

# DFPS 2012 Data Book

The Data Book is a descriptive statistical resource of the services provided to the people of the State of Texas by the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) for fiscal year 2012 (September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012).

Information in this book covers the most frequently asked statistical questions about DFPS programs. Our hope is that it will be beneficial in answering these questions and serve as a continuous resource.

The Data Book provides information in several types of charts using different time intervals and it provides county, regional, and statewide totals. Due to rounding of calculations, some percentages may not add to 100%.

When comparing data from one time period to another, please keep in mind that DFPS has undergone major changes over time. There have been re-alignments, major policy changes, and automation of case management and reporting that have all influenced the data. In some cases this can make direct comparisons across the years misleading.

*Note: The information contained in this printed book is subject to change. For the most recent version please see the online version at [http://www.dfps.state.tx.us/About/Data\\_Books\\_and\\_Annual\\_Reports/default.asp](http://www.dfps.state.tx.us/About/Data_Books_and_Annual_Reports/default.asp)*

**Texas Department of Family  
and Protective Services**  
701 West 51st  
P.O. Box 149030  
Austin, Texas 78714-9030  
(512) 438-4800



## Table of Contents

### Introduction

DFPS Mission, Vision and Values.....	vii
DFPS Regional Boundaries and Regional Headquarter Locations.....	viii

### Statewide Intake

Statewide Intake Overview.....	1
Legal Responsibility for Statewide Intake.....	2
Number of Contacts Received.....	3
Total Number of Contacts Received by Method of Receipt.....	3
Number of Contacts Over Time.....	3
Number of Contacts by Type of Contact.....	3
Source of Reports of Abuse/Neglect by Program.....	4
Total Phone Calls - English Queue.....	5
Total Phone Calls - All Calls.....	5

### Adult Protective Services (APS)

APS In-Home Overview.....	7
Legal Responsibility for Adult Protective Services.....	8
Fiscal Year 2004 and 2012 Pre- and Post-Reform Statistics by Region (APS In-Home).....	9
Map - Texas Adult Population Ages 65 and Over.....	10
Map - Texas Disabled Adult Population Ages 18 to 64 Years.....	11
Incidence of Maltreatment per 1,000 Adults Population by Region.....	12
APS In-Home Intake Reports by Region.....	12
APS In-Home Intake Reports by Priority.....	13
APS Intake In-Home Reports by Source.....	13
APS In-Home Intakes, Completed Investigations and Validated Cases 2010-2012.....	13
Map - APS Validated In-Home Investigations.....	14
Completed APS In-Home Investigations by Region.....	15
APS Daily Caseload.....	15
Completed APS In-Home Investigations by Region and Disposition.....	16
Recidivism of APS In-Home Cases by Fiscal Year.....	16
Recidivism of APS In-Home Cases by Region.....	16
Characteristics of Validated APS Victims in Completed In-Home Investigations.....	17
In-Home Validated Victims in Completed Investigations.....	17
Perpetrator Characteristics in Validated APS In-Home Investigations.....	18
Perpetrators in Validated In-Home Investigations.....	19
Number of Referrals Made to Law Enforcement in Completed APS In-Home Cases by Region.....	19
APS Victims of Family Violence in Validated Investigations by Region.....	19
Validated Allegations in APS In-Home Investigations by Type of Abuse/Neglect.....	20
Duration of Service Delivery Stages for APS In-Home Cases During Fiscal Year.....	20
Non-Purchased Client Services Delivered for APS In-Home Cases by Region.....	21

### APS Facility Investigations

APS Facility Investigations Overview.....	23
Legal Responsibility for Adult Protective Services.....	24
Completed Facility Investigations by Source of Report.....	25
Average Length of Completed Facility Investigations by Region.....	25
Number of Facility Investigations Referred to Law Enforcement by Setting.....	25
Types of Confirmed Allegations in Facility Investigations.....	25
Characteristics of Victims in Confirmed Facility Investigations.....	26
Characteristics of Perpetrators in Confirmed Facility Investigations.....	26
Completed Facility Investigations by Fiscal Year.....	27
Completed Facility Investigations by Setting.....	27
Disposition of Completed Facility Investigations by Setting.....	27

## Child Protective Services

Child Protective Services Overview.....	29
Legal Responsibility for Child Protective Services.....	30
Concepts Guiding Risk Determination.....	32
Fiscal Year 2004 and 2012 Pre- and Post-Reform Statistics by Region (CPS).....	33
CPS Daily Caseloads FY 2012.....	34
CPS Daily Caseloads FY 2011.....	35
Map - Texas Child Population Ages Birth through 17 Years.....	36
Map - Child Protective Services Completed Investigations.....	37
CPS Total Initial Intakes and Screened Out Cases.....	38
Risk Assessment Finding of Completed Child Abuse/Neglect Investigations.....	38
Number of Completed Investigations Where Family Violence Was Indicated in the Risk Assessment.....	38
Case Action for Risk Indicated Completed Investigations.....	39
Child Abuse/Neglect Allegation Dispositions.....	39
Investigations of Child Abuse/Neglect by Source of Report for Completed Investigations.....	39
Number of Child Abuse/Neglect Completed Investigations.....	40
Family Cases Opened for Services as a Result of a Completed Investigation.....	40
Confirmed Allegations of Child Abuse/Neglect by Type of Abuse.....	41
Children in Cases Opened for Services as a Result of a Completed Investigation.....	42
Point Prevalence Rate of Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children in TX Population by Region.....	42
Race/Ethnicity of Selected CPS Statistics Compared to Texas Child Population.....	43
Map - Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect.....	44
Profile of Confirmed Child Abuse/Neglect Victims.....	45
Alleged and Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect.....	46
CPS Confirmed Victims Where Confirmed Perpetrator was a Parent.....	46
Characteristics Of Perpetrators In Confirmed Investigations of Child Abuse/Neglect.....	47
Monthly Average Number of Families Receiving Preservation Services.....	48
Annual Number of Families Receiving Preservation Services.....	48
Monthly Average Number of Families Receiving Reunification Services.....	49
Annual Number of Families Receiving Reunification Services.....	49
Map - Children in Foster Care During FY by County.....	50
Number of Children Removed from Home as a Result of a CPS Abuse/Neglect Investigation.....	51
Point of Prevalence for Children Entering Substitute Care.....	51
Where are Children in DFPS Care?.....	52
Demographics of Children in Foster Care at the End of the Year By Fiscal Year.....	53
Point of Prevalence for Children in Substitute Care at the End of the Year.....	54
Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility, in Substitute Care or in Foster Care Placements.....	54
Legal Status of Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility.....	55
Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility by Living Arrangement at the End of Each Fiscal Year.....	56
Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility in Non-Foster Care Placements.....	56
Children in Substitute Care Placements by Living Arrangement Categories.....	57
Permanency Goal of Children in Substitute Care for Whom DFPS had Legal Responsibility.....	58
Number of DFPS Foster, Foster/Adoptive and Adoptive Homes as of August 31.....	58
Children Placed In Adoptive Homes By Region.....	59
Demographics of Children Placed in Adoptive Homes.....	59
Children with Disabling Conditions Placed in Adoptive Homes.....	60
Children in Consummated Adoptions by Type of Agency by Fiscal Year.....	60
Children in Consummated Adoptions by Region.....	60
Demographics of Children in Consummated Adoptions.....	61
Race/Ethnicity of Children and Adoptive Parents by Fiscal Year.....	61
CPS Outcomes Based on Data from Fiscal Year.....	62
Substitute Care Outcomes for Cases Open at the End of Fiscal Year.....	63
Status of Children No Longer in DFPS Legal Responsibility.....	64
Average Length of Time in Months for Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Type of Exit and Region.....	64
Average Length of Time in Months Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Type of Exit & Race/Ethnicity.....	64
Average Number of Out-of-Home Placements for Children Who Attained Permanency.....	65
Length of Time in Care for Children Who Achieved Permanency Status.....	65
Average Monthly Number of Children and Young Adults, FTEs in Paid Foster Care by Service Levels.....	66

Foster Care Expenditures by Source.....	66
Children and Young Adults in Paid Foster Care Monthly Average by Fiscal Year.....	67
Percent of Change in the Number of Children and Young Adults in Paid Foster Care by Fiscal Year.....	67
Children and Young Adults in Paid Foster Care Monthly Average by Region.....	67
Families and Children Receiving Kinship Caregiver Monetary Assistance.....	68
Families and Children Kinship Caregiver Monetary Assistance Payments.....	68
Average Number of Children Provided Adoption Subsidy by Fiscal Year.....	69
Percent Change Children Provided Adoption Subsidy by Fiscal Year.....	69
Average Number of Children Provided Adoption Subsidy by Region.....	69
Average Number of Children Provided Permanency Care Assistance by Fiscal Year.....	70
Average Number of Children Provided Permanency Care Assistance by Region.....	70
Average Number of Children and Families Receiving Purchased Services per Month.....	71
Average Monthly Percent of Children Receiving CPS Purchased Services by Region.....	71
Family Team Meetings Conducted by Race/Ethnicity.....	72
Family Group Conferences Conducted by Race/Ethnicity.....	72
Circles of Support Conducted by Race/Ethnicity.....	73
Preparation for Adult Living (PAL) Services Youth Ages 16 through 20.....	73
Fiscal Year 2004 and 2012 Daily Statistics.....	74

### **Day Care Licensing**

Child Day Care Licensing Overview.....	75
Legal Responsibility for Child-Care Licensing.....	76
Map - Texas Child Population Ages Birth through 13 Years.....	77
Child Day Care Operations in Texas as of August 31.....	78
Child Day Care Operations and Homes Regulated by Fiscal Year.....	79
Licensing of Child Day Care Operations by Region.....	80
Licensing of Child Day Care Operations by Region.....	81
Inspections in Child Day Care Operations.....	82
Inspections in Child Day Care Operations by Type of Inspection.....	83
Investigations in Child Day Care Operations.....	84
Investigations in Child Day Care Operations.....	85
Adverse Actions and Corrective Actions Initiated in Day Care Licensing Child Care Operations by Region.....	86
Adverse Actions and Corrective Actions Initiated in Day Care Licensing Child Care Operations by Region.....	87
Background Checks for Day Care Licensing Operation.....	88
State's Top 10 Standards Deficiencies for Child Day Care Operations.....	89

### **Residential Child Care Licensing**

Residential Child Care Licensing Overview.....	91
Legal Responsibility for Child-Care Licensing.....	92
Fiscal Year 2004 and 2012 Pre- and Post-Reform Statistics by Region (RCCI).....	93
Map - Texas Child Population Ages Birth through 17 Years.....	94
Residential Child Care Licensing Operations in Texas as of August 31.....	95
Residential Child Care Licensing Operations Regulated by Fiscal Year.....	96
Residential Child Care Licensing Operations Regulated by Fiscal Year.....	97
Licensing of Residential Child Care Operations by Region.....	98
Inspections in Residential Child Care Operations.....	99
Inspections in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations by Type of Inspection.....	100
Investigations in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations.....	101
Investigations in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations.....	102
Adverse and Corrective Actions in Residential Licensing Operations by Region.....	103
Background Checks for Residential Child Care Licensing Operations.....	104
Child Care Administrator Credential Exam.....	104
State's Top 10 Standards Deficiencies for Residential Child Care Licensing Operations.....	105

### **Division of Prevention and Early Intervention**

Legal Responsibility for the Division of Prevention and Early intervention.....	107
Prevention and Early Intervention - Expenditures and Staffing.....	109
STAR (Services To At-Risk) Youth Who are Registered and Received a Service by Fiscal Year.....	110

STAR (Services To At-Risk) Youth by Presenting Problem .....	110
Community Youth Development (CYD) Youth Served by Fiscal Year .....	111
Community Youth Development (CYD) Average Monthly Clients Served .....	111
Texas Youth and Runaway Hotline Incoming Calls by Fiscal Year .....	112
Characteristics of Hotline Callers .....	112
Number of Families (Primary Caregivers) Served in Child Abuse/Neglect Prevention Programs .....	113
Number of Youth Served in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs .....	114
Characteristics of Youth Served in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs .....	114
Prevention and Early Intervention Performance Outcomes, Outputs and Efficiencies by Fiscal Year .....	115

## Finance

Agency Funding Summary .....	117
Categorization of Client Service Contracts .....	118
TDFPS Cost per Service by Fiscal Year .....	122
Purchased Client Services Delivered in APS In-Home Validated Cases by Region .....	123
CPS Expenditures Fiscal Year .....	124
CPS Children in Residential Child Care Facilities Fiscal Year .....	124
Prevention and Early Intervention Expenditures .....	124
CPS Fiscal Year Other Expenditures .....	29

## County Charts

APS In-Home Population And Case-Related Statistics .....	125
Population with a Disability Ages 18-64 .....	125
Population Ages 65 Plus .....	125
Total APS Intakes .....	125
Total APS Completed Investigations .....	125
Validated APS Investigations .....	125
APS Clients Receiving Services .....	125
APS Facility Investigations .....	131
Intakes .....	131
Complete Investigation .....	131
Confirmed Investigations .....	131
CPS Calls, Reports, Intake or Investigation Workers, and Response Time .....	134
Initial Intakes Alleging Abuse/ Neglect .....	134
Child Abuse/ Neglect Reports Assigned for Investigation .....	134
CPS Workers Responsible for Intake or Investigation by Office Location .....	134
Investigation initiation response time in completed investigations .....	134
Completed CPS Abuse/Neglect Investigations .....	140
Alleged Victims of Child Abuse/ Neglect .....	140
Alleged Victims in Unconfirmed Investigations .....	140
Alleged Victims in Ruled Out Investigations .....	140
Alleged Victims Provided Services .....	140
Alleged Victims Not Provided Services .....	140
Children Removed From Home .....	140
Confirmed CPS Victims and Investigations .....	146
Child Population .....	146
Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect .....	146
Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children .....	146
Total CPS Completed Investigations .....	146
Confirmed CPS Investigations .....	146
Percent Investigations Confirmed .....	146
5 Year Outcome for Children Returned Home from Substitute Care or Served in FBSS .....	152
Total Children Served In Fiscal Year 2007 .....	152
Subsequently Confirmed Victims In Fiscal Years 2007 - 2012 .....	152
Child Abuse/Neglect Related Fatalities Fiscal Year 2012 .....	155
Child Abuse/Neglect Related Fatalities .....	155
Child/Abuse Related Fatalities in Foster Care at Time .....	155
CPS Children in Care During Fiscal Year 2012 .....	156

Child Population.....	156
Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility .....	156
Point of Prevalence.....	156
Children Entering Substitute Care (Total Removals).....	156
Children in Substitute Care.....	156
Children in Foster Care .....	156
Legal Statuses Granted for Children in Fiscal Year 2012 .....	162
Unique Children .....	162
Possessory CVS .....	162
TMC .....	162
PMC: Not Free For Adoption.....	162
PMC: Free For Adoption.....	162
Adoption Finalized.....	162
DFPS Responsibility Terminated.....	162
Foster Care Expenditures .....	168
Paid Foster Care Client.....	168
Foster Care Expenditures.....	168
DFPS Foster and Adoptive Homes .....	171
Foster Homes.....	171
Foster/Adoptive Homes .....	171
Adoptive Homes .....	171
CPS Purchased Services For Children .....	174
Children Receiving Sub-Care Purchased Services.....	174
Expenditures For Sub-Care Purchased Services .....	174
Children In Substitute Care .....	174
Children Receiving In-Home Purchased Services.....	174
Expenditures For In-Home Purchased Services .....	174
Children Receiving In-Home Services.....	174
Texas Child Population (Age 0-17) by Race/Ethnicity.....	180
Removals by Race/Ethnicity.....	186
Confirmed Victims of Abuse/Neglect by Race/Ethnicity.....	192
Children Waiting for Adoption by Race/Ethnicity .....	198
Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Exit Type.....	204
Child Day Care Licensing Statistics.....	210
Child Population Age 0-13.....	210
Licensed Child Care Centers .....	210
Total Child Care Centers Capacity.....	210
Licensed Child Care Homes .....	210
Licensed Child Care Homes Capacity.....	210
Listed Family Homes .....	210
Registered Child Care Homes .....	210
Residential Child Care Licensing Statistics.....	216
Child Population Age 0-17.....	216
Child Placing Agencies (CPA) .....	216
Homes Verified by CPAs.....	216
General Residential Operations .....	216
Indepent Foster and Group Homes.....	216
Residential Treatment Centers.....	216
Maternity Homes .....	216
Total Residential .....	216
Total Residential Capacity .....	216
Youth Served in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs.....	222
Families (Primary Caregivers) Served in Child Abuse/Neglect Prevention Programs .....	225
<b>Definitions</b>	
Adult Protective Services Program.....	229
Child Protective Services Program .....	236
Child Care Licensing Program .....	241

## DFPS Mission, Vision and Values

### **DFPS Mission**

The mission of The Texas Department of Family and Protective Services is to protect children, the elderly, and people with disabilities from abuse, neglect, and exploitation by involving clients, families and communities.

### **DFPS Vision**


The Department of Family and Protective Services:

- Is recognized for innovative, effective services;
- Builds strong, effective partnerships with clients, communities and state leaders;
- Provides effective leadership that is accountable for its actions and communicates openly with clients and stakeholders; and
- Supports staff who are highly motivated, diverse, ethical, well trained, and professional.

### **DFPS Values**

- We protect the unprotected.
- We involve clients, families and communities in decision-making.
- We provide quality services.
- We are innovative and strive for excellence.
- We are ethical and accountable.
- We promote diversity.
- We value our staff.

# DFPS Regional Boundaries and Regional Office Locations





# SWI

## Statewide Intake Overview

Statewide Intake serves as the “front door to the front line” for all DFPS programs. As the central point of contact for reports of abuse, neglect and exploitation of vulnerable Texans, SWI staff are available 24 hours a day, 7 days per week, 365 days per year.

### Total Average Filled Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff

Intake Specialists	304.9
Supervisors	33.2
Other Staff	68.8
<b>Total SWI Staff</b>	<b>406.9</b>

### Intake Specialists Demographics


Turnover Rate	19.5%
Agency Tenure:	
Less than 1 Year	14.3%
1 - 3 Years	28.6%
Greater than 3 Years	57.1%
Entry Salary	\$29,932.92
Average Age	38.1
Race/Ethnicity:	
African-American	13.6%
Anglo	63.3%
Hispanic	20.5%
Other	2.6%

### Supervisor Demographics

Turnover Rate	5.9%
Agency Tenure:	
Less than 1 Year	0.0%
1 - 3 Years	0.0%
Greater than 3 Years	100.0%
Entry Salary	\$38,145.96
Average Age	45.2
Race/Ethnicity:	
African-American	5.9%
Anglo	58.8%
Hispanic	26.5%
Other	8.8%

### SWI Expenditures

SWI Staff	\$18,127,383
-----------	--------------



## Legal Responsibility for Statewide Intake

### Statutory References

**Federal: Social Security Act**

**State: Texas Family Code, Human Resource Code**

### Major Functions

- Centralized point of intake for child abuse and neglect, abuse, neglect or exploitation of the elderly or adults with disabilities, clients served by DSHS or DADS employees in State Hospitals or State Supported Living Centers, and children in licensed child-care facilities or treatment centers for the entire State of Texas.
- Open 365 days a year, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.
- Able to receive information via phone, Internet reporting system, fax or mailed correspondence.
- Responsibility to assess information received to the definitions of possible abuse, neglect or exploitation for each program served and to prioritize and route the information to the correct destination workload.
- Information and Referral Service as warranted or when information received does not meet statutory definitions.
- Generate Law Enforcement Notifications and route to the correct law enforcement jurisdiction for CPS and CCL programs.
- Ensure confidentiality of IMPACT history and reporter identity.
- Serve as an Expedited Background Check function for CPS by checking criminal and IMPACT history to aid field staff during emergency removals.
- Quality Assurance unit to review complaints, random call monitors and assist in development of policy, procedure and best practice.
- Point program for identifying problems with IMPACT rollouts.

- Provide daily reports on call volume per application; hold times per application, etc.
- Integrate hardware and software upgrades to phone and computer systems to reduce hold times and improve efficiency.
- Use of an IEX Workforce Management System to schedule shifts, breaks and meal times for intake workers in order to maximize efficiency.
- Telstrat Engage call recording system utilized to record phone calls for Quality Assurance and legal requirements.
- Employee Development Unit leads all training for new and tenured staff

### Challenges

- Respond to ever increasing number of phone calls, Internet reports, fax and mailed correspondence while keeping hold times to 8.7 minutes or less while maintaining a high quality of intakes.
- Increase number of bilingual staff.
- Reduce turnover.

**Number of Contacts Received**

Fiscal Year	Hold Time*	# of Contacts**	% Change
2008	11.4	678,330	4.7%
2009	10.6	690,430	1.8%
2010	8.9	748,277	8.4%
2011	7.3	780,023	4.2%
2012	8.5	773,577	-0.8%


\*English phone queue only

\*\*Includes all contacts.

**Total Number of Contacts Received by Method of Receipt Fiscal Year 2012**

Contact Type	Number of Contacts	%
Internet	120,802	15.6%
Mail/Fax	33,099	4.3%
Other	1,200	0.2%
Phone	618,422	79.9%
Walk-in	54	0.0%
	773,577	100.0%

**Number of Contacts Over Time**



**Number of Contacts by Type of Contact Fiscal Year 2012**

	Adult Protective Services - In-Home	Adult Protective Services - Facility	Child Protective Services	Residential Child Care Licensing	Child Care Licensing	Total	% of Total
Reports of Alleged Abuse/Neglect*	107,201	11,587	241,428	3,458	3,129	366,803	47.4%
Case Related Special Requests	17	0	23,588	0	0	23,605	3.1%
Non Case Related Special Requests	Data not available by program					590	0.1%
Information and Referral - Related to Protective Services						320,193	41.4%
Information and Referral - Not Related to Protective Services						62,386	8.1%
<b>Grand Total</b>	107,218	11,587	265,016	3,458	3,129	773,577	100.0%

Note: The term "contacts" represent information received by DFPS and then entered into IMPACT system. Information may be received in the form of a telephone call, regular mail, via Internet reporting system or via fax:

\* Contacts by date received.

### Source of Reports of Abuse/Neglect by Program Fiscal Year 2012

Source of Report	Total		CPS		APS In-Home	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Medical Personnel	66,023	18.0%	41,401	17.1%	22,595	21.1%
Relative	45,913	12.5%	27,299	11.3%	18,247	17.0%
School	44,381	12.1%	43,113	17.9%	790	0.7%
Law Enforcement	40,107	10.9%	34,397	14.2%	5,074	4.7%
Other	27,586	7.5%	18,135	7.5%	8,170	7.6%
Parent	25,704	7.0%	22,811	9.4%	1,706	1.6%
Community Agency	23,505	6.4%	8,578	3.6%	13,387	12.5%
Friend-Neighbor	20,849	5.7%	14,070	5.8%	6,576	6.1%
Victim	18,853	5.1%	780	0.3%	15,327	14.3%
Anonymous	16,380	4.5%	12,575	5.2%	2,988	2.8%
DFPS Staff	11,234	3.1%	7,601	3.1%	2,020	1.9%
Provider	7,906	2.2%	954	0.4%	6,565	6.1%
Legal/Court	4,209	1.1%	3,562	1.5%	456	0.4%
Institutional Personnel	3,953	1.1%	267	0.1%	261	0.2%
Day Care Provider	2,844	0.8%	2,039	0.8%	145	0.1%
State Agency	2,203	0.6%	1,140	0.5%	861	0.8%
Financial Institution	1,312	0.4%	18	0.0%	1,293	1.2%
Unrelated Home Member	1,110	0.3%	508	0.2%	468	0.4%
Parent's Paramour	1,066	0.3%	1,025	0.4%	32	0.0%
24 Hour Care Provider	739	0.2%	475	0.2%	20	0.0%
Religious Entity	649	0.2%	494	0.2%	144	0.1%
Blank/Unknown	277	0.1%	186	0.1%	76	0.1%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>366,803</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>241,428</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>107,201</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source of Report	APS Facility		CCL		RCCL	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Medical Personnel	1,244	10.7%	372	11.9%	411	11.9%
Relative	202	1.7%	89	2.8%	76	2.2%
School	80	0.7%	90	2.9%	308	8.9%
Law Enforcement	139	1.2%	348	11.1%	149	4.3%
Other	755	6.5%	268	8.6%	258	7.5%
Parent	303	2.6%	734	23.5%	150	4.3%
Community Agency	1,000	8.6%	60	1.9%	480	13.9%
Friend-Neighbor	90	0.8%	72	2.3%	41	1.2%
Victim	2,717	23.4%	0	0.0%	29	0.8%
Anonymous	593	5.1%	148	4.7%	76	2.2%
DFPS Staff	442	3.8%	304	9.7%	867	25.1%
Provider	301	2.6%	6	0.2%	80	2.3%
Legal/Court	80	0.7%	9	0.3%	102	2.9%
Institutional Personnel	3,273	28.2%	0	0.0%	152	4.4%
Day Care Provider	28	0.2%	587	18.8%	45	1.3%
State Agency	187	1.6%	5	0.2%	10	0.3%
Financial Institution	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unrelated Home Member	128	1.1%	0	0.0%	6	0.2%
Parent's Paramour	1	0.0%	5	0.2%	3	0.1%
24 Hour Care Provider	13	0.1%	25	0.8%	206	6.0%
Religious Entity	4	0.0%	4	0.1%	3	0.1%
Blank/Unknown	7	0.1%	2	0.1%	6	0.2%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>11,587</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,129</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,458</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: Not all reports are assigned for investigation.

**Total Phone Calls - English Queue**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total Calls</b>	<b>Calls Handled</b>	<b>Calls Abandoned*</b>	<b>Average Time to Abandon</b>	<b>% Abandoned</b>
<b>2008</b>	423,851	246,200	177,651	8.0	41.9%
<b>2009</b>	431,419	264,491	166,928	7.5	38.7%
<b>2010</b>	442,383	297,381	145,002	6.7	32.8%
<b>2011</b>	435,622	317,938	117,684	5.9	27.0%
<b>2012</b>	442,221	310,614	131,607	6.5	29.8%

**Total Phone Calls - All Calls**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total Calls</b>	<b>Calls Handled</b>	<b>Calls Abandoned*</b>	<b>Average Time to Abandon</b>	<b>% Abandoned</b>
<b>2008</b>	621,623	405,159	216,464	7.4	34.8%
<b>2009</b>	638,747	429,551	209,196	6.9	32.8%
<b>2010</b>	647,537	468,272	179,265	6.2	27.7%
<b>2011</b>	642,320	492,885	149,435	5.4	23.3%
<b>2012</b>	651,244	484,312	166,932	6.0	25.6%

*\*An abandoned call is a call that disconnects after completing navigation of the recorded message, but prior to being answered by an intake specialist.*



# APS

## Adult Protective Services In-Home Overview

The mission of Adult Protective Services is to protect the elderly and adults with disabilities from abuse, neglect, and exploitation by investigating and providing or arranging for services necessary to alleviate or prevent further maltreatment.

APS serves persons who are reported to be abused, neglected, or exploited, and age 65 or older or age 18-64 with a disability.

### Total Average Filled Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff

Caseworkers	540.8
Supervisors	85.2
Other Staff	129.0
APS Program Support	77.1
Total APS In-Home Staff	832.1

### Worker Demographics


Turnover Rate	18.4%
Agency Tenure:	
Less Than 1 Year	15.3%
1 - 3 Years	24.0%
Greater than 3 Years	60.7%
Entry Salary	\$29,932.92
Average Age	41.2
Race/Ethnicity:	
African-American	33.0%
Anglo	37.3%
Hispanic	27.9%
Other	1.8%

### Supervisor Demographics

Turnover Rate	9.1%
Agency Tenure:	
Less Than 1 Year	2.4%
1 - 3 Years	1.2%
Greater than 3 Years	96.4%
Entry Salary	\$38,145.96
Average Age	46.9
Race/Ethnicity:	
African-American	31.0%
Anglo	42.9%
Hispanic	25.0%
Other	1.2%

### APS Expenditures

APS In-Home Staff	\$47,325,723
Purchased Client Services	\$8,852,279
Total APS Expenditures	\$56,178,002



*Note: The chart is for reference only and does not necessarily represent the flow of a case.*

### Statistics FY 2012

Completed In-Home Investigations	87,487
Validated In-Home Investigations	59,595

### Most Common...

- **Person reporting abuse/neglect/exploitation**  
Medical Personnel (20.8%)
- **Allegation validated**  
Physical Neglect (66.5%)
- **Validated perpetrator**  
Relationship: Adult Children (40.8%)  
Gender: Male (51.1%)  
Age: Age Over 45 (50.7%)
- **Characteristic of client**  
Gender: Female (60.5%)  
Age: Over 65 (50.2%)

## Legal Responsibility for Adult Protective Services

### Statutory References:

**Federal: Title XX, Social Security Act**  
**State: Human Resources Code, Chapters 40 and 48**  
**Texas Family Code, Title V**  
**Health and Safety Code, Chapter 532 and Chapters 591-595**

### Major Provisions:

- Mandatory reporting of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of adults who are elderly (defined as age 65 and older) or adults with disabilities
- Receipt and investigation of all reports (unless patently false); initiation of investigations within 24 hours of receipt of report
- Responsibility for referring reports to other state agencies when DFPS is not the appropriate investigating agency
- Provision or arrangement of services needed to prevent or alleviate abuse, neglect, and/or exploitation
- Enhancing and developing community resources in an effort to increase awareness of abuse, neglect, and exploitation and to address increasing needs of APS clients
- Responsibility for referring adult victims of abuse, neglect and/or exploitation to the Department of Aging and Disability Services (DADS) for guardianship services when these persons appear to lack the capacity to consent to services, there is no other potential guardian available, and guardianship is the least restrictive alternative that will ensure the person's safety and well-being
- Assessment of factors that may indicate an adult's possible lack of capacity to consent to services and pursuit of a medical or mental health evaluation, if indicated
- Using the least restrictive alternative in the provision of protective services
- Authority to seek court orders when necessary to gain access to the individual, to prevent interference with the provision of voluntary protective services, to access records or documents, and to initiate and provide emergency protective services (e.g., a removal), including after-hours and on holidays without a court order
- Requirement to notify law enforcement if APS removes a person from their home under a court order and their home will be left unattended.
- Requirement to notify law enforcement if APS suspects that a person who has been abused, neglected, or exploited in a manner that constitutes a criminal offense
- Confidentiality of case records
- Requirement to make referrals to the Employee Misconduct Registry for certain validated perpetrators

### Other Programmatic Information: Factors Contributing to Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation:

- Rapidly growing population of older adults
- Growing number of younger adults with disabilities
- Alcohol and drug dependency
- Poverty
- Lack of affordable housing and high costs of utility bills
- Inadequate access to health care and costly medications
- Toxic family relationships
- Dependence of family or others on the income of older adults and adults with disabilities
- Violence as a coping mechanism in society
- Physical and mental stress of caregiving in traditionally non-violent, caring households
- Denial of benefits, such as SSI and Medicaid, to some immigrants

### Challenges:

- Affordable and safe housing
- Waiting lists and other limitations in the availability of in-home care and home health care
- Shortage of resources to serve persons denied long-term care and other benefits
- Gaps in surrogate decision-making processes for incapacitated persons in hospitals, nursing homes, and community-based settings
- Inadequate community services for persons with a mental illness, including those discharged from state hospitals
- Lack of statewide access to preventative or early intervention services such as long-term case management for older adults and adults with disabilities who are at risk, but not yet experiencing abuse, neglect, or exploitation
- Hiring and maintaining skilled frontline caseworkers and supervisors
- Specialized geriatric social work training is not keeping pace with the ever-increasing number of older Americans



# Fiscal Year 2004 and 2012 Pre- and Post-Reform Statistics by Region (APS In-Home)

2004	Region 1 - Lubbock	2012
21.4	Caseworkers	33.9
7.3%	Turnover	14.0%
\$34,600	Average Base Salary	\$37,420
3,579	Completed Investigations	5,344

2004	Region 2 - Abilene	2012
24.8	Caseworkers	32.1
13.1%	Turnover	27.3%
\$33,022	Average Base Salary	\$37,704
4,590	Completed Investigations	5,446

2004	Region 3 - Arlington	2012
45.8	Caseworkers	91.0
16.2%	Turnover	21.7%
\$33,708	Average Base Salary	\$35,204
9,208	Completed Investigations	16,358

2004	Region 9 - Midland	2012
20.4	Caseworkers	21.5
9.8%	Turnover	22.0%
\$34,153	Average Base Salary	\$38,909
3,140	Completed Investigations	3,308

2004	Region 7 - Austin	2012
34.1	Caseworkers	51.0
15.5%	Turnover	20.3%
\$34,500	Average Base Salary	\$36,300
5,981	Completed Investigations	8,963


2004	Region 4 - Tyler	2012
27.0	Caseworkers	39.3
7.7%	Turnover	12.4%
\$33,472	Average Base Salary	\$36,628
4,497	Completed Investigations	5,841

2004	Region 10 - El Paso	2012
12.1	Caseworkers	20.6
48.3%	Turnover	4.8%
\$31,694	Average Base Salary	\$36,108
2,600	Completed Investigations	3,054

2004	Region 5 - Beaumont	2012
25.5	Caseworkers	31.9
13.0%	Turnover	18.2%
\$33,927	Average Base Salary	\$34,695
4,387	Completed Investigations	5,079

2004	Region 8 - San Antonio	2012
32.8	Caseworkers	68.0
20.8%	Turnover	23.4%
\$32,904	Average Base Salary	\$35,041
6,673	Completed Investigations	10,515

2004	Region 6 - Houston	2012
46.2	Caseworkers	102.6
10.7%	Turnover	14.2%
\$34,937	Average Base Salary	\$37,195
10,332	Completed Investigations	15,850




2004	Region 11 - Edinburg	2012
28.1	Caseworkers	49.0
13.6%	Turnover	17.9%
\$34,759	Average Base Salary	\$38,548
5,990	Completed Investigations	7,698

2004	Statewide Totals	2012
318.3	Caseworkers	540.8
14.4%	Turnover	18.4%
\$33,971	Average Base Salary	\$36,509
60,998	Completed Investigations	87,487

- *The State Total for Completed Investigations includes those where the Region was Unknown and/or Out of State.*

### Texas Adult Population Ages 65 and Over Fiscal Year 2012


State Total: 2,818,076



Population Data Source: Texas State Data Center, University of Texas (San Antonio). Based on Census 2010 data.


**Texas Disabled Adult Population  
Ages 18 to 64 Years  
Fiscal Year 2012**

State Total: 1,683,350




Population Data Source: Texas State Data Center, University of Texas (San Antonio). Based on Census 2010 data.

**Incidence of Maltreatment per 1,000 Adult Population by Region  
Fiscal Year 2012**




*Note: Calculations are based on the percent of validated APS in-home investigations. Unreported incidences are not reflected.*

**APS In-home Intake Reports by Region  
Fiscal Year 2012  
State Total 107,203**



*Note: 76 Reports did not have a region identified.*


**APS Intake Reports\* by Priority  
Fiscal Year 2012**



Priority	Intakes	%
P1	13,339	12.4%
P2	63,195	58.9%
P3	25,896	24.2%
P4	4,773	4.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>107,203</b>	<b>100%</b>


\* Intakes included by the date intake closed.  
Refer to the definitions section for priority definitions.

**APS In-Home Intake\* Reports by Source  
Fiscal Year 2012**



Note: A report of abuse/neglect/exploitation may come from multiple sources.  
\* Intakes included by the date intake closed.


**APS In-home Intakes, Completed Investigations and Validated Cases  
Fiscal Years 2010 - 2012**



\* Intakes included by date intake closed


### Adult Protective Services Validated In-Home Investigations Fiscal Year 2012

State Total: 59,595



Note: 19 validated investigations did not have a county designated.


**Completed APS In-Home Investigations by Region  
Fiscal Year 2012  
State Total 87,487**



\* "Other" category refers to those investigations that workers could not complete for some reason, e.g. clients died or cases were misclassified.

