 2007.<sup>20</sup>

In the 2001-2002 Legislative Session, the New Hampshire Legislature passed House Bill 475 and Senate Bill 433.<sup>21</sup> House Bill 475 established “a statewide protocol for interviewing in all sexual assault assessments, including adults,”<sup>22</sup> and Senate Bill 433 created “a standardized protocol for the investigation and assessment of child abuse and neglect.”<sup>23</sup> With the passage of these two bills, the Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect was assigned with implementing the new standards. They did so by forming the New Hampshire Network of Child Advocacy Centers (NHNCAC) in 2003 with the purpose of promoting “an integrated, multidisciplinary team (MDT) response to child abuse through the state” to improve family access to services.<sup>24</sup> As is evident, NHNCAC are not only focused on treatment of child abuse and neglect in New Hampshire, but also prevention.

In 2006, the third major piece of legislation, Senate Bill 370, “created enabling legislation for the CAC/multidisciplinary model in New Hampshire.”<sup>25</sup> The legislation allowed the



CAC's and DCYF to share case records with MDTs to the extent permitted by law.<sup>26</sup> Members of MDT could access the information as long as it was in the best interest of the child.<sup>27</sup>

As defined by the Task Force in 2008, every party that could be involved in child abuse and neglect forms part of MDT and thus works to protect the child. Each party must follow specific guidelines in reporting child maltreatment. For example, education professionals must report specific details to DCYF Intake and subsequently send a written report within 58 hours of the initial report. In addition, MDT utilize a protocol for interviews. They stipulate that the layout of an interview should be: introduction, rapport building, guidelines/rules/instructions, questions, detail gathering, and wrapping up.<sup>28</sup> MDT also require that interviews be video recorded. This allows for the examination of a child's facial expressions to make judgments and the review of past interviews if there are doubts surrounding an interviewer's conduct or a child's response<sup>29</sup>.

Recent changes in child maltreatment policy could very well have had an impact on lower substantiation rate. The recent policy changes appear to be part of an overall trend of an increase in structural policies in New Hampshire. As mentioned earlier, New Hampshire has a quite low substantiation rate that has decreased in the past eight years.<sup>30</sup>

### **3. DATA AND METHODS**

Our quantitative analysis seeks to determine if specific demographic characteristics of children and families in reported child maltreatment assessments are associated with substantiation. We use 2010-2012 data from NCANDS. Our analysis sample is restricted to assessments designated as substantiated or unsubstantiated, eliminating assessments reported as "closed-no finding" or with an "unknown/missing" disposition.<sup>31</sup> To assess the effects of case characteristics on the likelihood of substantiation, we perform chi square tests for the relationship between report disposition (whether it was substantiated) and various child, family, and case variables. We also identify the largest contributors to the chi square statistic and highlight their impact on substantiation. All tests are performed using a 95 percent confidence level. Our computer program, Stata, reports p-values as 0 when the p-value is <0.001.

### **4. QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS**

Our quantitative analysis primarily addresses the demographics of the 2012 NCANDS data. 1,069 assessments of suspected maltreatment, out of 12,959, were substantiated. After discussing our findings for the 2012 data, we consider trends from 2010 to 2012.

#### *4.1 Report and Child Characteristics*

The information about report and child characteristics describes where the report was filed, who filed it, the date of the report, and demographic information about the victim.



We find significant relationships between substantiation and the county of the report, the report's source, and whether the child is white or non-white. All other indicators related to the demographic characteristics of the alleged victim, such as the child's race, sex and age, are not significantly related to substantiation.

In terms of the county of the report, our chi-square test indicates a significant relationship between county and substantiation ( $p < .001$ ). Reports in Merrimack County and Rockingham County have the strongest relationship between substantiation and the county of the report.

**Table 1. County of Report Findings**

<b>County of Report</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Merrimack County</b>	65	1,334	4.9%
<b>Rockingham County</b>	91	1,572	5.8%

With regard to the report source, or the type of community member who submits the report of suspected child maltreatment, our chi-square test reports a p-value of  $< 0.001$ , as well. Reports are more likely to be substantiated if they are submitted by social services personnel, law enforcement, or legal personnel than if they are submitted by an anonymous reporter. Since this disparity exists, it is possible that DCYF gives greater credence to these reports or investigates them in a different manner than petitions submitted by other types of community reporters. It may be possible that social services and law enforcement officers are heavily involved in investigating child maltreatment that they are better able to report suspected maltreatment accurately.

**Table 2. Report Source Findings**

<b>Report Source</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Social Services</b>	184	1,142	16.1%
<b>Law Enforcement</b>	292	2,350	12.4%
<b>Anonymous</b>	48	1,504	3.2%

Our analysis reveals only a weak relationship between the race of suspected victims and substantiation. There was not a significant relationship between the American Indian, Asian, African American or Native Hawaiian origins and substantiated assessments. However, if the child is white, the relationship is significant at the 0.05 level ( $p = 0.048$ ). If a suspected victim is non-white, the report is more likely to be substantiated. Out of 1,218 reports for non-white children, 118 were substantiated, yielding a substantiation rate of 9.69%.

We find a significant relationship between the child's living situation and whether the report was substantiated ( $p < .001$ ). If the child lives in a non-parent relative household or non-relative household, the report is more likely to be substantiated. This includes both relative and non-relative foster care. It is possible that in these assessments, the child is



already a victim of child abuse or in a difficult familial situation, making DCYF and the courts predisposed to substantiate the case.

**Table 3. Child Living Arrangement Findings**

<b>Living Arrangement</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Non-parent relative</b>	114	216	52.78%
<b>Non-relative</b>	194	360	53.89%

We also find a significant relationship between prior victims of maltreatment and substantiation ( $p < .001$ ). If the child was a prior victim of maltreatment, they are more likely to have the report substantiated. Out of 7,865 assessments, 796 assessments involving prior victims were substantiated, resulting in a substantiation rate of 10.12%.