Note: 31 investigations had an "unknown" region. Of those, 19 were Validated, 6 were Invalid, 5 were Unable to Determine and 1 was Other.

**APS Daily Caseload  
Fiscal Year 2012**




### Completed APS In-Home Investigations by Region and Disposition Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Average Length (Days)	Invalid	Valid Progressed*	Valid Not Progressed	Unable to Determine	Other**	Region Subtotal	Thousands				
								0	5	10	15	20
1 Lubbock	25.9	783	3,900	312	239	110	5,344					
2 Abilene	24.3	894	3,450	862	176	64	5,446					
3 Arlington	40.3	3,087	8,028	3,348	1,456	439	16,358					
4 Tyler	37.7	1,127	3,547	639	353	175	5,841					
5 Beaumont	40.0	928	3,166	510	214	261	5,079					
6 Houston	42.1	3,739	8,088	2,247	1,238	538	15,850					
7 Austin	39.7	2,484	4,244	1,223	646	366	8,963					
8 San Antonio	52.4	3,214	4,895	1,372	658	376	10,515					
9 Midland	29.7	601	2,093	429	143	42	3,308					
10 El Paso	43.5	655	1,267	783	244	105	3,054					
11 Edinburg	45.7	1,783	4,610	563	461	281	7,698					
Unknown	49.7	6	8	11	5	1	31					
<b>State</b>	<b>40.1</b>	<b>19,301</b>	<b>47,296</b>	<b>12,299</b>	<b>5,833</b>	<b>2,758</b>	<b>87,487</b>					


\* Valid investigations in which the client requires services are "progressed" into the service delivery stage.

\*\* "Other" category refers to those investigations that workers could not complete for some reason, e.g. clients died or cases were misclassified.

### Recidivism\* of APS In-Home Cases Fiscal Years 2008-2012



### Recidivism\* of APS In-Home Cases by Region Fiscal Year 2012



\*Recidivism is a measure of the percentage of APS clients referred to the APS system more than once during the fiscal year, including clients who refused services and were re-returned.




**Characteristics of Validated APS Victims in Completed In-Home Investigations  
Fiscal Year 2012**


Characteristic	Female		Male		Unknown		Subtotal	
	N	% of Total	N	% of Total	N	% of Total	N	% of Total
<b>Race/Ethnicity *</b>								
Anglo	18,374	30.8%	12,005	20.1%	22	0.0%	30,401	51.0%
African American	8,749	14.7%	4,917	8.2%	12	0.0%	13,678	22.9%
Hispanic	7,755	13.0%	5,745	9.6%	18	0.0%	13,518	22.7%
Native American	92	0.2%	55	0.1%	0	0.0%	147	0.2%
Asian	206	0.3%	125	0.2%	0	0.0%	331	0.6%
Other	892	1.5%	631	1.1%	3	0.0%	1,526	2.6%
<b>Total Victims</b>	<b>36,068</b>	<b>60.5%</b>	<b>23,478</b>	<b>39.4%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>59,601</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

**In-Home Validated Victims in Completed Investigations  
Fiscal Year 2012**



Characteristic	Total	Percentage
Disabled	29,683	49.8%
Aged	29,918	50.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>59,601</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



Characteristic	Total	Percentage
Female	36,068	60.5%
Male	23,478	39.4%
Unknown	55	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>59,601</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Perpetrator Characteristics In Validated APS In-Home Investigations  
(Characteristic as % of Total Validated Perpetrators\*)  
Fiscal Year 2012**


Characteristic	Female		Male		Unknown		Subtotal	
	N	% of Total	N	% of Total	N	% of Total	N	% of Total
<b>Age</b>								
Under 18	129	2.8%	180	3.9%	1	0.0%	310	6.8%
18-25	177	3.9%	218	4.8%	4	0.1%	399	8.7%
26-35	310	6.8%	334	7.3%	3	0.1%	647	14.2%
36-45	445	9.7%	447	9.8%	0	0.0%	892	19.5%
Over 45	1,156	25.3%	1,157	25.3%	4	0.1%	2,317	50.7%
Unknown	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	5	0.1%	7	0.2%
<b>Race/Ethnicity **</b>								
Anglo	979	21.4%	1,176	25.7%	4	0.1%	2,159	47.2%
African American	471	10.3%	329	7.2%	2	0.0%	802	17.5%
Hispanic	612	13.4%	683	14.9%	2	0.0%	1,297	28.4%
Native American	2	0.0%	9	0.2%	0	0.0%	11	0.2%
Asian	9	0.2%	5	0.1%	1	0.0%	15	0.3%
Other	145	3.2%	135	3.0%	8	0.2%	288	6.3%
<b>Marital Status</b>								
Child, Not Applicable	123	2.7%	179	3.9%	0	0.0%	302	6.6%
Divorced	193	4.2%	168	3.7%	0	0.0%	361	7.9%
Married	524	11.5%	549	12.0%	0	0.0%	1,073	23.5%
Separated	62	1.4%	53	1.2%	0	0.0%	115	2.5%
Single, Never Married	297	6.5%	409	8.9%	0	0.0%	706	15.4%
Widowed	64	1.4%	23	0.5%	0	0.0%	87	1.9%
Unknown	955	20.9%	956	20.9%	17	0.4%	1,928	42.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,218</b>	<b>48.5%</b>	<b>2,337</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>4,572</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\*Does not include self as perpetrator investigations (i.e. a finding of self-neglect).


\*\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

Note: Each victim may have more than one perpetrator at the end of an investigation.

**Perpetrators\* in Validated In-Home Investigations  
Fiscal Year 2012**




**Number of Referrals Made to Law Enforcement in Completed APS In-Home Cases by Region  
Fiscal Year 2012**



\*Does not include self as perpetrator investigations (i.e. a finding of self-neglect).  
Note: Each victim may have more than one perpetrator at the end of an investigation.

Note: Referral may have been made in previous fiscal year

**APS Victims of Family Violence in Validated Investigations by Region  
Fiscal Year 2012**



### Validated Allegations in APS In-Home Investigations by Type of Abuse/Neglect Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Emotional/ Verbal Abuse	Exploitation	Medical Neglect	Mental Health Neglect	Physical Abuse	Physical Neglect
1 Lubbock	117	48	1,092	458	78	3,914
2 Abilene	76	39	1,100	407	58	3,943
3 Arlington	409	168	2,801	1,636	303	9,987
4 Tyler	102	48	736	338	67	3,822
5 Beaumont	51	56	717	219	44	3,343
6 Houston	199	142	2,610	1,521	203	9,154
7 Austin	183	96	1,425	869	176	4,541
8 San Antonio	284	130	1,195	688	199	5,405
9 Midland	50	36	796	455	36	2,306
10 El Paso	98	40	622	346	62	1,743
11 Edinburg	149	45	1,075	822	139	4,517
Unknown	1	0	7	4	1	15
<b>State Total</b>	<b>1,719</b>	<b>848</b>	<b>14,176</b>	<b>7,763</b>	<b>1,366</b>	<b>52,690</b>

Region	Suicidal Threat	Sexual Abuse	Total	% by Region	Unduplicated Validated Victims*	% Unduplicated by Region
1 Lubbock	23	3	5,733	7.2%	4,213	7.1%
2 Abilene	37	1	5,661	7.1%	4,312	7.2%
3 Arlington	119	6	15,429	19.5%	11,378	19.1%
4 Tyler	36	2	5,151	6.5%	4,186	7.0%
5 Beaumont	22	2	4,454	5.6%	3,676	6.2%
6 Houston	80	8	13,917	17.6%	10,335	17.3%
7 Austin	50	7	7,347	9.3%	5,468	9.2%
8 San Antonio	81	2	7,984	10.1%	6,267	10.5%
9 Midland	23	2	3,704	4.7%	2,522	4.2%
10 El Paso	26	4	2,941	3.7%	2,051	3.4%
11 Edinburg	78	9	6,834	8.6%	5,174	8.7%
Unknown	0	0	28	0.0%	19	0.0%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>79,183</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>59,601</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Victims have been unduplicated by investigation stage.

### Duration of Service Delivery Stages for APS In-Home Cases During Fiscal Year 2012

Days	Cases	%
Under 30	25,286	54.9%
31-60	11,781	25.6%
61-90	4,776	10.4%
91-120	2,077	4.5%
121-180	1,389	3.0%
181-365	698	1.5%
Over 1 Year	76	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>46,083</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### Non-Purchased Client Services Delivered for APS In-Home Cases by Region Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Social Casework	Other Government Agency	Legal	Total
1 Lubbock	4,445	136	13	4,594
2 Abilene	3,515	108	19	3,642
3 Arlington	8,653	135	33	8,821
4 Tyler	4,433	161	0	4,594
5 Beaumont	3,418	186	1	3,605
6 Houston	9,883	192	5	10,080
7 Austin	4,380	252	20	4,652
8 San Antonio	6,324	219	6	6,549
9 Midland	2,039	33	8	2,080
10 El Paso	1,807	70	17	1,894
11 Edinburg	5,295	194	16	5,505
Unknown	11	2	0	13
State Total	54,203	1,688	138	56,029

**Note:** Clients in validated cases may receive more than one service.

**Social Casework** - Actions taken by the caseworker to provide assistance to a victim of abuse, neglect or exploitation, in such areas as counseling/ education, assistance with benefits, and mediation. These actions may include referrals to community organizations that provide direct services to the client.

**Other Government Agency** - This term is used to describe services that were provided by another government agency. For example, the client was referred to the Social Security Administration, or the Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services in order to resolve abuse, neglect or exploitation.

**Legal** - Legal actions that are taken as a result of Adult Protective Services involvement. An example would be Emergency Order for Protective Services.



# APS

## Adult Protective Services Facility Investigations Overview

The Adult Protective Services Facility Investigations Program investigates reports of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of persons with disabilities (children and adults) receiving services in state operated and/or contracted settings that serve adults and children with mental illness, intellectual disabilities, or developmental disabilities. Investigation results are sent to the facility or program administrator for appropriate action.

### Total Average Filled Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff

Caseworkers	121.5
Supervisors	22.7
Other Staff	24.2
<b>Total APS Facility Staff</b>	<b>168.4</b>

### Worker Demographics

Turnover Rate	24.1%
Agency Tenure:	
Less Than 1 Year	7.8%
1 - 3 Years	28.7%
Greater than 3 Years	63.5%
Entry Salary	\$29,932.92
Average Age	41.2
Race/Ethnicity:	
African-American	16.5%
Anglo	57.4%
Hispanic	26.1%
Other	0.0%

### Supervisor Demographics

Turnover Rate	4.4%
Agency Tenure:	
Less Than 1 Year	4.5%
1 - 3 Years	0.0%
Greater than 3 Years	95.5%
Entry Salary	\$38,145.96
Average Age	45.7
Race/Ethnicity:	
African-American	9.1%
Anglo	77.3%
Hispanic	13.6%
Other	0.0%

### APS Facility Expenditures

APS Facility Staff	\$9,569,597
--------------------	-------------



*Note: This chart is for reference only and does not necessarily represent the flow of a case.*

### Statistics FY 2012

Completed MH&ID Investigations	10,803
Confirmed MH&ID Investigations	1,259

### Most Common...

- **Person reporting abuse/neglect/exploitation**  
Institutional Personnel (28.6%)
- **Allegation confirmed**  
Neglect (59.4%)
- **MH&ID setting investigated**  
State Supported Living Centers (34.5%)

## Legal Responsibility for Adult Protective Services

### Statutory References:

**Federal: Title XX, Social Security Act**  
**State: Human Resources Code, Chapters 40 and 48**  
**Texas Family Code, Title V**  
**Health and Safety Code, Chapter 532 and Chapters 591-595**

### Major Provisions:

- Mandatory reporting of abuse, neglect, and exploitation of persons receiving services in state-operated mental health and intellectual and developmental disability facilities (State Hospitals, State Supported Living Centers, and Rio Grande State Center) and/or state contracted settings (Community Centers, Home and Community-based Services programs, Texas Home Living Waiver Program, and privately-operated Intermediate Care Facilities for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF-IID)).
- After an allegation is reported to the DFPS Abuse Hotline, APS initiates investigations by notifying the facility or provider agency within one hour. APS also notifies law enforcement and the Health and Human Services Commission Office of Inspector General (OIG) within one hour, if necessary. .
- Refer reports to other state agencies when DFPS is not the appropriate investigating agency
- Notify OIG(Office of Inspector General) and local law enforcement if APS has cause to believe a crime may have been committed
- Report findings to the facility or provider
- Make referrals to the Employee Misconduct Registry of certain confirmed perpetrators
- Confidentiality of case records

### Other Programmatic Information:

#### Factors Contributing to Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation:


- Physical Conditions/Quality of Care
- Lack of facility/ provider training, policy or procedures
- Staff burnout
- Staff shortages that lead to staff stress
- Inadequate case manager planning for behavioral concerns or plans of care
- Physical and mental stress of familial care giving in foster care settings

### Challenges:

- Meeting Department of Justice requirements including commencement of investigations, prior case history searches, and 10 day investigation timeframes in State Supported Living Centers and Rio Grande State Center
- Requests by Law Enforcement or OIG that APS stop its investigation until they have finished
- Staff shortages in facilities affecting access to staff for interviews
- Lack of training and policy in place for community providers
- Inability to find private space to conduct interviews
- Increase in number of intakes with fewer investigators to conduct investigations



**Completed Facility Investigations by Source of Report Fiscal Year 2012**



*Note: A report of abuse/neglect/exploitation may come from multiple sources.*

**Average Length of Completed Facility Investigations by Region Fiscal Year 2012**

Region	Investigations	Average Days
1 Lubbock	416	13.6
2 Abilene	1,452	7.0
3 Arlington	1,098	11.3
4 Tyler	689	8.5
5 Beaumont	318	11.2
6 Houston	734	14.6
7 Austin	2,483	11.4
8 San Antonio	1,225	14.2
9 Midland	1,216	9.2
10 El Paso	275	9.4
11 Edinburg	897	8.9
State	10,803	10.7


**Number of Facility Investigations Referred to Law Enforcement by Setting for Fiscal Year 2012**

Setting	Law Enforcement Provided	
	Notification of Investigation*	Investigation Report**
State Supported Living Centers	2,258	1,698
State Hospitals	1,456	636
HCS Homes	1,182	426
Private ICF-IID	457	188
Community Centers	216	72
State Centers	112	70
Other	12	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,693</b>	<b>3,091</b>

\* Notification sent on investigations which involve a child or serious physical injury, sexual abuse, or death of an adult person served.

\*\* This data includes all cases in which a final investigation report was sent regardless of investigation disposition.

**Types of Confirmed Allegations in Facility Investigations Fiscal Year 2012**



## Characteristics of Victims in Confirmed Facility Investigations Fiscal Year 2012

Characteristic	Female		Male		Unknown		Subtotal	
	N	% of Total	N	% of Total	N	% of Total	N	% of Total
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>								
Anglo	344	19.8%	636	36.6%	3	0.2%	983	56.6%
African American	78	4.5%	201	11.6%	0	0.0%	279	16.1%
Hispanic	137	7.9%	269	15.5%	1	0.1%	407	23.4%
Native American	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	2	0.1%
Asian	6	0.3%	5	0.3%	0	0.0%	11	0.6%
Other	27	1.6%	27	1.6%	2	0.1%	56	3.2%
<b>Total Victims</b>	<b>593</b>	<b>34.1%</b>	<b>1,139</b>	<b>65.5%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>1,738</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

Note: A completed investigation may have more than one victim.


## Characteristics of Perpetrators in Confirmed Facility Investigations Fiscal Year 2012

Characteristic	Female		Male		Unknown		Subtotal	
	N	% of Total	N	% of Total	N	% of Total	N	% of Total
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>								
Anglo	171	12.2%	100	7.1%	4	0.3%	275	19.5%
African American	364	25.9%	204	14.5%	7	0.5%	575	40.9%
Hispanic	176	12.5%	152	10.8%	3	0.2%	331	23.5%
Native American	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Asian	4	0.3%	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	6	0.4%
Other	46	3.3%	32	2.3%	142	10.1%	220	15.6%
<b>Age</b>								
Under 18	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
18-25	189	13.4%	178	12.7%	11	0.8%	378	26.9%
26-35	206	14.6%	137	9.7%	27	1.9%	370	26.3%
36-45	135	9.6%	77	5.5%	31	2.2%	243	17.3%
Over45	230	16.3%	96	6.8%	20	1.4%	346	24.6%
Unknown	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	66	4.7%	69	4.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>761</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>34.8%</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>1,407</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

Note: Each victim may have more than one perpetrator.  
Each perpetrator may have more than one victim.

**Completed Facility Investigations by Fiscal Year**



**Completed Facility Investigations by Setting Fiscal Year 2012**

Setting	Completed Investigations
State Supported Living Centers	3,724
State Hospitals	2,693
HCS	2,623
Private ICF-IID	1,048
Community Centers	536
State Centers	179
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,803</b>

**Disposition of Completed Facility Investigations by Setting Fiscal Year 2012**

Setting	Confirmed		Unconfirmed		Inconclusive		Unfounded		Other		Blank		Subtotal	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community Center	98	0.9%	203	1.9%	79	0.7%	3	0.0%	78	0.7%	75	0.7%	536	5.0%
HCS	452	4.2%	1,199	11.1%	367	3.4%	19	0.2%	372	3.4%	214	2.0%	2,623	24.3%
Private ICFs/IID	169	1.6%	375	3.5%	130	1.2%	4	0.0%	209	1.9%	161	1.5%	1,048	9.7%
State Center	22	0.2%	134	1.2%	10	0.1%	0	0.0%	4	0.0%	9	0.1%	179	1.7%
State Hospital	126	1.2%	1,293	12.0%	138	1.3%	120	1.1%	563	5.2%	453	4.2%	2,693	24.9%
SSLC	392	3.6%	1,829	16.9%	179	1.7%	529	4.9%	467	4.3%	328	3.0%	3,724	34.5%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>1,259</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>5,033</b>	<b>46.6%</b>	<b>903</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>1,693</b>	<b>15.7%</b>	<b>1,240</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>10,803</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Region	Confirmed		Unconfirmed		Inconclusive		Unfounded		Other		Blank		Subtotal	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 Lubbock	113	1.0%	166	1.5%	56	0.5%	8	0.1%	68	0.6%	5	0.0%	416	3.9%
2 Abilene	146	1.4%	712	6.6%	81	0.7%	84	0.8%	237	2.2%	192	1.8%	1,452	13.4%
3 Arlington	178	1.6%	508	4.7%	116	1.1%	26	0.2%	88	0.8%	182	1.7%	1,098	10.2%
4 Tyler	33	0.3%	275	2.5%	41	0.4%	4	0.0%	5	0.0%	331	3.1%	689	6.4%
5 Beaumont	70	0.6%	148	1.4%	37	0.3%	1	0.0%	31	0.3%	31	0.3%	318	2.9%
6 Houston	124	1.1%	303	2.8%	125	1.2%	2	0.0%	36	0.3%	144	1.3%	734	6.8%
7 Austin	206	1.9%	1,048	9.7%	168	1.6%	399	3.7%	428	4.0%	234	2.2%	2,483	23.0%
8 San Antonio	117	1.1%	637	5.9%	109	1.0%	23	0.2%	312	2.9%	27	0.2%	1,225	11.3%
9 Midland	118	1.1%	562	5.2%	79	0.7%	33	0.3%	401	3.7%	23	0.2%	1,216	11.3%
10 El Paso	52	0.5%	131	1.2%	17	0.2%	3	0.0%	69	0.6%	3	0.0%	275	2.5%
11 Edinburg	102	0.9%	543	5.0%	74	0.7%	92	0.9%	18	0.2%	68	0.6%	897	8.3%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>1,259</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>5,033</b>	<b>46.6%</b>	<b>903</b>	<b>8.4%</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>1,693</b>	<b>15.7%</b>	<b>1,240</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>10,803</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: "Other" and "Blank" include cases referred back to the provider or closed at intake because they do not meet the definitions of abuse, neglect, or exploitation and therefore are not investigated.



# CPS

## Child Protective Services Overview

### Total Average Filled Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff

Caseworkers:	
Investigation	1,737.2
Family-Based Safety Services	812.7
Conservatorship	1,539.7
FAD	193.5
Kinship	101.3
Other Workers	167.3
Supervisors	741.7
Program Directors/Administrators	160.8
Admin/Clerical	974.1
Case Aides	483.0
Other Staff	818.3
CPS Program Support	334.9
<b>Total CPS Staff</b>	<b>8,064.5</b>

### Worker Demographics


Turnover Rate	26.1%
Agency Tenure:	
Less Than 1 Year	29.4%
1 - 3 Years	25.4%
Greater than 3 Years	45.1%
Entry Salary (INV)	\$36,728.96
Entry Salary (Non INV)	\$31,728.96
Average Age	36.2
Race/Ethnicity:	
African-American	31.1%
Anglo	39.7%
Hispanic	27.8%
Other	1.4%

### Supervisor Demographics

Turnover Rate	9.7%
Agency Tenure:	
Less Than 1 Year	0.9%
1 - 3 Years	2.5%
Greater than 3 Years	96.5%
Entry Salary	\$38,145.96
Average Age	41.9
Race/Ethnicity:	
African-American	26.6%
Anglo	48.1%
Hispanic	22.9%
Other	2.4%

### CPS Expenditures

CPS Staff	\$451,810,639
Purchased Client Services	\$85,858,415
Foster Care Payments	\$381,819,486
Adoption Subsidy Payments	\$191,923,319
Permanency Care Assistance	\$2,030,974
Relative/Other Designated Caregiver Reimbursement Program	\$7,859,926
Other Client Services	\$3,937,447
<b>Total CPS Expenditures</b>	<b>\$1,125,240,206</b>



*Note: This chart is for reference only and does not necessarily represent the flow of a case.*

### Statistics FY 2012

Texas State Child Population	7,054,634
Children, Alleged Victims	275,961
Children in Confirmed Investigations	97,688
Children Removed	16,972

**The Child Protective Services Vision is “Children First: Protected and Connected”.**

**The Mission of Child Protective Services** is to protect children and to act in the children’s best interest. To seek active involvement of the children’s parents and other family members to solve problems that lead to abuse and neglect.

#### **The Values are**

- Respect for culture
- Inclusiveness of families, youth and community
- Integrity in decision making
- Compassion for all
- Commitment to reducing disproportionality

#### **Most Common...**

- Person reporting abuse/neglect
  - School (17.6%)
- Allegation confirmed
  - Neglectful Supervision (66.0%)
- Confirmed perpetrator of abuse/neglect
  - Relationship: Parent (77.9%)
  - Gender: Female (56.6%)
  - Age: Age 26-35 (39.9%)
- Characteristic of confirmed victim
  - Age: Age 1 to 3 (24.4%)
  - Gender: Female (51.4%)

#### **Legal Responsibility for Child Protective Services**

##### **Statutory References**

Social Security Act  
Texas Family Code  
Human Resources Code  
Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act  
Indian Child Welfare Act  
Adam Walsh Act

##### **Major Provisions**

- Definitions of abuse and neglect of children
- Mandatory reporting of suspected abuse or neglect of children
- Prepare and disseminate statistics by county relating to CPS in an annual report made available to the legislature and general public
- Responsibility for receiving reports of suspected abuse or neglect of children
- Responsibility for thorough investigation of a report of child abuse or neglect allegedly committed

by a person responsible for a child’s care, custody or welfare

- Responsibility to assign priorities and prescribe investigative procedures for investigations based on the severity and immediacy of the alleged harm to the child
- Take action to protect abused and neglected children from further harm
- Establish review teams to evaluate department casework and decision-making related to investigations of child abuse or neglect
- Employ Child Safety Specialists to conduct staff reviews and evaluations of cases determined to involve high risk, monitor cases with multiple referrals, and approve decisions and assessments related to investigations that involve a high risk to the health or safety of a child

- Work with children and their families, providing services to prevent further abuse, help alleviate the effects of the abuse suffered, prevent removal of the child from the home, and provide reunification services when appropriate for the return of the child to the home
- When necessary, secure appropriate court orders and take possession of a child if there is an immediate danger to the physical health or safety of the child or the child has been a victim of neglect or sexual abuse and that continuation in the home would be contrary to the child's welfare
- Make reasonable efforts to secure the return of the child
- Develop a service plan in conference with the child's parents to determine return of the child to the child's parents, termination of parental rights and placement of the child for adoption, or because of the child's special needs or exceptional circumstances continue the child's care out of the child's home
- Provide substitute care for children until the problems have been sufficiently resolved
- Provide permanent placement for children who cannot safely return to their home
- Establish a database of all verified foster homes willing to accept foster care placement of a child in care
- Recruit potential adoptive parents for children whose parents have had their parental rights terminated
- Requirements for frequency and location of contact with children in substitute care
- Requirements for conducting criminal background and central registry checks of foster and adoptive parents

The federal Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, requires DFPS to:

- Provide written notification to maternal and paternal grandparents and other adult relatives regarding a child's removal and placement in state custody and support options.
- Ensure youth aging out of state care have a Transition Plan developed within 90 days of turning 18 or the date leaving CPS extended foster care.
- Seek to have education stability for children in DFPS custody.
- Have a health oversight and coordination plan.

- Keep siblings in custody placed together. If this is not possible, the state must provide for frequent visitation or other ongoing interaction between the siblings, unless the state shows frequent visits or other interaction would be contrary to the safety or well-being of any of the siblings.
- Make eligibility changes for the Title IV-E adoption assistance program to promote adoption of children with special needs.
- Provide information about Adoption Tax Credits during training for adoptive parents.

The federal Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act allows and the Texas Legislature supported:

- Establishing a relative guardianship subsidy program. For Texas, this is a subsidy program called the Permanency Care Assistance program for relatives taking permanent managing conservatorship of a child. This program is intended to provide an additional option for children and youth who might otherwise remain in kinship foster care. It is not intended to be a long term foster care program.
- Allowing youth aging out of care to stay in extended foster care for a variety of reasons until they turn 21.
- Extending adoption assistance benefits and Permanency Care Assistance benefits until the youth turns 21 if the adoption assistance agreement or Permanency Care Assistance agreement was signed after the youth turns 16.
- Authorizing federally recognized tribes to apply for IV-E funding directly.

### Concepts Guiding Risk Determination

Child Vulnerability	Home & Social	Caregiver Capability	Quality of Care
Child fragility	Stressors	Knowledge	Quality of connection
Child behavior	Dangerous exposure	Skills	Emotional care
	Social Climate	Capacity	Physical care
	Social Violence		

Maltreatment Pattern	Response to CPS	Protective Capacities
Chronicity	Attitude	Protective Capacities
Current Severity	Deception	
Trends		

### Federal Outcomes Used to Assess Child Welfare Services

#### Safety Outcomes

- Safety Outcome 1: Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.
- Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

#### Permanency Outcomes

- Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.
- Permanency Outcome 2: The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.

#### Well-Being Outcomes

- Well-Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.
- Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.



# Fiscal Year 2004 and 2012 Pre- and Post-Reform Statistics by Region (CPS)

2004	Region 1 - Lubbock	2012
168.1	Caseworkers	243.0
22.0%	Turnover	27.4%
\$32,459	Average Base Salary	\$34,935
6,406	Completed Investigations	7,244
733	Removals	828
143	Adoptions Consummated	316

2004	Region 2 - Abilene	2012
86.4	Caseworkers	144.4
13.9%	Turnover	24.8%
\$33,678	Average Base Salary	\$35,459
4,325	Completed Investigations	4,370
351	Removals	499
80	Adoptions Consummated	108


2004	Region 3 - Arlington	2012
687.8	Caseworkers	987.4
26.3%	Turnover	18.1%
\$32,943	Average Base Salary	\$35,675
33,509	Completed Investigations	41,455
3,270	Removals	3,549
516	Adoptions Consummated	831

2004	Region 9 - Midland	2012
65.0	Caseworkers	129.9
15.5%	Turnover	34.3%
\$33,375	Average Base Salary	\$34,497
3,666	Completed Investigations	4,276
255	Removals	566
32	Adoptions Consummated	110

2004	Region 7 - Austin	2012
366.3	Caseworkers	481.4
20.9%	Turnover	32.6%
\$32,398	Average Base Salary	\$35,393
18,147	Completed Investigations	21,136
1,645	Removals	2,195
351	Adoptions Consummated	602

2004	Region 4 - Tyler	2012
160.8	Caseworkers	232.9
29.3%	Turnover	32.9%
\$32,436	Average Base Salary	\$35,434
8,561	Completed Investigations	8,881
728	Removals	1,065
124	Adoptions Consummated	267

2004	Region 10 - El Paso	2012
75.7	Caseworkers	121.5
13.6%	Turnover	17.6%
\$34,227	Average Base Salary	\$35,215
3,397	Completed Investigations	4,561
183	Removals	308
66	Adoptions Consummated	89



2004	Region 5 - Beaumont	2012
89.8	Caseworkers	151.2
11.2%	Turnover	22.9%
\$34,251	Average Base Salary	\$35,913
5,717	Completed Investigations	6,207
392	Removals	626
55	Adoptions Consummated	123

2004	Region 8 - San Antonio	2012
355.3	Caseworkers	630.7
20.7%	Turnover	32.2%
\$33,124	Average Base Salary	\$34,706
13,382	Completed Investigations	20,592
1,993	Removals	2,938
390	Adoptions Consummated	1,191


2004	Region 6 - Houston	2012
653.1	Caseworkers	961.1
25.8%	Turnover	23.2%
\$32,737	Average Base Salary	\$35,052
27,543	Completed Investigations	30,473
2,773	Removals	2,641
651	Adoptions Consummated	1,197

2004	Region 11 - Edinburg	2012
238.8	Caseworkers	468.2
22.1%	Turnover	30.7%
\$32,828	Average Base Salary	\$34,570
13,871	Completed Investigations	16,984
1,108	Removals	1,757
104	Adoptions Consummated	206


2004	Statewide Totals	2012
2,947.2	Caseworkers	4,551.7
23.0%	Turnover	26.1%
\$32,892	Average Base Salary	\$35,171
138,587	Completed Investigations	166,211
13,431	Removals	16,972
2,512	Adoptions Consummated	5,040

• The State Total for Completed Investigations includes those where the Region was Unknown and/or Out of State.

### CPS Daily Caseload Fiscal Year 2012




### CPS Daily Caseload Fiscal Year 2011



### Texas Child Population Ages Birth through 17 Years Fiscal Year 2012


State Total: 7,054,634



Population Data Source: Texas State Data Center, University of Texas (San Antonio). Based on Census 2010 data.

**Child Protective Services  
Completed Investigations  
Fiscal Year 2012**

State Total: 166,211



Note: 32 investigations did not have the county designated.

### CPS Total Initial Intakes and Screened Out Cases Fiscal Year 2012

#### Total Initial Intakes


	Number	Percent
PN	5,296	2.2%
P1	65,203	27.0%
P2	171,182	70.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>241,681</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

#### Total P2 Intakes

	Number	Percent
Not Eligible for Screening	100,700	58.8%
Eligible and Assigned to Screeners	70,482	41.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>171,182</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

#### Eligible and Assigned to Screeners

	Number	Percent
Not Screened Out	51,273	72.7%
Screened Out (P2 to PN)	19,209	27.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>70,482</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



Note: When a case is a P2, all alleged victims are age 6 or older, and there is not currently an open case, a formal screening occurs. The purpose of the formal screening is to determine if CPS intervention is warranted. There may be eligible P2s not assigned to screeners. A PN is assessed when a situation appears to involve abuse or neglect, and a key piece of information from a specific identified person is needed in order to determine if an assignable allegation exists

### Risk Assessment Finding of Completed Child Abuse/Neglect Investigations Fiscal Year 2012

Disposition of Investigation	No Significant Risk Identified		Risk Controlled		Risk Indicated		Risk Not Applicable Blank/Invalid		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Confirmed	83	0.9%	17,821	16.7%	20,639	77.5%	182	0.8%	38,725	23.3%
Unconfirmed	9,286	99.1%	88,750	83.3%	5,993	22.5%	23,457	99.2%	127,486	76.7%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>9,369</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>106,571</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>26,632</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>23,639</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>166,211</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### Number of Completed Investigations Where Family Violence\* Was Indicated in the Risk Assessment

Fiscal Year	Number of Complete Investigations	Family Violence Indicated	Family Violence Not Indicated
2,009	165,444	54,143	111,301
2,010	169,583	54,842	114,741
2,011	175,421	56,068	119,353
2,012	166,211	53,705	112,505

\* Family violence risk is determined by a positive response to one of two questions on the risk assessment: (1) Has any person in the home ever been a victim of family violence, and (2) Has any person in the home ever been a perpetrator of family violence

### Case Action for Risk Indicated Completed Investigations Fiscal Year 2012

Open to Services	25,440	95.5%
Not Open to Services	1,192	4.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,632</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

*Note: Only investigations with a risk finding of "Risk Indicated" can be opened for further services. Opened for services is defined as services provided after the investigation was completed.*

### Child Abuse/Neglect Allegation Dispositions

*The categories used to record the findings of initial assessment/investigation of child abuse neglect are defined as:*

#### **Confirmed Investigations**

- **Reason to believe** – Based on preponderance of evidence, staff concluded that abuse or neglect occurred.

#### **Unconfirmed Investigations**

- **Ruled out** - Staff determined, based upon on available information, that it is reasonable to conclude that abuse or neglect has not occurred.
- **Unable to complete** – Before staff could reach a conclusion, the persons involved in the report moved, could not be located or refused to cooperate.
- **Unable to determine** – Staff concluded that none of the other dispositions were appropriate.

### Investigations of Child Abuse/Neglect by Source of Report for Completed Investigations

Sources	Fiscal Year 2010		Fiscal Year 2011		Fiscal Year 2012	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
School	37,817	18.6%	37,540	17.7%	35,100	17.6%
Medical Personnel	32,786	16.2%	34,999	16.5%	33,787	16.9%
Law Enforcement	30,759	15.2%	32,234	15.2%	31,949	16.0%
Relative	24,575	12.1%	25,557	12.1%	23,386	11.7%
Parent	17,212	8.5%	17,959	8.5%	16,267	8.2%
Other	13,975	6.9%	15,165	7.2%	14,577	7.3%
Friend-Neighbor	13,756	6.8%	14,602	6.9%	12,638	6.3%
Anonymous	10,002	4.9%	11,277	5.3%	10,751	5.4%
Community Agency	7,072	3.5%	7,359	3.5%	6,647	3.3%
DFPS Staff	5,869	2.9%	5,799	2.7%	5,804	2.9%
Legal/Court	2,775	1.4%	2,691	1.3%	2,500	1.3%
Day Care Provider	1,717	0.8%	1,949	0.9%	1,804	0.9%
State Agency	878	0.4%	928	0.4%	789	0.4%
Parent's Paramour	967	0.5%	925	0.4%	960	0.5%
Provider	918	0.5%	813	0.4%	706	0.4%
Victim	626	0.3%	648	0.3%	560	0.3%
Unrelated Home Member	386	0.2%	411	0.2%	451	0.2%
Religious Entity	340	0.2%	361	0.2%	338	0.2%
24 Hour Care Provider	200	0.1%	229	0.1%	280	0.1%
Institutional Personnel	138	0.1%	171	0.1%	148	0.1%
Blank/Unknown	17	0.0%	18	0.0%	18	0.0%
Financial Institution	13	0.0%	14	0.0%	14	0.0%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>202,798</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>211,649</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>199,474</b>	<b>100.0%</b>


*Note: A report of abuse/neglect may come from multiple sources.*

### Number of Child Abuse/Neglect Completed Investigations Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Total	Confirmed	% Confirmed Investigations	Unconfirmed Investigations
1 Lubbock	7,244	2,034	28.1%	5,210
2 Abilene	4,370	1,306	29.9%	3,064
3 Arlington	41,455	9,910	23.9%	31,545
4 Tyler	8,881	1,874	21.1%	7,007
5 Beaumont	6,207	1,449	23.3%	4,758
6 Houston	30,473	5,506	18.1%	24,967
7 Austin	21,136	4,830	22.9%	16,306
8 San Antonio	20,592	5,106	24.8%	15,486
9 Midland	4,276	1,170	27.4%	3,106
10 El Paso	4,561	1,212	26.6%	3,349
11 Edinburg	16,984	4,319	25.4%	12,665
Unknown	32	9	28.1%	23
<b>State</b>	<b>166,211</b>	<b>38,725</b>	<b>23.3%</b>	<b>127,486</b>

### Family Cases Opened for Services as a Result of a Completed Investigation Fiscal Year 2012

Region	In-Home Direct Delivery	In-Home Purchased	Family Substitute Care	Total
1 Lubbock	868	0	383	1,251
2 Abilene	691	0	231	922
3 Arlington	3,769	1	1,609	5,379
4 Tyler	522	0	499	1,021
5 Beaumont	411	0	294	705
6 Houston	2,674	2	1,302	3,978
7 Austin	1,409	0	1,035	2,444
8 San Antonio	3,242	0	1,245	4,487
9 Midland	541	0	268	809
10 El Paso	580	0	117	697
11 Edinburg	3,030	1	713	3,744
Other	-	-	3	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,737</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7,699</b>	<b>25,440</b>





## Confirmed Allegations of Child Abuse/Neglect by Type of Abuse Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Physical Abuse	Sexual Abuse	Emotional Abuse	Abandonment	Medical Neglect	Physical Neglect
1 Lubbock	629	299	28	7	48	349
2 Abilene	396	175	30	8	49	222
3 Arlington	3,328	1,528	77	48	336	1,057
4 Tyler	577	325	25	4	69	251
5 Beaumont	424	186	26	8	65	215
6 Houston	1,756	998	60	25	245	557
7 Austin	1,305	645	46	13	138	347
8 San Antonio	1,320	727	55	25	236	593
9 Midland	421	159	35	5	56	219
10 El Paso	425	143	22	2	68	164
11 Edinburg	1,207	745	74	14	273	705
Unknown	1	1	0	0	0	0
<b>State Total</b>	<b>11,789</b>	<b>5,931</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>1,583</b>	<b>4,679</b>

Region	Neglectful Supervision	Refusal to Accept Parental Responsibility	Total Confirmed Allegations of Child Abuse/Neglect	Percent of Child Abuse/Neglect	*Unduplicated Confirmed Victims
1 Lubbock	2,849	49	4,258	5.7%	3,654
2 Abilene	1,696	13	2,589	3.5%	2,212
3 Arlington	11,985	114	18,473	24.9%	15,930
4 Tyler	2,213	31	3,495	4.7%	2,951
5 Beaumont	1,792	16	2,732	3.7%	2,375
6 Houston	5,826	112	9,579	12.9%	8,358
7 Austin	6,204	105	8,803	11.9%	7,831
8 San Antonio	7,043	64	10,063	13.6%	8,931
9 Midland	1,493	15	2,403	3.2%	1,983
10 El Paso	1,615	25	2,464	3.3%	2,116
11 Edinburg	6,269	96	9,383	12.6%	8,009
Unknown	14	0	16	0.0%	16
<b>State Total</b>	<b>48,999</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>74,258</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>64,366</b>


\* Victims have been unduplicated by investigation stage.

**Children in Cases Opened for Services as a Result of a Completed Investigation  
Fiscal Year 2012**

Region	In-Home Direct Delivery	In-Home Purchased	% Opened In-Home	Family Substitute Care*	Total
1 Lubbock	2,304	0	69.9%	991	3,295
2 Abilene	1,759	0	75.2%	580	2,339
3 Arlington	9,748	2	71.2%	3,938	13,688
4 Tyler	1,320	0	52.2%	1,211	2,531
5 Beaumont	1,070	0	59.7%	722	1,792
6 Houston	7,427	4	68.4%	3,431	10,862
7 Austin	3,773	0	57.1%	2,829	6,602
8 San Antonio	8,967	0	71.9%	3,509	12,476
9 Midland	1,342	0	65.7%	700	2,042
10 El Paso	1,608	0	83.4%	321	1,929
11 Edinburg	9,359	1	81.3%	2,150	11,510
Other	0	0	0.0%	7	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>48,677</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>70.5%</b>	<b>20,389</b>	<b>69,073</b>

\*Includes all children in the case regardless of victimization.


**Point Prevalence\* Rate of Child Abuse/Neglect  
per 1,000 Children in Texas Population per Region  
Fiscal Year 2012**




\* Point prevalence is the number of children who are alleged/ confirmed victims per 1,000 children in the region.

### Race/Ethnicity \* of Selected CPS Statistics Compared to Texas Child Population Fiscal Year 2012


Texas Child Population - 7,054,634



CPS Confirmed Victims - 64,366




Children in Cases Opened for Services - 69,073




*Includes all children in the case regardless of victimization.*

Number of Removals - 16,972




*Includes removals from all stages of service.*

Number of Children Awaiting Adoption - 6,471



*Note: Other includes anyone not categorized as Anglo, African-American, Hispanic or Native American*


Median Time Waiting for Adoption in Months - 10.6



\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

### Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect Fiscal Year 2012

State Total: 64,366



\* 16 confirmed victims did not have a county designated.

**Profile of Confirmed Child Abuse/Neglect Victims\***  
**Fiscal Year 2012**


Age	Gender	Anglo	African American	Hispanic	Native American	Asian	Other	Total
<b>Under 1</b>								
	Female	1,416	893	1,913	0	6	426	4,654
	Male	1,453	986	2,069	2	10	456	4,976
	Unknown	7	5	10	0	0	9	31
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2,876</b>	<b>1,884</b>	<b>3,992</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>891</b>	<b>9,661</b>
<b>1-3 Years</b>								
	Female	2,260	1,231	3,492	2	32	463	7,480
	Male	2,513	1,270	3,825	4	37	544	8,193
	Unknown	15	9	7	0	1	7	39
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4,788</b>	<b>2,510</b>	<b>7,324</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>1,014</b>	<b>15,712</b>
<b>4-6 Years</b>								
	Female	2,062	976	3,086	2	31	369	6,526
	Male	2,070	1,017	3,251	6	28	365	6,737
	Unknown	12	5	10	0	0	7	34
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4,144</b>	<b>1,998</b>	<b>6,347</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>741</b>	<b>13,297</b>
<b>7-9 Years</b>								
	Female	1,524	686	2,496	5	16	244	4,971
	Male	1,498	732	2,304	4	24	232	4,794
	Unknown	0	2	11	0	0	0	13
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3,022</b>	<b>1,420</b>	<b>4,811</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>476</b>	<b>9,778</b>
<b>10-12 Years</b>								
	Female	1,319	530	2,189	2	29	146	4,215
	Male	1,170	555	1,567	4	23	139	3,458
	Unknown	3	2	3	0	0	2	10
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2,492</b>	<b>1,087</b>	<b>3,759</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>7,683</b>
<b>13-17 Years</b>								
	Female	1,681	772	2,528	7	39	192	5,219
	Male	1,085	475	1,260	3	30	135	2,988
	Unknown	3	0	2	0	0	1	6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2,769</b>	<b>1,247</b>	<b>3,790</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>8,213</b>
<b>Age Unknown</b>								
	Female	1	1	5	0	0	0	7
	Male	3	4	6	0	0	2	15
	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Total Victims</b>								
	Female	10,263	5,089	15,709	18	153	1,840	33,072
	Male	9,792	5,039	14,282	23	152	1,873	31,161
	Unknown	40	23	43	0	1	26	133
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>20,095</b>	<b>10,151</b>	<b>30,034</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>3,739</b>	<b>64,366</b>

\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

**Alleged and Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect  
Fiscal Year 2012**

Region	Alleged Victims	Confirmed Victims	Unconfirmed Victims	Percent Confirmed
1 Lubbock	12,793	3,654	9,139	28.6%
2 Abilene	7,313	2,212	5,101	30.2%
3 Arlington	67,786	15,930	51,856	23.5%
4 Tyler	14,424	2,951	11,473	20.5%
5 Beaumont	10,302	2,375	7,927	23.1%
6 Houston	48,571	8,358	40,213	17.2%
7 Austin	34,757	7,831	26,926	22.5%
8 San Antonio	34,740	8,931	25,809	25.7%
9 Midland	7,139	1,983	5,156	27.8%
10 El Paso	7,697	2,116	5,581	27.5%
11 Edinburg	30,382	8,009	22,373	26.4%
Out of State	57	16	41	28.1%
<b>State</b>	<b>275,961</b>	<b>64,366</b>	<b>211,595</b>	<b>23.3%</b>

**CPS Confirmed Victims Where the Confirmed Perpetrator was a Parent  
Fiscal Year 2012  
Total 62,863**



### Characteristics Of Perpetrators In Confirmed Investigations of Child Abuse/Neglect Fiscal Year 2012

Characteristic	Female		Male		Unknown		Total	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
<b>Age</b>								
Under 18	738	1.4%	1,472	2.8%	1	0.0%	2,211	4.3%
18-25	9,938	19.2%	5,347	10.3%	3	0.0%	15,288	29.5%
26-35	12,264	23.6%	8,452	16.3%	6	0.0%	20,722	39.9%
36-45	4,459	8.6%	4,532	8.7%	6	0.0%	8,997	17.3%
Over 45	1,963	3.8%	2,672	5.1%	1	0.0%	4,636	8.9%
Invalid	3	0.0%	10	0.0%	18	0.0%	31	0.1%
<b>Marital Status</b>								
Married	6,863	13.2%	7,137	13.8%	2	0.0%	14,002	27.0%
Widowed	279	0.5%	111	0.2%	0	0.0%	390	0.8%
Separated	1,792	3.5%	1,160	2.2%	0	0.0%	2,952	5.7%
Divorced	2,114	4.1%	1,242	2.4%	0	0.0%	3,356	6.5%
Single	9,466	18.2%	4,856	9.4%	0	0.0%	14,322	27.6%
Unknown	8,110	15.6%	6,413	12.4%	32	0.1%	14,555	28.1%
Not Applicable (Under 18)	741	1.4%	1,566	3.0%	1	0.0%	2,308	4.4%
<b>Race/Ethnicity *</b>								
Anglo	12,039	23.2%	8,002	15.4%	1	0.0%	20,042	38.6%
African American	5,069	9.8%	3,735	7.2%	2	0.0%	8,806	17.0%
Hispanic	11,262	21.7%	9,474	18.3%	4	0.0%	20,740	40.0%
Native American	37	0.1%	23	0.0%	0	0.0%	60	0.1%
Asian	147	0.3%	129	0.2%	0	0.0%	276	0.5%
Other	811	1.6%	1,122	2.2%	28	0.1%	1,961	3.8%
<b>Relation to Oldest Victim</b>								
Parent	26,092	50.3%	14,333	27.6%	1	0.0%	40,426	77.9%
Grandparent	1,376	2.7%	809	1.6%	0	0.0%	2,185	4.2%
Sibling/Other Relative	388	0.7%	1,861	3.6%	3	0.0%	2,252	4.3%
Aunt/Uncle	593	1.1%	1,106	2.1%	1	0.0%	1,700	3.3%
Parent's Paramour	373	0.7%	3,329	6.4%	0	0.0%	3,702	7.1%
Other	543	1.0%	1,047	2.0%	30	0.1%	1,620	3.1%
<b>Total Perpetrators</b>	<b>29,365</b>	<b>56.6%</b>	<b>22,485</b>	<b>43.3%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>51,885</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

### Monthly Average Number of Families Receiving Preservation Services Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Regular	Intensive	Moderate	Contracted	Total
1 Lubbock	488	3	203	0	694
2 Abilene	196	0	189	0	385
3 Arlington	1,396	5	690	1	2,092
4 Tyler	340	0	61	0	401
5 Beaumont	193	0	38	0	231
6 Houston	1,478	37	355	0	1,870
7 Austin	668	16	223	0	907
8 San Antonio	1,851	1	70	0	1,922
9 Midland	233	1	134	0	368
10 El Paso	342	0	36	0	378
11 Edinburg	1,532	4	356	0	1,892
Out of State	0	0	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,717</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>2,356</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11,141</b>

### Annual Number of Families Receiving Preservation Services Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Regular	Intensive	Moderate	Contracted	Total
1 Lubbock	1,158	9	478	0	1,645
2 Abilene	540	0	498	0	1,038
3 Arlington	3,788	19	1,807	3	5,617
4 Tyler	867	0	201	0	1,068
5 Beaumont	557	3	129	0	689
6 Houston	3,584	118	897	0	4,599
7 Austin	1,626	46	593	0	2,265
8 San Antonio	4,480	4	168	0	4,652
9 Midland	559	3	331	0	893
10 El Paso	800	0	108	0	908
11 Edinburg	3,927	20	982	1	4,930
Out of State	1	0	1	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>21,887</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>6,193</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>28,306</b>

*Family Preservation Services is under the umbrella of Family Based Safety Services (FBSS).*

*Family Preservation Services are services provided to the child and the family without removing the child from the home.*

*Note: Families may receive more than one type of service.*



### Monthly Average Number of Families Receiving Reunification Services Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Regular	Intensive	Moderate	Contracted	Total
1 Lubbock	123	0	0	0	123
2 Abilene	82	0	1	0	83
3 Arlington	334	0	1	0	335
4 Tyler	78	0	1	0	79
5 Beaumont	56	0	1	0	57
6 Houston	222	1	1	0	224
7 Austin	301	2	1	0	304
8 San Antonio	257	0	0	0	257
9 Midland	71	0	0	0	71
10 El Paso	32	0	1	0	33
11 Edinburg	205	1	21	0	227
Out of State	1	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	1,762	4	28	0	1,794

### Annual Number of Families Receiving Reunification Services Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Regular	Intensive	Moderate	Contracted	Total
1 Lubbock	292	0	2	0	294
2 Abilene	203	0	2	0	205
3 Arlington	934	0	3	0	937
4 Tyler	248	0	2	0	250
5 Beaumont	170	0	2	0	172
6 Houston	722	2	4	0	728
7 Austin	751	3	3	0	757
8 San Antonio	693	0	1	0	694
9 Midland	157	0	0	0	157
10 El Paso	108	0	2	0	110
11 Edinburg	574	5	62	0	641
Out of State	6	0	1	0	7
<b>Total</b>	4,858	10	84	0	4,952


*Family Reunification Services are under the umbrella of Family Based Safety Services (FBSS).*

*Family Reunification Services are provided to the family as a child is returning home from court-ordered substitute care.*

*Note: Families may receive more than one type of service.*

### Children in Foster Care by County During Fiscal Year 2012


State Total: 31,302



Note: Six children were out of state.


### Number of Children Removed from Home as a Result of a CPS Abuse/Neglect Investigation

Fiscal Year	as a Result of an Investigation	from Family Based Safety Services*	from Family Substitute Care Services	Total
2008	10,808	3,276	211	14,295
2009	8,527	3,404	176	12,107
2010	11,266	4,815	266	16,347
2011	12,148	4,717	243	17,108
2012	12,538	4,220	214	16,972



\*Removals from Family Based Safety Services includes Family Preservation and Family Reunification.  
 Note: The data presented in this chart have been modified to more accurately report where a removal occurred and therefore will not match prior data books.

### Point of Prevalence\* for Children Entering Substitute Care Fiscal Year 2012



\* Point of prevalence is the number of children entering substitute care per 1,000 children in the region.

**Where are children in DFPS care?**

Of the 27,919 children in DFPS substitute care on August 31, 2012:

**16,697 children were in Foster Care**

**11,552**  
children were placed in  
**Child Placing Agency  
(CPA) Foster Homes**  
Foster homes are families who accept  
foster children into their homes.  
These foster homes are recruited,  
trained, verified and managed by  
private CPAs. DFPS has contracts  
with over 100 CPAs.

The majority of CPA foster homes  
are verified to provide *therapeutic*  
foster care services.

**379** of these children were placed in  
Kinship Verified Foster Homes

**1,839**  
children were placed in  
**DFPS Foster Homes**  
These are families who accept foster  
children into their homes and are  
recruited, trained, verified and  
managed by DFPS. The majority  
provide *basic* foster care services.

**460** of these children were placed in  
Kinship Verified Foster Homes

**765**  
children were placed in  
**Basic Child Care**  
These are typically cottage and campus  
type settings meeting basic child needs

**1,527**  
children were placed in  
**Residential Treatment  
Centers**  
An RTC is a very structured setting for  
children with serious emotional  
disturbance or mental health issues.

**620**  
children were placed in  
**Emergency Shelters**  
These are intended for stays of less  
than 30 days.

**394**  
children were placed in  
**Other types of foster care**  
such as camps, maternity homes  
hospitals, juvenile detention, ICF-ID,  
HCS homes, state schools & hospitals.

**11,222 children were in other types of Substitute Care**

**9,982**  
children were placed in  
**Kinship Care**  
DFPS supports eligible relative  
caregivers by assisting with initial costs  
of accepting a child and through  
ongoing case management.

**433**  
children were in pending adoptions in  
**CPA Adoptive Homes**

**323**  
children were in pending adoptions in  
**DFPS Adoptive Homes**

**484**  
children were placed in  
**Other Substitute Care**  
which includes independent living  
programs, unauthorized absences and  
court ordered placements.

**Notes:**


A. The 27,919 children includes 602 youth over the age of 18 in foster care, but who have "aged-out" of the legal conservatorship of DFPS.

B. There are a total of 29,775 children in DFPS legal responsibility. 2,458 are in the legal conservatorship of DFPS but **not** in substitute care; the majority of these children are in a reunification stage and are living with their families of origin.


**Demographics of Children in Foster Care at the End of the Year  
By Fiscal Year**

Characteristic	August 2009		August 2010		August 2011		August 2012	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
<b>Age</b>								
Birth - 2	3,319	20.8%	3,868	22.7%	3,797	22.1%	3,614	21.6%
3 - 5	2,249	14.1%	2,711	15.9%	2,903	16.9%	2,766	16.6%
6 - 9	2,679	16.8%	2,782	16.3%	2,948	17.2%	2,948	17.7%
10 - 13	2,930	18.4%	2,959	17.4%	2,972	17.3%	2,820	16.9%
14 - 17	4,225	26.5%	4,102	24.1%	3,976	23.1%	3,947	23.6%
18 - 21	530	3.3%	605	3.6%	587	3.4%	602	3.6%
<b>Gender</b>								
Male	8,689	54.5%	9,203	54.0%	9,308	54.2%	9,030	54.1%
Female	7,243	45.5%	7,824	46.0%	7,874	45.8%	7,667	45.9%
Unknown	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Race/Ethnicity *</b>								
Anglo	4,522	28.4%	5,008	29.4%	5,044	29.4%	5,048	30.2%
African American	3,976	25.0%	4,107	24.1%	4,126	24.0%	3,825	22.9%
Hispanic	6,529	38.3%	6,946	40.8%	6,995	40.7%	6,813	40.8%
Native American	40	0.3%	29	0.2%	31	0.2%	22	0.1%
Asian	43	0.3%	44	0.3%	44	0.3%	38	0.2%
Other	822	5.2%	893	5.2%	943	5.5%	951	5.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15,932</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>17,027</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>17,183</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>16,697</b>	<b>100.0%</b>


**Age**



**Gender**




**Race/Ethnicity**



*\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.*

### Point of Prevalence for Children in Substitute Care at the End of Fiscal Year 2012



Note: Point of prevalence is the number of children in substitute care per 1,000 children in the region.  
Includes children ages 0 - 17.

### Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility, in Substitute Care or in Foster Care Placements at the End of Fiscal Year 2012

Region	DFPS Legal Responsibility	Substitute Care	Foster Care*
1 Lubbock	1,788	1,642	1,053
2 Abilene	902	793	525
3 Arlington	5,616	5,238	3,222
4 Tyler	1,612	1,502	921
5 Beaumont	987	914	616
6 Houston	6,293	6,029	3,373
7 Austin	3,401	3,139	1,797
8 San Antonio	5,171	4,961	2,709
9 Midland	1,119	1,045	674
10 El Paso	528	499	350
11 Edinburg	2,358	2,157	1,457
<b>Total</b>	<b>29,775</b>	<b>27,919</b>	<b>16,697</b>

Note: Includes youth who have aged out of DFPS legal responsibility but remain in substitute care.

\* Foster Care is a subset of Substitute Care

## Legal Status of Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility

Legal Status	August 2010		August 2011		August 2012	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Care, Custody & Control*	36	0.1%	25	0.1%	49	0.2%
Temporary Managing Conservatorship**	16,612	57.5%	17,489	57.9%	17,332	58.2%
<b>Permanent Managing Conservatorship***</b>						
Parental Rights Not Terminated	2,929	10.1%	3,110	10.3%	2,863	9.6%
Parental Rights Terminated (All)	8,885	30.8%	9,147	30.3%	9,105	30.6%
Parental Rights Terminated (One Parent)	397	1.4%	396	1.3%	400	1.3%
Possessory Conservatorship****	34	0.1%	37	0.1%	26	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28,893</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>30,204</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>29,775</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* *Care, Custody and Control* - In some counties in Texas, this type of custody is given at an Ex Parte Hearing rather than appointing a temporary managing conservator. This provides legal authority for DFPS to ensure a child's safety and meet a child's basic needs for shelter, food, and education.


\*\* *Temporary Managing Conservatorship* - TMC is awarded to DFPS as a result of a court hearing and written order and continues until a judge issues another order changing the legal status. It authorizes DFPS to act in the child's best interest and has exclusive rights including the following and others: designating the primary residence of a child, make decisions concerning the child's education, consent to marriage or enlistment in the armed forces.

\*\*\* *Permanent Managing Conservatorship* - PMC is awarded to DFPS as a result of a court hearing and written order. PMC authorizes DFPS to act in the child's best interest and have the rights of a Managing Conservator on a permanent basis.

\*\*\*\* *Possessory Conservatorship* - The court appoints a parent as Possessory Conservator who is not appointed as a sole or joint managing conservator, unless this appointment is not in the best interest of the child. Possessory Conservators are provided with visitation orders, unless access would endanger the child physically or emotionally.

### Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility by Living Arrangement at End of Each Fiscal Year


	Non-Foster Care	Foster Care	Total	% Change
2009	11,061	15,402	26,463	-8.0%
2010	12,471	16,422	28,893	9.2%
2011	13,608	16,596	30,204	4.5%
2012	13,680	16,095	29,775	-1.4%



*Note: Foster care totals exclude youth over 18 who remain in foster care but have aged out of DFPS legal responsibility. Non-foster care placements include adoption, relative, own home and other.*

### Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility in Non-Foster Care Placements

	Total Non-Foster Care	Other*	Adoption	Relative	Own Home
2009	11,061	630	957	7,673	1,801
2010	12,471	573	815	8,894	2,189
2011	13,608	543	868	9,858	2,339
2012	13,680	484	756	9,982	2,458



*\* Other includes independent living, hospitals, nursing homes, correctional facilities and unauthorized absences.*



### Children\* in Substitute Care Placements by Living Arrangement Categories As of August 31, 2012


Region	CPA Foster - Group Homes & Independent Homes	DFPS Foster & Foster Group Homes	DFPS Adoptive Homes	Private Adoptive Homes	Kinship
1 Lubbock	506	150	11	22	518
2 Abilene	341	97	3	4	256
3 Arlington	2,412	294	20	81	1,848
4 Tyler	593	114	33	13	506
5 Beaumont	349	162	8	4	277
6 Houston	2,442	305	180	184	2,188
7 Austin	1,137	249	21	29	1,255
8 San Antonio	1,728	179	27	67	2,040
9 Midland	425	99	8	9	325
10 El Paso	202	73	1	1	140
11 Edinburg	1,044	99	11	19	629
Out of State	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,179</b>	<b>1,821</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>9,982</b>

Region	General Residential Operation	Emergency Shelters	Residential Treatment	Other	Total
1 Lubbock	148	53	137	56	1,601
2 Abilene	10	17	37	15	780
3 Arlington	55	47	246	118	5,121
4 Tyler	59	26	92	43	1,479
5 Beaumont	29	19	39	19	906
6 Houston	42	81	302	176	5,900
7 Austin	37	37	224	73	3,062
8 San Antonio	237	195	209	173	4,855
9 Midland	13	41	68	42	1,030
10 El Paso	1	21	26	13	478
11 Edinburg	63	59	120	61	2,105
Out of State	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>596</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>789</b>	<b>27,317</b>

\*Excludes 602 young adults over 18 who have aged out of DFPS conservatorship but remain in DFPS care.

**Permanency Goal of Children in Substitute Care for Whom DFPS had Legal Responsibility****Fiscal Year End 2012****Total Children: 22,308**

Goal	Count	Percent
Adoption	10,893	48.8%
Reunification	7,213	32.3%
Permanent Placement with Relatives and Other Caregivers	2,030	9.1%
Alternative Long Term Living	1,206	5.4%
Adult Living	966	4.3%
<b>Total Children</b>	<b>22,308</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Number of DFPS Foster, Foster/Adoptive and Adoptive Homes as of August 31, 2012**

Region	Foster Homes*	Foster/Adoptive Homes**	Adoptive Homes***
1 Lubbock	4	116	17
2 Abilene	4	59	11
3 Arlington	40	250	87
4 Tyler	10	77	35
5 Beaumont	17	115	20
6 Houston	39	251	244
7 Austin	24	161	92
8 San Antonio	8	140	108
9 Midland	2	56	14
10 El Paso	2	43	10
11 Edinburg	8	53	24
Out of State	23	35	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>1,356</b>	<b>668</b>


\* Includes 58 verified kinship homes.

\*\* Includes 23 legal risk homes and 392 verified kinship homes.

\*\*\* This number does not include homes open only for receipt of adoption subsidy.


**Children Placed in Adoptive Homes by Region  
Fiscal Year 2012**

Total Adoptive Placements 5,093  
Total Unique Children 5,079




**Demographics of 5,079 Children in Adoptive Homes  
Fiscal Year 2012**

Age	Count
Under 1 year	78
1 - 5 years	2,899
6 - 12 years	1,672
13 years and over	430
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,079</b>



Race/Ethnicity *	Count
Anglo	1,365
African American	1,173
Hispanic	2,181
Native American	10
Asian	14
Other	336
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,079</b>



Child Characteristics	Count
Disabling Condition	1,713
No Special Characteristics	3,366
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,079</b>



Sex	Count
Female	2,507
Male	2,572
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,079</b>




\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

### Children with Disabling Conditions Placed in Adoptive Homes Fiscal Year 2012

Total number of children placed in adoptive homes  
Number of unique children with disabling conditions placed  
in adoptive homes

5,079  
1,713

Children with Disabling Condition



Disabling Condition	Percentage of all Children Placed in Adoptive Homes	Number of Children with Disabling Condition
Drug/Alcohol*	15.4%	784
Learning Disabilities	13.6%	690
Emotionally Disturbed	9.0%	458
Medically Involved	5.8%	295
Physical	1.4%	70
Other**	0.3%	16

\* Drug/Alcohol disabling condition can either be due to self abuse or exposure to an individual with the condition.

\*\* Other includes teen parent or pregnant.

Note: Children may be duplicated across categories because some may have more than one disabling condition.


### Children in Consummated Adoptions by Type of Agency by Fiscal Year

	2009		2010		2011		2012	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
DFPS	2,804	57.7%	2,841	59.2%	2,563	55.3%	2,823	56.0%
Non DFPS*	2,055	42.3%	1,962	40.8%	2,072	44.7%	2,217	44.0%
<b>Total Consummations</b>	<b>4,859</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4,803</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4,635</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5,040</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Non DFPS includes private agency adoptions, relative adoptions and out of state adoptions.


### Children in Consummated Adoptions by Region Fiscal Year 2012

Total: 5,040



**Demographics of 5,040 Children in Consummated Adoptions  
Fiscal Year 2012**


<b>Age</b>	<b>Count</b>
Under 1 year	62
1 - 5 years	2,895
6 - 12 years	1,642
13 years and over	441
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,040</b>



<b>Gender</b>	<b>Count</b>
Male	2,534
Female	2,506
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,040</b>



<b>Race/Ethnicity *</b>	<b>Count</b>
Anglo	1,394
African American	1,125
Hispanic	2,182
Native American	8
Asian	8
Other	323
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,040</b>



*\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.*

**Race/Ethnicity of Children and Adoptive Parents by Fiscal Year**

	2009		2010		2011		2012	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<b>Race/Ethnicity of parent(s) is same as child</b>	3,020	62.2%	2,970	61.8%	2,718	58.6%	3,071	60.9%
<b>Race/Ethnicity of one or both parents differs from child's (Multiracial)*</b>	1,839	37.8%	1,833	38.2%	1,917	41.4%	1,969	39.1%
<b>Total Adoptions</b>	4,859	100.0%	4,803	100.0%	4,635	100.0%	5,040	100.0%

*\* Includes when Race/Ethnicity was not determined.*

*\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.*

## CPS Outcomes Based on Data from Fiscal Year 2012

### Child Safety Outcomes

Percent of children who remained safe in substitute care  
(children in care during FY12 who did not experience a confirmed incident of maltreatment) 99.9%

Absence of Repeat Maltreatment  
(child victims without a subsequent confirmed allegation within 6 months of the prior confirmed allegation) 97.1%

### Permanency Services

Percentage of children with 2 or fewer placements that have been in care 12 months or less 85.9%

### Family Preservation Outcomes

(measured from start of services to end of services)

Average length of Service 7.7 months

### Family Reunification Outcomes

(measured from removal to placement in own home and termination of DFPS conservatorship)

Percent of children returned to own home 33.3%

Average number of placements per child 1.9 placements

Average length of service 13.3 months

Median length of service 12.1 months

Children reunified with family, with DFPS conservatorship terminated, within 12 months of removal 63.7%

### Adoption Services Outcomes

(measured from removal to adoption consummation)

Percent of children who left DFPS legal responsibility with an adoption consummation 28.6%

Average number of placements per child 2.7 placements

Average length of service 29.2 months

From removal to final order 13.9 months

From final order to adoptive placement 13.8 months

From placement to adoption consummated 1.5 months

Median length of service 24.2 months

Children adopted within 24 months of removal 49.3%

### Permanent Relative Care Outcomes

(measured from removal to date DFPS legal responsibility ended)

Percent of children who left DFPS legal responsibility to a relative placement 29.1%

Average number of placements 1.9 placements

Average length of service 14.0 months

Median length of service 11.6 months

Children re-entering foster care within 12 months of discharge from a previous episode of foster care 4.4%

## CPS Outcomes Based on Data from Fiscal Year 2012

### Long-term Substitute Care Outcomes

<b>Emancipation (includes children who left DFPS legal responsibility by emancipation or turning 18)</b>	
(measured from removal to date DFPS legal responsibility ended or date child turns 18 years of age)	
Percent of children who left DFPS legal responsibility	7.7%
Average number of placements	7.0 placements
Average length of service	58.0 months
Median length of service	45.6 months

#### Other Long-term Substitute Care

(measured from removal to date DFPS legal responsibility ended)	
Percent of children who left DFPS legal responsibility	1.2%
Average number of placements	2.3 placements
Average length of service	14.6 months
Median length of service	8.9 months

### Fiscal Year 2012 Recidivism Outcomes

#### For All Stages:

(measured as a new confirmed reason to believe allegation within 12 months of the end of services or a return to substitute care or new Family Preservation services provided)	7.8%
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------

#### For Family Preservation:

(measured as a new confirmed reason to believe allegation within 12 months of the end of Family Preservation services or new Family Preservation services provided)	7.4%
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------

#### For Family Reunification:


(measured as a new confirmed reason to believe allegation or a return to substitute care within 12 months of the end of Family Reunification services or new Family Preservation services provided)	17.0%
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

### Substitute Care Outcomes for Cases Open at the End of Fiscal Year 2012

Average length of service for children in temporary managing conservatorship	6.8 months
Median length of service for children in temporary managing conservatorship	5.7 months
Average length of service for children in permanent managing conservatorship	39.2 months
Median length of service for children in permanent managing conservatorship	27.5 months

**Status of Children No Longer in DFPS Legal Responsibility****Fiscal Year 2012****Total Children: 17,625**

Outcome	Count	Percent
Family Reunification	5,873	33.3%
Custody to Relatives with PCA	530	3.0%
Custody to Relatives without PCA	4,605	26.1%
Relative Adoption Consummated	2,358	13.4%
Non-Relative Adoption Consummated	2,682	15.2%
Children Emancipated*	1,363	7.7%
Other**	214	1.2%
<b>Total Children</b>	<b>17,625</b>	<b>100%</b>



\* Of the 1,363 youth emancipated in FY12, 1,019 were emancipated from paid foster care.

\*\* Other includes children absent without permission, children in court ordered or independent living placements; children for whom conservatorship was never obtained and children with a missing discharge reason.

**Average Length of Time in Months for Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Type of Exit and Region**  
Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Family Reunification	Relative Care	Adoption	Long Term Care - Emancipation	Long Term Care - Other
1 Lubbock	16.9	15.1	30.8	66.8	8.4
2 Abilene	14.3	16.7	32.4	49.5	10.2
3 Arlington	11.8	12.9	26.4	59.0	13.1
4 Tyler	12.7	11.5	27.0	53.7	18.9
5 Beaumont	12.9	12.1	28.7	58.2	51.8
6 Houston	14.6	16.3	33.0	62.8	16.2
7 Austin	13.1	14.0	27.3	50.2	15.0
8 San Antonio	12.3	14.3	27.5	57.7	13.2
9 Midland	16.9	19.0	32.4	63.4	11.3
10 El Paso	12.2	9.9	28.4	64.0	7.5
11 Edinburg	12.7	12.8	31.7	47.5	15.3
State	13.3	14.0	29.2	58.0	14.6

**Average Length of Time in Months for Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Type of Exit and Race/Ethnicity\*\*\***  
Fiscal Year 2012

Race/Ethnicity	Family Reunification	Relative Care	Adoption	Long Term Care - Emancipation	Long Term Care - Other
Anglo	13.7	13.5	27.0	57.1	15.5
African American	13.1	15.2	33.6	62.8	14.7
Hispanic	13.2	14.1	28.8	55.3	14.2
Native American	25.9	22.4	34.4	1.5	na
Asian	9.5	4.2	20.4	28.7	na
Other	12.1	12.5	26.0	56.9	12.6
State	13.3	14.0	29.2	58.0	14.6

\*\*\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.




### Average Number of Out-of-Home Placements for Children Who Attained Permanency Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Family Reunification	Relative Care	Adoption	Long Term Care - Emancipation	Long Term Care - Other
1 Lubbock	1.8	2.2	3.0	8.9	1.1
2 Abilene	2.1	2.1	2.7	6.3	2.4
3 Arlington	1.8	1.8	2.7	6.9	1.8
4 Tyler	1.7	1.9	2.5	6.4	1.8
5 Beaumont	2.0	2.0	2.8	6.2	4.5
6 Houston	1.8	2.0	2.5	7.1	3.1
7 Austin	1.9	1.8	2.6	6.6	2.8
8 San Antonio	2.0	1.8	3.0	7.4	1.5
9 Midland	2.0	2.3	2.8	6.1	2.0
10 El Paso	1.9	1.6	3.0	6.2	2.3
11 Edinburg	2.1	2.2	2.8	6.2	1.6
<b>State Total</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>

Note: The average number of placements per child in substitute care for all children who attained permanency is 2.5 placements.

### Length of Time in Care for Children Who Achieved Permanency Status\* Fiscal Year 2012



\* Children who left substitute care via an own home, permanent relative placement or adoption consummation and DFPS legal responsibility was ended.

### Average Monthly Number of Children and Young Adults, FTEs\* in Paid Foster Care by Service Levels Fiscal Year 2012

Service Level	Number of Children & Young Adults	Number of FTEs
Basic	11,329	10,005
Child Specific**	39	36
Emergency Shelter	919	572
Intense	304	270
Moderate	3,370	3,074
Psychiatric Transition	24	16
Specialized	2,672	2,419
	18,657***	16,392
<b>Unduplicated Count</b>	18,172	

Note: Calculations exclude children where cost of care was not covered by Title IV-E or state paid foster care.