#### *4.2 Maltreatment Type*

When we evaluate the maltreatment data, we only look at the child's first instance of maltreatment. We note a significant relationship ( $p$ -value  $< 0.001$ ) between the type of maltreatment and the report disposition. Children who are physically or sexually abused are more likely to have their reports substantiated. The higher substantiation rate for sexual abuse assessments could be explained by the fact that the assessment process for such reports, as outlined earlier, is distinct from the general process for assessing child abuse or neglect.

**Table 4. Maltreatment Type Findings**

<b>Maltreatment Type</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Physical Abuse</b>	214	3,208	6.67%
<b>Sexual Abuse</b>	112	978	11.45%

#### *4.3 Child Risk Factors*

DCYF collects information on potential risk factors for each child victim, including alcohol or drug abuse and documented disabilities. We find a significant relationship ( $p$ -value of 0.02 or less) between the presence of a risk factor and substantiation for five of nine indicators. On average, the substantiation rate for assessments with one or more risk factors was 14.4%.





**Table 5. Child Risk Factor Findings**

<b>Risk Factors</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Alcohol Abuse</b>	5	23	21.74%
<b>Drug Abuse</b>	46	335	13.73%
<b>Mental Retardation</b>	74	694	10.60%
<b>Learning Disability</b>	37	251	14.74%
<b>Other Medical Disability</b>	140	1,250	11.52%

#### 4.4 Caregiver Risk Factors

DCYF also collects information about potential risk factors for the caregiver. These include the same types of risk factors documented for the child and information about potential financial or domestic violence problems. We find a significant relationship (p-value of 0.008 or less) between the presence of a risk factor and substantiation for eight of twelve indicators, producing an average substantiation rate of 14.4 percent.

**Table 6. Caregiver Risk Factor Findings**

<b>Risk Factors</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Alcohol Abuse</b>	140	701	19.97%
<b>Drug Abuse</b>	173	893	19.60%
<b>Emotionally Disturbed</b>	307	2503	12.27%
<b>Physical Disability</b>	46	387	11.47%
<b>Other Medical Condition</b>	319	2245	14.21%
<b>Domestic Violence</b>	456	3148	14.49%
<b>Inadequate Housing</b>	7	30	23.33%
<b>Public Assistance Unknown</b>	223	4496	4.96%

#### 4.5 Changes Over Time

We analyze the 2010 and 2011 NCANDS data in the same manner. As stated earlier, New Hampshire amended the Child Protection Act in 2011, which may have had a slight effect on the data.

The following relationships remain significant in all three years:

- County of Report
- Report Source
- Child Living Arrangement
- Prior Victim Status
- Public Assistance
- Mental Retardation—Child



- Alcohol Abuse—Caregiver
- Drug Abuse—Caregiver
- Emotional Disturbed—Caregiver
- Inadequate Housing

This seems to suggest that DCYF tends to substantiate reports that contain one or more risk factors regardless of the year. In addition, many of the case characteristics may not change dramatically over three years, especially in terms of how DCYF investigates suspected maltreatment.

Although these relationships remain significant over the three years we analyze, the largest contributors to the chi-square statistic vary.<sup>1</sup> For 2011 and 2012 County of Report, reports filed in Merrimack County and Rockingham County were the most likely to be substantiated, but in 2010 Merrimack County and Strafford County reports were most likely to be substantiated. With regard to the report source, in 2010 and 2011, reports filed by law enforcement officers were more likely to be substantiated, but in 2012, reports filed by social services, law enforcement, and anonymously were more likely to be substantiated. In many assessments, relationships were significant in 2010 and 2012, but not 2011. However, since the Child Protection Act was amended in 2011, we found it most useful to see how the significant relationships changed after 2011. See Appendix IV for the full results.

## **5. QUALITATIVE FINDINGS: COMPARATIVE STATE ANALYSIS**

### *5.1 Introduction*

Instead of performing an in-depth study of one or two states' child abuse and neglect laws, this section compares many states' policies using similar indicators. The states analyzed include ones in New England—Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maine, and Rhode Island—Pennsylvania, one of the only states with a lower substantiation rate than New Hampshire, and Idaho, a state with a similar substantiation rate as New Hampshire.

### *5.2 Substantiation Rates*

Kid Count Data Center compiles substantiation rates for all fifty states using the same definition of substantiation.<sup>32</sup> Kid Count Data Center rates are expressed as the number of substantiated cases out of 1,000 children, to standardize rates across states with different population sizes. All substantiation rates reported here are from 2011, the most recent

---

<sup>1</sup>In many assessments, relationships were significant in 2010 and 2012, but not 2011. However, since the Child Protection Act was amended in 2011, we found it most useful to see how the significance relationships changed after 2011.



year available on the organization’s website. According to Kid Count Data Center, New Hampshire’s substantiation rate is three cases per 1,000 children. The only state with a lower substantiation rate is Pennsylvania, one case per 1,000 children. Of the New England states, the lowest substantiation rate, besides New Hampshire, is Vermont with five cases. All of the other New England states have quite high substantiation rates: Connecticut, 11; Maine, 12; both Massachusetts and Rhode Island have rates of 14. Idaho’s substantiation rate is three, the same as New Hampshire’s.<sup>33</sup> Figure 1 presents these substantiation rates.

**Figure 1: Substantiation Rates of States in Case Study** (*Source: Kid Count Data Center*)

Location	Data Type	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Connecticut	Number	9,037	8,852	9,000	9,956	9,934
	Rate per 1,000	11	11	11	12	12
Idaho	Number	1,524	1,762	1,566	1,607	1,465
	Rate per 1,000	4	4	4	4	3
Maine	Number	3,791	3,704	3,791	3,259	3,109
	Rate per 1,000	14	13	14	12	12
Massachusetts	Number	33,534	36,766	34,615	24,376	20,213
	Rate per 1,000	23	26	24	17	14
New Hampshire	Number	869	1,059	917	847	874
	Rate per 1,000	3	4	3	3	3
Pennsylvania	Number	3,888	3,759	3,785	3,448	3,091
	Rate per 1,000	1	1	1	1	1
Rhode Island	Number	3,344	2,770	2,791	3,281	3,117
	Rate per 1,000	14	12	12	15	14
Vermont	Number	803	634	691	655	627
	Rate per 1,000	6	5	5	5	5

### 5.3 Definition of Child Abuse and Neglect

As stated in the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, child abuse and neglect includes “any recent act or failure to act on the part of a parent or caretaker, which results in death, serious physical or emotional harm, sexual abuse, or exploitation, or an act or failure to act which resents an imminent risk of serious harm.”<sup>34</sup> This is the federal government’s definition.



In this section, we examine the differences in definition of child abuse and neglect in the states that form our comparison group. We compare state definitions by determining whether or not they include physical harm (meaning inflicting injury or sexual assault), psychological/emotional harm (meaning cruel punishments and moral/emotional degradation), or lack of proper care (which is very all-encompassing). Table 7 details our systematic categorization, using terms drawn from the state laws.

**Table 7. Definition of Physical & Psychological Harm and Lack of Proper Care**

<b>Type of Maltreatment</b>	<b>Potential Definitions</b>
<b>Physical Harm</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-“sexual abuse”</li> <li>-“intentionally physically injured”</li> <li>-“physically injured by other than accidental means”</li> <li>-“sexual molestation or exploitation”</li> <li>-“deprivation of essential needs”</li> <li>-“sexual contact”</li> </ul>
<b>Psychological Harm</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-“emotional maltreatment”</li> <li>-“cruel punishment”</li> <li>-“emotional injury or impairment”</li> </ul>
<b>Lack of Proper Care</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-“without proper parental care or control”</li> <li>-without “care or control necessary for his or her health”</li> <li>-“parents, guardian or custodian are unable to discharge their responsibilities to and for the child because of incarceration, hospitalization, or other physical or mental incapacity”</li> <li>-“has been abandoned”</li> <li>-“is being denied proper care and attention physically, educationally, emotionally, or morally”</li> <li>-“failure to ensure compliance with school attendance requirements”</li> <li>-“deliberately or through negligence or inability to take those actions necessary to provide a child with minimally adequate food, clothing shelter, medical care, supervision, emotional stability, and growth”</li> </ul>

*Source: Child Welfare Information Gateway*

Besides Maine, all states in our comparison group separate their definitions of abuse and neglect in their state laws. New Hampshire defines abuse as the physical and psychological harm to a child and neglect as the lack of proper care.<sup>35</sup> Connecticut, Rhode Island and Vermont define abuse and neglect similarly to New Hampshire.<sup>36</sup> Massachusetts also categorizes abuse as physical and psychological harm and neglect as lack of proper care, however, Massachusetts is the only state that uses the terminology of



“minimally adequate” proper care rather than just adequate.<sup>37</sup> Although Maine is the sole state that groups abuse and neglect in its definition, it includes physical harm, psychological harm and lack of proper care in its definition as well.

Pennsylvania and Idaho have very similar state laws. The difference between these two states and the others in our case study analysis is that they do not include psychological harm in their definitions of abuse or neglect, focusing solely on physical harm and lack of proper care.<sup>38</sup> Idaho is the only state that details different types of physical harm (“any case in which a child has been the victim of conduct or omission resulting in skin bruising, bleeding, malnutrition, burns, fractures of any bone, subdural hematoma, soft tissue swelling, failure to thrive, or death”).<sup>39</sup>

Observing the definitions of abuse and neglect in different states, one of the most noticeable similarities is that every state considers “lack of proper care” as a sign of neglect; however, states describe “proper care” in different ways. Massachusetts sets the standard as “minimally adequate care” and New Hampshire specifies a financial component: the parent must be doing everything in his or her power to protect the child within their financial limits.<sup>40</sup> It would seem that these two caveats would decrease the amount of assessments that are reported, which, although not the topic of this brief, would be an issue to look further into.

#### *5.4 Initial Individual Response to Abuse or Neglect by Reporter*

Each state has regulations regarding when and how to make a report and what to include in the report. Out of the case study states, only three (New Hampshire, Maine and Massachusetts) require an immediate oral report upon realization of the suspected child abuse or neglect.<sup>41</sup> Connecticut requires a report within 12 hours of suspicion of abuse or neglect; Rhode Island, Vermont and Idaho require a report within 24 hours of suspect; and Pennsylvania requires a report within 48 hours of suspect.<sup>42</sup> All of the initial required reports are only oral reports and New Hampshire, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania require a written report within 48 hours of the first oral report.<sup>43</sup> Mandating that a report be made immediately could have both positive and negative impacts on the situation. Because the report would have occurred not long after the incident, details would be more easily recalled and the report would theoretically be more complete. On the other hand, it might not provide the witness enough time to contemplate whether an incident he or she witnessed actually constitutes abuse or neglect. This is a distinction that is important for DCYF to know because there are tradeoffs to the New Hampshire law that could result in underreporting. As you can see from Table 8, there is no relationship between time allowed before reporting suspected abuse and neglect and the substantiation rates, but it is still important to take into account.

Additionally, some states discuss mandated reporters in their laws while others do not. Mandated reporters are people who come into contact with children due to the nature of their work.<sup>44</sup> Connecticut, Vermont, Idaho, and Pennsylvania explicitly distinguish the



duties of mandated reporters in their law, which might deter other individuals from reporting. Nevertheless, an association between states that specify mandated reporters in their laws and their substantiation rate does not exist. Table 8 presents this information.