\* An FTE is calculated by dividing the number of paid foster care days in the month by the number of days in a month.

\*\* Child Specific contracts do not have an actual level of care.

\*\*\* Duplicated count due to changes in service levels during the month.

Note: For HHSC 24-Hour Residential Child Care Facilities Rates go to [http://www.dfps.state.tx.us/PCS/rates\\_childcare\\_reimbursement.asp](http://www.dfps.state.tx.us/PCS/rates_childcare_reimbursement.asp)

### Foster Care Expenditures by Source Fiscal Year 2012 Total Expenditures: \$373,644,867



#### Title IV-E Foster Care Program Description


The Foster Care Program helps States to provide safe and stable out-of-home care for children until the children are safely returned home, placed permanently with adoptive families or placed in other planned arrangements for permanency. Funds are available for: monthly maintenance payments to eligible foster care providers; administrative costs to manage the program; training staff and foster parents; foster parent recruitment; and other related expenses.

State Paid Foster Care may be funded with Federal Block Grant (TANF)

**Children and Young Adults\* in Paid Foster Care Monthly Average by Fiscal Year**

Fiscal Year	State Paid Children in Foster Care**	State Paid Young Adults* in Foster Care**	Title IV-E Children in Foster Care	Title IV-E Young Adults* in Foster Care	Total Children & Young Adults in Foster Care***	% Change from Previous Fiscal Year
2008	4,673	651	12,828	546	18,698	-8.7%
2009	4,344	700	11,485	545	17,074	-8.7%
2010	4,308	783	11,936	558	17,585	3.0%
2011	4,562	821	12,569	509	18,461	5.0%
2012	4,649	726	12,283	525	18,183	-1.5%

**Percent of Change in the Number of Children and Young Adults in Paid Foster Care by Fiscal Year**



**Children and Young Adults\* in Paid Foster Care Monthly Average by Region Fiscal Year 2012**

Region	State Paid Children in Foster Care**	State Paid Young Adults* in Foster Care**	Title IV-E Children in Foster Care	Title IV-E Young Adults* in Foster Care	Total Children and Young Adults
1 Lubbock	260	52	803	40	1,155
2 Abilene	111	19	428	20	578
3 Arlington	836	146	2,417	106	3,505
4 Tyler	329	41	565	23	958
5 Beaumont	186	17	440	10	653
6 Houston	802	153	2,626	115	3,696
7 Austin	672	105	1,154	43	1,974
8 San Antonio	870	103	1,942	88	3,003
9 Midland	135	22	518	17	692
10 El Paso	57	16	292	19	384
11 Edinburg	392	53	1,104	44	1,593
Unknown	1	0	1	0	2
<b>Total***</b>	<b>4,651</b>	<b>727</b>	<b>12,290</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>18,193</b>

**Unduplicated** 18,172

\* A young adult is any person in foster care who was 18 to 21 years of age at anytime during the fiscal year.  
 \*\* State Paid Foster Care may be funded with Federal Block Grant (TANF).  
 \*\*\* Some children are served in more than one region and/or eligibility type in a month.

### Families and Children Receiving Kinship Caregiver Monetary Assistance Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Families Served	Children Served
1 Lubbock	308	547
2 Abilene	155	260
3 Arlington	1,461	2,543
4 Tyler	204	354
5 Beaumont	151	254
6 Houston	1,382	2,365
7 Austin	645	1,150
8 San Antonio	652	1,171
9 Midland	176	283
10 El Paso	85	155
11 Edinburg	562	1,113
Out-of-State/Unknown	112	177
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,893</b>	<b>10,372</b>


### Families and Children Kinship Caregiver Monetary Assistance Payments Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Total Integration Payments	Total Flexible Support Payments	Total Relative Caregiver Support
1 Lubbock	\$181,750.00	\$211,000.00	\$392,750.00
2 Abilene	104,000.00	120,500.00	224,500.00
3 Arlington	733,250.00	1,210,500.00	1,943,750.00
4 Tyler	142,250.00	166,000.00	308,250.00
5 Beaumont	89,750.00	105,500.00	195,250.00
6 Houston	541,500.00	1,029,200.00	1,570,700.00
7 Austin	431,250.00	544,500.00	975,750.00
8 San Antonio	400,000.00	320,000.00	720,000.00
9 Midland	94,000.00	127,550.00	221,550.00
10 El Paso	56,000.00	63,000.00	119,000.00
11 Edinburg	228,250.00	556,500.00	784,750.00
Unknown	47,000.00	81,500.00	128,500.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,049,000.00</b>	<b>\$4,535,750.00</b>	<b>\$7,584,750.00</b>


**Number of Children Provided Adoption Subsidy\* by Fiscal Year**

Fiscal Year	State Paid Adoption Subsidies	Title IV-E Adoption Subsidies	Total Children Provided Adoption Subsidy	% Change from Previous Fiscal Year
2008	6,288	21,235	27,523	11.7%
2009	6,707	23,994	30,701	11.5%
2010	7,146	26,558	33,704	9.8%
2011	7,296	28,994	36,290	7.7%
2012	7,550	31,506	39,056	7.6%

**Percent Change Children Provided Adoption Subsidy Monthly Total by Fiscal Year**



**Number of Children Provided Adoption Subsidy\* by Region Fiscal Year 2012**




\*Subsidy includes financial payments only, not medical and non-recurring subsidies.

**Number of Children Provided Permanency Care Assistance\* by Fiscal Year**

Fiscal Year	State Paid Permanency Care Assistance	Title IV-E Permanency Care Assistance	Number of Children Provided Permanency Care Assistance	% Change from Previous Fiscal Year
2011	34	170	204	N/A
2012	119	415	534	161.8%

**Number of Children Provided Permanency Care Assistance\* by Region Fiscal Year 2012**



*\*Does not include non-recurring payments.*

### Average Number of Children and Families Receiving Purchased Services per Month Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Living at Home	Living Out of Home	Post Adoption	Total Children	Total Adults	Total Clients
1 Lubbock	431	406	0	837	855	1,692
2 Abilene	104	229	496	829	437	1,266
3 Arlington	1,122	1,500	0	2,622	1,451	4,073
4 Tyler	257	299	0	556	925	1,481
5 Beaumont	119	208	89	416	398	814
6 Houston	640	1,350	313	2,303	2,924	5,227
7 Austin	502	692	0	1,194	1,699	2,893
8 San Antonio	631	806	93	1,530	1,743	3,273
9 Midland	105	200	0	305	500	805
10 El Paso	44	130	0	174	113	287
11 Edinburg	647	376	0	1,023	2,021	3,044
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,602</b>	<b>6,196</b>	<b>991</b>	<b>11,789</b>	<b>13,066</b>	<b>24,855</b>

Note: Averages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

### Average Monthly Percent of Children Receiving CPS Purchased Services by Region Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Number of In-Home Children Receiving Purchased Services	Total Number of In-Home Children	% of In-Home Children Receiving Purchased Services	Number of Children in Substitute Care Receiving Purchased Services	Total Number of Children in Substitute Care	% of Children in Substitute Care Receiving Purchased Services
1 Lubbock	431	2,277	18.9%	406	1,793	22.7%
2 Abilene	104	1,231	8.5%	229	841	27.2%
3 Arlington	1,122	6,610	17.0%	1,500	5,465	27.5%
4 Tyler	257	1,315	19.5%	299	1,582	18.9%
5 Beaumont	119	758	15.6%	208	905	23.0%
6 Houston	640	6,274	10.2%	1,350	6,631	20.4%
7 Austin	502	3,385	14.8%	692	3,312	20.9%
8 San Antonio	631	6,370	9.9%	806	5,241	15.4%
9 Midland	105	1,194	8.8%	200	1,046	19.1%
10 El Paso	44	1,198	3.7%	130	530	24.5%
11 Edinburg	647	6,823	9.5%	375	2,366	15.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,602</b>	<b>37,435</b>	<b>12.3%</b>	<b>6,196</b>	<b>29,712</b>	<b>20.9%</b>

**Family Group Decision Making (FGDM)** is a part of the CPS process to be family-centered. The goal is to enhance safety, permanency, and well-being for children by providing direct services and support services to their caregivers, whether biological or through affinity. FGDM describes a variety of practices to work with and engage families in problem solving, including Family Team Meetings (FTM), Family Group Conferences (FGC), and Circles of Support (COS):

- **Family Team Meeting (FTM)** is designed as a rapid response to child safety and placement concerns and is used to achieve positive outcomes for children in the earliest stages of interaction between CPS and families.
- **Family Group Conference (FGC)** is a process where families join with relatives, friends, and others in the community to develop a plan to ensure children are cared for and protected from future harm. This broader constellation of “family” convenes with information providers/community supports and CPS caseworkers in a unique partnership that empowers the “family group” with a high degree of decision-making authority and responsibility.
- **Circles of Support (COS)** is a youth-focused, youth-driven meeting with the primary purpose of developing a plan for older youth to transition from foster care to adulthood. It may be used for other purposes as well. It includes broader participation of the youth’s support network.

### Family Team Meetings Conducted By Race/Ethnicity Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Anglo	African American	Hispanic	Native American	Asian	Other	Total
1 Lubbock	248	57	345	0	2	40	692
2 Abilene	241	28	126	0	0	29	424
3 Arlington	805	324	358	3	7	125	1,622
4 Tyler	303	74	53	1	0	42	473
5 Beaumont	114	46	14	0	1	23	198
6 Houston	408	345	335	0	9	85	1,182
7 Austin	661	283	642	0	4	146	1,736
8 San Antonio	286	82	728	2	3	44	1,145
9 Midland	83	13	105	0	1	10	212
10 El Paso	23	12	178	3	0	10	226
11 Edinburg	80	10	724	0	0	13	827
Other/Unknown	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,252</b>	<b>1,274</b>	<b>3,609</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>8,738</b>

### Family Group Conferences Conducted By Race/Ethnicity Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Anglo	African American	Hispanic	Native American	Asian	Other	Total
1 Lubbock	167	41	199	0	0	33	440
2 Abilene	284	40	106	0	0	29	459
3 Arlington	475	266	238	0	2	106	1,087
4 Tyler	271	79	53	0	0	56	459
5 Beaumont	76	41	9	0	0	16	142
6 Houston	330	330	248	3	5	109	1,025
7 Austin	314	139	181	2	0	82	718
8 San Antonio	286	84	937	2	2	72	1,383
9 Midland	131	23	160	0	0	17	331
10 El Paso	5	2	82	0	0	5	94
11 Edinburg	144	11	1,246	0	0	42	1,443
Other/Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,483</b>	<b>1,056</b>	<b>3,459</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>7,581</b>




**Circles of Support Conducted by Race/Ethnicity\*  
Fiscal Year 2012**

Region	Anglo	African American	Hispanic	Native American	Asian	Other	Total
1 Lubbock	98	32	60	0	0	16	206
2 Abilene	47	20	14	0	0	8	89
3 Arlington	171	190	106	2	5	39	513
4 Tyler	60	42	10	1	0	4	117
5 Beaumont	29	17	7	0	0	9	62
6 Houston	168	368	167	0	7	48	758
7 Austin	131	105	81	0	1	45	363
8 San Antonio	81	40	231	0	0	25	377
9 Midland	57	7	36	0	0	4	104
10 El Paso	5	5	38	0	0	4	52
11 Edinburg	17	9	166	0	0	12	204
<b>Total</b>	<b>864</b>	<b>835</b>	<b>916</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>2,845</b>

*\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.*

**Preparation for Adult Living (PAL) Services  
Youth Ages 16 through 20**

The Transitional Services Program includes Preparation for Adult Living (PAL) program services to help youth aging out of foster care prepare for adult life, and assist with the initial transition to adult living. PAL services ensure that DFPS foster youth and those aging out of care receive the tools, resources, supports, and personal and community connections they need to become self-sufficient adult. Supportive services and benefits are provided to eligible youth ages 16 to 21, and in some cases up to age 23 for certain educational/vocational needs, to assist when they leave foster care.



*Note: 948 youth who were not served in FY 2012 received services prior to FY 2012.*

## Fiscal Year 2004 and 2012 Daily Statistics

Total DFPS Calls		
2004	1,987	per day
2012	2,106	per day

CPS Reports		
2004	568	per day
2012	565	per day

Completed Investigations		
2004	379	per day
2012	455	per day

Confirmed Investigations		
2004	89	per day
2012	106	per day

Alleged Victims		
2004	613	per day
2012	756	per day

Confirmed Victims		
2004	138	per day
2012	176	per day

Children Removed		
2004	37	per day
2012	46	per day

Total Children Exiting CVS		
2004	30	per day
2012	48	per day

## Where do children exiting CVS go?

Family Reunification		
2004	11	per day
2012	16	per day

Custody Given to Relatives		
2004	8	per day
2012	14	per day

Adoption Consummated		
2004	7	per day
2012	14	per day

Child Emancipated		
2004	3	per day
2012	4	per day

Other		
2004	2	per day
2012	1	per day

# DCL

## Child Day Care Licensing Overview

The Texas Department of Family and Protective Services is granted its authority to regulate child-care facilities and child-placing agencies by the Texas Legislature in Chapter 42 of the Texas Human Resources Code.

The purpose of regulation is to protect a group or class of children by establishing and enforcing statewide minimum standards.

### Total Average Filled Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff

Caseworkers	255.4
Supervisors	36.5
Other Staff	110.1
<b>Total CCL Staff</b>	<b>402.0</b>

### Worker Demographics


Turnover Rate	17.6%
Agency Tenure:	
Less Than 1 Year	12.8%
1 - 3 Years	15.6%
Greater than 3 Years	71.6%
Entry Salary (Inv)	\$31,728.96
Entry Salary (Non-Inv)	\$28,239.00
Average Age	40.8
Race/Ethnicity:	
African-American	26.8%
Anglo	44.0%
Hispanic	24.0%
Other	5.2%

### Supervisor Demographics

Turnover Rate	2.7%
Agency Tenure:	
Less Than 1 Year	0.0%
1 - 3 Years	0.0%
Greater than 3 Years	100.0%
Entry Salary	\$38,145.96
Average Age	48.5
Race/Ethnicity:	
African-American	21.6%
Anglo	45.9%
Hispanic	32.4%
Other	0.0%

### DCL Expenditures

DCL Staff	\$23,604,100
-----------	--------------



*Note: The chart is for reference only and does not necessarily represent the flow of a case.*

### Statistics FY 2012

Daycare Operations/Homes	23,992
Capacity	1,078,044
Abuse/Neglect Investigations	1,802
Non-Abuse/Neglect Investigations	12,147
Inspections	35,755
Adverse Actions	175

## Legal Responsibility for Child-Care Licensing

### Day Care and Residential Care: Statutory References

Social Security Act

Human Resources Code, Chapters 40, 42, and 43

Texas Family Code, Title 5

Texas Government Code

Texas Health and Safety Code, Chapter 249

Texas Administrative Code, Title 40

### Major Provisions:


- Develop minimum standards to promote the health, safety, and well being of children in out-of-home care.
- Inspect child-care operations to ensure they maintain compliance with minimum standards.
- Investigate allegations of abuse/neglect, investigate violations of standards or the law and ensure appropriate enforcement actions are taken.
- Conduct criminal background checks and DFPS Central Registry checks on all adult staff or caregivers, other adults and youth ages 14 to 18 who will be in regular or frequent contact with children in child-care operations.
- Take corrective and adverse actions when necessary.
- Offer consultation to potential applicants and permit holders about meeting and maintaining compliance with Licensing standards.
- Educate the general public about choosing regulated child-care and inform them of the child-care options in Texas through media campaigns and by maintaining an online database of child-care providers, including information regarding each operation's compliance history.
- Enforce regulatory requirements for all child-care providers, including illegally operating child-care providers.

### Other Programmatic Information: Challenges

- Consistently enforcing adherence to minimum standards across the state.
- Developing cooperative, professional, and effective relationships with child-care operations resulting in increased compliance and stronger protection for children.
- Providing technical assistance to all child care operations, especially focusing on those struggling to maintain compliance with standards.
- Providing thorough, efficient and timely background check results to over a quarter of a million people each year seeking to work in child care, provide foster care or adopt a child.
- Maximizing technology resources to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of regulatory practices and allow licensing staff to become an increasingly mobile workforce.
- Creating standards that protect the health and safety of children in care without impacting the affordability and availability of that care.

**Texas Child Population  
Ages Birth through 13 Years  
Fiscal Year 2012**

State Total: 5,517,274



Population Data Source: Texas State Data Center, University of Texas (San Antonio). Based on Census 2010 data.

**Child Day Care Operations in Texas as of August 31**

Year	Licensed Child Care Centers	Licensed Child Care Homes	Listed Family Homes	Registered Child Care Homes	Small Employer Based Child Care	Total Day Care Operations
2008	9,309	1,564	8,257	6,895	1	26,026
2009	9,342	1,617	7,305	6,700	1	24,965
2010	9,436	1,684	7,589	6,537	4	25,250
2011	9,519	1,743	7,477	6,302	4	25,045
2012	9,601	1,774	6,774	5,837	6	23,992

*Note: Counts do not include Applicants*

**Child Day Care Operations in Texas as of August 31**

Day Care Licensing Operation Type	2011		2012	
	Count	Capacity	Count	Capacity
Licensed Child Care Centers				
Before/After School Program	696	49,675	728	53,088
Child Care Program	8,019	844,572	8,104	854,572
School Age Program	733	64,463	756	67,400
Temporary Shelter Program	2	125	6	306
No Care Type	69	6,883	7	502
Subtotal	9,519	965,718	9,601	975,868
Licensed Child Care Homes				
Licensed Child Care Homes	1,743	20,771	1,774	21,147
Listed Family Homes	7,477	14,124	6,774	12,831
Registered Child Care Homes	6,302	73,221	5,837	68,126
Small Employer Based Child Care	4	48	6	72
<b>Total Child Day Care Operations</b>	<b>25,045</b>	<b>1,073,882</b>	<b>23,992</b>	<b>1,078,044</b>


## Child Day Care Operations and Homes Regulated by Fiscal Year

Region	Licensed Child Care Centers		Licensed Child Care Homes		Listed Family Homes	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
1 Lubbock	299	291	69	75	422	314
2 Abilene	218	213	66	60	177	140
3 Arlington	2,355	2,390	473	505	2,204	2,101
4 Tyler	355	346	68	67	386	337
5 Beaumont	219	217	28	28	86	82
6 Houston	2,326	2,354	255	270	1,481	1,323
7 Austin	1,337	1,342	242	254	880	944
8 San Antonio	917	908	115	113	632	447
9 Midland	214	221	48	43	239	186
10 El Paso	283	285	148	148	399	368
11 Edinburg	996	1,034	231	211	571	532
Unknown/ Out of State	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,519</b>	<b>9,601</b>	<b>1,743</b>	<b>1,774</b>	<b>7,477</b>	<b>6,774</b>


Region	Registered Child Care Homes		Small Employer Based Child Care		Total	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
1 Lubbock	162	155	0	0	952	835
2 Abilene	149	142	0	0	610	555
3 Arlington	2,116	1,935	1	3	7,149	6,934
4 Tyler	82	85	0	0	891	835
5 Beaumont	65	57	0	0	398	384
6 Houston	2,089	1,910	0	0	6,151	5,857
7 Austin	604	583	1	1	3,064	3,124
8 San Antonio	595	560	2	2	2,261	2,030
9 Midland	48	44	0	0	549	494
10 El Paso	100	96	0	0	930	897
11 Edinburg	292	270	0	0	2,090	2,047
Unknown/ Out of State	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,302</b>	<b>5,837</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25,045</b>	<b>23,992</b>

### Licensing of Child Day Care Operations by Region Fiscal Year 2012

#### Licensed Child Care Centers




#### Licensed Child Care Homes






**Licensing of Child Day Care Operations by Region  
Fiscal Year 2012**



**Listed Family Homes**



**Registered Child Care Homes**



### Inspections\* in Child Day Care Operations




Facility Type	2011	2012
Licensed Child Care Centers	24,305	24,538
Licensed Child Care Homes	3,544	3,849
Listed Family Homes	602	1,200
Registered Child Care Homes	6,986	5,846
Small Employer Based Child Care	3	3
Illegal Operations	270	270
Exemption Requests	61	49
<b>Total</b>	<b>35,771</b>	<b>35,755</b>

\* Beginning in FY12 the LBB Performance Measure definition of Inspections does not include Inspections done as part of an Abuse/Neglect Investigation.

**Inspections\* in Child Day Care Operations by Type of Inspection  
Fiscal Year 2012  
Total Inspections: 35,755**


**Child Day Care Operations**

Inspection Type	Number
Monitoring	24,851
Follow-up	9,198
Other	1,387
<b>Total</b>	<b>35,436</b>




**Illegal Operations**

Inspection Type	Number
Monitoring	1
Follow-up	252
Other	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>270</b>




**Exemption Requests**

Inspection Type	Number
Monitoring	0
Follow-up	30
Other	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>



\* Beginning in FY12 the LBB Performance Measure definition of Inspections does not include Inspections done as part of an Abuse/Neglect Investigation.

### Investigations in Child Day Care Operations



\*Includes Small Employer Based Child Care

### Investigations in Child Day Care Operations Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Licensed Child Care Centers*	Licensed Child Care Homes	Listed Family Homes	Registered Child Care Homes	Illegal Operations Exemptions	Day Care Total
1 Lubbock	497	7	29	24	35	592
2 Abilene	260	14	18	21	30	343
3 Arlington	3,111	145	101	272	282	3,911
4 Tyler	386	5	28	10	43	472
5 Beaumont	178	4	8	16	13	219
6 Houston	2,239	74	96	225	132	2,766
7 Austin	1,488	57	42	108	141	1,836
8 San Antonio	1,493	49	59	198	115	1,914
9 Midland	247	2	14	6	21	290
10 El Paso	231	21	15	8	15	290
11 Edinburg	1,006	95	116	104	54	1,375
Other/Unknown	0	0	0	0	106	106
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,136</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>992</b>	<b>987</b>	<b>14,114</b>

\*Includes Small Employer Based Child Care

## Investigations in Child Day Care Operations Fiscal Year 2012

Operation Type	Total Number Operations as of 8/31/12	Investigations	Number of Abuse/Neglect Investigations			Number of Non Abuse/Neglect Investigations	
			Total	Valid	Percent Validated	Total	Deficiency Cited
<b>Child Day Care Operations</b>							
Licensed Child Care Centers	9,601	11,136	1,263	145	11.5%	9,874	2,958
Licensed Child Care Homes	1,774	473	61	13	21.3%	410	74
Listed Family Homes	6,774	526	85	16	18.8%	445	151
Registered Child Care Homes	5,837	992	117	23	19.7%	873	191
Small Employer Based Child Care	6	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>23,992</b>	<b>13,127</b>	<b>1,526</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>12.9%</b>	<b>11,602</b>	<b>3,374</b>
<b>Unlicensed Operations</b>							
Illegal Operations	458	943	275	87	31.6%	502	121
Exemption Requests	157	44	1	0	0.0%	43	28
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>987</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>31.5%</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>24,607</b>	<b>14,114</b>	<b>1,802</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>15.8%</b>	<b>12,147</b>	<b>3,523</b>

*Note: The number of Investigations and the number of Non Abuse/Neglect Investigations are based on the date that the worker completed the investigation. The number of Abuse/Neglect Investigations uses the date that the investigation stage closed. Therefore, the sum of Abuse/Neglect Investigations and Non Abuse/Neglect Investigations will not match the total Investigations.*

## Adverse Actions and Corrective Actions Initiated in Child Day Care Operations by Region Fiscal Year 2012

Licensed Child Care Centers							
Region	Adverse Actions				Corrective Actions		
	Permits Denied	Permits Revoked	Permits Suspended	Total Adverse Actions	Evaluation	Probation	Total Corrective Actions
1 Lubbock	0	1	0	1	7	2	9
2 Abilene	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
3 Arlington	3	2	0	5	32	12	44
4 Tyler	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
5 Beaumont	0	0	0	0	3	2	5
6 Houston	14	3	0	17	38	17	55
7 Austin	2	3	0	5	15	9	24
8 San Antonio	4	1	0	5	15	9	24
9 Midland	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
10 El Paso	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
11 Edinburg	2	1	0	3	12	4	16
<b>State Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>188</b>

Licensed Child Care Homes							
Region	Adverse Actions				Corrective Actions		
	Permits Denied	Permits Revoked	Permits Suspended	Total Adverse Actions	Evaluation	Probation	Total Corrective Actions
1 Lubbock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Abilene	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
3 Arlington	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
4 Tyler	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5 Beaumont	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 Houston	1	0	0	1	1	1	2
7 Austin	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
8 San Antonio	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
9 Midland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 El Paso	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
11 Edinburg	0	0	0	0	3	1	4
<b>State Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>

*Note: Adverse actions are determined by the date the facility was sent the letter of intent. Finalizing adverse action through due process is lengthy. Corrective actions begin after the due process is completed. Voluntary Suspensions are not counted in the number of suspensions.*

**Adverse Actions and Corrective Actions Initiated in Child Day Care Operations by Region  
Fiscal Year 2012**

Region	Listed Family Homes Adverse Actions				Corrective Actions		
	Permits Denied	Permits Revoked	Permits Suspended	Total Adverse Actions	Evaluation	Probation	Total Corrective Actions
1 Lubbock	8	1	0	9	0	0	0
2 Abilene	3	1	0	4	0	0	0
3 Arlington	17	0	0	17	0	0	0
4 Tyler	5	1	0	6	0	0	0
5 Beaumont	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
6 Houston	8	3	0	11	0	0	0
7 Austin	12	2	0	14	0	0	0
8 San Antonio	12	3	0	15	0	0	0
9 Midland	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
10 El Paso	5	0	0	5	0	0	0
11 Edinburg	12	0	0	12	0	0	0
<b>State Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

*Note: Beginning in FY12, due to a statutory change, suspensions related to Listed Family Homes that did not pay fees are no longer considered to be Adverse Actions.*

Region	Registered Child Care Homes Adverse Actions				Corrective Actions		
	Permits Denied	Permits Revoked	Permits Suspended	Total Adverse Actions	Evaluation	Probation	Total Corrective Actions
1 Lubbock	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
2 Abilene	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
3 Arlington	1	3	0	4	1	0	1
4 Tyler	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
5 Beaumont	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
6 Houston	4	7	0	11	7	4	11
7 Austin	0	5	0	5	0	0	0
8 San Antonio	2	5	1	8	0	0	0
9 Midland	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
10 El Paso	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
11 Edinburg	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>State Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>

Grand Total	Child Day Care Operations Adverse Actions				Corrective Actions		
	Permits Denied	Permits Revoked	Permits Suspended	Total Adverse Actions	Evaluation	Probation	Total Corrective Actions
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>208</b>

*Note: Adverse actions are determined by the date the facility was sent the letter of intent. Finalizing adverse action through due process is lengthy. Corrective actions begin after the due process is completed. Voluntary Suspensions are not counted in the number of suspensions.*

## Background Checks for Day Care Licensing Child Care Operations Fiscal Year 2012

Operation Type	Central Registry Checks	DPS Checks	FBI Checks *
<b>Day Care Licensing</b>			
Licensed Child Care Center	190,244	190,242	154,261
Licensed Child Care Home	5,313	5,312	883
Listed Family Home	8,064	8,064	688
Registered Child Care Home	10,676	10,679	1,150
Small Employer Based Child Care	16	16	15
Total	214,313	214,313	156,997

\* Represents the number of FBI checks that were requested, not the number that were actually processed.

Note: Does not include background checks conducted on individuals in an illegal child-care operation or exemption request. Review the definition section for details on who is required to have Central Registry, DPS and FBI checks.



## State's Top 10 Standards Deficiencies for Child Day Care Operations

### Fiscal Year 2010

Rank	Standard Rule*	Description**	Deficiencies	Percent of Total Deficiencies
1	746.1203(4)	Responsibilities of Caregivers- Supervision of Children	1,516	1.7
2	746.3701	Safety - Areas Free From Hazards	1,493	1.7
3	746.1201(1)	Responsibilities of Employees and Caregivers -Demonstrate Competency, Good Judgment, Self-control	1,354	1.5
4	746.3407	Maintenance of Building, Grounds and Equipment	1,287	1.4
5	745.615(a)(2)	Required background checks - each person employed	1,172	1.3
6	746.5101(a)	Annual Fire Inspection - Before Initial Permit Issued and Every 12 Months	1,119	1.3
7	746.1601	Child/ Caregiver Ratio - 13 or More Children	918	1.0
8	746.605(6)	Required Admission Information - Emergency Contact	906	1.0
9	747.3501	Safety - Areas Free From Hazards	839	0.9
10	746.1315(a)	One Caregiver per Group of Children Must Have Current Training in First Aid with Rescue Breathing and Choking. Pediatric First Aid is Preferred	829	0.9

### Fiscal Year 2011

Rank	Standard Rule*	Description**	Deficiencies	Percent of Total Deficiencies
1	745.625(7)	Background checks submitted - Every 24 months after each person's background check was first submitted	2,346	2.5
2	745.615(a)(2)	Required background checks - each person employed	1,842	2.0
3	746.3701	Safety - Areas Free From Hazards	1,613	1.7
4	746.1203(4)	Responsibilities of Caregivers- Supervision of Children	1,544	1.6
5	745.615(b)(2)	Required FBI check -Persons at child care center, before/after-school, or school-age program required to have name-based check unless only meet (a)(7)	1,411	1.5
6	746.3407	Maintenance of Building, Grounds and Equipment	1,378	1.5
7	746.1201(1)	Responsibilities of Employees and Caregivers -Demonstrate Competency, Good Judgment, Self-control	1,157	1.2
8	746.5101(a)	Annual Fire Inspection - Before Initial Permit Issued and Every 12 Months	1,084	1.1
9	747.3501	Safety - Areas Free From Hazards	1,032	1.1
10	746.1601	Child/ Caregiver Ratio - 13 or More Children	871	0.9

## State's Top 10 Standards Deficiencies for Child Day Care Operations

### Fiscal Year 2012

Rank	Standard Rule*	Description	Deficiencies	Percent of Total Deficiencies
1	745.625(7)	Background checks submitted - Every 24 months after each person's background check was first submitted	1,827	2.1
2	745.615(a)(2)	Required background checks - each person employed	1,583	1.8
3	746.1203(4)	Responsibilities of Caregivers- Supervision of Children	1,369	1.6
4	746.3701	Safety - Areas Free From Hazards	1,289	1.5
5	746.3407	Maintenance of Building, Grounds and Equipment	1,182	1.3
6	745.615(b)(2)	Required FBI check -Persons at child care center, before/after-school, or school-age program required to have name-based check unless only meet (a)(7)	1,180	1.3
7	746.1201(1)	Responsibilities of Employees and Caregivers -Demonstrate Competency, Good Judgment, Self-control	1,037	1.2
8	746.5101(a)	Annual Fire Inspection - Before Initial Permit Issued and Every 12 Months	976	1.1
9	747.3501	Safety - Areas Free From Hazards	918	1.0
10	746.1601	Child/ Caregiver Ratio - 13 or More Children	832	0.9
10	747.501(10)	Written Operational Policies- Emergency Preparedness Plan	832	0.9

\* Only includes deficiencies where administrative review was upheld or waived.

\*\* As described in FY 2012.

Note: Does not include assessment deficiencies.

# RCCL

## Residential Child Care Licensing Overview

The Texas Department of Family and Protective Services is granted its authority to regulate child care facilities and child placing agencies by the Texas Legislature in Chapter 42 of the Texas Human Resources Code.

The purpose of regulation is to protect a group or class of children by establishing and enforcing statewide minimum standards.

### Total Average Filled Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff

Caseworkers	116.5
Supervisors	21.8
Other Staff	28.1
<b>Total RCCL Staff</b>	<b>166.4</b>

### Worker Demographics


Turnover Rate	18.6%
Agency Tenure:	
Less Than 1 Year	5.8%
1 - 3 Years	11.7%
Greater than 3 Years	82.5%
Entry Salary (Inv)	\$35,650.92
Entry Salary (Non-Inv)	\$31,728.96
Average Age	40.5
Race/Ethnicity:	
African-American	35.8%
Anglo	35.0%
Hispanic	27.5%
Other	1.7%

### Supervisor Demographics

Turnover Rate	4.7%
Agency Tenure:	
Less Than 1 Year	0.0%
1 - 3 Years	0.0%
Greater than 3 Years	100.0%
Entry Salary	\$43,672.92
Average Age	39.6
Race/Ethnicity:	
African-American	45.0%
Anglo	25.0%
Hispanic	25.0%
Other	5.0%

### RCCL Expenditures

RCCL Staff	\$9,264,001
------------	-------------



*Note: The chart is for reference only and does not necessarily represent the flow of a case.*

### Statistics FY 2012

24-Hour Care Facilities	10,459
Capacity of Facilities	41,420
Abuse/Neglect Investigations	2,167
Non-Abuse/Neglect Investigations	2,997
Inspections	4,736
Adverse Actions	0

## Legal Responsibility for Child-Care Licensing

### Day Care and Residential Care: Statutory References

Social Security Act

Human Resources Code, Chapters 40, 42, and 43

Texas Family Code, Title 5

Texas Government Code

Texas Health and Safety Code, Chapter 249

Texas Administrative Code, Title 40

### Major Provisions:

- Develop minimum standards to promote the health, safety, and well being of children in out-of-home care.
- Inspect child-care operations to ensure they maintain compliance with minimum standards.
- Investigate allegations of abuse/neglect, investigate violations of standards or the law and ensure appropriate enforcement actions are taken.
- Conduct criminal background checks and DFPS Central Registry checks on all adult staff or caregivers, other adults and youth ages 14 to 18 who will be in regular or frequent contact with children in child-care operations.
- Take corrective and adverse actions when necessary.
- Offer consultation to potential applicants and permit holders about meeting and maintaining compliance with Licensing standards.
- Educate the general public about choosing regulated child-care and inform them of the child-care options in Texas through media campaigns and by maintaining an online database of child-care providers, including information regarding each operation's compliance history.
- Enforce regulatory requirements for all child-care providers, including illegally operating child-care providers.
- Conduct inspections of a random sample of agency foster homes.
- Conduct annual enforcement team conferences to thoroughly review operations.

### Other Programmatic Information: Challenges

- Consistently enforcing adherence to minimum standards across the state.
- Developing cooperative, professional, and effective relationships with operations resulting in increased compliance and stronger protection for children.
- Providing technical assistance to all child care operations, especially focusing on those struggling to maintain compliance with standards.
- Providing thorough, efficient and timely background check results to over a quarter of a million people each year seeking to work in child care, provide foster care or adopt a child.
- Maximizing technology resources to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of regulatory practices and allow licensing staff to become an increasingly mobile workforce.
- Creating standards that protect the health and safety of children in care without impacting the affordability and availability of that care.