**Table 8. Amount of Time a Reporter Has to Report Suspected Maltreatment & Whether a “Mandated Reporter” in Specified in State Law**

State	Substantiation Rate (2011)	Time to Report	“Mandated Reporter”
New Hampshire	3	Immediate	No
Connecticut	12	12 hours	Yes
Massachusetts	14	Immediate	No
Maine	12	Immediate	No
Rhode Island	14	24 hours	No
Vermont	5	24 hours	Yes
Pennsylvania	1	48 hours	Yes
Idaho	3	24 hours	Yes

*Source: Source: Child Welfare Information Gateway*

Each state studied has slightly different bylaws for what information is required in the report. In general, every report for the states analyzed asks for the name and address of the child, the nature and extent of the injuries, any evidence of prior injuries, and any other useful information the reporter may have. None of the information is mandatory; if it is unknown to the reporter, he or she can still make the report based on the information available.<sup>45</sup> New Hampshire, Connecticut and Pennsylvania also ask about the name of the person suspected and reason that person is suspected.<sup>46</sup> Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and New Hampshire all require extra information about how the suspected abuse or neglect came to the reporter’s attention and what steps the reporter took to help the child.<sup>47</sup> Connecticut and Pennsylvania both go a step further to ask for the reporter’s name, so the process is not anonymous.<sup>48</sup> This could cause less people to report suspected abuse or neglect if they want to stay anonymous, which will impact reporting rates even if it does not impact substantiation rates. Connecticut and Pennsylvania also ask specific questions about the approximate dates and locations where the suspected abuse took place.<sup>49</sup> Connecticut, Maine, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Vermont all ask some combination of additional questions about the age, gender, sex, and family composition of the child.<sup>50</sup> Finally, both Rhode Island and Idaho lack specific details about what exactly to include in the report—Rhode Island law states that a written report must “explain the extent and nature of the abuse or neglect the child is alleged to have suffered” and reports in Idaho must contain a “description of conditions and circumstances that led to make the report.”<sup>51</sup> As stated above, these differences in report composition seem to have no impact on substantiation rate in the states. We would have assumed that states that require more information in their reports might have higher substantiation rates because more detailed reports would cause officials to less frequently dismiss a report based on lack of information although this does not end up being the case. Table 9 organizes this information.



## 5.6 Assessment Process

The assessment process for most states is generally similar. Each of the departments conducts interviews whereby their main goal is to determine basic information about the family (i.e. the family composition and if there are any other children in the household), whether or not maltreatment occurred (not only to the child for which the case was reported, but other children in the household as well), what the risk is of the child staying in the home, and what action should be taken to best protect the child. Also, every state has certain laws limiting the ability for an investigator to come into the household and observe or interview family members without the written consent of the family. They could, alternatively, interview and observe in a school setting, and many other public settings without the parent's permission.

Some states in our case study included extra steps that should be taken. To start, New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont have regulations in place to not only assess and investigate whether or not maltreatment occurred and thus whether or not the case should be substantiated, but also steps to help the parents or guardians in the situation. For example, New Hampshire law states that during the assessment process, the DHHS must “determine the protective treatment, and ameliorative services that appear necessary to help prevent further child abuse or neglect and to improve the home environment and the parents' ability to adequately care for the child.”<sup>52</sup> Maine's assessment process “focuses on the family strengths and needs” and “promotes family engagement and inclusion in a team approach to planning and intervention with child safety first and foremost.”<sup>53</sup> Finally, Vermont officials work with the family to identify “family strengths, resources, and service needs” and develop “a plan of services that reduces the risk of harm and improves family well-being.” Vermont department officials will even provide these services if the case is not found worthy of an assessment, although the parents can deny their help.<sup>54</sup> Having a family assistance aspect of the law could potentially lower the substantiation rates, because the state could help a family that needs support and maltreatment, especially neglect, could become a non-issue. On the flip side, states that do not have this statute could end up having high substantiation rates as the state potentially could have ameliorated some assessments if they had the services available. New Hampshire and Vermont both have lower substantiation rates, and so family assistance very well could be part of the reason for this. Maine, however, has a higher substantiation rate so it is clear that this stipulation is not a strong reason for lower substantiation rates.

Two states in our case study possess the ability to form a multidisciplinary team. Multidisciplinary teams allow DCYF to assess child safety while law enforcement and forensic interviewers focus on the investigation process. Both Idaho and New Hampshire have low substantiation rates. Perhaps because of the added focus on child safety, multidisciplinary teams may be less inclined to substantiate cases in which they deem that the family situation has potential to be improved. Table 9 details all of the above information.



**Table 9. Details Included in Assessment Process<sup>55</sup>**

	NH	CT	MA	ME	RI	VT	PA	ID
<b><i>If known: Name and address of child, nature and extent of injuries, evidence of prior injuries, other useful information</i></b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No*	Yes	Yes	No*
<b><i>If known: details regarding person responsible for suspected abuse</i></b>	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
<b><i>If known: details about reporter (i.e. name and how they came to know about suspected abuse)</i></b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
<b><i>If known: specific details about injuries (i.e. where the suspected abuse occurred and the approximate date)</i></b>	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
<b><i>If known: specific details about child in danger (i.e. age, sex, gender, family composition)</i></b>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No

### 5.7 Timeframe for Assessment

Each state studied has its own timeframe in which the assessment of child maltreatment must take place. For example, in New Hampshire, an assessment must commence within 72 hours of accepting the report and the assessment must be completed 60 days later (or less).<sup>56</sup> The only other state with a 60-day completion time period is Pennsylvania. However, Pennsylvania requires the assessment to begin within 24 hours of receiving the report.<sup>57</sup> Both Connecticut and Vermont have a 45-day completion time period. Connecticut requires assessments to begin within 24 hours if “severe” and within 72 hours if “nonsevere,” while Vermont requires assessments to begin within 72 hours for all non-emergency assessments.<sup>58</sup> Massachusetts’ timeframe of assessment is considerably shorter: assessments of emergency reports, which must start within two hours of receiving the report, must be completed within five days and nonemergency reports (started within 48 hours of receiving the report) must be completed within 15 days of the start.<sup>59</sup>

Even though we performed extensive research, we could not find a completion deadline for the other states in our case study (Maine, Rhode Island, and Idaho); however, we were still able to gather useful information. In Maine, the decision to begin an assessment lead by the protective services, to begin an assessment lead by a contract agency, or to screen out the case must be made within 24 hours. If the assessment is decided upon, an interview with the victim or an observation of the victim must occur within 72 hours.<sup>60</sup> In Rhode Island, “emergency” assessments are passed off to child protection investigators (CPI) within ten minutes of receiving the case and the assessment must commence within ten minutes of assignment. In “immediate” assessments CPIs are assigned within one hour of receiving the case and they must start the assessment within their shift. Finally, in





“routine” assessments, CPIs are assigned within one hour as well, but they have 24 hours to begin the assessment.<sup>61</sup> In Idaho, there are also three different levels of assessment. In “Priority I” assessments (emergencies), the department must immediately respond and notify law enforcement if necessary. In “Priority II” assessments, whereby the allegations of child maltreatment are clear but there is no immediate danger, law enforcement will be notified within 24 hours and the interviews with and observations of the victim must begin within 48 hours of receiving the report. In “Priority III” assessments, family service responders must act within 72 hours and the victim must be interviewed or observed within five days.<sup>62</sup> We detail all of the aforementioned information in Table 10.