## Fiscal Year 2004 and 2012 Pre- and Post - Reform Statistics by Region (RCCL)

2004	Region 1 - Lubbock	2012
0.0%	Turnover	36.4%
\$44,338	Average Base Salary	\$40,205
95	Inspections	570
129	Investigations	271

2004	Region 2 - Abilene	2012
0.0%	Turnover	0.0%
\$0	Average Base Salary	\$39,751
38	Inspections	381
134	Investigations	161

2004	Region 3 - Arlington	2012
0.0%	Turnover	30.8%
\$39,191	Average Base Salary	\$37,571
341	Inspections	2,119
436	Investigations	939

2004	Region 9 - Midland	2012
0.0%	Turnover	0.0%
\$0	Average Base Salary	\$43,779
24	Inspections	135
87	Investigations	46

2004	Region 7 - Austin	2012
26.7%	Turnover	16.0%
\$34,351	Average Base Salary	\$37,705
396	Inspections	1,665
603	Investigations	783


2004	Region 4 - Tyler	2012
0.0%	Turnover	0.0%
\$32,501	Average Base Salary	\$39,414
95	Inspections	320
139	Investigations	173

2004	Region 10 - El Paso	2012
0.0%	Turnover	0.0%
\$32,865	Average Base Salary	\$43,888
38	Inspections	254
47	Investigations	95

2004	Region 5 - Beaumont	2012
100.0%	Turnover	0.0%
\$34,518	Average Base Salary	\$39,891
57	Inspections	276
62	Investigations	148

2004	Region 8 - San Antonio	2012
38.1%	Turnover	9.6%
\$34,462	Average Base Salary	\$39,535
337	Inspections	1,857
367	Investigations	959

2004	Region 6 - Houston	2012
0.0%	Turnover	21.5%
\$36,337	Average Base Salary	\$37,687
660	Inspections	2,800
991	Investigations	1,192




2004	Region 11 - Edinburg	2012
0.0%	Turnover	25.0%
\$33,926	Average Base Salary	\$40,066
132	Inspections	921
339	Investigations	372

2004	Statewide Totals	2012
33.8	Caseworkers*	116.5
12.9%	Turnover	18.6%
\$36,499	Average Base Salary	\$38,586
2,213	Inspections	11,301
3,341	Investigations	5,139

\* RCCL workers report to a state office division and are not regionally allocated.  
 Note: The State Total for Inspections and Investigations includes those where the Region was Unknown and/or Out of State.  
 Note: The State Total for Inspections and Investigations does not include Illegal Operations.

**Texas Child Population  
Ages Birth through 17 Years  
Fiscal Year 2012**

State Total: 7,054,634



Population Data Source: Texas State Data Center, University of Texas (San Antonio). Based on Census 2010 data.

## Residential Child Care Licensing Operations\* in Texas as of August 31

Year	Child Placing Agencies (CPA)**	Homes Verified by CPAs	General Residential Operations	Residential Treatment Centers	Independent Foster Family and Group Homes	Maternity Homes	Total Licensed Residential
2008	331	9,518	144	90	10	13	10,106
2009	334	9,761	150	89	14	13	10,361
2010	341	9,731	154	79	7	10	10,322
2011	350	10,167	160	85	4	8	10,774
2012	362	9,849	157	80	5	6	10,459

\* Counts do not include Applicants

\*\* Counts include Branch Offices

## Residential Child Care Licensing Operations in Texas as of August 31

	2011		2012	
Child Placing Agencies*	Count	Capacity	Count	Capacity
Main Offices	205	NA	209	NA
Branch Offices**	145	NA	153	NA
Subtotal	350	NA	362	NA
Homes Verified by Child Placing Agencies	Count	Capacity	Count	Capacity
Agency Foster Homes ***	7,138	22,392	7,240	21,849
Agency Group Homes ***	429	3,781	404	3,547
CPS Foster Family Homes	1,822	5,300	1,525	4,525
CPS Foster Group Homes	20	116	12	73
CPS Adoptive Homes	758	N/A	668	NA
Subtotal	10,167	31,589	9,849	29,994
Licensed Residential Operations	Count	Capacity	Count	Capacity
General Residential Operations	160	7,258	157	7,679
Residential Treatment Centers	85	3,749	80	3,589
Independent Foster Homes	1	6	1	6
Independent Foster Group Homes	3	32	4	38
Maternity Homes	8	132	6	114
Subtotal	257	11,177	248	11,426
<b>Total Residential Child Care Licensing Operations</b>	<b>10,774</b>	<b>42,766</b>	<b>10,459</b>	<b>41,420</b>

\* Includes 11 DFPS Regional Child Placing Agencies

\*\* Branch Offices operate under the license authority of the main office.

\*\*\* Adoptive only homes are not included in the number of private agency homes.

## Residential Child Care Licensing Operations Regulated by Fiscal Year

## Child Placing Agencies

Region	Main Offices		Branch Offices		Total CPAs	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
1 Lubbock	9	9	11	11	20	20
2 Abilene	7	7	13	13	20	20
3 Arlington	64	63	21	23	85	86
4 Tyler	6	6	7	8	13	14
5 Beaumont	5	4	6	7	11	11
6 Houston	38	39	20	25	58	64
7 Austin	34	36	20	18	54	54
8 San Antonio	30	32	19	20	49	52
9 Midland	4	4	4	4	8	8
10 El Paso	3	3	5	5	8	8
11 Edinburg	5	6	19	19	24	25
Unknown/Out Of State	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>362</b>

## Homes Verified by Child Placing Agencies

Region	Agency Foster Homes		Agency Group Homes		CPS Foster Homes	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
1 Lubbock	304	303	12	15	148	118
2 Abilene	203	201	18	17	95	63
3 Arlington	1,884	1,814	102	93	400	287
4 Tyler	274	277	17	13	110	87
5 Beaumont	176	171	24	20	134	131
6 Houston	1,549	1,671	64	65	340	290
7 Austin	1,026	1,040	51	44	201	183
8 San Antonio	1,016	1,073	68	70	141	145
9 Midland	124	136	11	12	77	57
10 El Paso	146	133	9	4	43	45
11 Edinburg	435	420	53	51	82	61
Unknown/Out Of State	1	1	0	0	51	58
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,138</b>	<b>7,240</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>1,822</b>	<b>1,525</b>

Region	CPS Foster Group Homes		CPS Adoptive Homes		Subtotal - Total Homes Verified by CPAs	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
1 Lubbock	2	2	18	17	484	455
2 Abilene	0	0	13	11	329	292
3 Arlington	2	3	102	87	2,490	2,284
4 Tyler	0	0	55	35	456	412
5 Beaumont	0	1	41	20	375	343
6 Houston	6	0	224	244	2,183	2,270
7 Austin	2	2	138	92	1,418	1,361
8 San Antonio	6	3	91	108	1,322	1,399
9 Midland	1	1	21	14	234	220
10 El Paso	0	0	17	10	215	192
11 Edinburg	1	0	26	24	597	556
Unknown/Out Of State	0	0	12	6	64	65
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>758</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>10,167</b>	<b>9,849</b>



## Residential Child Care Licensing Operations Regulated by Fiscal Year


## Licensed Residential Operations

Region	General Residential Operations		Residential Treatment Centers		Independent Foster Family Homes	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
1 Lubbock	12	10	3	3	0	0
2 Abilene	6	6	1	0	0	0
3 Arlington	21	19	7	8	0	1
4 Tyler	6	6	4	4	0	0
5 Beaumont	6	5	2	2	0	0
6 Houston	32	35	39	35	0	0
7 Austin	24	24	14	13	0	0
8 San Antonio	30	28	13	13	1	0
9 Midland	4	4	0	0	0	0
10 El Paso	5	6	1	1	0	0
11 Edinburg	14	14	1	1	0	0
Unknown/Out Of State	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Region	Independent Foster Group Homes		Maternity Homes		Subtotal - Licensed Residential Operations	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
1 Lubbock	0	0	1	1	16	14
2 Abilene	0	0	0	0	7	6
3 Arlington	0	0	1	1	29	29
4 Tyler	0	0	2	1	12	11
5 Beaumont	0	0	0	0	8	7
6 Houston	3	4	1	1	75	75
7 Austin	0	0	2	2	40	39
8 San Antonio	0	0	1	0	45	41
9 Midland	0	0	0	0	4	4
10 El Paso	0	0	0	0	6	7
11 Edinburg	0	0	0	0	15	15
Unknown/Out Of State	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>248</b>



Region	Total Residential Child Care Licensing Operations								
	2011	2012	0	500	1,000	1,500	2,000	2,500	3,000
1 Lubbock	520	489							
2 Abilene	356	318							
3 Arlington	2,604	2,399							
4 Tyler	481	437							
5 Beaumont	394	361							
6 Houston	2,316	2,409							
7 Austin	1,512	1,454							
8 San Antonio	1,416	1,492							
9 Midland	246	232							
10 El Paso	229	207							
11 Edinburg	636	596							
Unknown/Out Of State	64	65							
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,774</b>	<b>10,459</b>							

### Licensing of Residential Child Care Operations by Region Fiscal Year 2012



*Note: Does not include homes verified by CPA's. Includes Child Placing Agencies, General Residential Operations (including Residential Treatment Centers a service type of the General Residential Operations), Independent Foster Group Homes, and Independent Foster Family Homes.*

### Inspections\* in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations



Facility Type	2011	2012
Child Placing Agencies	1,078	1,200
CPA Foster Family & Group Homes	2,482	2,048
CPS Foster Family & Group & Adoptive Homes	643	422
General Residential Operation	560	542
Residential Treatment Center	570	490
Maternity Homes	24	18
Independent Foster/ Foster Group Homes	16	13
Illegal Operations	1	3
Exemption Requests	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,374</b>	<b>4,736</b>

Note: RCCL inspects agency foster homes for two reasons (1) to conduct an investigation; or (2) to determine whether the CPA managing the foster homes is compliant in its verification, monitoring and management of the foster home and the children in care. Foster home inspections for the latter purpose are periodically selected at random from across the state from the DFPS database for inspection.


\* Beginning in FY12 the LBB Performance Measure definition of Inspections does not include Inspections done as part of an Abuse/Neglect Investigation.

## Inspections\*\* in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations by Type of Inspection Fiscal Year 2012

Total Inspections: 4,736


### Child Placing Agencies

Inspection Type	Number
Agency Home Sample Inspections	2,470
Monitoring	712
Follow-up	121
Other	367
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,670</b>




### General Residential Operations\*

Inspection Type	Number
Monitoring	312
Follow-up	98
Other	150
<b>Total</b>	<b>560</b>



### Residential Treatment Centers

Inspection Type	Number
Monitoring	258
Follow-up	77
Other	155
<b>Total</b>	<b>490</b>




*Note: RCCL inspects agency foster homes for two reasons (1) to conduct an investigation; or (2) to determine whether the CPA managing the foster homes is compliant in its verification, monitoring and management of the foster home and the children in care. Foster home inspections for the latter purpose are periodically selected at random from across the state from the DFPS database for inspection.*

*\*Includes Maternity Home and Exemption Request Facility Types*


*\*\* Beginning in FY12 the LBB Performance Measure definition of Inspections does not include Inspections done as part of an Abuse/Neglect Investigation.*

## Inspections\*\* in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations by Type of Inspection Fiscal Year 2012

Independent Foster/Foster Group Home	
Inspection Type	Number
Monitoring	9
Follow-up	4
Other	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>



Illegal Operations	
Inspection Type	Number
Monitoring	0
Follow-up	3
Other	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>




Note: RCCL inspects agency foster homes for two reasons (1) to conduct an investigation; or (2) to determine whether the CPA managing the foster homes is compliant in its verification, monitoring and management of the foster home and the children in care. Foster home inspections for the latter purpose are periodically selected at random from across the state from the DFPS database for inspection.

\*Includes Maternity Home and Exemption Request Facility Types

\*\* Beginning in FY12 the LBB Performance Measure definition of Inspections does not include Inspections done as part of an Abuse/Neglect Investigation.

## Investigations in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations



\* Totals include investigations of Illegal Operations and Exemption Requests

\*\* Includes homes regulated by Child Placing Agencies

## Investigations in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Child Placing Agencies	Licensed Residential Operations	Exemption Requests	Illegal Operations	Total Investigations
1 Lubbock	132	139	0	0	271
2 Abilene	133	28	2	1	164
3 Arlington	835	104	1	2	942
4 Tyler	97	76	0	0	173
5 Beaumont	98	50	0	0	148
6 Houston	653	539	0	4	1,196
7 Austin	338	445	0	2	785
8 San Antonio	519	440	0	1	960
9 Midland	30	16	0	1	47
10 El Paso	80	15	0	0	95
11 Edinburg	284	88	0	0	372
Other/Unknown	0	0	0	6	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,199</b>	<b>1,940</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5,159</b>

## Investigations in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations Fiscal Year 2012

Operation Type	Total Number Operations as of 8/31/12	Investigations	Number of Abuse/Neglect Investigations			Number of Non Abuse/Neglect Investigations	
			Total	Valid	Percent Validated	Total	Investigations with a Deficiency Cited
<b>Residential Child Care Licensing Operations</b>							
Child Placing Agencies (CPA)*	362	3,199	1,367	61	4.5%	1,829	580
General Residential Operations	157	827	265	9	3.4%	567	146
Residential Treatment Centers	80	1,110	529	21	4.0%	586	134
Independent Foster/ Foster Group Homes	5	3	2	0	0.0%	1	1
Maternity Homes	6	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>610</b>	<b>5,139</b>	<b>2,163</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>2,983</b>	<b>861</b>
<b>Unlicensed Operations</b>							
Exemption Requests	0	3	2	0	0.0%	1	0
Illegal Operations	21	17	2	0	0.0%	13	5
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>631</b>	<b>5,159</b>	<b>2,167</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>2,997</b>	<b>866</b>

\* Includes CPA branch offices

Note: The number of Investigations and the number of Non Abuse/Neglect Investigations are based on the date that the worker completed the investigation. The number of Abuse/Neglect Investigations uses the date that the Investigation stage closed. Therefore, the sum of Abuse/Neglect Investigations and Non Abuse/Neglect Investigations will not match the total Investigations.

## Adverse and Corrective Actions in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations by Region Fiscal Year 2012

### Adverse Actions in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations by Region Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Permits Denied	Permits Revoked	Permits Suspended	Total Adverse Actions
1 Lubbock	0	0	0	0
2 Abilene	0	0	0	0
3 Arlington	0	0	0	0
4 Tyler	0	0	0	0
5 Beaumont	0	0	0	0
6 Houston	0	0	0	0
7 Austin	0	0	0	0
8 San Antonio	0	0	0	0
9 Midland	0	0	0	0
10 El Paso	0	0	0	0
11 Edinburg	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0
<b>State Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Corrective Actions in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations by Region Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Evaluation	Probation	Total Corrective Actions
1 Lubbock	1	0	1
2 Abilene	0	0	0
3 Arlington	5	0	5
4 Tyler	2	0	2
5 Beaumont	0	0	0
6 Houston	3	2	5
7 Austin	2	0	2
8 San Antonio	0	1	1
9 Midland	0	0	0
10 El Paso	0	0	0
11 Edinburg	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>State Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16</b>

*Note: Adverse actions are determined by the date the facility was sent the letter of intent. Finalizing adverse action through due process is lengthy. Voluntary Suspensions are not counted in the number of suspensions. Corrective actions begin after the due process is completed.*

## Background Checks for Residential Child Care Licensing Operations Fiscal Year 2012

Residential Child Care Licensing Operations	Central Registry Checks	DPS Checks	FBI Checks *
CPAs, CPA Foster Agency Homes	50,795	50,797	22,239
General Residential Operations	13,938	13,938	1,446
Independent Foster/ Group Homes	282	282	22
Residential Treatment Centers	7,598	7,598	631
Maternity Homes	500	500	34
<b>Total</b>	<b>73,113</b>	<b>73,115</b>	<b>24,372</b>

\* Represents the number of FBI checks that were requested, not the number that were actually processed.

Note: Does not include background checks conducted on individuals in illegal child-care operations or CPS Foster and CPS Adoptive homes. Review the definition section for details on who is required to have Central Registry, DPS and FBI checks.

## Child Care Administrator Credential Exam Fiscal Year 2012

Licensed Child Care Administrators (LCCA)	57	Passed
	8	Failed
	<u>65</u>	<b>Total Exams</b>
Licensed Child Placing Agency Administrators (LCPA)	68	Passed
	6	Failed
	<u>74</u>	<b>Total Exams</b>

Total number of exams for both licenses for FY12 was 139.

On 8/31/2012 there were:

	Active	Inactive	Total
<b>LCCA</b>	746	151	897
<b>LCPA</b>	465	29	494
<b>Total</b>			<u>1,391</u>



## State's Top 10 Standards Deficiencies for Residential Child Care Licensing Operations

## Fiscal Year 2010

Rank	Standard Rule*	Description**	Deficiencies	Percent of Total Deficiencies
1	749.607(1)	Employee and caregiver responsibilities-Competency, prudent judgment, self-control in presence of children and when performing assigned tasks	132	2.3
2	749.1953(a)	Corporal Punishment-May not use/threaten corporal punishment, such as hitting/spanking, forced exercise, holding physical position, unproductive work	109	1.9
3	745.625(a)(7)	Background checks submitted-every 24 months after first submitted	86	1.5
4	748.507(1)	Employee general responsibilities-Demonstrate competency, prudent judgment, self-control in presence of children and when performing assigned tasks	76	1.3
5	748.685(a)(4)	Caregiver responsibility - providing the level of supervision necessary to ensure each child's safety and well-being	58	1
6	745.615(a)(8)	Required background check - Applicants for a child-care administrator's license	57	1
7	749.2593(a)(3)	Supervision-The caregiver is responsible for ensuring each child's safety and well being, including auditory and/or visual awareness of the child	55	1
8	748.3301(a)	Physical Site-Buildings must be structurally sound, clean, and in good repair. Paints must be lead-free	51	0.9
9	749.1521(1)	Medication Storage-Store medication in a locked container	48	0.8
10	749.1541(a)	Medication Record-Maintain cumulative record of prescription medications dispensed to child, include nonprescription meds for child under five yrs old	47	0.8

## Fiscal Year 2011

Rank	Standard Rule*	Description**	Deficiencies	Percent of Total Deficiencies
1	749.1953(a)	Corporal Punishment-May not use/threaten corporal punishment, such as hitting/spanking, forced exercise, holding physical position, unproductive work	132	2.3
2	745.625(7)	Background checks submitted - Every 24 months after each person's background check was first submitted	130	2.2
3	749.607(1)	Employee and caregiver responsibilities-Competency, prudent judgment, self-control in presence of children and when performing assigned tasks	78	1.3
4	745.615(a)(7)	Required background checks - Persons 14 years or older, other than clients, who will regularly or frequently be present while children are in care	75	1.3
5	748.685(a)(4)	Caregiver responsibility - providing the level of supervision necessary to ensure each child's safety and well-being	67	1.2
6	749.1521(1)	Medication Storage-Store medication in a locked container	60	1
7	748.3301(a)	Physical Site-Buildings must be structurally sound, clean, and in good repair. Paints must be lead-free	59	1
8	748.507(1)	Employee general responsibilities-Demonstrate competency, prudent judgment, self-control in presence of children and when performing assigned tasks	53	0.9
9	748.3301(i)	Physical Site-Equipment and furniture must be safe for children and must be kept clean and in good repair	50	0.9
10	749.2593(a)(3)	Supervision-The caregiver is responsible for ensuring each child's safety and well being, including auditory and/or visual awareness of the child	49	0.8

## Fiscal Year 2012

Rank	Standard Rule*	Description	Deficiencies	Percent of Total Deficiencies
1	745.625(7)	Background checks submitted - Every 24 months after each person's background check was first submitted	175	2.8
2	749.1953(a)	Corporal Punishment-May not use/threaten corporal punishment, such as hitting/spanking, forced exercise, holding physical position, unproductive work	136	2.2
3	745.615(a)(7)	Required background checks - Persons 14 years or older, other than clients, who will regularly or frequently be present while children are in care	105	1.7
4	749.1521(1)	Medication Storage-Store medication in a locked container	92	1.5
5	749.607(1)	Employee and caregiver responsibilities-Competency, prudent judgment, self-control in presence of children and when performing assigned tasks	85	1.4
6	749.2593(a)(3)	Supervision-The caregiver is responsible for ensuring each child's safety and well being, including auditory and/or visual awareness of the child	83	1.3
7	749.1541(a)	Medication Record-Maintain cumulative record of prescription medications dispensed to child, include nonprescription meds for child under five yrs old	66	1.1
8	749.1417(a)	TB exam-Persons over 1 yr old who live, work, volunteer at operation have exam w/in 30 days, unless person had previous exam that meets requirements	61	1
9	748.685(a)(4)	Caregiver responsibility - providing the level of supervision necessary to ensure each child's safety and well-being	56	0.9
10	748.507(1)	Employee general responsibilities-Demonstrate competency, prudent judgment, self-control in presence of children and when performing assigned tasks	53	0.8
10	749.1957(8)	Other Prohibited Discipline-Humiliating, shaming, ridiculing, rejecting, or yelling at a child	53	0.8

\* Only includes deficiencies where administrative review was upheld or waived.

\*\*As described in FY 2012

Note: Does not include assessment deficiencies.



## Legal Responsibility for the Division of Prevention and Early Intervention

**Federal:** Title XX, Social Security Act  
**Federal:** Title IV-B, Part 2, Social Security Act  
**State:** Texas Family Code, 264.301 also Chapter 265 – created through SB1574 below  
**State:** Senate Bill 1574, 76th Legislature  
**State:** Human Resources Code, 40.0561

### The Division of Prevention and Early Intervention

(PEI) was created to consolidate prevention and early intervention programs within the jurisdiction of a single state agency. Consolidation of these programs is intended to eliminate fragmentation and duplication of contracted prevention and early intervention services for at-risk children, youth, and families.

- **Community Youth Development (CYD)**-The CYD program contracts with community-based organizations to develop juvenile delinquency prevention programs in ZIP codes with high juvenile crime rates. Approaches used by communities to prevent delinquency have included mentoring, youth employment programs, career preparation, youth leadership development and recreational activities. Communities prioritize and fund specific prevention services according to local needs. CYD services are available in 15 targeted Texas ZIP codes.
- **Services to At-Risk Youth (STAR)**-The STAR program contracts with community agencies to offer family crisis intervention counseling, short-term emergency respite care, and individual and family counseling. Youth up to age 17 and their families are eligible if they experience conflict at home, truancy or delinquency, or a youth who runs away from home. STAR services are available in all 254 Texas counties. Each STAR contractor also provides universal child abuse prevention services, ranging from local media campaigns to informational brochures and parenting classes.
- **Texas Families: Together and Safe**-TFTS funds evidence-based, community-based programs designed to alleviate stress and promote parental competencies and behaviors that increase the ability of families to become self-sufficient and successfully nurture their children. The goals of TFTS are to: improve and enhance access to family support services; increase the efficiency and effectiveness of community-based family support services; enable children to remain in their own

homes by providing preventative services, and to increase collaboration among local programs, government agencies, and families.

- **Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention**-The CBCAP program seeks to increase community awareness of existing prevention services, strengthen community and parental involvement in child abuse prevention efforts, and encourage families to engage in services that are already available. CBCAP funds a variety of contracts with community based organizations to provide child abuse and neglect prevention services. These include the Relief Nursery, Family Support and Rural Family Support programs, as well as various special initiatives and public awareness campaigns.
- **Family Strengthening** - A variety of Family Strengthening services, available across the state, have been evaluated and proven to effectively increase family protective factors. These services are designed to increase the resiliency of families and prevent child abuse and neglect. Programs must also foster strong community collaboration to provide a continuum of family services. This program was eliminated as a result of budget cuts during the 82nd legislative session.
- **Youth Resiliency** - Youth Resiliency Programs provide services proven to increase protective factors for youth. A variety of services are available across the state designed to increase youth resiliency and prevent juvenile delinquency. These programs must foster strong community collaboration to provide a continuum of services for participating youth. This program was eliminated as a result of budget cuts during the 82nd legislative session.
- **Community Based Family Services** - This program serves families who were investigated by CPS but whose allegations were unsubstantiated, through community and evidence-based services. Services include home visitation, case management,

and additional social services to provide a safe and stable home environment.

- **Tertiary Child Abuse Prevention** - Community-based, volunteer-driven prevention, intervention, and aftercare services are provided for children who are or have been, or who are at risk of being, abused and/or neglected. The goals of the program include reducing child maltreatment and the number of families re-entering the Child Protective Services system. Additional goals are to improve the quality and availability of aftercare services for abused children and enhance a statewide network of tertiary child abuse prevention programs.
- **Statewide Youth Services Network**- The Statewide Youth Services Network contracts provide community and evidence-based juvenile


delinquency prevention programs focused on youth ages 10 through 17, in each DFPS region.

- **Texas Youth and Runaway Hotlines**-The toll-free Texas Runaway Hotline and the Texas Youth Hotline offer crisis intervention, telephone counseling, and referrals to troubled youth and families. Volunteers answer the phones and interact with callers facing a variety of problems including family conflict, delinquency, truancy, and abuse and neglect issues. The program increases public awareness through media efforts that may include television, radio, billboards and other printed materials.



## Prevention and Early Intervention - Expenditures and Staffing as of 1/9/2013

Staff Cost	\$1,101,866.00
Total Staff	16.6
Total	\$27,862,496.26

PEI Programs - Contracted	FY 2012 Expenditures
Services to At-Risk Youth	\$16,792,154.35
Community Youth Development	4,692,711.02
Texas Families: Together and Safe	2,281,923.58
Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention	716,847.63
Community-Based Family Services	420,974.73
Statewide Youth Services Network (SYSN)	1,600,194.95
<b>Total Contracted Expenditures</b>	<b>\$26,504,806.26</b>
PEI Programs - Non-Contracted	FY 2012 Expenditures
Texas Runaway and Youth Hotlines	255,824.00
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$26,760,630.26</b>




**STAR (Services To At-Risk) Youth Who are Registered and Received a Service by Fiscal Year**





**STAR (Services To At-Risk) Youth by Presenting Problem Fiscal Year 2012**

Presenting Problem	
Family Conflict	18,230
Misdemeanor Offense	4,053
Runaway	335
State Jail Felony Offense	31
Truant	3,850
Youth Under 10 Delinquent	335
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,834</b>



### Community Youth Development (CYD) Youth Served by Fiscal Year



### Community Youth Development (CYD) Average Monthly Clients Served Fiscal Year 2012


City	Zip Code of Site	County	Average Unduplicated Youth Served per Month
Amarillo	79107	Potter	301
Austin	78744	Travis	238
Corpus Christi	78415	Nueces	471
Dallas	75216	Dallas	352
Dallas	75217	Dallas	386
El Paso	79924	El Paso	574
Fort Worth	76106	Tarrant	471
Galveston	77550	Galveston	269
Houston	77081	Harris	260
Lubbock	79415	Lubbock	276
McAllen	78501	Hidalgo	707
Pasadena	77506	Harris	505
San Antonio	78207	Bexar	395
Waco	76707	McLennan	326
<b>State Total</b>			<b>5,530</b>

### Texas Youth and Runaway Hotlines Incoming Calls by Fiscal Year


Fiscal Year	Texas Youth & Runaway Hotlines	Forwarded from STAR Program	Total Calls
2008	19,363	11,913	31,276
2009*	13,072**	0	13,072**
2010*	12,940	0	12,940
2011*	9,757	0	9,757
2012*	9,011	0	9,011

\*In prior fiscal years calls were forwarded from STAR program when STAR program operators were absent or unavailable. Beginning in fiscal year 2009, the STAR program was required to have staff available at all times so calls were no longer forwarded and therefore not included in the Runaway Hotline counts.

\*\*Fiscal Year 2009 call data from the Youth hotline 1-800-98YOUTH is incomplete and missing due to a reporting malfunction (number was omitted from Vendor's online reporting system).



### Characteristics of Hotline Callers Fiscal Year 2012





**Number of Families (Primary Caregivers) Served in the  
Child Abuse/Neglect Prevention Programs  
Fiscal Year 2012**

**Total Families Served: 2,653**

Unduplicated Families Served						
Program	2010	Percent	2011	Percent	2012	Percent
Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP)	372	13.8%	461	12.0%	577	21.7%
Community-Based Family Services (CBFS)	337	2.2%	280	7.3%	206	7.8%
Texas Families: Together and Safe (TFTS)	3,410	59.8%	2,110	55.0%	1,870	70.5%
Family Strengthening Program (FSP)**	1,616	23.6%	938	24.5%	0	0.0%
Tertiary Child Abuse Prevention (TPP)**	61	0.6%	44	1.1%	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,796</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,833</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,653</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Primary Caregivers							
Ethnicity *	CBCAP	CBFS	TFTS	FSP**	TPP**	Total	%
African American	21	17	302	0	0	340	12.8%
Anglo	145	42	392	0	0	579	21.8%
Asian	1	1	24	0	0	26	1.0%
Hispanic	405	145	1,127	0	0	1,677	63.2%
Native American	1	0	3	0	0	4	0.2%
Other	4	1	22	0	0	27	1.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>1,870</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,653</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Primary Caregivers							
Gender	CBCAP	CBFS	TFTS	FSP**	TPP**	Total	%
Female	489	190	1,710	0	0	2,389	90.0%
Male	88	16	160	0	0	264	10.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>1,870</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,653</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Primary Caregivers							
Age Group	CBCAP	CBFS	TFTS	FSP**	TPP**	Total	%
Under 18	50	9	73	0	0	132	5.0%
18-25	183	79	511	0	0	773	29.1%
26-35	200	74	697	0	0	971	36.6%
36-45	90	32	399	0	0	521	19.6%
Over 45	54	12	190	0	0	256	9.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>1,870</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,653</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

\*\*This program was eliminated as a result of budget cuts during the 82nd legislative session.

## Number of Youth Served in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs by Fiscal Year

Program	Unduplicated Youth Served					
	2010	%	2011	%	2012	%
Services to At Risk Youth (STAR)	30,042	54.8%	30,168	53.2%	26,834	54.8%
Community Youth Development (CYD)	17,799	32.5%	19,731	34.8%	16,900	34.5%
Statewide Youth Services Network (SYSN)	5,513	10.1%	5,720	10.1%	5,273	10.8%
Youth Resiliency Program (YRP)**	1,445	2.6%	1,066	1.9%	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>54,799</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>56,685</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>49,007</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## Characteristics of Youth Served in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs Fiscal Year 2012

Race/Ethnicity *	STAR	CYD	SYSN	YRP**	Total	%
African American	210	3,490	1,829	0	5,529	11.3%
Anglo	424	611	854	0	1,889	3.9%
Asian	4	141	25	0	170	0.3%
Hispanic	13,718	12,397	2,420	0	28,535	58.2%
Native American	3	13	10	0	26	0.1%
Other	12,475	248	135	0	12,858	26.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,834</b>	<b>16,900</b>	<b>5,273</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49,007</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Gender	STAR	CYD	SYSN	YRP**	Total	%
Female	12,186	9,049	2,791	0	24,026	49.0%
Male	14,628	7,846	2,480	0	24,954	50.9%
Unknown	20	5	2	0	27	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,834</b>	<b>16,900</b>	<b>5,273</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49,007</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Age Group	STAR	CYD	SYSN	YRP**	Total	%
Under 6	2,343	27	305	0	2,675	5.5%
6-9	4,889	2,136	135	0	7,160	14.6%
10-17	19,602	14,025	4,833	0	38,460	78.5%
Over 17	0	712	0	0	712	1.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,834</b>	<b>16,900</b>	<b>5,273</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49,007</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

\*\*This program was eliminated as a result of budget cuts during the 82nd legislative session.

## Prevention and Early Intervention Performance Outcomes, Outputs and Efficiencies by Fiscal Year

<b>Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs</b>				
	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Community Youth Development (CYD)</b>				
Percent of youth not referred to juvenile probation	97.8%	98.3%	98.8%	98.1%
Annual number of youth served	19,390	17,799	19,731	16,900
Average monthly number of youth served	5,668	5,930	6,158	5,530
Average monthly cost per youth served	\$84.06	\$75.14	\$82.77	\$69.91
<b>Statewide Youth Services Network (SYSN)</b>				
Annual number of youth served	6,548	5,513	5,720	5,273
Average monthly number of youth served	3,232	3,099	3,126	3,055
Average monthly cost per youth served	\$51.76	\$51.73	\$52.94	\$43.65
<b>Youth Resiliency Program (YRP)***</b>				
Annual number of youth served	1,654	1,445	1,066	0
Average monthly number of youth served	707	694	547	0
Average monthly cost per youth served	\$224.03	\$213.95	\$224.83	\$0.00
<b>Child Abuse/Neglect Prevention Programs</b>				
	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP)</b>				
Annual number of families served	699	372	461	577
Average monthly number of families served	163	130	141	132
<b>Community-Based Family Services (CBFS)*</b>				
Annual number of families served	110	337	280	206
Average monthly number of CBFS families Served	51	99	82	58
<b>Texas Families: Together and Safe (TFTS)</b>				
Annual number of families served	3,040	3,410	2,110	1,870
Average monthly number of families served	991	1,087	573	586
Average monthly cost per family served	\$275.62	\$249.52	\$433.71	\$362.54
<b>Family Strengthening Program (FSP)***</b>				
Annual number of families served	1,200	1,616	938	0
Average monthly number of families served	507	666	250	0
Average monthly cost per family served	\$267.07	\$337.06	\$945.92	\$0.00
<b>Tertiary Child Abuse Program**</b>				
Annual number of families served	32	61	44	0
Average monthly number served by Tertiary Families Program	9	17	14	0
<b>Child Abuse/Neglect and Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs</b>				
	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Services to At-Risk Youth (STAR)</b>				
Percent of youth with better outcomes 90 days after termination	88.7%	87.3%	87.7%	87.5%
Annual number of youth served	29,406	30,042	30,168	26,834
Average monthly number of youth served	5,468	6,116	6,438	5,863
Average monthly cost per youth served	\$299.95	\$287.90	\$246.38	\$243.84

\* The Community-Based Family Services (CBFS) Program began in FY09 and served clients for five months during the fiscal year. The average monthly count is based upon the five months of service.

\*\* The Tertiary Child Abuse Program began in FY09 and served clients for ten months during the fiscal year. The average monthly count is based upon the ten months of service.

\*\*\*This program was eliminated as a result of budget cuts during the 82nd legislative session.



## Texas Department of Family and Protective Services Agency Funding Summary

Goal/Strategy	2011 Expended	2012 Expended	2013 Projected
A.1.1. Statewide Intake Services	\$ 19,005,668	\$ 18,127,383	\$ 18,247,592
B.1.1. CPS Direct Delivery Staff	416,860,641	412,207,220	424,957,327
B.1.2. CPS Program Support	42,008,060	43,540,866	50,268,461
B.1.3. TWC Foster Day Care	12,099,519	12,115,653	8,334,843
B.1.4. TWC Relative Day Care	10,608,455	9,102,010	9,145,642
B.1.5. TWC Protective Day Care	22,027,973	19,282,337	18,256,362
B.1.6. Adoption Purchased Services	7,237,759	6,245,863	4,536,571
B.1.7. Post-Adoption Purchased Services	4,021,644	2,446,100	2,744,777
B.1.8. PAL Purchased Services	8,902,942	9,108,293	9,925,055
B.1.9. Substance Abuse Purchased Services	6,292,490	4,873,959	5,040,919
B.1.10. Other CPS Purchased Services	35,890,722	22,684,200	35,977,328
B.1.11. Foster Care Payments	383,230,394	381,819,486	392,149,879
B.1.12. Adoption Subsidy Payments	179,527,130	193,954,293	208,647,383
B.1.13. Relative Caregiver Monetart Assistance Payments	9,630,251	7,859,926	7,263,863
C.1.1. STAR Program	19,423,201	17,284,076	18,283,304
C.1.2. CYD Program	6,115,709	4,810,652	5,039,300
C.1.3. Texas Families Program	2,982,184	2,549,382	2,610,039
C.1.4. Child Abuse Prevention Grants	1,207,345	4,183,651	3,946,954
C.1.5. Other At-Risk Prevention Programs	6,747,408	2,094,261	2,290,576
C.1.6. At-Risk Prevention Program Support	1,189,034	853,195	1,155,248
D.1.1. APS Direct Delivery Staff	49,782,534	50,981,369	52,872,205
D.1.2. APS Program Support	4,910,115	5,196,633	5,779,811
D.1.3. MH & MR Investigations	9,041,836	9,569,597	9,456,167
E.1.1. Child Care Regulation	34,676,076	32,868,101	33,846,439
F.1.1. Central Administration	14,332,196	14,253,029	13,803,438
F.1.2. Other Support Services	5,137,021	5,388,236	5,376,168
F.1.3. Regional Administration	355,848	355,368	358,304
F.1.4. IT Program Support	30,700,932	23,715,329	23,649,366
F.1.5. Agency-wide Automated Systems	33,068,523	14,761,056	18,240,012
<b>DFPS Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,377,013,612</b>	<b>\$ 1,332,231,524</b>	<b>\$ 1,392,203,333</b>

### Method of Finance

General Revenue Fund	\$ 571,730,347	\$ 625,893,843	\$ 648,194,377
General Revenue - Dedicated	7,663,848	5,697,301	5,696,201
Federal Funds, est.	778,496,468	692,886,897	729,507,549
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds	12,329,816	0	0
Other	6,793,133	7,753,483	8,805,206

<b>Total Method of Finance</b>	<b>\$ 1,377,013,612</b>	<b>\$ 1,332,231,524</b>	<b>\$ 1,392,203,333</b>
--------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

### Number of Positions

(FTEs) estimated	10,901.8	10,576.8	10,580.5
------------------	----------	----------	----------

## Categorization of Client Services Contracts Fiscal Year 2012

Program	Subject (i.e., Primary Service)	Description	Primary Payment Type(s)	Number of FY 2012 Contracts	Number of FY 2012 Contractors	FY 2012 Expenditures (as of 1/9/2013)
APS	Counseling	Counseling for APS clients.	FS	26	26	\$ 9,711.01
	Extermination	Treatment of a residence with commercial sprays to remove roaches, ants, spiders, silverfish, fleas, and earwigs, and other insect pests. May include treatment for rodent problems.	FS	5	5	\$ 30,848.04
	Heavy Cleaning	Restoration of a safe living environment by clearing trash, debris, accumulated grime, insects, rodents, animal feces, and dead animals from inside or outside a client's home. Does not include normal housekeeping or home maintenance services.	FS	31	22	\$ 296,352.47
	Medical and Mental Health Assessments	Contracted home or office visits by a physician, psychiatrist, registered nurse, or other health professional to evaluate a client's capacity to consent, mental health condition, and need for treatment. May also include home and/or office visits by a psychologist to evaluate the client's mental status and competency. The service must include provision of a written assessment, consultation to the caseworker, and court testimony.	FS; NA	35	27	\$ 425,995.72
	Money Management	Paying bills, budgeting, and managing financial affairs for a client who needs assistance with these tasks. This must include services of a representative payee, who is accountable to the source of income (Social Security or Veteran's Administration).	FS	3	3	\$ 16,127.30
	On-going Service Support	Services provided by a community agency staff to ensure the health and safety of clients and provide access to available community services. Services include, but are not limited to, arranging for and transporting clients to medical appointments, assisting clients with payment of bills, and financial management, contacting resources to obtain emergency assistance, and assisting clients with applications for Food Stamps, Social Security, and other benefits. On-going support services cannot be used for the initiation of the investigation, initial face-to-face visit, collateral investigative contacts, assessment, or service plan development.	FS	8	7	\$ 65,267.97
	Personal Assistance Care	Regular, non-skilled, non-technical service provided in a client's home by a licensed home and community support services agency. Tasks performed for the client may involve basic tasks, which include personal care, housekeeping, meal preparation, and other activities of daily living; high-risk clients may also need assistance with transferring into or out of bed, chair, or toilet, eating, getting to or using the toilet, taking self-administered medication, preparing a meal, etc. Additionally, if the caseworker determines that there is a high likelihood that the client's health, safety, or well-being would be jeopardized if the services were not provided on a single given shift, and if no one else can be identified by the caseworker as being capable or willing to provide the needed assistance, services for high-risk clients may be required outside normal work hours.	FS	40	40	\$ 772,352.54
	Program Direct Purchases (PDPs)	Individual purchase orders less than \$2,000 issued to service providers who do not have an existing contract with the Department.	CR; FP	61	58	\$ 569,799.16
	Purchase Order for Placement Services (POPS)	Emergency short term residential care.	FS; RBP	140	129	\$ 484,940.82
	Transportation	Transportation of a client to and from medical appointments, placements, or community agency or governmental offices to secure resources. Depending on the impairment of the client, transportation may be provided by ambulance, taxi, or private automobile with escort.	FS	1	1	\$ 13,183.00
<b>APS TOTAL</b>				<b>350</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>\$ 2,684,578.03</b>

### Primary Payment Types

CR	Cost Reimbursement
FP	Fixed Price
FS	Fee for Service
RBP	Rate Based Payment
NA	Does Not Apply
PC	Progress Towards Completion

## Categorization of Client Services Contracts Fiscal Year 2012

Program	Subject (i.e., Primary Service)	Description	Primary Payment Type(s)	Number of FY 2012 Contracts	Number of FY 2012 Contractors	FY 2012 Expenditures (as of 1/9/2013)
CPS	Adoption	Services include: placing the child with an adoptive family; developing an adoption service plan; post-placement supervision of the adoption placement; assisting the adoptive family and their attorney in the completion of the adoption consummation process; and financial assistance, when applicable.	FS	112	110	\$ 5,712,999.99
	Community and Parent Group	Services with councils, associations, and organizations to develop and expand the activities of groups that promote services to abused and neglected children or their caregivers.	CR	39	38	\$ 367,346.79
	Court Ordered (Non-E&T)	Non-Evaluation and Treatment Services purchased as a result of a court order.	FS	2	2	\$ 790.00
	CPS TPASS Drug Testing	Drug testing accessed through a TPASS contract.	FS; NA	3	3	\$ 2,311,106.94
	Drug Testing	Substance abuse testing for clients when/if the worker has reason to believe the client has a substance abuse problem and the client denies the problem and/or refuses to participate in substance abuse assessment and/or treatment.	FS	13	2	\$ 537,652.00
	Evaluation & Treatment	Services include assessment and evaluation, services include psychiatric and psychological testing and individual, group, and family counseling.	CR; FS	592	525	\$ 15,389,480.73
	Court Ordered (Evaluation & Treatment)	E&T services purchased as a result of a court order.	FS	10	10	\$ 17,772.79
	Family Group Decision-Making	Family group decision-making is one method of case planning used to ensure effective permanency plans for children. The service consists of a meeting of parents, other relatives and close friends of the family to discuss possible relative or fictive placement of the child. The process emphasizes the family's responsibility to care for their children, and encourages families to connect with others who can help support them.	CR; FS	3	2	\$ 1,138,987.06
	Homemaker	Services provided to children and families in their homes by trained and supervised homemakers and hospital sitting services requiring 24-hour care of children by trained and supervised hospital sitters during a child's hospital stay.	FS	10	6	\$ 261,973.79
	Intermittent Alternate Care	Provides temporary relief to foster families with children in the conservatorship of DFPS by allowing substitute child-care services from an alternate caregiver.	FS	204	201	\$ 40,998.00
	Interstate Compact for Placement of Children	Courtesy Supervision	FS	3	2	\$ 47,521.00
	Kinship Caregiver Home Assessments and Adoption Readiness Reports (HSEGH)	Services include home assessments of kin or significant others for consideration of a child's placement into the home or a summary report documenting the child's readiness for adoption.	FS	198	153	\$ 1,571,052.00
	Other	Diagnostic Consultation (SXAB); Diligent Recruitment activities; Intake Case Management Services; Out of State Adoption; Pre-adopt review and approval staffing; FAD Home Screenings and Adoption Readiness Reports; Fatherhood Project and Program Evaluation	CR; FS	9	8	\$ 381,602.36
	Post-adoptive Services	Services are provided to an adoptive family to help the adopted child and the family adjust to the adoption; cope with any history of abuse or neglect in the child's background; cope with mental health issues the child may have; and avoid permanent or long-term removal of children from the family.	CR	5	4	\$ 2,415,178.94
	Preparation for Adult Living	Services provided to prepare youth for adult life when they leave foster care. Services, benefits, resources, and supports provided to help youth become healthy, productive adults. The program makes efforts to connect youth to community resources they will need in adulthood.	CR; NA	34	25	8,304,866.55
	Service Levels System	A system of assessing a child's needs when he/she comes into care with DFPS. Levels of care (basic, moderate, specialized and intense) determine type of placement and daily child care reimbursement rate. DFPS staff may authorize Basic level only. For those children who need more than basic care, a third-party contractor must determine level of care.	CR	1	1	\$ 1,245,980.47
	STAR Health (DC/CR)	Contract for Diagnostic Consultation or Court Related Services (DC/CR) for the STAR Health Program.	FS	51	35	\$ 8,811.15
	Supervised Visitation	Contract for supervised visitation services.	FS	1	1	\$ 234,812.50
	Title IV-E (Child Welfare - Financial) Funded Services	A contract with a county government to establish and maintain a child welfare board and reimburse that county for eligible Title IV-E expenditures for the child welfare board and/or foster children.	CR; NA	104	56	\$ 271,249.64
	Title IV-E (CWB - Non-financial)	A contract with a county government to establish and maintain a child welfare board and to provide for a county-wide, jointly financed (with no expenditure reimbursement component), and state administered program of child protection.	NA	160	115	\$ -
Title IV-E (Legal) Funded Services	A contract with a county government to reimburse the county for eligible Title IV-E legal expenses.	CR	85	46	\$ 2,847,252.50	
TWC Child Care	Interagency contract with the Texas Workforce Commission that provides protective, Title IV-E foster, other foster, and relative caregiver day care through Child Care Development Funds.	CR	1	1	\$ 37,064,452.63	
Unaccompanied Refugee Minor	Contracted services for children referred by the Office of Refugee & Resettlement, including group home placement, educational assistance to include English as a second language, and Preparation for Adult Living.	CR	2	2	\$ 3,374,227.25	
<b>CPS TOTAL</b>				<b>1642</b>	<b>1348</b>	<b>\$ 83,546,115.08</b>

## Categorization of Client Services Contracts Fiscal Year 2012

Program	Subject (i.e., Primary Service)	Description	Primary Payment Type(s)	Number of FY 2012 Contracts	Number of FY 2012 Contractors	FY 2012 Expenditures (as of 1/9/2013)
PEI	Community Youth Development	Provides services to alleviate family and community factors that lead to juvenile delinquency in select communities that have a high incidence of juvenile crime. Approaches used by communities to prevent delinquency have included mentoring, youth employment programs, career preparation, and alternative recreation activities.	CR	14	13	\$ 4,692,711.02
	Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention	To increase community awareness of existing prevention services and to strengthen community and parental involvement in child abuse prevention efforts.	CR; FS	6	5	\$ 716,847.63
	Community-Based Family Services	Prevention services that are designed to prevent child abuse and neglect. Services include an initial home visit to assess needs of families, case management and an evidence-based parent education curriculum.	CR	1	1	\$ 420,974.73
	Services to At-Risk Youth	Services include: crisis intervention, family and individual counseling, skills-based training for parent and youth, emergency short-term respite services, and universal child abuse and neglect prevention activities.	CR	34	33	\$ 16,792,154.35
	Statewide Youth Services Network (SYSN)	Evidence-based, prevention services that must work to prevent juvenile delinquency and create positive outcomes for youth by increasing protective factors in the population served.	CR	2	2	\$ 1,600,194.95
	Texas Families: Together and Safe	Evidence-based services that are designed to alleviate stress and promote parental competencies and behaviors that will increase the ability of families to successfully nurture their children and work toward family self-sufficiency; enable families to use other resources and opportunities available in the community; and create support networks that enhance child-rearing abilities of parents.	CR	6	6	\$ 2,281,923.58
<b>PEI TOTAL</b>				<b>63</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>\$ 26,504,806.26</b>

### Primary Payment Types

CR	Cost Reimbursement
FP	Fixed Price
FS	Fee for Service
RBP	Rate Based Payment
NA	Does Not Apply
PC	Progress Towards Completion



**Categorization of Client Services Contracts  
Fiscal Year 2012**

Program	Subject (i.e., Primary Service)	Description	Primary Payment Type(s)	Number of FY 2012 Contracts	Number of FY 2012 Contractors	FY 2012 Expenditures (as of 1/9/2013)
RCC	Child Placing Agency	A residential child-care facility where a person, including an organization, other than the natural parents or guardian of a child who plans for the placement of or places a child in a child-care facility, agency foster home, agency foster group home, or adoptive home.	RBP	117	108	\$ 226,898,902.27
	Child Specific Residential Contract	A contract with a residential operation that provides services to one child.	RBP; FS	85	23	\$ 4,937,693.71
	General Residential Operation (GRO) Basic Child Care	A residential child-care facility that provides child care for 13 or more children or young adults. Child-Care Services are services that meet a child's basic need for shelter, nutrition, clothing, nurture, socialization, and interpersonal skills, care for personal health and hygiene, supervision, education, and service planning.	RBP	30	27	\$ 12,257,319.17
	GRO Basic Child Care and Emergency Shelter	A residential child-care facility that provides child care for 13 or more children or young adults. In addition to providing Child-Care services as defined above, the operation also offers a specialized type of child-care services designed and offered to provide short-term child care to children who, upon admission, are in an emergency constituting an immediate danger to the physical health or safety of the child or the child's offspring.	RBP	1	1	\$ 210,253.35
	GRO Emergency Shelter	A residential child-care facility that provides child care for 13 or more children or young adults. The operation provides a specialized type of child-care services designed and offered to provide short-term child care to children who, upon admission, are in an emergency constituting an immediate danger to the physical health or safety of the child or the child's offspring.	RBP	52	50	\$ 24,170,919.35
	GRO Treatment for Emotional Disorders	A residential child-care facility that provides child care for 13 or more children or young adults. The care includes Treatment Services for Emotional Disorders, such as mood disorders, psychotic disorders, or dissociative disorders, and who demonstrate three or more of the following: (i) A Global Assessment of Functioning of 50 or below; (ii) A current DSM diagnosis; (iii) Major self-injurious actions, including recent suicide attempts; (iv) Difficulties that present a significant risk of harm to others, including frequent or unpredictable physical aggression; or (v) A primary diagnosis of substance abuse or dependency and severe impairment because of substance abuse. These operations include formerly titled emergency shelters, operations providing basic child care, operations serving children with mental retardation, and halfway houses. The operation is not licensed as a GRO Residential Treatment Center.	RBP	25	25	\$ 15,656,019.13
	Intensive Psychiatric Transition Program	Provides short-term mental health treatment and placement options for DFPS children with intensive psychiatric needs at the time of release from a psychiatric hospitalization or as an alternative to an imminent psychiatric hospitalization.	RBP	7	7	\$ 2,236,624.13
	Non-Financial Residential Care	A residential child-care facility, licensed by DFPS, who provides the program of services without receiving the daily reimbursement from DFPS.	RBP	8	8	\$ -
	Residential Treatment Center	A residential child-care facility, licensed by DFPS as a GRO, that exclusively provides care and treatment services for emotional disorders for 13 or more children.	RBP	61	55	\$ 71,568,298.70
<b>RCC TOTAL</b>				<b>386</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>\$ 357,936,029.81</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>				<b>2441</b>	<b>2030</b>	<b>\$ 470,671,529.18</b>

**Primary Payment Types**  
 CR Cost Reimbursement  
 FP Fixed Price  
 FS Fee for Service  
 RBP Rate Based Payment  
 NA Does Not Apply  
 PC Progress Towards Completion

## Texas Department of Family and Protective Services

### Cost per Service\* by Fiscal Year

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Statewide Intake Services</b>					
Average cost per SWI Report of Abuse & Neglect	\$50.33	\$54.54	\$49.75	\$53.00	\$55.02
<b>CPS Direct Delivery Services</b>					
Average Daily CPS Cost (All Stages)	\$9.59	\$10.70	\$10.47	\$10.26	\$10.70
<b>TWC Foster Day Care</b>					
Average Daily Cost for TWC Foster Day Care Services	\$19.08	\$20.13	\$20.85	\$21.53	\$21.94
<b>TWC Relative Day Care</b>					
Average Daily Cost for TWC Relative Day Care Services	\$19.78	\$20.34	\$21.49	\$20.67	\$20.71
<b>TWC Protective Day Care</b>					
Average Daily Cost for TWC Protective Day Care Services	\$21.16	\$22.85	\$21.09	\$20.24	\$20.83
<b>Adoption Purchased Services</b>					
Average Monthly Cost per Child: Adoption Placement Purchased Services	\$3,016.15	\$3,499.88	\$3,322.42	\$3,276.49	\$3,133.89
<b>Post Adoption Purchased Services</b>					
Average Cost per Client Receiving CPS Post-Adoption Purchased Services	\$273.32	\$287.91	\$218.72	\$235.34	\$153.98
<b>PAL Purchased Services</b>					
Average Cost per Youth: Preparation for Adult Living Services	\$466.37	\$528.62	\$484.57	\$557.37	\$563.63
<b>Substance Abuse Purchased Services</b>					
Average Monthly Cost per Client: Substance Abuse Purchased Services	\$55.62	\$62.88	\$54.83	\$66.08	\$58.02
<b>Other CPS Purchased Services</b>					
Average Monthly Cost per Client: Other CPS Purchased Services	\$304.03	\$352.44	\$312.26	\$323.64	\$242.63
<b>Foster Care &amp; Relative Care Payments</b>					
Average Monthly Payment per Child (FTE) in Paid Foster Care	\$1,774.92	\$1,848.03	\$1,934.59	\$1,898.55	\$1,899.56
Average Monthly Cost per Child: Caregiver Monetary Assistance	\$784.70	\$677.12	\$703.09	\$748.45	\$727.80
<b>Adoption Subsidy Payments</b>					
Average Monthly Payment per Adoption Subsidy	\$443.54	\$437.36	\$433.75	\$431.75	\$429.09
<b>Services to At-Risk Youth Program</b>					
Average Monthly Cost per STAR Youth Served	\$297.89	\$299.95	\$287.90	\$246.38	\$243.84
<b>Community Youth Development Program</b>					
Average Monthly Cost per CYD Youth Served	\$138.97	\$84.06	\$75.14	\$82.77	\$69.91
<b>Texas Families Program</b>					
Average Monthly Cost per Family Served in the Texas Families Program	\$289.49	\$275.62	\$249.52	\$433.71	\$362.54
<b>APS Direct Delivery Services</b>					
Average Daily APS Cost (All Stages)	\$8.69	\$8.54	\$7.99	\$8.30	\$9.14
<b>MH &amp; MR Investigations</b>					
Average Monthly Cost per Investigation in MH & MR Settings	\$470.58	\$460.94	\$644.74	\$599.66	\$647.48
<b>Child Care Regulation</b>					
Average Cost per Inspection **	\$276.55	\$286.01	\$365.05	\$296.88	\$560.80

\*Note: This data reflects the estimate of the cost of service at the time of final reporting for a fiscal year. Expenditure data can continue to be reported for another two fiscal years after the final report, therefore, subsequent agency reports could be different from this data.

\*\* Beginning in FY12 the LBB Performance Measure definition of inspections does not include inspections done as part of an Abuse/Neglect investigation.

## Purchased Client Services Delivered in APS In-Home Validated Cases by Region Fiscal Year 2012

Region	Assistance	Environment	Medical
1 Lubbock	\$ 388,906.36	\$ 127,135.11	\$ 80,388.94
2 Abilene	\$ 261,710.62	\$ 215,232.92	\$ 127,272.78
3 Arlington	\$ 508,942.29	\$ 201,696.19	\$ 241,480.53
4 Tyler	\$ 233,359.07	\$ 78,115.56	\$ 94,038.43
5 Beaumont	\$ 350,493.04	\$ 81,292.29	\$ 111,311.97
6 Houston	\$ 847,130.67	\$ 264,167.19	\$ 130,521.89
7 Austin	\$ 178,064.87	\$ 122,944.54	\$ 51,120.67
8 San Antonio	\$ 482,732.92	\$ 203,384.36	\$ 122,487.68
9 Midland	\$ 153,771.72	\$ 156,746.81	\$ 69,505.50
10 El Paso	\$ 42,647.61	\$ 35,249.85	\$ 31,902.40
11 Edinburg	\$ 422,140.30	\$ 99,260.80	\$ 144,975.15
State Total	\$ 3,869,899.47	\$ 1,585,225.62	\$ 1,205,005.94

Region	Other	Residential	Services	Total
1 Lubbock	\$ 10,528.43	\$ 58,959.99	\$ -	\$ 665,918.83
2 Abilene	\$ 18,952.85	\$ 25,547.25	\$ 32.50	\$ 648,748.92
3 Arlington	\$ 17,847.56	\$ 159,723.06	\$ 199.95	\$ 1,129,889.58
4 Tyler	\$ 11,854.95	\$ 27,987.72	\$ -	\$ 445,355.73
5 Beaumont	\$ 15,930.77	\$ 8,162.05	\$ -	\$ 567,190.12
6 Houston	\$ 20,968.97	\$ 34,717.70	\$ 658.88	\$ 1,298,165.30
7 Austin	\$ 22,395.46	\$ 73,779.08	\$ -	\$ 448,304.62
8 San Antonio	\$ 11,714.95	\$ 47,314.24	\$ 42.00	\$ 867,676.15
9 Midland	\$ 12,026.80	\$ 15,724.04	\$ -	\$ 407,774.87
10 El Paso	\$ 4,584.93	\$ 116,989.07	\$ 174.00	\$ 231,547.86
11 Edinburg	\$ 5,921.42	\$ 309,480.33	\$ 300.00	\$ 982,078.00
State Total	\$ 152,727.09	\$ 878,384.53	\$ 1,407.33	\$ 7,692,649.98

**Note:** Clients in validated cases may receive more than one service.

Examples of the above described services may include:

**Assistance** - utilities, rent, personal care services, transportation, etc.

**Environment** - animal control, extermination, appliances, and home repair, etc.

**Medical** - medical supplies, medication, and adaptive equipment, etc.

**Residential** - temporary room and board, emergency shelter and adult foster care, etc.

**Services** - home delivered meals and emergency response services, etc.

Data does not include expenditures for clients who were validated in a prior fiscal year but continued to receive services.

Note: data as of 11/7/2012

**CPS Expenditures\***  
**Fiscal Year 2012**

CPS Categories	FY 2012 Expenditures
Substitute Care Services	\$51,666,298.25
Evaluation/Treatment Services	\$15,407,253.52
Adoption	\$5,712,999.99
Other	\$3,231,151.30
Title IV-E	\$3,118,502.14
Client Support Services	\$2,462,699.94
Studies/Assessments	\$1,571,052.00
Program Support Services	\$367,346.79
STAR Health (DC/CR)	\$8,811.15
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$83,546,115.08</b>

**CPS Children in Residential Child Care Facilities\***  
**Fiscal Year 2012**

RCC Services	FY 2012 Expenditures
Child Placing Agency	\$226,898,902.27
Residential Treatment Center	71,568,298.70
GRO Emergency Shelter	24,170,919.35
GRO Treatment for Emotional Disorders	15,656,019.13
GRO Basic Child Care	12,257,319.17
Child Specific Residential Contract	4,937,693.71
Intensive Psychiatric Transition Program	2,236,624.13
GRO Basic Child Care and Emergency Shelter	210,253.35
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$357,936,029.81</b>

**Prevention and Early Intervention Expenditures\***  
**Fiscal Year 2012**

PEI Programs	FY 2012 Expenditures
Services to At-Risk Youth	\$16,792,154.35
Community Youth Development	4,692,711.02
Texas Families: Together and Safe	2,281,923.58
Statewide Youth Services Network (SYSN)	1,600,194.95
Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention	716,847.63
Community-Based Family Services	420,974.73
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$26,504,806.26</b>

\* Data as of 1/9/2013

## APS In-Home Population And Case-Related Statistics

County	Population With a Disability Ages 18-64	Population Ages 65 Plus	Total APS Intakes	Total APS Completed Investigations	Validated APS Investigations	APS Clients Receiving Services
Anderson	6,050	7,777	382	354	291	466
Andrews	1,200	1,751	34	32	18	10
Angelina	8,970	12,572	693	559	358	369
Aransas	2,010	6,148	197	177	128	108
Archer	870	1,533	116	93	71	67
Armstrong	130	423	7	5	2	2
Atascosa	3,500	6,420	199	156	93	109
Austin	1,650	4,905	117	82	51	82
Bailey	490	1,048	43	40	37	41
Bandera	1,770	4,652	110	81	45	52
Bastrop	5,250	9,768	377	296	171	182
Baylor	320	957	81	81	70	88
Bee	3,090	3,590	159	142	124	127
Bell	20,390	29,410	1,565	1,299	916	703
Bexar	135,590	188,632	9,876	7,709	4,528	5,626
Blanco	750	2,156	31	20	14	17
Borden	50	143	2	2	2	1
Bosque	1,120	4,094	130	93	58	32
Bowie	8,960	13,695	481	403	252	286
Brazoria	17,780	33,281	680	581	401	353
Brazos	11,760	15,426	386	338	237	230
Brewster	670	1,700	90	68	57	100
Briscoe	110	407	11	9	8	8
Brooks	630	1,314	64	50	34	31
Brown	3,380	7,062	418	332	268	273
Burleson	1,190	3,225	81	62	44	60
Burnet	2,760	8,723	177	140	80	69
Caldwell	2,510	4,992	173	165	99	90
Calhoun	1,630	3,456	83	64	31	25
Callahan	1,250	2,615	129	110	75	84
Cameron	33,090	48,338	1,664	1,447	1,004	1,207
Camp	1,100	2,153	91	70	55	54
Carson	430	1,094	13	8	6	9
Cass	2,880	6,133	179	139	81	73
Castro	570	1,146	22	15	15	16
Chambers	2,070	3,812	60	48	30	46
Cherokee	4,500	8,050	540	472	373	546
Childress	500	1,110	73	52	43	96
Clay	1,040	2,025	165	142	128	93
Cochran	220	510	95	87	86	116
Coke	240	866	28	21	14	7
Coleman	810	2,024	86	78	57	60
Collin	45,060	72,084	1,053	859	616	540
Collingsworth	210	566	20	17	14	23
Colorado	1,170	4,212	87	64	45	83
Comal	9,250	19,096	451	326	217	207
Comanche	1,160	3,036	110	84	66	90
Concho	410	607	25	24	23	20

## APS In-Home Population And Case-Related Statistics

County	Population With a Disability Ages 18-64	Population Ages 65 Plus	Total APS Intakes	Total APS Completed Investigations	Validated APS Investigations	APS Clients Receiving Services
Cooke	2,060	6,510	168	109	78	62
Coryell	4,700	6,229	189	165	114	123
Cottle	130	387	21	20	15	15
Crane	370	556	19	14	11	12
Crockett	320	608	14	11	10	12
Crosby	440	1,103	55	56	44	53
Culberson	160	397	7	5	5	2
Dallam	480	698	20	19	15	16
Dallas	129,140	218,059	8,309	6,718	4,610	3,837
Dawson	1,150	2,018	124	119	89	48
Deaf Smith	1,360	2,281	45	38	28	30
Delta	480	1,127	43	38	22	19
Denton	37,740	54,739	1,223	856	629	471
De Witt	1,620	3,822	116	91	52	55
Dickens	180	516	22	26	17	17
Dimmit	750	1,554	37	35	16	18
Donley	250	799	21	15	10	25
Duval	1,040	2,031	46	44	29	24
Eastland	1,630	3,858	218	171	140	156
Ector	11,250	14,754	730	619	463	557
Edwards	160	485	7	5	5	4
Ellis	8,570	17,056	399	287	206	226
El Paso	52,360	87,302	3,658	2,934	1,948	2,085
Erath	1,950	5,077	102	86	63	60
Falls	1,320	2,999	103	69	48	43
Fannin	1,930	6,159	142	132	115	102
Fayette	1,620	5,617	84	80	42	50
Fisher	350	916	37	24	22	17
Floyd	450	1,168	45	37	31	35
Foard	120	335	16	16	14	7
Fort Bend	35,100	51,098	840	650	377	415
Franklin	890	2,114	37	30	19	16
Freestone	1,390	3,490	79	73	40	35
Frio	1,350	2,100	62	41	24	27
Gaines	1,290	1,650	41	31	21	14
Galveston	17,080	34,982	1,146	996	533	436
Garza	530	763	62	53	42	50
Gillespie	1,830	7,037	87	53	39	34
Glasscock	100	188	5	2	2	2
Goliad	600	1,510	35	22	14	12
Gonzales	1,520	3,190	84	64	38	17
Gray	1,600	3,662	112	88	60	62
Grayson	6,730	20,170	710	611	450	487
Gregg	11,050	17,229	747	572	402	523
Grimes	1,990	4,004	103	85	66	58
Guadalupe	10,740	17,128	440	370	224	182
Hale	2,580	4,495	165	130	105	118
Hall	220	788	13	11	8	27

## APS In-Home Population And Case-Related Statistics

County	Population With a Disability Ages 18-64	Population Ages 65 Plus	Total APS Intakes	Total APS Completed Investigations	Validated APS Investigations	APS Clients Receiving Services
Hamilton	500	2,137	57	41	21	14
Hansford	390	814	14	9	7	6
Hardeman	360	862	67	55	40	38
Hardin	6,160	7,938	281	234	163	175
Harris	220,070	360,999	13,794	11,370	7,492	7,646
Harrison	6,320	9,368	350	304	242	311
Hartley	470	798	13	11	8	8
Haskell	530	1,292	54	53	44	73
Hays	10,370	15,745	340	230	120	126
Hemphill	260	544	8	7	4	3
Henderson	6,920	15,912	624	551	449	765
Hidalgo	61,370	78,933	2,804	2,312	1,443	1,722
Hill	2,200	6,856	187	164	115	98
Hockley	1,670	3,100	191	191	166	256
Hood	2,890	11,942	216	181	155	187
Hopkins	3,060	5,790	185	155	88	103
Houston	2,750	4,819	332	314	274	256
Howard	3,210	4,802	320	295	183	78
Hudspeth	240	540	14	10	8	7
Hunt	4,870	13,184	590	487	410	374
Hutchinson	1,560	3,321	103	93	79	97
Irion	140	319	3	4	4	1
Jack	860	1,443	113	87	72	56
Jackson	1,060	2,407	35	29	20	25
Jasper	3,980	6,241	338	305	199	241
Jeff Davis	180	611	9	7	6	8
Jefferson	28,870	32,401	1,868	1,474	954	906
Jim Hogg	450	893	32	35	22	16
Jim Wells	3,530	5,711	233	204	124	104
Johnson	8,320	19,443	597	467	289	238
Jones	2,090	2,934	173	159	118	88
Karnes	1,240	2,188	58	59	25	18
Kaufman	6,100	12,097	372	321	289	352
Kendall	2,760	6,318	91	74	43	34
Kenedy	40	75	0	0	0	0
Kent	60	219	4	3	2	2
Kerr	3,640	12,991	382	299	198	192
Kimble	380	1,161	46	39	38	61
King	20	42	0	0	0	0
Kinney	260	937	14	9	9	8
Kleberg	2,670	3,955	129	111	81	82
Knox	310	801	43	36	25	34
Lamar	4,520	8,728	441	342	217	171
Lamb	970	2,277	137	106	87	93
Lampasas	1,280	3,359	84	70	50	80
La Salle	520	985	23	9	7	12
Lavaca	1,440	4,219	80	58	30	27
Lee	1,130	2,802	73	66	39	36

## APS In-Home Population And Case-Related Statistics

County	Population With a Disability Ages 18-64	Population Ages 65 Plus	Total APS Intakes	Total APS Completed Investigations	Validated APS Investigations	APS Clients Receiving Services
Leon	1,090	3,892	71	76	55	58
Liberty	4,400	9,476	392	349	255	306
Limestone	1,610	4,033	126	90	55	42
Lipscomb	230	502	2	2	2	2
Live Oak	1,060	2,345	47	27	18	14
Llano	1,220	6,261	128	107	78	81
Loving	10	19	0	0	0	0
Lubbock	20,570	31,984	3,104	2,731	2,182	2,606
Lynn	430	990	52	51	38	53
Madison	910	2,035	63	65	52	46
Marion	1,120	2,487	124	93	84	136
Martin	380	645	27	20	16	9
Mason	310	1,075	19	21	19	18
Matagorda	2,010	5,564	137	138	102	171
Maverick	3,880	6,217	179	122	98	49
McCulloch	650	1,779	99	78	67	70
McLennan	15,130	30,260	1,208	1,002	475	371
McMullen	60	200	3	3	2	1
Medina	3,740	6,887	147	92	51	33
Menard	180	642	25	24	20	21
Midland	11,520	15,763	451	356	221	136
Milam	1,570	4,575	125	111	68	79
Mills	280	1,197	17	15	10	8
Mitchell	900	1,311	71	54	36	23
Montague	1,750	4,118	264	219	173	133
Montgomery	26,270	54,847	1,429	1,160	747	757
Moore	1,540	2,198	51	46	35	29
Morris	1,250	2,607	114	87	49	40
Motley	80	349	24	22	15	17
Nacogdoches	6,840	8,069	289	269	253	298
Navarro	2,630	7,331	281	258	175	166
Newton	1,680	2,491	110	105	65	89
Nolan	1,330	2,638	174	157	112	82
Nueces	30,870	43,637	2,131	1,788	1,318	1,507
Ochiltree	700	1,121	10	11	7	6
Oldham	140	288	11	10	8	7
Orange	9,150	11,993	538	423	255	182
Palo Pinto	1,530	4,972	183	151	114	116
Panola	2,250	3,944	108	95	63	79
Parker	6,980	16,126	353	242	172	264
Parmer	730	1,280	23	14	12	16
Pecos	1,410	1,958	78	66	53	64
Polk	5,020	9,213	411	356	274	299
Potter	9,030	13,667	886	773	568	537
Presidio	490	1,483	31	30	26	23
Rains	1,000	2,504	70	50	35	38
Randall	8,680	16,113	423	346	240	226
Reagan	280	406	8	5	5	7



## APS In-Home Population And Case-Related Statistics

County	Population With a Disability Ages 18-64	Population Ages 65 Plus	Total APS Intakes	Total APS Completed Investigations	Validated APS Investigations	APS Clients Receiving Services
Real	250	932	20	13	4	5
Red River	1,210	2,873	119	99	76	70
Reeves	1,300	1,743	87	78	53	56
Refugio	650	1,519	26	21	17	21
Roberts	60	170	0	0	0	0
Robertson	1,190	2,971	99	73	51	52
Rockwall	4,570	8,813	142	115	89	65
Runnels	880	2,130	101	91	74	61
Rusk	5,260	7,946	243	178	115	169
Sabine	1,180	3,141	112	96	81	93
San Augustine	1,000	2,197	128	102	86	110
San Jacinto	3,060	5,049	308	274	230	285
San Patricio	5,560	8,931	400	347	234	230
San Saba	370	1,268	31	22	15	28
Schleicher	260	509	21	20	20	24
Scurry	1,520	2,487	97	92	63	44
Shackelford	310	633	15	14	10	12
Shelby	2,680	4,173	239	224	193	168
Sherman	210	451	2	2	2	1
Smith	18,680	31,410	1,305	1,047	811	829
Somervell	480	1,361	20	19	18	21
Starr	4,840	6,755	208	188	92	101
Stephens	840	1,814	136	104	86	61
Sterling	90	206	2	3	1	0
Stonewall	130	369	12	12	7	10
Sutton	350	656	19	21	20	19
Swisher	550	1,369	39	33	24	20
Tarrant	100,000	173,925	5,461	4,330	2,795	2,456
Taylor	11,770	17,963	1,478	1,220	941	786
Terrell	80	229	3	3	0	0
Terry	910	1,891	163	141	125	172
Throckmorton	140	423	10	8	7	16
Titus	2,470	3,944	124	107	72	86
Tom Green	8,760	15,943	1,538	1,289	1,059	1,035
Travis	66,820	81,272	4,059	3,088	1,695	1,670
Trinity	1,650	3,488	214	198	178	233
Tyler	2,410	4,401	144	146	113	135
Upshur	3,700	6,652	189	144	88	167
Upton	280	538	22	20	13	15
Uvalde	1,900	4,140	142	98	55	53
Val Verde	3,480	6,442	291	182	142	121
Van Zandt	4,600	10,148	340	288	166	217
Victoria	6,660	12,370	423	332	204	221
Walker	4,250	7,357	181	154	112	125
Waller	2,520	5,071	138	110	72	82
Ward	880	1,644	63	61	53	48
Washington	2,330	6,541	168	143	95	73
Webb	20,220	21,168	716	624	378	425