**Table 10. Timeline for Assessment**

State	Substantiation Rate (2011)	Commencement of Assessment	Completion of Assessment
New Hampshire	3	Within 72 hours of report acceptance	60 days
Connecticut	12	<i>Emergency</i> : same day <i>Severe</i> : within 24 hours <i>Nonsevere</i> : within 72 hours	45 days
Maine	12	<i>Decision to assess or screen out</i> : within 24 hours <i>Interviews/ Observations of victim</i> : 72 hours	Not detailed in law
Massachusetts	14	<i>Emergency</i> : within 2 hours <i>Nonemergency</i> : within 48 hours	- <i>Emergency</i> : within 5 days - <i>Nonemergency</i> : within 15 days
Rhode Island	14	<i>Emergency</i> : within 10 minutes of being assigned <i>Immediate</i> : within shift of assigned worker <i>Routine</i> : within 24 hours of being assigned	Not detailed in law
Vermont	5	Within 72 hours	Within 45 days (can be extended to 60 days with justification)
Pennsylvania	1	<i>Emergency</i> : immediate <i>Nonemergency</i> : within 24 hours of receiving report	60 days
Idaho	3	<i>Priority I</i> : immediate response <i>Priority II</i> : within 24 hours, observation/interviews with victim within 48 hours	Not detailed in law



		Priority III: within 72 hours, observations/interviews with victim within 5 days	
--	--	--	--

*Source: Source: Child Welfare Information Gateway*

There are two trends that are clear from this data. First, states with higher substantiation rates (like Rhode Island and Massachusetts) are quicker to start their assessments than states like Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and Vermont, who all have lower substantiation rates. The second trend is that states with higher substantiation rates have less time to complete an assessment as compared to states with lower substantiation rates. The longer time New Hampshire provides to complete an assessment could be a sign of their added focus on providing services rather than prosecution.

### *5.8 Classification of Report*

In New Hampshire, after the assessment process, reports are either classified as founded (whereby there is “probable cause” to believe that a child was abused or neglected) or unfounded (whereby there is “no probable cause” that abuse or neglect occurred).<sup>63</sup> Founded assessments are the ones that are substantiated. Vermont and Idaho classify their completed assessments in the same manner; however, all of the other states classify their reports in different categories and have more than two options for the assessments.<sup>64</sup>

Connecticut’s classification system most closely resembles New Hampshire, Vermont and Idaho’s in that assessments are either founded or unfounded, but the department also determines whether or not they should continue to give support to the family and the parents in order to improve the well-being of the child.<sup>65</sup> In both Rhode Island and Pennsylvania, assessments can be categorized as founded, indicated, or unfounded.

Founded assessments have a high level of evidence and almost a certainty that the report is a case of child abuse or neglect. Indicated assessments provide “substantial evidence” that abuse or neglect is occurring, although indicated assessments do not have all of the certainty that founded assessments do. As is the same as New Hampshire, Vermont, and Idaho, unfounded assessments show no evidence of abuse or neglect.<sup>66</sup> Maine has a similarly worded classification system as Pennsylvania and Rhode Island but slightly different definitions for those categories. Maine specifies a substantiated case as a case with a “preponderance of evidence” that severe abuse or neglect occurred. Indicated assessments also have evidence that abuse or neglect occurred, it is just at a lower, more moderate severity. Finally, unsubstantiated assessments show no signs of abuse or neglect, but that does not mean that there is no risk that it will occur in the future.<sup>67</sup>

Massachusetts classifies the assessments as either supported (meaning that the evidence supports the report and that abuse or neglect by a caregiver did occur), reasonable cause to believe (meaning that “a collection of facts, knowledge, or observations” lead one to conclude that abuse or neglect occurred) or unsupported. In Massachusetts, a report could



be “supported” without the department assessing the report determining which caretaking is the one that actually abused the child.<sup>68</sup>

As Table 11 and the text above demonstrate, states with more classifying categories tend to have higher substantiation rates.

**Table 11. Classification of Reports**

State	Substantiation Rate	Classification Groups
New Hampshire	3	2—founded, unfounded
Connecticut	12	2—founded, unfounded
Maine	12	3—substantiated, indicated, unsubstantiated
Massachusetts	14	3—supported, reasonable cause to believe, unsupported
Rhode Island	14	3—founded, indicated, unfounded
Vermont	5	2—founded, unfounded
Pennsylvania	1	3—founded, indicated, unfounded
Idaho	3	2—founded, unfounded

*Source: Source: Child Welfare Information Gateway*

## 6. QUALITATIVE FINDINGS: DCYF INTERVIEWS

In order to conduct a more holistic analysis, we interviewed three members of the DCYF staff, with the goal of identifying factors that could contribute to New Hampshire’s low substantiation rate and evaluating the current state of DCYF’s investigation process. In order to protect their identities, they are cited as DCYF Staffer #1, DCYF Staffer #2, and DCYF Staffer #3.

### 6.1 Factors leading to a low substantiation rate

Both DCYF Staffer #1 and DCYF Staffer #2 mention the screening process and the state definitions of abuse and neglect as possible causes of the low substantiation rate. As it stands, instances of suspected child abuse or neglect can be reported anonymously. When a report is anonymous, follow-up interviews to help the investigation process cannot be conducted, and witnesses cannot be later used to prove an assessment in court. According to DCYF Staffer #3, because of DCYF’s decision to err on the side of caution, reports can also be screened in knowing that there is not enough information to make a finding. Such incomplete reports would leave investigators with insufficient information with which to corroborate an instance of child maltreatment. In order to improve the screening process, DCYF Staffer #3 proposes that it be required that the reporter answer to how he or she knows of the incident of potential child maltreatment and when the incident happened. DCYF Staffer #1 further proposed that anonymous reports be automatically screened out.



Next, citing the state's definition of abuse as a possible driver of New Hampshire's low substantiation rate, all three DCYF staffers state that the portion of the state statute addressing psychological harm is inadequate. According to DCYF staff interviewed, the current placement of psychological harm under the abuse statute creates a very high standard of proof. Proving psychological harm currently involves having to provide evidence of psychological injury to the victim. Both DCYF Staffer #2 and DCYF Staffer #1 state that it is very rare that assessments under psychological harm are substantiated. DCYF Staffer #3 and DCYF Staffer #1 believe that "psychological harm" should instead be placed under the neglect statute. According to DCYF Staffer #2, DCYF is already attempting to investigate psychological harm instances as neglect.

Though DCYF Staffer #3 does not mention the founded/unfounded category as a possible factor in the substantiation rate, DCYF Staffer #2, who was a member of the DCYF staff when the category for assessments were founded/unfounded/unfounded-at-risk, states that she preferred having unfounded-at-risk as an additional category. Assessments designated unfounded-at-risk were ones in which DCYF was suspicious but unable to prove abuse or neglect. DCYF Staffer #2 does not note a difference in the investigation process between now and when the categories for making a determination were more extensive; however, she believes that the extensive category helped differentiate between unfounded assessments and assessments in which DCYF was still concerned for the child's wellbeing despite not making a finding. DCYF Staffer #1 believes that having a record of suspected abuse would help DCYF make future findings if the same child is later reported as a victim of another abuse incident.

## *6.2 Investigation Process*

All three DCYF staffers believe that the investigation process is not at fault when it comes to New Hampshire's low substantiation rate. DCYF Staffer #1 and DCYF Staffer #2 state that House Bill 475 and Senate Bill 433, bills that were previously mentioned in this paper, actually improved the investigation process. As stated earlier, the two bills modified the New Hampshire Task Force to include NHNCAC and MDT for more efficient collaboration between DCYF and law enforcement in investigating assessments. DCYF Staffer #1 stated that the creation of the Child Advocacy Centers improved DCYF's ability to make findings in sexual abuse cases. All three also agreed that the creation of the multidisciplinary team has vastly improved the investigation process.

DCYF Staffer #3 and DCYF Staffer #2 believe that New Hampshire's long grace period for verifying assessments is beneficial, as it allows DCYF to make a more comprehensive assessment. According to DCYF Staffer #3, the longer assessment investigation period reflects DCYF's belief in a family's ability to make the changes necessary to resolve an incident. DCYF Staffer #2 also alluded to the sentiment that New Hampshire is a state that is more focused on providing services to families rather than being punitive. For example, she stated that an assessment in which child neglect constitutes an unkempt



environment may be deemed unfounded if the family follows the appropriate steps to ameliorate the living conditions. Further, if an assessment involves sexual abuse, but the child is no longer in a high safety risk because the family took the necessary steps to resolve the incident, the case can be deemed founded/problem resolved, which means that DCYF will not prosecute the case in court.

## **7. CONCLUSION**

In assessing the cause of New Hampshire's low substantiation rate, we conduct a quantitative and two separate qualitative analyses. The results highlight the demographic characteristics and risk factors that make a case of suspected maltreatment more or less likely to be substantiated. We find that assessments that contain child or caregiver risk factors have a higher likelihood of being substantiated. DCYF could consider targeting the education of communities that contain a high proportion of families exhibiting those risk factors in order to inform members of such communities of the avenues available to seek help in instances of child maltreatment. Upon completing our qualitative state analysis, we find that states with a higher number of categories to designate to an assessment, states that do not include psychological harm in their state definition of abuse, and states with shorter periods for assessment completion tended to have a higher substantiation rate.

Our qualitative interviews point to New Hampshire's definition of abuse and the screening in process that occurs at DCYF Central Intake as the two main factors that could be improved. It could be argued, based on our interviews, that the recent bills that were passed into law, House Bill 475 and Senate Bill 433, increased the efficiency of the investigation process. Since there was a drastic decrease in the substantiation rate starting eight years ago with the passage of these bills, the current low substantiation rate may in fact be an accurate reflection of assessments that have enough evidence of abuse out of the assessments that are screened in.

If we assume that the low substantiation rate does not reflect the actual rate of child abuse and neglect in New Hampshire, then the fault would not be in the investigation process—rather, it would be in the screening process and the state statute defining abuse. If that is the case, then the requirements for a case to be screened in should be increased, while the descriptions for child abuse or neglect should be broadened to provide investigators with more information and allow investigators more discretion when deciding whether or not to substantiate a case.



## 8. APPENDICES

### Appendix I. Complete 2010 Data Analysis

Although we only highlight the largest contributors to the chi-square statistics in the body of the report, we have included the full data analysis here.

**Appendix Table 1. County of Report Findings**

<b>County of Report</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Belkap County</b>	70	648	10.8%
<b>Carroll County</b>	48	338	14.2%
<b>Cheshire County</b>	107	898	11.9%
<b>Coos County</b>	68	548	12.4%
<b>Grafton County</b>	59	561	10.5%
<b>Hillsborough County</b>	313	3,371	9.3%
<b>Merrimack County</b>	86	1,192	7.2%
<b>Rockingham County</b>	138	1,442	9.6%
<b>Strafford County</b>	165	1,169	14.1%
<b>Sullivan County</b>	61	571	10.7%