## APS In-Home Population And Case-Related Statistics

County	Population With a Disability Ages 18-64	Population Ages 65 Plus	Total APS Intakes	Total APS Completed Investigations	Validated APS Investigations	APS Clients Receiving Services
Wharton	2,230	6,175	176	148	118	198
Wheeler	370	1,035	21	16	11	11
Wichita	12,290	17,564	1,842	1,532	1,266	1,266
Wilbarger	1,240	2,214	181	138	106	83
Willacy	1,940	2,756	151	131	98	127
Williamson	27,470	44,846	886	715	544	659
Wilson	3,660	6,116	95	89	40	28
Winkler	590	946	39	30	24	30
Wise	3,360	8,159	204	129	103	106
Wood	3,640	11,029	299	223	136	130
Yoakum	570	974	19	23	21	37
Young	1,640	3,517	303	261	204	172
Zapata	1,100	1,583	80	47	27	41
Zavala	850	1,496	52	33	15	15
Unknown	0	0	76	31	19	4
Out of State	0	0	0	0	0	43
State Total	1,683,350	2,818,076	107,203	87,487	59,595	61,857

*Note: APS clients are counted each time a service is provided. Services may be provided prior to the completion of an investigation.*

*Population Data Source: Texas State Data Center, University of Texas (San Antonio). Based on Census 2010 data.*

## APS Facility Investigations

County	Intakes	Complete Investigation	Confirmed Investigations	County	Intakes	Complete Investigation	Confirmed Investigations
Anderson	4	4	0	Cooke	1	0	0
Andrews	0	0	0	Coryell	2	1	0
Angelina	219	194	35	Cottle	0	0	0
Aransas	1	0	0	Crane	0	0	0
Archer	3	4	1	Crockett	0	0	0
Armstrong	0	0	0	Crosby	0	0	0
Atascosa	1	2	0	Culberson	0	0	0
Austin	0	0	0	Dallam	0	0	0
Bailey	0	0	0	Dallas	255	212	35
Bandera	0	0	0	Dawson	0	0	0
Bastrop	6	4	0	Deaf Smith	1	1	0
Baylor	0	0	0	Delta	0	0	0
Bee	1	1	0	Denton	278	263	35
Bell	93	85	11	Dewitt	1	0	0
Bexar	1,179	1,064	99	Dickens	0	0	0
Blanco	0	0	0	Dimmit	0	0	0
Borden	0	0	0	Donley	0	0	0
Bosque	0	0	0	Duval	0	0	0
Bowie	11	11	1	Eastland	11	9	4
Brazoria	62	61	10	Ector	7	6	2
Brazos	38	36	1	Edwards	0	0	0
Brewster	1	1	0	Ellis	3	4	2
Briscoe	0	0	0	El Paso	273	274	52
Brooks	2	2	0	Erath	3	6	0
Brown	37	36	9	Falls	2	2	0
Burleson	0	0	0	Fannin	0	0	0
Burnet	0	0	0	Fayette	2	1	0
Caldwell	5	4	2	Fisher	0	0	0
Calhoun	0	0	0	Floyd	0	0	0
Callahan	0	0	0	Foard	0	0	0
Cameron	297	268	38	Fort Bend	245	227	26
Camp	0	0	0	Franklin	3	9	1
Carson	0	0	0	Freestone	5	4	0
Cass	1	1	0	Frio	1	0	0
Castro	0	0	0	Gaines	1	1	0
Chambers	0	0	0	Galveston	31	25	2
Cherokee	523	492	17	Garza	0	0	0
Childress	0	0	0	Gillespie	1	1	0
Clay	1	1	0	Glasscock	0	0	0
Cochran	0	0	0	Goliad	0	0	0
Coke	0	0	0	Gonzales	1	1	0
Coleman	0	0	0	Gray	7	6	3
Collin	68	60	5	Grayson	22	18	6
Collingsworth	0	0	0	Gregg	107	110	10
Colorado	0	0	0	Grimes	0	1	1
Comal	39	29	6	Guadalupe	26	24	7
Comanche	0	0	0	Hale	1	1	0
Concho	0	0	0	Hall	0	0	0

## APS Facility Investigations

County	Intakes	Complete Investigation	Confirmed Investigations	County	Intakes	Complete Investigation	Confirmed Investigations
Hamilton	0	0	0	Leon	13	1	0
Hansford	0	0	0	Liberty	13	10	3
Hardeman	0	0	0	Limestone	1,044	980	43
Hardin	7	7	0	Lipscomb	0	0	0
Harris	412	356	70	Live Oak	0	0	0
Harrison	0	0	0	Llano	1	1	0
Hartley	0	0	0	Loving	0	0	0
Haskell	0	0	0	Lubbock	300	288	68
Hays	30	24	5	Lynn	0	0	0
Hemphill	0	0	0	Madison	2	2	0
Henderson	5	5	0	Marion	2	1	0
Hidalgo	37	36	7	Martin	0	0	0
Hill	0	0	0	Mason	0	0	0
Hockley	6	6	1	Matagorda	6	6	1
Hood	4	4	2	Maverick	6	6	1
Hopkins	3	2	0	Mcculloch	0	0	0
Houston	0	0	0	Mclennan	104	92	4
Howard	299	284	17	Mcmullen	0	0	0
Hudspeth	0	0	0	Medina	3	2	0
Hunt	17	14	3	Menard	0	0	0
Hutchinson	1	1	1	Midland	36	35	1
Irion	0	0	0	Milam	1	1	0
Jack	0	0	0	Mills	0	0	0
Jackson	0	0	0	Mitchell	0	0	0
Jasper	2	1	0	Montague	0	0	0
Jeff Davis	0	0	0	Montgomery	39	31	6
Jefferson	99	94	31	Moore	0	1	0
Jim Hogg	0	0	0	Morris	0	1	0
Jim Wells	3	3	1	Motley	0	0	0
Johnson	43	36	10	Nacogdoches	3	4	1
Jones	5	5	0	Navarro	45	46	5
Karnes	0	0	0	Newton	2	2	1
Kaufman	160	151	9	Nolan	3	3	1
Kendall	0	0	0	Nueces	591	560	49
Kenedy	0	0	0	Ochiltree	0	0	0
Kent	0	0	0	Oldham	0	0	0
Kerr	83	82	2	Orange	9	9	2
Kimble	0	0	0	Palo Pinto	1	1	1
King	0	0	0	Panola	2	1	0
Kinney	0	0	0	Parker	0	1	0
Kleberg	4	3	1	Parmer	0	0	0
Knox	0	0	0	Pecos	0	0	0
Lamar	14	12	0	Polk	0	0	0
Lamb	0	0	0	Potter	23	22	7
Lampasas	0	0	0	Presidio	0	0	0
Lasalle	0	0	0	Rains	0	0	0
Lavaca	0	0	0	Randall	102	90	33
Lee	7	5	1	Reagan	0	0	0

## APS Facility Investigations

County	Intakes	Complete Investigation	Confirmed Investigations	County	Intakes	Complete Investigation	Confirmed Investigations
Real	0	0	0	Tom Green	910	889	98
Red River	0	0	0	Travis	1,078	1,001	120
Reeves	0	0	0	Trinity	0	0	0
Refugio	0	0	0	Tyler	0	0	0
Roberts	0	0	0	Upshur	4	4	2
Robertson	3	2	0	Upton	0	0	0
Rockwall	4	2	0	Uvalde	2	2	0
Runnels	0	0	0	Val Verde	5	4	0
Rusk	1	1	0	Van Zandt	3	2	0
Sabine	0	0	0	Victoria	6	5	0
San Augustine	8	7	0	Walker	4	3	2
San Jacinto	0	0	0	Waller	8	8	2
San Patricio	3	3	0	Ward	2	1	0
San Saba	0	0	0	Washington	178	173	11
Schleicher	0	0	0	Webb	21	21	6
Scurry	0	0	0	Wharton	6	7	2
Shackelford	0	0	0	Wheeler	0	0	0
Shelby	1	0	0	Wichita	350	341	27
Sherman	0	0	0	Wilbarger	588	569	23
Smith	29	25	1	Willacy	0	0	0
Somervell	0	0	0	Williamson	69	63	7
Starr	6	0	0	Wilson	3	3	2
Stephens	1	1	0	Winkler	0	0	0
Sterling	0	0	0	Wise	0	0	0
Stonewall	0	0	0	Wood	0	0	0
Sutton	0	0	0	Yoakum	0	0	0
Swisher	0	0	0	Young	2	2	1
Tarrant	316	280	65	Zapata	0	0	0
Taylor	489	481	80	Zavala	0	0	0
Terrell	0	0	0	Unknown	0	0	0
Terry	1	0	0	<b>State Total</b>	<b>11,587</b>	<b>10,803</b>	<b>1,259</b>
Throckmorton	0	0	0				
Titus	12	8	1				

## CPS Calls, Reports, Intake or Investigation Workers, and Response Time

County	Initial Intakes Alleging Abuse/ Neglect	Child Abuse/ Neglect Reports Assigned for Investigation	CPS Workers Responsible for Intake or Investigation by Office Location	Investigation initiation response time in completed investigations			
				Priority I		Priority II	
				Within 24 Hours	Over 24 Hours	Within 72 Hours	Over 72 Hours
Anderson	665	583	6	113	3	381	12
Andrews	149	129	2	23	0	64	15
Angelina	984	789	7	121	5	534	30
Aransas	303	275	0	71	2	136	4
Archer	35	27	0	5	1	20	0
Armstrong	17	17	0	4	0	6	2
Atascosa	540	463	4	78	6	315	49
Austin	175	152	3	16	1	74	8
Bailey	55	51	0	13	1	27	4
Bandera	185	147	0	24	3	87	12
Bastrop	884	729	10	69	2	509	18
Baylor	56	51	0	5	0	26	0
Bee	388	326	7	68	2	159	12
Bell	4,388	3,900	28	635	24	2,083	139
Bexar	20,948	17,220	170	3,808	193	9,621	850
Blanco	71	61	0	5	0	41	3
Borden	7	2	0	0	0	0	0
Bosque	173	148	0	29	1	123	2
Bowie	1,074	895	9	182	6	573	47
Brazoria	2,310	1,991	22	312	11	1,034	222
Brazos	1,201	1,052	13	228	9	682	39
Brewster	67	59	0	13	1	25	6
Briscoe	6	4	0	1	0	7	1
Brooks	136	127	0	26	2	36	6
Brown	504	389	2	53	9	203	59
Burleson	161	141	1	29	0	84	1
Burnet	511	444	6	70	1	238	13
Caldwell	482	393	2	16	0	278	7
Calhoun	240	202	3	47	0	110	2
Callahan	176	134	0	14	0	87	8
Cameron	4,549	3,806	43	878	13	2,432	49
Camp	132	111	0	13	0	86	6
Carson	57	44	0	8	0	26	2
Cass	382	313	4	61	1	221	4
Castro	75	63	0	18	2	40	2
Chambers	292	249	0	37	2	124	38
Cherokee	628	554	5	116	5	319	9
Childress	90	79	1	9	1	37	5
Clay	67	58	0	3	0	38	1
Cochran	22	22	0	4	0	13	2
Coke	35	34	0	3	0	11	1
Coleman	121	89	1	10	2	52	11
Collin	4,578	3,824	35	490	14	2,029	352
Collingsworth	28	22	2	6	0	15	1
Colorado	152	138	1	22	2	61	10
Comal	1,051	876	10	128	9	366	116
Comanche	130	108	0	13	1	47	14
Concho	24	22	0	3	0	11	1

## CPS Calls, Reports, Intake or Investigation Workers, and Response Time

County	Initial Intakes Alleging Abuse/ Neglect	Child Abuse/ Neglect Reports Assigned for Investigation	CPS Workers Responsible for Intake or Investigation by Office Location	Investigation initiation response time in completed investigations			
				Priority I		Priority II	
				Within 24 Hours	Over 24 Hours	Within 72 Hours	Over 72 Hours
Cooke	483	445	5	82	13	205	48
Coryell	937	860	8	154	2	480	16
Cottle	18	18	0	1	0	13	0
Crane	25	17	0	3	0	10	3
Crockett	37	32	0	6	0	21	4
Crosby	91	88	0	14	0	53	3
Culberson	18	13	0	3	0	8	1
Dallam	77	71	1	11	5	37	13
Dallas	21,273	18,533	176	3,028	205	7,967	3,250
Dawson	167	144	1	21	1	60	14
Deaf Smith	229	187	3	40	2	112	13
Delta	63	52	0	8	0	40	6
Denton	4,483	3,790	37	475	15	2,333	189
De Witt	214	156	1	18	1	117	21
Dickens	27	25	0	2	1	12	2
Dimmit	123	103	0	21	3	64	10
Donley	42	38	0	6	2	14	6
Duval	123	109	0	20	1	47	6
Eastland	229	182	0	24	0	116	7
Ector	1,917	1,666	19	236	18	880	155
Edwards	16	12	0	2	0	11	1
Ellis	1,237	1,035	6	142	10	504	80
El Paso	7,111	5,959	55	822	9	3,081	550
Erath	329	298	3	52	1	176	4
Falls	130	111	1	33	0	80	3
Fannin	347	312	2	40	5	103	40
Fayette	172	146	0	21	0	87	5
Fisher	43	37	0	5	2	16	2
Floyd	88	82	0	13	0	34	9
Foard	13	11	0	0	0	6	0
Fort Bend	2,558	2,208	22	414	32	877	403
Franklin	112	93	1	11	1	65	4
Freestone	131	109	0	30	0	75	2
Frio	283	248	4	39	7	134	30
Gaines	117	94	0	13	2	37	9
Galveston	2,986	2,600	23	433	28	1,178	381
Garza	82	72	0	13	1	43	3
Gillespie	175	139	0	33	2	85	15
Glasscock	1	1	0	2	0	0	1
Goliad	82	71	0	19	1	44	4
Gonzales	248	201	3	17	0	139	15
Gray	352	331	5	71	7	153	15
Grayson	1,557	1,355	14	197	19	779	99
Gregg	1,380	1,158	13	255	2	695	31
Grimes	230	199	0	25	2	124	3
Guadalupe	1,401	1,054	10	136	7	747	44
Hale	390	359	3	61	10	167	41
Hall	58	56	0	8	1	25	3

## CPS Calls, Reports, Intake or Investigation Workers, and Response Time

County	Initial Intakes Alleging Abuse/ Neglect	Child Abuse/ Neglect Reports Assigned for Investigation	CPS Workers Responsible for Intake or Investigation by Office Location	Investigation initiation response time in completed investigations			
				Priority I		Priority II	
				Within 24 Hours	Over 24 Hours	Within 72 Hours	Over 72 Hours
Hamilton	76	67	2	13	0	51	0
Hansford	27	20	0	2	0	13	3
Hardeman	50	41	0	6	0	16	0
Hardin	603	484	4	71	7	308	33
Harris	30,773	25,985	243	5,636	545	9,616	4,815
Harrison	721	631	5	151	7	372	18
Hartley	14	14	0	2	0	3	3
Haskell	56	45	4	8	0	20	2
Hays	1,157	971	12	112	2	723	47
Hemphill	15	14	0	2	0	12	2
Henderson	1,068	923	5	132	16	430	125
Hidalgo	8,306	7,167	67	1,620	35	4,466	134
Hill	349	307	4	51	1	217	8
Hockley	287	251	1	40	3	135	12
Hood	623	546	6	115	3	314	40
Hopkins	301	252	4	36	0	149	17
Houston	206	175	1	45	2	95	9
Howard	429	371	3	62	6	167	34
Hudspeth	22	16	0	5	0	8	2
Hunt	990	900	10	149	5	425	66
Hutchinson	340	298	4	46	8	163	17
Irion	8	8	0	0	0	6	0
Jack	81	65	0	9	1	42	12
Jackson	124	108	0	20	0	71	1
Jasper	383	339	5	50	0	273	3
Jeff Davis	5	5	0	0	0	3	0
Jefferson	2,495	2,272	24	410	14	1,389	134
Jim Hogg	58	53	0	14	0	42	1
Jim Wells	557	522	7	132	6	244	32
Johnson	1,879	1,684	16	290	30	933	128
Jones	245	192	0	11	0	78	6
Karnes	158	122	0	13	2	89	8
Kaufman	964	836	11	153	6	408	82
Kendall	152	131	1	15	4	84	19
Kenedy	7	5	0	0	0	1	0
Kent	4	4	0	2	0	3	0
Kerr	513	437	7	79	7	300	39
Kimble	66	61	0	3	0	39	0
King	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
Kinney	12	10	0	0	0	6	0
Kleberg	311	283	4	65	2	129	17
Knox	32	27	0	3	0	16	2
Lamar	587	464	5	48	2	341	20
Lamb	200	177	2	11	1	92	13
Lampasas	246	222	1	34	0	120	3
La Salle	64	59	0	8	1	31	6
Lavaca	143	118	1	11	1	78	10
Lee	156	123	2	17	0	80	1



## CPS Calls, Reports, Intake or Investigation Workers, and Response Time

County	Initial Intakes Alleging Abuse/ Neglect	Child Abuse/ Neglect Reports Assigned for Investigation	CPS Workers Responsible for Intake or Investigation by Office Location	Investigation initiation response time in completed investigations			
				Priority I		Priority II	
				Within 24 Hours	Over 24 Hours	Within 72 Hours	Over 72 Hours
Leon	170	149	0	35	1	93	4
Liberty	935	819	8	123	14	394	115
Limestone	248	208	3	32	0	136	2
Lipscomb	29	23	0	5	0	16	3
Live Oak	136	109	0	24	0	60	3
Llano	220	199	0	30	2	101	6
Loving	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lubbock	3,288	2,987	34	529	21	1,658	203
Lynn	56	47	0	12	2	22	0
Madison	119	108	2	15	0	63	0
Marion	172	148	0	31	0	98	5
Martin	26	23	0	5	0	15	1
Mason	17	15	0	3	0	11	0
Matagorda	303	267	2	70	7	124	60
Maverick	294	249	3	53	1	118	14
McCulloch	98	93	1	17	1	62	1
McLennan	2,890	2,494	26	408	9	1,557	47
McMullen	8	6	0	0	0	7	0
Medina	454	383	4	56	3	214	22
Menard	18	17	0	2	0	16	1
Midland	1,219	1,038	10	136	14	636	104
Milam	339	287	1	54	1	147	4
Mills	40	37	0	5	0	22	0
Mitchell	109	96	0	18	0	71	4
Montague	266	207	4	22	3	121	16
Montgomery	4,035	3,327	29	346	18	1,817	368
Moore	246	212	1	40	10	93	26
Morris	167	140	0	19	0	91	6
Motley	7	6	0	0	0	2	1
Nacogdoches	583	425	6	82	4	266	30
Navarro	493	446	6	60	6	162	48
Newton	137	121	0	10	2	71	2
Nolan	301	259	5	35	3	135	10
Nueces	4,150	3,717	39	811	28	2,096	121
Ochiltree	86	80	0	15	1	50	4
Oldham	12	10	0	0	0	3	1
Orange	1,216	1,073	13	222	5	731	27
Palo Pinto	439	402	3	80	5	237	25
Panola	199	178	2	35	0	108	6
Parker	1,317	1,179	11	189	12	632	91
Parmer	43	40	0	8	3	31	1
Pecos	114	75	3	10	0	60	5
Polk	517	421	6	85	7	253	46
Potter	2,120	1,831	28	367	30	1,022	81
Presidio	41	31	0	11	1	9	3
Rains	80	68	0	9	1	42	7
Randall	1,134	980	4	199	6	571	57
Reagan	32	27	0	2	1	17	1

## CPS Calls, Reports, Intake or Investigation Workers, and Response Time

County	Initial Intakes Alleging Abuse/Neglect	Child Abuse/Neglect Reports Assigned for Investigation	CPS Workers Responsible for Intake or Investigation by Office Location	Investigation initiation response time in completed investigations			
				Priority I		Priority II	
				Within 24 Hours	Over 24 Hours	Within 72 Hours	Over 72 Hours
Real	36	30	0	8	1	8	10
Red River	132	106	1	11	0	67	9
Reeves	87	71	0	9	0	44	9
Refugio	81	64	0	17	1	35	3
Roberts	5	5	0	0	0	1	0
Robertson	172	153	1	42	1	95	4
Rockwall	452	387	1	51	1	163	38
Runnels	115	92	1	12	2	37	4
Rusk	508	447	3	80	2	273	5
Sabine	76	67	2	5	0	53	5
San Augustine	69	61	0	10	0	38	1
San Jacinto	324	274	2	44	5	173	14
San Patricio	895	803	10	142	8	404	38
San Saba	58	52	0	11	0	24	1
Schleicher	18	17	0	0	1	7	1
Scurry	216	176	1	29	3	99	7
Shackelford	18	17	0	0	1	14	1
Shelby	275	198	2	38	4	107	25
Sherman	15	13	0	2	1	7	0
Smith	1,774	1,408	14	343	15	1,192	41
Somervell	66	59	0	10	0	35	7
Starr	400	368	7	98	0	265	2
Stephens	136	111	1	12	0	69	6
Sterling	7	7	0	1	0	3	0
Stonewall	12	12	0	1	0	6	1
Sutton	29	25	0	0	0	14	5
Swisher	72	60	1	13	1	39	5
Tarrant	18,932	16,876	156	3,018	143	8,527	1,401
Taylor	1,959	1,685	19	280	12	810	74
Terrell	11	10	0	1	0	7	0
Terry	173	156	2	35	1	94	2
Throckmorton	12	11	0	2	0	7	0
Titus	334	256	1	42	3	171	12
Tom Green	1,340	1,188	15	161	15	749	29
Travis	11,351	9,491	92	1,208	21	6,309	453
Trinity	214	175	3	25	1	102	6
Tyler	259	212	2	19	3	148	5
Upshur	466	387	5	52	4	248	23
Upton	32	23	0	5	0	14	2
Uvalde	352	298	3	51	0	151	31
Val Verde	290	245	4	68	7	126	12
Van Zandt	567	490	5	105	5	255	43
Victoria	1,118	919	9	190	10	587	27
Walker	423	324	1	43	1	192	34
Waller	344	311	2	53	6	118	18
Ward	124	88	1	8	1	64	3
Washington	236	212	4	34	0	129	6
Webb	2,625	1,993	20	517	14	982	64

## CPS Calls, Reports, Intake or Investigation Workers, and Response Time

County	Initial Intakes Alleging Abuse/ Neglect	Child Abuse/ Neglect Reports Assigned for Investigation	CPS Workers Responsible for Intake or Investigation by Office Location	Investigation initiation response time in completed investigations			
				Priority I		Priority II	
				Within 24 Hours	Over 24 Hours	Within 72 Hours	Over 72 Hours
Wharton	288	256	3	60	5	113	42
Wheeler	53	52	0	12	1	26	1
Wichita	1,771	1,491	13	183	8	826	47
Wilbarger	168	138	3	17	0	83	1
Willacy	283	241	1	65	0	172	2
Williamson	3,383	2,716	25	370	10	1,562	82
Wilson	321	257	2	22	1	159	21
Winkler	89	72	0	6	4	36	11
Wise	622	546	7	97	5	305	14
Wood	444	367	3	62	4	197	19
Yoakum	48	43	0	10	1	30	2
Young	234	202	3	23	6	106	32
Zapata	144	128	0	25	1	68	1
Zavala	174	151	0	13	1	77	16
Unknown	14	2	0	14	0	16	2
Out of State	139	55	0	0	0	0	0
SWI	0	0	308	0	0	0	0
State Total	241,681	206,206	2,287	36,887	2,033	109,246	18,045

Percent Priority one calls responded to within 24 hours = 94.8%

Percent Priority two calls responded to within 72 Hours = 85.8%

This table addresses Texas Family Code §261.004, Subsection (b) (1), (3), (8) and (9) respectively.

## Completed CPS Abuse/Neglect Investigations

County	Alleged Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	Alleged Victims in Unconfirmed Investigations	Alleged Victims in Ruled Out Investigations*	Alleged Victims Provided Services**	Alleged Victims Not Provided Services**	Children Removed From Home***
Anderson	809	597	554	93	716	40
Andrews	152	98	82	34	118	14
Angelina	1,169	841	701	120	1,049	24
Aransas	356	209	172	132	224	38
Archer	43	29	22	6	37	0
Armstrong	20	16	14	3	17	0
Atascosa	827	559	513	243	584	88
Austin	173	134	116	28	145	10
Bailey	82	70	70	6	76	4
Bandera	203	148	140	42	161	21
Bastrop	1,009	719	607	155	854	81
Baylor	52	41	35	5	47	0
Bee	422	266	207	166	256	42
Bell	4,757	3,701	3,494	706	4,051	360
Bexar	24,476	17,570	15,813	6,584	17,892	1,356
Blanco	76	70	63	1	75	1
Borden	0	0	0	0	0	3
Bosque	241	171	160	34	207	11
Bowie	1,394	1,092	828	193	1,201	103
Brazoria	2,472	1,969	1,717	315	2,157	59
Brazos	1,645	1,232	1,084	189	1,456	74
Brewster	71	64	53	8	63	0
Briscoe	13	8	6	7	6	1
Brooks	142	99	87	57	85	12
Brown	532	390	332	112	420	53
Burleson	189	145	136	19	170	18
Burnet	545	387	372	86	459	37
Caldwell	493	353	315	65	428	50
Calhoun	244	187	174	41	203	11
Callahan	178	125	118	36	142	4
Cameron	6,264	4,227	3,667	1,809	4,455	152
Camp	161	124	110	21	140	11
Carson	63	47	40	3	60	2
Cass	483	389	312	58	425	38
Castro	124	83	83	33	91	10
Chambers	320	239	209	57	263	26
Cherokee	752	572	516	109	643	65
Childress	90	59	39	29	61	5
Clay	67	47	29	9	58	2
Cochran	32	20	20	2	30	1
Coke	21	18	16	3	18	4
Coleman	127	85	67	28	99	8
Collin	4,540	3,343	2,173	596	3,944	150
Collingsworth	41	27	21	7	34	0
Colorado	173	130	102	26	147	2
Comal	1,006	560	496	340	666	79
Comanche	139	89	72	36	103	16
Concho	24	17	15	7	17	4

## Completed CPS Abuse/Neglect Investigations

County	Alleged Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	Alleged Victims in Unconfirmed Investigations	Alleged Victims in Ruled Out Investigations*	Alleged Victims Provided Services**	Alleged Victims Not Provided Services**	Children Removed From Home***
Cooke	595	457	394	66	529	20
Coryell	1,044	804	774	155	889	78
Cottle	25	22	22	3	22	0
Crane	26	26	24	1	25	1
Crockett	50	34	32	12	38	2
Crosby	130	100	92	15	115	2
Culberson	28	18	18	10	18	0
Dallam	116	89	88	13	103	3
Dallas	23,788	18,024	14,471	3,630	20,158	984
Dawson	181	124	104	45	136	3
Deaf Smith	308	234	227	32	276	6
Delta	86	64	63	18	68	9
Denton	4,609	3,575	2,785	566	4,043	231
De Witt	259	218	188	32	227	10
Dickens	31	22	18	6	25	3
Dimmit	186	156	145	19	167	13
Donley	57	36	30	11	46	7
Duval	131	92	83	41	90	8
Eastland	243	170	156	48	195	7
Ector	2,179	1,476	1,308	451	1,728	143
Edwards	27	20	20	6	21	0
Ellis	1,152	920	738	159	993	24
El Paso	7,532	5,185	4,437	1,357	6,175	176
Erath	370	244	204	64	306	22
Falls	191	137	131	24	167	9
Fannin	292	232	186	24	268	5
Fayette	199	107	89	48	151	28
Fisher	38	19	18	14	24	2
Floyd	118	64	45	26	92	10
Foard	14	14	14	0	14	0
Fort Bend	2,677	2,045	1,575	405	2,272	57
Franklin	129	94	88	17	112	5
Freestone	187	140	131	24	163	9
Frio	382	251	229	125	257	37
Gaines	101	68	61	16	85	7
Galveston	3,238	2,730	2,441	476	2,762	64
Garza	101	57	55	23	78	3
Gillespie	212	154	149	43	169	20
Glasscock	4	2	2	2	2	0
Goliad	107	82	70	11	96	0
Gonzales	288	215	190	42	246	8
Gray	408	274	210	82	326	26
Grayson	1,797	1,292	1,041	223	1,574	54
Gregg	1,531	1,137	948	227	1,304	74
Grimes	247	186	168	18	229	10
Guadalupe	1,549	1,106	942	337	1,212	89
Hale	559	311	258	133	426	39
Hall	73	47	30	21	52	6

## Completed CPS Abuse/Neglect Investigations

County	Alleged Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	Alleged Victims in Unconfirmed Investigations	Alleged Victims in Ruled Out Investigations*	Alleged Victims Provided Services**	Alleged Victims Not Provided Services**	Children Removed From Home***
Hamilton	102	77	69	8	94	3
Hansford	40	35	34	2	38	0
Hardeman	34	22	21	8	26	0
Hardin	688	538	498	72	616	7
Harris	32,790	26,673	20,934	4,496	28,294	1,393
Harrison	912	707	574	86	826	42
Hartley	13	6	6	0	13	0
Haskell	59	41	27	4	55	2
Hays	1,439	1,064	915	185	1,254	61
Hemphill	30	19	16	8	22	4
Henderson	1,102	920	791	110	992	57
Hidalgo	11,346	8,334	7,102	2,241	9,105	436
Hill	470	311	281	76	394	42
Hockley	327	179	178	84	243	19
Hood	738	429	357	182	556	40
Hopkins	315	234	215	44	271	16
Houston	243	179	161	31	212	15
Howard	463	292	263	133	330	32
Hudspeth	21	17	15	3	18	1
Hunt	1,068	801	622	200	868	104
Hutchinson	395	316	273	43	352	8
Irion	9	5	5	0	9	0
Jack	99	80	66	18	81	8
Jackson	150	119	104	20	130	0
Jasper	557	426	323	85	472	16
Jeff Davis	5	5	5	0	5	0
Jefferson	3,183	2,455	2,168	393	2,790	161
Jim Hogg	114	61	53	33	81	11
Jim Wells	715	521	453	197	518	62
Johnson	2,282	1,513	1,155	380	1,902	111
Jones	163	122	93	27	136	1
Karnes	189	131	117	57	132	7
Kaufman	1,078	828	607	191	887	51
Kendall	213	142	131	48	165	11
Kenedy	1	1	1	0	1	0
Kent	10	4	4	6	4	4
Kerr	648	444	439	146	502	39
Kimble	75	65	65	9	66	5
King	1	1	1	0	1	0
Kinney	9	9	9	0	9	0
Kleberg	355	261	235	85	270	12
Knox	37	27	17	11	26	4
Lamar	661	514	479	107	554	44
Lamb	197	139	136	19	178	5
Lampasas	268	208	198	48	220	25
La Salle	94	64	61	23	71	11
Lavaca	169	125	112	33	136	15
Lee	162	94	82	36	126	17

## Completed CPS Abuse/Neglect Investigations

County	Alleged Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	Alleged Victims in Unconfirmed Investigations	Alleged Victims in Ruled Out Investigations*	Alleged Victims Provided Services**	Alleged Victims Not Provided Services**	Children Removed From Home***
Leon	240	171	149	28	212	10
Liberty	1,065	737	615	220	845	115
Limestone	272	223	207	38	234	20
Lipscomb	48	37	27	11	37	3
Live Oak	161	74	66	72	89	13
Llano	200	145	137	37	163	28
Loving	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lubbock	4,367	2,894	2,380	910	3,457	210
Lynn	66	48	47	13	53	1
Madison	142	97	95	22	120	20
Marion	230	200	179	18	212	5
Martin	31	20	20	11	20	1
Mason	24	14	14	4	20	0
Matagorda	431	323	243	90	341	21
Maverick	308	263	261	24	284	8
McCulloch	153	108	91	27	126	6
McLennan	3,314	2,531	2,328	665	2,649	146
McMullen	11	2	2	8	3	2
Medina	484	319	309	120	364	51
Menard	34	17	17	10	24	3
Midland	1,420	1,024	835	248	1,172	60
Milam	359	242	231	86	273	32
Mills	37	30	30	7	30	4
Mitchell	160	98	79	56	104	7
Montague	259	176	139	64	195	20
Montgomery	4,081	3,191	2,479	781	3,300	279
Moore	270	168	165	56	214	7
Morris	198	170	149	16	182	4
Motley	8	0	0	0	8	0
Nacogdoches	648	452	416	94	554	65
Navarro	478	358	247	95	383	29
Newton	155	108	90	33	122	12
Nolan	335	178	153	136	199	38
Nueces	5,097	3,862	3,346	1,136	3,961	172
Ochiltree	117	82	64	13	104	8
Oldham	6	6	6	0	6	0
Orange	1,615	1,146	900	138	1,477	71
Palo Pinto	625	424	344	154	471	42
Panola	252	193	170	31	221	6
Parker	1,483	1,183	998	180	1,303	41
Parmer	72	52	40	6	66	0
Pecos	130	80	63	36	94	7
Polk	653	499	441	98	555	46
Potter	2,622	1,873	1,541	498	2,124	79
Presidio	40	25	18	18	22	10
Rains	88	73	67	7	81	5
Randall	1,334	943	764	271	1,063	140
Reagan	27	25	23	3	24	1

## Completed CPS Abuse/Neglect Investigations

County	Alleged Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	Alleged Victims in Unconfirmed Investigations	Alleged Victims in Ruled Out Investigations*	Alleged Victims Provided Services**	Alleged Victims Not Provided Services**	Children Removed From Home***
Real	38	25	23	13	25	1
Red River	138	105	86	30	108	10
Reeves	117	89	80	23	94	0
Refugio	94	76	69	20	74	5
Roberts	3	0	0	0	3	0
Robertson	245	174	157	34	211	16
Rockwall	395	307	210	64	331	12
Runnels	89	69	66	12	77	4
Rusk	587	427	389	75	512	32
Sabine	106	83	53	14	92	3
San Augustine	68	49	30	16	52	3
San Jacinto	401	309	279	69	332	30
San Patricio	1,061	719	628	308	753	49
San Saba	79	60	57	13	66	2
Schleicher	22	8	8	13	9	3
Scurry	260	183	152	56	204	4
Shackelford	18	14	12	2	16	0
Shelby	279	198	180	55	224	38
Sherman	17	16	16	0	17	0
Smith	2,540	1,998	1,856	268	2,272	150
Somervell	92	61	48	27	65	3
Starr	627	386	337	189	438	35
Stephens	150	122	88	27	123	2
Sterling	10	7	7	0	10	0
Stonewall	12	8	8	2	10	0
Sutton	21	14	11	8	13	2
Swisher	112	70	54	30	82	0
Tarrant	21,673	15,368	11,626	3,154	18,519	662
Taylor	1,965	1,206	1,040	644	1,321	96
Terrell	11	9	7	0	11	0
Terry	242	163	155	48	194	20
Throckmorton	16	12	6	1	15	0
Titus	359	264	241	71	288	19
Tom Green	1,596	1,122	997	434	1,162	163
Travis	13,211	9,720	8,568	1,344	11,867	478
Trinity	241	159	136	60	181	29
Tyler	296	235	211	27	269	3
Upshur	540	437	395	58	482	21
Upton	33	23	18	8	25	0
Uvalde	410	321	308	82	328	27
Val Verde	380	315	298	55	325	23
Van Zandt	686	492	440	91	595	48
Victoria	1,378	998	887	281	1,097	81
Walker	431	329	273	92	339	44
Waller	334	281	228	48	286	11
Ward	133	98	82	30	103	0
Washington	281	206	198	41	240	21
Webb	2,845	1,843	1,666	1,227	1,618	223



## Completed CPS Abuse/Neglect Investigations

County	Alleged Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	Alleged Victims in Unconfirmed Investigations	Alleged Victims in Ruled Out Investigations*	Alleged Victims Provided Services**	Alleged Victims Not Provided Services**	Children Removed From Home***
Wharton	386	299	235	49	337	13
Wheeler	65	48	32	18	47	6
Wichita	1,746	1,113	821	360	1,386	70
Wilbarger	171	133	109	38	133	14
Willacy	446	280	227	160	286	15
Williamson	3,113	2,332	2,142	431	2,682	84
Wilson	319	232	190	74	245	37
Winkler	92	76	61	10	82	3
Wise	731	546	471	120	611	35
Wood	471	340	312	93	378	59
Yoakum	75	58	55	3	72	3
Young	272	224	198	24	248	4
Zapata	194	121	109	60	134	14
Zavala	185	137	129	48	137	8
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0
Out Of State	57	39	15	5	52	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>275,961</b>	<b>203,838</b>	<b>170,710</b>	<b>49,014</b>	<b>226,947</b>	<b>12,900</b>

\* Subcategory of Unconfirmed investigation

\*\* Only includes children who received post-investigation services

\*\*\* Children removed from home as a result of a completed investigation without regards to any concurrent open family stages, a subset of total children entering substitute care.