**Appendix Table 2. Report Source Findings**

<b>Report Source</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Social Services Personnel</b>	144	949	15.2%
<b>Medical Personnel</b>	68	844	8.1%
<b>Mental Health Personnel</b>	62	759	8.2%
<b>Law Enforcement Personnel</b>	358	1,880	19.0%
<b>Education Personnel</b>	184	2,069	8.9%
<b>Daycare Provider</b>	12	96	12.5%
<b>Substitute Care Provider</b>	2	28	7.1%
<b>Alleged Victim</b>	2	14	14.3%
<b>Parent</b>	58	800	7.3%
<b>Other Relative</b>	64	826	7.7%
<b>Friends/Neighbors</b>	16	389	4.1%
<b>Anonymous</b>	83	1,357	6.1%



**Appendix Table 3. Child Living Arrangement Findings**

<b>Living Arrangement</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Non-parent relative</b>	104	178	58.5%
<b>Non-relative</b>	214	354	60.4%
<b>Group Home</b>	38	202	18.8%
<b>Other</b>	8	68	11.8%
<b>Unknown</b>	802	10,226	7.8%

**Appendix Table 4. Maltreatment Type Findings**

<b>Maltreatment Type</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Physical Abuse</b>	358	3,969	9.0%
<b>Neglect</b>	676	5,818	11.6%
<b>Medical Neglect</b>	11	200	5.5%
<b>Sexual Abuse</b>	116	904	12.8%
<b>Emotional</b>	5	127	3.9%
<b>Maltreatment</b>			

Appendix II. Complete 2011 Data Analysis

We attach below the full analysis of the 2011 data.

**Appendix Table 1. County of Report Findings**

<b>County of Report</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Belknap County</b>	70	844	8.3%
<b>Carroll County</b>	41	368	11.1%
<b>Cheshire County</b>	103	848	12.2%
<b>Coos County</b>	57	453	12.6%
<b>Grafton County</b>	72	843	10.5%
<b>Hillsborough County</b>	369	3,384	8.5%
<b>Merrimack County</b>	90	1,514	5.9%
<b>Rockingham County</b>	113	1,715	6.6%
<b>Strafford County</b>	183	1,566	11.7%
<b>Sullivan County</b>	60	699	8.6%



**Appendix Table 2. Report Source Findings**

<b>Report Source</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Social Services Personnel</b>	137	1,030	13.3%
<b>Medical Personnel Mental Health Personnel</b>	86	950	9.1%
<b>Law Enforcement Personnel</b>	57	881	6.5%
<b>Education Personnel Daycare Provider Substitute Care Provider</b>	392	2,369	16.5%
<b>Alleged Victim Parent</b>	117	2,088	5.6%
<b>Other Relative Friends/Neighbors</b>	11	78	14.1%
<b>Anonymous</b>	1	20	5.0%
	1	23	4.4%
	78	1,044	7.6%
	61	895	6.8%
	47	412	11.4%
	90	1,466	6.2%

**Appendix Table 3. Child Living Arrangement Findings**

<b>Living Arrangement</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Non-parent relative Non-relative Group Home Other Unknown</b>	104	215	48.4%
	217	354	61.3%
	31	198	15.7%
	4	70	5.7%
	832	11,703	7.1%

**Appendix Table 4. Maltreatment Type Findings**

<b>Maltreatment Type</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Physical Abuse Neglect</b>	-	-	-
<b>Medical Neglect Sexual Abuse Emotional Maltreatment</b>	268	1,512	17.7%
	26	196	13.3%
	54	421	12.8%
	14	261	5.4%





Appendix III. Complete 2012 Data Analysis

The full analysis of the 2012 data is shown below.

**Appendix Table 1. County of Report Findings**

<b>County of Report</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Belkap County</b>	73	721	10.1%
<b>Carroll County</b>	32	419	7.6%
<b>Cheshire County</b>	101	848	11.9%
<b>Coos County</b>	45	298	15.1%
<b>Grafton County</b>	61	688	8.8%
<b>Hillsborough County</b>	350	3,479	10.1%
<b>Merrimack County</b>	65	1,269	5.1%
<b>Rockingham County</b>	91	1,481	6.1%
<b>Strafford County</b>	165	1,630	10.1%
<b>Sullivan County</b>	54	745	7.2%

**Appendix Table 2. Report Source Findings**

<b>Report Source</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Social Services Personnel</b>	184	958	16.1%
<b>Medical Personnel</b>	71	823	8.6%
<b>Mental Health Personnel</b>	78	937	8.2%
<b>Law Enforcement Personnel</b>	292	2,058	14.2%
<b>Education Personnel</b>	151	2,195	6.9%
<b>Daycare Provider</b>	1	88	1.1%
<b>Substitute Care Provider</b>	0	18	0.0%
<b>Alleged Victim</b>	0	20	0.0%
<b>Parent</b>	80	903	8.9%
<b>Other Relative</b>	39	846	4.6%
<b>Friends/Neighbors</b>	31	537	5.8%
<b>Anonymous</b>	92	1,456	6.3%



**Appendix Table 3. Child Living Arrangement Findings**

<b>Living Arrangement</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Non-parent relative</b>	114	216	52.8%
<b>Non-relative</b>	194	360	60.4%
<b>Group Home</b>	60	221	18.8%
<b>Other</b>	3	54	11.8%
<b>Unknown</b>	698	12,108	5.8%

**Appendix Table 4. Maltreatment Type Findings**

<b>Maltreatment Type</b>	<b>Assessments Substantiated</b>	<b>Total Assessments</b>	<b>Substantiation Rate</b>
<b>Physical Abuse</b>	214	3,208	7.1%
<b>Neglect</b>	735	8,441	8.7%
<b>Medical Neglect</b>	6	201	2.9%
<b>Sexual Abuse</b>	112	978	11.5%
<b>Emotional</b>	2	128	1.6%
<b>Maltreatment</b>			

Appendix IV. Summary of Significant Relationships

In this section, we show how significance changes over time. If the relationship is significant in a particular year, we mark it with an “X”. If the relationship is not significant, we leave it blank.

**Appendix Table 1. Summary of Significant Relationships Over Time—Report and Child Characteristics**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>County of Report</b>	X	X	X
<b>Report Source</b>	X	X	X
<b>Child Sex</b>			
<b>Child Race— American Indian</b>		X	
<b>Child Race—Asian</b>			
<b>Child Race—Black</b>		X	
<b>Child Race—Native Hawaiian</b>			
<b>Child Race—White</b>			X
<b>Child Race—Unable to Determine</b>			
<b>Child Ethnicity</b>			
<b>Child Living Arrangement</b>	X	X	X
<b>Prior Victim</b>	X	X	X
<b>Maltreatment Type</b>	X		X



**Table 2. Child Risk Factors**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Alcohol Abuse</b>	X	X	X
<b>Drug Abuse</b>	X		X
<b>Mental Retardation</b>	X	X	X
<b>Emotionally Disturbed</b>			
<b>Visually/Hearing Impaired</b>			
<b>Learning Disability</b>			X
<b>Physical Disability</b>			
<b>Behavioral Disability</b>			
<b>Other</b>	X		X

**Table 3. Caregiver Risk Factors**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Alcohol Abuse</b>	X	X	X
<b>Drug Abuse</b>	X	X	X
<b>Mental Retardation</b>	X		
<b>Emotionally Disturbed</b>	X	X	X
<b>Visually/Hearing Impaired</b>			
<b>Learning Disability</b>	X		
<b>Physical Disability</b>			X
<b>Other</b>	X		X
<b>Domestic Violence</b>	X		X
<b>Inadequate Housing</b>	X	X	X



## 9. REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> Children Who Are Confirmed By Child Protective Services As Victims of Maltreatment. (2014, June 1). Retrieved August 12, 2014.
- <sup>2</sup> Vanyukevch, A. (2013, October 17). Personal Interview.
- <sup>3</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C:3.II.
- <sup>4</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C:3.XIX.
- <sup>5</sup> *Warning signs*. (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.dhhs.nh.gov/dcyf/cps/signs.htm>.
- <sup>6</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C:30.
- <sup>7</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C-8.I.
- <sup>8</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C-12-c.
- <sup>9</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C-13.
- <sup>10</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C:15.
- <sup>11</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C-34.I.
- <sup>12</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C-34.II.
- <sup>13</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C-34.III.
- <sup>14</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C-34.V.
- <sup>15</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C-38.I.
- <sup>16</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C-38.V.
- <sup>17</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C:34a.I.
- <sup>18</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C:34a. II.
- <sup>19</sup> "Attorney General's Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect." 2008. The State of New Hampshire Division for Children Youth and Family and New Hampshire Network of Child Advocacy Centers. Third Edition. 1.
- <sup>20</sup> Vanyukevch, A. (2013, October 17). Personal Interview.



- 
- <sup>21</sup> “Attorney General’s Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect.” 2008. The State of New Hampshire Division for Children Youth and Family and New Hampshire Network of Child Advocacy Centers. Third Edition. 1.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>24</sup> “Attorney General’s Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect.” 2.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>27</sup> “Attorney General’s Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect.” 26-27.
- <sup>28</sup> “Attorney General’s Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect.” 52-55.
- <sup>29</sup> “Attorney General’s Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect.” 50.
- <sup>30</sup> Vanyukevch, A. (2013, October 17). Personal Interview.
- <sup>31</sup> We felt that this choice would best show how certain case characteristics make a case more or less likely to be substantiated. In 2012, only 3.2 percent of assessments were designated “closed-no finding” and 2.1% were marked “unknown/missing.”
- <sup>32</sup> Kid Count Data Center. “Children Who are Confirmed By Child Protective Services as Victims of Maltreatment.” Datacenter.kidscount.org
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>34</sup> Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C.A. § 5106g)
- <sup>35</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C-3 II.
- <sup>36</sup> Child Welfare Information Gateway. “Definitions of Child Abuse and Neglect.” 21, 73, 83. [www.childwelfare.gov](http://www.childwelfare.gov)
- <sup>37</sup> Code of Massachusetts Regulatory Title 110 § 2.00
- <sup>38</sup> Child Welfare Information Gateway. “Definitions of Child Abuse and Neglect.” 32, 70. [www.childwelfare.gov](http://www.childwelfare.gov)
- <sup>39</sup> Child Welfare Information Gateway. “Definitions of Child Abuse and Neglect.” 31-32. [www.childwelfare.gov](http://www.childwelfare.gov)
- <sup>40</sup> Child Welfare Information Gateway. “Definitions of Child Abuse and Neglect.” 44. [www.childwelfare.gov](http://www.childwelfare.gov); New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act. 169-C-3 II.
- <sup>41</sup> Child Welfare Information Gateway. “Making and Screening Reports of Child Abuse and Neglect.” <http://www.childwelfare.gov>. 57, 62, 82.
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid. 24, 39, 105, 101, 118.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid. 24, 57, 63, 82, 101.
- <sup>44</sup> The Protect Our Children Committee. “What is child abuse in Pennsylvania?” <http://www.protectpachildren.org/files/childabuseFAQ1252012.pdf>
- <sup>45</sup> Child Welfare Information Gateway. “Making and Screening Reports of Child Abuse and Neglect.” <http://www.childwelfare.gov>
- <sup>46</sup> Ibid. 24, 82, 101.
- <sup>47</sup> Ibid. 24, 58, 63, 82, 101.
- <sup>48</sup> Ibid. 24, 101.



<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid. 24, 58, 63, 82, 101, 118.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid. 101, 105.

<sup>52</sup> New Hampshire Revised Statutes. Title XII: Public Safety and Welfare. Chapter 169-C: Child Protection Act.

<sup>53</sup> Child Welfare Information Gateway. "Making and Screening Reports of Child Abuse and Neglect." <http://www.childwelfare.gov>. 60.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid. 120.

<sup>55</sup> \*RI and ID have a very general description about what to include in their report. See written case study portion for more details.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

<sup>57</sup> Child Welfare Information Gateway. "Making and Screening Reports of Child Abuse and Neglect." <http://www.childwelfare.gov>. 103.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid. 26, 120.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid. 65.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid. 40, 60, 107.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid. 40.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid. 107.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid. 84.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid. 41, 120.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid. 26.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid. 103, 107.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid. 60.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid. 65.