This table addresses Texas Family code §261.004, subsections (b) (2) and (4) (B through F) respectively.

Note: See "CPS Children in Care During the Fiscal Year 2012" p. 156-161, for total removals.

## Confirmed CPS Victims and Investigations

County	Child Population	Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children	Total CPS Completed Investigations	Confirmed CPS Investigations	Percent Investigations Confirmed
Anderson	11,498	187	16.3	509	123	24.2%
Andrews	4,431	47	10.6	102	28	27.5%
Angelina	23,448	297	12.7	690	173	25.1%
Aransas	4,505	127	28.2	213	76	35.7%
Archer	2,159	13	6.0	26	8	30.8%
Armstrong	396	4	10.1	12	2	16.7%
Atascosa	13,238	251	19.0	448	120	26.8%
Austin	7,331	34	4.6	99	21	21.2%
Bailey	2,302	12	5.2	45	7	15.6%
Bandera	4,003	47	11.7	126	33	26.2%
Bastrop	20,398	254	12.5	598	153	25.6%
Baylor	760	11	14.5	31	5	16.1%
Bee	6,904	138	20.0	241	82	34.0%
Bell	93,172	924	9.9	2,881	579	20.1%
Bexar	477,922	6,205	13.0	14,472	3,550	24.5%
Blanco	2,281	6	2.6	49	5	10.2%
Borden	128	0	0.0	0	0	0.0%
Bosque	4,102	61	14.9	155	42	27.1%
Bowie	22,147	258	11.6	808	159	19.7%
Brazoria	91,471	448	4.9	1,579	292	18.5%
Brazos	43,546	346	7.9	958	215	22.4%
Brewster	1,929	6	3.1	45	6	13.3%
Briscoe	344	5	14.5	9	2	22.2%
Brooks	1,983	41	20.7	70	20	28.6%
Brown	9,115	131	14.4	324	80	24.7%
Burleson	4,118	41	10.0	114	23	20.2%
Burnet	10,064	135	13.4	322	85	26.4%
Caldwell	10,088	125	12.4	301	74	24.6%
Calhoun	5,726	50	8.7	159	34	21.4%
Callahan	3,262	49	15.0	109	29	26.6%
Cameron	137,876	1,819	13.2	3,372	909	27.0%
Camp	3,396	32	9.4	105	23	21.9%
Carson	1,545	16	10.4	36	8	22.2%
Cass	7,036	81	11.5	287	51	17.8%
Castro	2,497	40	16.0	62	17	27.4%
Chambers	10,367	79	7.6	201	51	25.4%
Cherokee	13,396	169	12.6	449	106	23.6%
Childress	1,520	26	17.1	52	20	38.5%
Clay	2,394	19	7.9	42	13	31.0%
Cochran	885	12	13.6	19	8	42.1%
Coke	661	3	4.5	15	2	13.3%
Coleman	1,957	41	21.0	75	21	28.0%
Collin	237,706	1,082	4.6	2,885	682	23.6%
Collingsworth	840	14	16.7	22	8	36.4%
Colorado	4,928	31	6.3	95	18	18.9%
Comal	26,685	421	15.8	619	238	38.4%
Comanche	3,337	44	13.2	75	22	29.3%
Concho	568	7	12.3	15	4	26.7%

## Confirmed CPS Victims and Investigations

County	Child Population	Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children	Total CPS Completed Investigations	Confirmed CPS Investigations	Percent Investigations Confirmed
Cooke	9,788	122	12.5	348	78	22.4%
Coryell	22,088	214	9.7	652	128	19.6%
Cottle	342	3	8.8	14	1	7.1%
Crane	1,286	0	0.0	16	0	0.0%
Crockett	970	16	16.5	31	11	35.5%
Crosby	1,737	29	16.7	70	13	18.6%
Culberson	658	10	15.2	12	4	33.3%
Dallam	2,065	22	10.7	66	16	24.2%
Dallas	667,394	5,107	7.7	14,450	3,183	22.0%
Dawson	3,418	54	15.8	96	26	27.1%
Deaf Smith	6,363	66	10.4	167	34	20.4%
Delta	1,153	22	19.1	54	15	27.8%
Denton	193,415	929	4.8	3,012	617	20.5%
De Witt	4,478	35	7.8	157	25	15.9%
Dickens	473	9	19.0	17	5	29.4%
Dimmit	2,932	28	9.5	98	13	13.3%
Donley	729	21	28.8	28	9	32.1%
Duval	3,044	34	11.2	74	20	27.0%
Eastland	4,197	59	14.1	147	37	25.2%
Ector	40,880	633	15.5	1,289	384	29.8%
Edwards	412	4	9.7	14	3	21.4%
Ellis	44,792	208	4.6	736	132	17.9%
El Paso	244,164	2,081	8.5	4,462	1,191	26.7%
Erath	8,657	114	13.2	233	76	32.6%
Falls	3,871	50	12.9	116	32	27.6%
Fannin	7,539	52	6.9	188	37	19.7%
Fayette	5,434	80	14.7	113	42	37.2%
Fisher	827	17	20.6	25	12	48.0%
Floyd	1,813	41	22.6	56	22	39.3%
Foard	264	0	0.0	6	0	0.0%
Fort Bend	184,786	535	2.9	1,726	378	21.9%
Franklin	2,649	34	12.8	81	22	27.2%
Freestone	4,644	38	8.2	107	20	18.7%
Frio	4,226	124	29.3	210	70	33.3%
Gaines	6,436	26	4.0	61	17	27.9%
Galveston	75,257	451	6.0	2,020	301	14.9%
Garza	1,272	44	34.6	60	23	38.3%
Gillespie	5,119	55	10.7	135	30	22.2%
Glasscock	329	2	6.1	3	2	66.7%
Goliad	1,613	21	13.0	68	13	19.1%
Gonzales	5,447	70	12.9	171	37	21.6%
Gray	5,714	111	19.4	246	70	28.5%
Grayson	29,242	453	15.5	1,094	271	24.8%
Gregg	31,504	373	11.8	983	233	23.7%
Grimes	6,083	54	8.9	154	33	21.4%
Guadalupe	38,282	404	10.6	934	226	24.2%
Hale	10,553	209	19.8	279	108	38.7%
Hall	829	25	30.2	37	13	35.1%

## Confirmed CPS Victims and Investigations

County	Child Population	Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children	Total CPS Completed Investigations	Confirmed CPS Investigations	Percent Investigations Confirmedw
Hamilton	1,790	19	10.6	64	14	21.9%
Hansford	1,697	5	2.9	18	3	16.7%
Hardeman	1,018	12	11.8	22	8	36.4%
Hardin	14,333	134	9.3	419	88	21.0%
Harris	1,171,213	5,383	4.6	20,612	3,575	17.3%
Harrison	17,217	184	10.7	548	114	20.8%
Hartley	1,322	3	2.3	8	2	25.0%
Haskell	1,210	18	14.9	30	6	20.0%
Hays	43,078	315	7.3	884	198	22.4%
Hemphill	1,122	11	9.8	16	4	25.0%
Henderson	18,071	161	8.9	703	105	14.9%
Hidalgo	276,110	2,685	9.7	6,255	1,438	23.0%
Hill	8,639	144	16.7	277	84	30.3%
Hockley	6,277	132	21.0	190	68	35.8%
Hood	11,029	287	26.0	472	184	39.0%
Hopkins	9,087	72	7.9	202	46	22.8%
Houston	4,822	58	12.0	151	40	26.5%
Howard	7,854	156	19.9	269	85	31.6%
Hudspeth	991	4	4.0	15	3	20.0%
Hunt	22,135	244	11.0	645	154	23.9%
Hutchinson	5,815	69	11.9	234	43	18.4%
Irion	338	4	11.8	6	2	33.3%
Jack	1,957	17	8.7	64	14	21.9%
Jackson	3,559	29	8.1	92	20	21.7%
Jasper	8,846	111	12.5	326	68	20.9%
Jeff Davis	388	0	0.0	3	0	0.0%
Jefferson	60,731	661	10.9	1,947	436	22.4%
Jim Hogg	1,515	45	29.7	57	22	38.6%
Jim Wells	11,941	175	14.7	414	113	27.3%
Johnson	42,338	691	16.3	1,381	443	32.1%
Jones	3,740	36	9.6	95	22	23.2%
Karnes	2,934	51	17.4	112	28	25.0%
Kaufman	31,438	220	7.0	649	140	21.6%
Kendall	8,338	64	7.7	122	38	31.1%
Kenedy	96	0	0.0	1	0	0.0%
Kent	178	6	33.7	5	2	40.0%
Kerr	10,128	190	18.8	425	117	27.5%
Kimble	920	10	10.9	42	7	16.7%
King	61	0	0.0	1	0	0.0%
Kinney	689	0	0.0	6	0	0.0%
Kleberg	8,369	82	9.8	213	55	25.8%
Knox	936	5	5.3	21	5	23.8%
Lamar	12,128	128	10.6	411	81	19.7%
Lamb	4,035	51	12.6	117	26	22.2%
Lampasas	4,926	59	12.0	157	33	21.0%
La Salle	1,522	29	19.1	46	14	30.4%
Lavaca	4,357	42	9.6	100	22	22.0%
Lee	4,195	61	14.5	98	35	35.7%

## Confirmed CPS Victims and Investigations

County	Child Population	Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children	Total CPS Completed Investigations	Confirmed CPS Investigations	Percent Investigations Confirmed
Leon	3,795	62	16.3	133	42	31.6%
Liberty	19,812	303	15.3	646	178	27.6%
Limestone	5,557	46	8.3	170	31	18.2%
Lipscomb	899	11	12.2	24	5	20.8%
Live Oak	2,270	77	33.9	87	37	42.5%
Llano	3,119	50	16.0	139	39	28.1%
Loving	7	0	0.0	0	0	0.0%
Lubbock	70,284	1,328	18.9	2,411	755	31.3%
Lynn	1,597	17	10.6	36	8	22.2%
Madison	3,021	41	13.6	78	22	28.2%
Marion	1,970	25	12.7	134	17	12.7%
Martin	1,438	10	7.0	21	7	33.3%
Mason	835	9	10.8	14	4	28.6%
Matagorda	9,557	92	9.6	261	58	22.2%
Maverick	18,421	39	2.1	186	27	14.5%
McCulloch	2,004	44	22.0	81	23	28.4%
McLennan	60,271	698	11.6	2,021	428	21.2%
McMullen	121	9	74.4	7	5	71.4%
Medina	12,056	146	12.1	295	91	30.8%
Menard	436	15	34.4	19	9	47.4%
Midland	38,364	366	9.5	890	229	25.7%
Milam	6,448	107	16.6	206	64	31.1%
Mills	1,163	7	6.0	27	5	18.5%
Mitchell	1,816	59	32.5	93	32	34.4%
Montague	4,557	74	16.2	162	48	29.6%
Montgomery	132,405	794	6.0	2,549	506	19.9%
Moore	7,140	93	13.0	169	54	32.0%
Morris	3,035	24	7.9	116	16	13.8%
Motley	249	6	24.1	3	3	100.0%
Nacogdoches	16,124	181	11.2	382	98	25.7%
Navarro	13,134	116	8.8	276	62	22.5%
Newton	3,177	39	12.3	85	22	25.9%
Nolan	3,978	147	37.0	183	75	41.0%
Nueces	88,188	1,107	12.6	3,056	676	22.1%
Ochiltree	3,380	32	9.5	70	17	24.3%
Oldham	630	0	0.0	4	0	0.0%
Orange	20,590	435	21.1	985	256	26.0%
Palo Pinto	7,095	176	24.8	347	100	28.8%
Panola	5,851	47	8.0	149	32	21.5%
Parker	31,106	267	8.6	924	162	17.5%
Parmer	3,268	19	5.8	43	12	27.9%
Pecos	3,884	48	12.4	75	25	33.3%
Polk	9,670	141	14.6	391	82	21.0%
Potter	34,211	666	19.5	1,500	358	23.9%
Presidio	2,247	15	6.7	24	8	33.3%
Rains	2,374	15	6.3	59	11	18.6%
Randall	31,181	363	11.6	833	214	25.7%
Reagan	1,017	2	2.0	21	2	9.5%

## Confirmed CPS Victims and Investigations

County	Child Population	Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children	Total CPS Completed Investigations	Confirmed CPS Investigations	Percent Investigations Confirmed
Real	604	13	21.5	27	9	33.3%
Red River	2,730	30	11.0	87	19	21.8%
Reeves	3,111	26	8.4	62	12	19.4%
Refugio	1,739	18	10.4	56	15	26.8%
Roberts	238	3	12.6	1	1	100.0%
Robertson	4,212	68	16.1	142	41	28.9%
Rockwall	25,042	77	3.1	253	52	20.6%
Runnels	2,614	15	5.7	55	11	20.0%
Rusk	12,632	144	11.4	360	92	25.6%
Sabine	2,051	21	10.2	63	12	19.0%
San Augustine	1,840	15	8.2	49	12	24.5%
San Jacinto	6,410	79	12.3	236	44	18.6%
San Patricio	18,070	312	17.3	592	165	27.9%
San Saba	1,247	13	10.4	36	6	16.7%
Schleicher	1,121	11	9.8	9	5	55.6%
Scurry	4,325	69	16.0	138	44	31.9%
Shackelford	816	4	4.9	16	3	18.8%
Shelby	6,739	77	11.4	174	45	25.9%
Sherman	879	1	1.1	10	1	10.0%
Smith	54,893	493	9.0	1,591	319	20.1%
Somervell	2,206	28	12.7	52	16	30.8%
Starr	20,668	216	10.5	365	125	34.2%
Stephens	2,280	25	11.0	87	14	16.1%
Sterling	275	3	10.9	4	1	25.0%
Stonewall	325	4	12.3	8	2	25.0%
Sutton	1,109	7	6.3	19	7	36.8%
Swisher	2,026	34	16.8	58	16	27.6%
Tarrant	517,952	5,598	10.8	13,089	3,426	26.2%
Taylor	32,799	707	21.6	1,176	408	34.7%
Terrell	207	2	9.7	8	2	25.0%
Terry	3,317	73	22.0	132	41	31.1%
Throckmorton	345	4	11.6	9	3	33.3%
Titus	9,999	89	8.9	228	56	24.6%
Tom Green	26,599	427	16.1	954	242	25.4%
Travis	259,016	3,045	11.8	7,991	1,878	23.5%
Trinity	3,008	78	25.9	134	37	27.6%
Tyler	4,251	48	11.3	175	36	20.6%
Upshur	9,830	91	9.3	327	62	19.0%
Upton	943	10	10.6	21	6	28.6%
Uvalde	7,636	80	10.5	233	47	20.2%
Val Verde	14,849	61	4.1	213	38	17.8%
Van Zandt	12,663	170	13.4	408	100	24.5%
Victoria	23,152	346	14.9	814	191	23.5%
Walker	11,453	85	7.4	270	49	18.1%
Waller	11,256	45	4.0	195	29	14.9%
Ward	2,887	29	10.0	76	17	22.4%
Washington	7,510	68	9.1	169	39	23.1%
Webb	90,260	903	10.0	1,577	458	29.0%

## Confirmed CPS Victims and Investigations

County	Child Population	Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children	Total CPS Completed Investigations	Confirmed CPS Investigations	Percent Investigations Confirmed
Wharton	11,007	78	7.1	220	50	22.7%
Wheeler	1,364	15	11.0	40	10	25.0%
Wichita	30,823	541	17.6	1,064	336	31.6%
Wilbarger	3,411	38	11.1	101	16	15.8%
Willacy	5,958	151	25.3	239	74	31.0%
Williamson	129,411	700	5.4	2,024	440	21.7%
Wilson	11,587	84	7.2	203	48	23.6%
Winkler	2,102	16	7.6	57	11	19.3%
Wise	15,837	159	10.0	421	95	22.6%
Wood	8,708	122	14.0	282	72	25.5%
Yoakum	2,519	16	6.4	43	8	18.6%
Young	4,489	44	9.8	167	29	17.4%
Zapata	4,920	70	14.2	95	29	30.5%
Zavala	3,646	42	11.5	107	24	22.4%
Unknown	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0%
Out of State	0	16	0.0	32	9	28.1%
State Total	7,054,634	64,366	9.1	166,211	38,725	23.3%

*This table addresses Texas Family Code §261.004, Subsection (b) (4) (A).*

*Population Data Source: Texas State Data Center, University of Texas (San Antonio). Based on Census 2010 data.*

## Five Year Outcome for Children Returned Home from Substitute Care or Served in Family Based Safety Services in FY 2007

County	Total Children Served In Fiscal Year 2007	Subsequently Confirmed Victims In Fiscal Years 2007- 2012	County	Total Children Served In Fiscal Year 2007	Subsequently Confirmed Victims In Fiscal Years 2007 - 2012
Anderson	164	23	Cooke	119	25
Andrews	43	19	Coryell	318	68
Angelina	125	23	Cottle	0	0
Aransas	143	46	Crane	11	0
Archer	1	1	Crockett	36	5
Armstrong	0	0	Crosby	4	0
Atascosa	189	36	Culberson	14	5
Austin	38	3	Dallam	54	12
Bailey	6	1	Dallas	3,605	557
Bandera	30	11	Dawson	53	24
Bastrop	132	31	Deaf Smith	73	14
Baylor	23	8	Delta	25	5
Bee	221	55	Denton	450	64
Bell	862	121	De Witt	53	8
Bexar	5,982	1,126	Dickens	7	1
Blanco	4	0	Dimmit	43	13
Borden	0	0	Donley	7	0
Bosque	26	8	Duval	79	28
Bowie	272	44	Eastland	48	11
Brazoria	547	97	Ector	458	103
Brazos	242	43	Edwards	0	0
Brewster	19	0	Ellis	291	43
Briscoe	0	0	El Paso	1,478	306
Brooks	107	17	Erath	63	13
Brown	149	39	Falls	33	3
Burleson	47	14	Fannin	61	9
Burnet	121	20	Fayette	36	9
Caldwell	117	16	Fisher	21	8
Calhoun	68	7	Floyd	30	10
Callahan	17	3	Foard	3	0
Cameron	1,560	384	Fort Bend	365	40
Camp	56	22	Franklin	18	2
Carson	6	0	Freestone	37	8
Cass	49	2	Frio	156	21
Castro	22	4	Gaines	36	4
Chambers	27	8	Galveston	1,038	148
Cherokee	73	8	Garza	20	3
Childress	8	2	Gillespie	31	3
Clay	20	14	Glasscock	1	0
Cochran	3	0	Goliad	8	0
Coke	18	5	Gonzales	53	11
Coleman	31	13	Gray	40	7
Collin	551	97	Grayson	174	24
Collingsworth	16	0	Gregg	370	70
Colorado	51	3	Grimes	69	14
Comal	169	53	Guadalupe	345	74
Comanche	57	14	Hale	112	28
Concho	5	2	Hall	6	5



## Five Year Outcome for Children Returned Home from Substitute Care or Served in Family Based Safety Services in FY 2007

County	Total Children Served In Fiscal Year 2007	Subsequently Confirmed Victims In Fiscal Years 2007 - 2012	County	Total Children Served In Fiscal Year 2007	Subsequently Confirmed Victims In Fiscal Years 2007 - 2012
Hamilton	18	2	Leon	46	14
Hansford	2	0	Liberty	101	22
Hardeman	11	4	Limestone	68	7
Hardin	117	27	Lipscomb	6	0
Harris	6,566	726	Live Oak	63	10
Harrison	136	37	Llano	60	11
Hartley	17	3	Loving	0	0
Haskell	15	3	Lubbock	626	161
Hays	202	35	Lynn	13	2
Hemphill	0	0	Madison	58	5
Henderson	525	131	Marion	15	3
Hidalgo	1,859	395	Martin	4	0
Hill	72	18	Mason	8	2
Hockley	91	16	Matagorda	58	14
Hood	97	38	Maverick	28	9
Hopkins	98	29	McCulloch	29	10
Houston	25	3	McLennan	496	109
Howard	138	30	McMullen	0	0
Hudspeth	5	0	Medina	135	26
Hunt	190	37	Menard	4	0
Hutchinson	59	10	Midland	297	49
Irion	2	1	Milam	86	10
Jack	22	1	Mills	12	1
Jackson	30	7	Mitchell	15	4
Jasper	77	18	Montague	55	18
Jeff Davis	0	0	Montgomery	553	108
Jefferson	286	44	Moore	68	12
Jim Hogg	43	7	Morris	43	15
Jim Wells	298	89	Motley	4	0
Johnson	526	133	Nacogdoches	148	29
Jones	55	21	Navarro	52	8
Karnes	49	10	Newton	8	0
Kaufman	130	28	Nolan	78	21
Kendall	28	0	Nueces	2,099	437
Kenedy	0	0	Ochiltree	1	0
Kent	0	0	Oldham	5	0
Kerr	98	28	Orange	85	16
Kimble	15	5	Palo Pinto	81	18
King	0	0	Panola	50	15
Kinney	0	0	Parker	252	58
Kleberg	189	57	Parmer	23	4
Knox	3	0	Pecos	32	6
Lamar	179	28	Polk	96	26
Lamb	33	14	Potter	336	127
Lampasas	66	10	Presidio	28	0
La Salle	34	7	Rains	34	9
Lavaca	57	11	Randall	194	38
Lee	11	6	Reagan	5	0

## Five Year Outcome for Children Returned Home from Substitute Care or Served in Family Based Safety Services in FY 2007

County	Total Children Served In Fiscal Year 2007	Subsequently Confirmed Victims In Fiscal Years 2007 - 2012	County	Total Children Served In Fiscal Year 2007	Subsequently Confirmed Victims In Fiscal Years 2007 - 2012
Real	6	1	Tom Green	423	90
Red River	32	5	Travis	1,302	252
Reeves	31	12	Trinity	29	7
Refugio	40	5	Tyler	47	12
Roberts	3	0	Upshur	101	20
Robertson	39	4	Upton	6	0
Rockwall	41	4	Uvalde	94	24
Runnels	18	8	Val Verde	44	8
Rusk	108	28	Van Zandt	132	21
Sabine	34	6	Victoria	304	60
San Augustine	4	0	Walker	75	12
San Jacinto	36	5	Waller	64	7
San Patricio	571	124	Ward	36	9
San Saba	10	3	Washington	82	16
Schleicher	9	0	Webb	939	165
Scurry	62	10	Wharton	37	8
Shackelford	14	6	Wheeler	16	2
Shelby	26	4	Wichita	420	120
Sherman	7	3	Wilbarger	51	11
Smith	292	66	Willacy	158	44
Somervell	21	7	Williamson	494	114
Starr	276	60	Wilson	53	11
Stephens	43	8	Winkler	22	0
Sterling	0	0	Wise	161	33
Stonewall	3	0	Wood	106	27
Sutton	16	6	Yoakum	6	1
Swisher	27	6	Young	77	22
Tarrant	3,983	931	Zapata	110	25
Taylor	450	122	Zavala	41	19
Terrell	0	0	Out of State	18	1
Terry	26	8	State Total	53,566	10,347
Throckmorton	0	0			
Titus	89	12			

*This table addresses Texas Family Code §261.004, Subsection (b) (11).*

## Child Abuse/Neglect Related Fatalities Fiscal Year 2012

County	Child Abuse/Neglect Related Fatalities	Child/Abuse Related Fatalities in Foster Care at Time*	County	Child Abuse/Neglect Related Fatalities	Child/Abuse Related Fatalities in Foster Care at Time*
Anderson	1	1	Kleberg	2	0
Bastrop	1	0	Liberty	3	0
Bell	5	1	Lubbock	1	0
Bexar	19	1	Madison	1	0
Bowie	1	0	Matagorda	4	2
Brazoria	2	0	Mclennan	1	0
Brazos	1	0	Midland	2	0
Cameron	3	0	Montague	1	0
Cass	1	0	Montgomery	4	0
Cherokee	2	0	Newton	1	0
Collin	4	0	Nueces	5	0
Comal	2	1	Orange	1	0
Cooke	1	0	Potter	2	0
Dallam	1	0	San Patricio	2	0
Dallas	11	1	Smith	3	0
Denton	2	0	Tarrant	19	0
Ector	4	0	Taylor	1	0
El Paso	4	1	Tom Green	4	0
Erath	1	0	Travis	2	0
Fort Bend	3	0	Uvalde	1	0
Frio	1	0	Victoria	1	0
Galveston	3	0	Waller	1	0
Gregg	3	0	Webb	4	1
Hamilton	1	0	Wharton	2	0
Harris	45	5	Wichita	2	0
Harrison	3	0	Wise	3	0
Henderson	1	0	Wood	1	0
Hidalgo	1	0	State Total	212	14
Hill	1	0			
Howard	1	0			
Jasper	1	0			
Jefferson	5	0			
Kaufman	1	0			
Kerr	2	0			

*Note: Child fatalities in foster care may be the result of injuries inflicted prior to the child's entry into foster care and are not necessarily a reflection on the current caretaker.*

*\* This is a subset of Child Abuse/Neglect Related Fatalities*

*This table addresses Texas Family Code §261.004, Subsections (b) (6) and (7).*

## CPS Children in Care During Fiscal Year 2012

County	Child Population	Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility	Point of Prevalence**	Children Entering Substitute Care (Total Removals)	Children in Substitute Care***	Children in Foster Care*
Anderson	11,498	158	13.7	40	147	93
Andrews	4,431	48	10.8	18	45	26
Angelina	23,448	113	4.8	42	111	84
Aransas	4,505	115	25.5	39	110	76
Archer	2,159	0	0.0	0	0	0
Armstrong	396	5	12.6	3	5	5
Atascosa	13,238	210	15.9	90	213	154
Austin	7,331	20	2.7	10	21	20
Bailey	2,302	33	14.3	10	33	33
Bandera	4,003	63	15.7	23	63	45
Bastrop	20,398	222	10.9	113	216	139
Baylor	760	4	5.3	3	4	4
Bee	6,904	131	19.0	65	125	89
Bell	93,172	925	9.9	421	885	595
Bexar	477,922	5,761	12.1	2,164	5,722	3,747
Blanco	2,281	7	3.1	1	6	4
Borden	128	3	23.4	3	3	0
Bosque	4,102	40	9.8	16	36	31
Bowie	22,147	209	9.4	119	201	120
Brazoria	91,471	302	3.3	92	296	206
Brazos	43,546	217	5.0	73	206	167
Brewster	1,929	5	2.6	0	5	5
Briscoe	344	2	5.8	2	2	2
Brooks	1,983	32	16.1	12	32	22
Brown	9,115	150	16.5	62	146	111
Burleson	4,118	43	10.4	18	44	27
Burnet	10,064	110	10.9	47	109	70
Caldwell	10,088	135	13.4	61	134	69
Calhoun	5,726	20	3.5	8	21	21
Callahan	3,262	25	7.7	4	19	16
Cameron	137,876	476	3.5	192	458	336
Camp	3,396	46	13.5	16	46	29
Carson	1,545	11	7.1	5	12	10
Cass	7,036	61	8.7	35	60	39
Castro	2,497	31	12.4	30	30	16
Chambers	10,367	75	7.2	37	76	42
Cherokee	13,396	207	15.5	95	200	149
Childress	1,520	24	15.8	9	24	20
Clay	2,394	9	3.8	2	9	6
Cochran	885	7	7.9	2	8	7
Coke	661	12	18.2	5	8	8
Coleman	1,957	36	18.4	9	37	28
Collin	237,706	429	1.8	159	409	311
Collingsworth	840	11	13.1	2	11	7
Colorado	4,928	27	5.5	2	25	13
Comal	26,685	218	8.2	71	211	123
Comanche	3,337	24	7.2	15	26	16
Concho	568	6	10.6	3	7	9

## CPS Children in Care During Fiscal Year 2012

County	Child Population	Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility	Point of Prevalence**	Children Entering Substitute Care (Total Removals)	Children in Substitute Care***	Children in Foster Care*
Cooke	9,788	87	8.9	27	87	73
Coryell	22,088	217	9.8	99	200	110
Cottle	342	0	0.0	0	0	0
Crane	1,286	2	1.6	0	2	1
Crockett	970	7	7.2	2	8	6
Crosby	1,737	16	9.2	6	18	12
Culberson	658	0	0.0	0	0	0
Dallam	2,065	11	5.3	3	11	9
Dallas	667,394	3,948	5.9	1,597	3,877	2,465
Dawson	3,418	33	9.7	14	34	20
Deaf Smith	6,363	55	8.6	14	56	39
Delta	1,153	14	12.1	8	14	13
Denton	193,415	684	3.5	271	652	458
De Witt	4,478	48	10.7	8	49	28
Dickens	473	10	21.1	0	10	8
Dimmit	2,932	80	27.3	5	83	50
Donley	729	14	19.2	4	13	10
Duval	3,044	29	9.5	7	31	26
Eastland	4,197	49	11.7	18	49	37
Ector	40,880	446	10.9	158	422	313
Edwards	412	16	38.8	0	17	5
Ellis	44,792	75	1.7	30	76	52
El Paso	244,164	814	3.3	297	788	624
Erath	8,657	62	7.2	23	61	41
Falls	3,871	25	6.5	9	26	16
Fannin	7,539	30	4.0	5	27	21
Fayette	5,434	82	15.1	31	72	42
Fisher	827	6	7.3	2	6	6
Floyd	1,813	39	21.5	15	38	23
Foard	264	0	0.0	0	0	0
Fort Bend	184,786	238	1.3	73	233	156
Franklin	2,649	11	4.2	6	11	6
Freestone	4,644	28	6.0	9	31	24
Frio	4,226	100	23.7	38	96	61
Gaines	6,436	35	5.4	8	26	18
Galveston	75,257	327	4.3	98	305	169
Garza	1,272	20	15.7	6	20	14
Gillespie	5,119	56	10.9	20	53	38
Glasscock	329	0	0.0	0	0	0
Goliad	1,613	6	3.7	0	2	2
Gonzales	5,447	26	4.8	8	25	17
Gray	5,714	138	24.2	26	128	82
Grayson	29,242	146	5.0	61	146	120
Gregg	31,504	279	8.9	85	276	211
Grimes	6,083	43	7.1	13	41	24
Guadalupe	38,282	250	6.5	121	244	142
Hale	10,553	130	12.3	46	120	76
Hall	829	15	18.1	4	16	16

## CPS Children in Care During Fiscal Year 2012

County	Child Population	Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility	Point of Prevalence**	Children Entering Substitute Care (Total Removals)	Children in Substitute Care***	Children in Foster Care*
Hamilton	1,790	18	10.1	3	18	15
Hansford	1,697	4	2.4	0	4	3
Hardeman	1,018	9	8.8	4	9	9
Hardin	14,333	51	3.6	16	50	42
Harris	1,171,213	7,420	6.3	1,781	7,177	4,441
Harrison	17,217	130	7.6	45	124	90
Hartley	1,322	0	0.0	0	1	1
Haskell	1,210	8	6.6	2	8	7
Hays	43,078	177	4.1	72	173	89
Hemphill	1,122	6	5.3	4	6	5
Henderson	18,071	248	13.7	73	228	148
Hidalgo	276,110	1,313	4.8	599	1,237	963
Hill	8,639	74	8.6	46	74	53
Hockley	6,277	103	16.4	34	99	77
Hood	11,029	114	10.3	52	109	85
Hopkins	9,087	63	6.9	24	63	37
Houston	4,822	60	12.4	21	54	42
Howard	7,854	111	14.1	58	109	70
Hudspeth	991	4	4.0	1	1	1
Hunt	22,135	251	11.3	129	247	193
Hutchinson	5,815	65	11.2	24	56	23
Irion	338	5	14.8	0	5	3
Jack	1,957	17	8.7	8	15	10
Jackson	3,559	3	0.8	0	3	2
Jasper	8,846	42	4.7	17	44	35
Jeff Davis	388	0	0.0	0	0	0
Jefferson	60,731	403	6.6	202	398	329
Jim Hogg	1,515	25	16.5	15	25	13
Jim Wells	11,941	131	11.0	68	128	94
Johnson	42,338	396	9.4	150	393	317
Jones	3,740	11	2.9	2	11	8
Karnes	2,934	42	14.3	11	44	32
Kaufman	31,438	136	4.3	58	126	82
Kendall	8,338	51	6.1	13	46	33
Kenedy	96	0	0.0	0	0	0
Kent	178	4	22.5	4	4	4
Kerr	10,128	207	20.4	44	203	134
Kimble	920	17	18.5	8	17	13
King	61	0	0.0	0	0	0
Kinney	689	5	7.3	3	5	3
Kleberg	8,369	85	10.2	19	87	58
Knox	936	10	10.7	4	11	11
Lamar	12,128	118	9.7	47	114	83
Lamb	4,035	33	8.2	5	28	22
Lampasas	4,926	70	14.2	30	70	57
La Salle	1,522	27	17.7	12	28	17
Lavaca	4,357	27	6.2	16	27	19
Lee	4,195	71	16.9	16	65	51

## CPS Children in Care During Fiscal Year 2012

County	Child Population	Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility	Point of Prevalence**	Children Entering Substitute Care (Total Removals)	Children in Substitute Care***	Children in Foster Care*
Leon	3,795	29	7.6	12	29	20
Liberty	19,812	275	13.9	123	271	150
Limestone	5,557	59	10.6	20	60	39
Lipscomb	899	8	8.9	2	8	7
Live Oak	2,270	29	12.8	15	29	21
Llano	3,119	57	18.3	28	59	42
Loving	7	0	0.0	0	0	0
Lubbock	70,284	899	12.8	276	856	606
Lynn	1,597	8	5.0	1	8	8
Madison	3,021	46	15.2	20	47	30
Marion	1,970	23	11.7	9	20	6
Martin	1,438	2	1.4	1	2	0
Mason	835	5	6.0	0	3	2
Matagorda	9,557	52	5.4	22	47	37
Maverick	18,421	29	1.6	10	30	14
McCulloch	2,004	20	10.0	11	18	17
McLennan	60,271	515	8.5	157	494	349
McMullen	121	3	24.8	2	2	0
Medina	12,056	215	17.8	66	206	143
Menard	436	12	27.5	4	12	10
Midland	38,364	220	5.7	73	206	141
Milam	6,448	101	15.7	41	96	62
Mills	1,163	9	7.7	4	8	7
Mitchell	1,816	16	8.8	7	16	16
Montague	4,557	116	25.5	30	100	78
Montgomery	132,405	870	6.6	318	838	508
Moore	7,140	44	6.2	18	43	21
Morris	3,035	16	5.3	4	16	13
Motley	249	2	8.0	0	2	1
Nacogdoches	16,124	201	12.5	67	199	161
Navarro	13,134	107	8.1	37	105	80
Newton	3,177	27	8.5	13	24	19
Nolan	3,978	82	20.6	51	79	58
Nueces	88,188	681	7.7	211	653	435
Ochiltree	3,380	15	4.4	6	15	11
Oldham	630	2	3.2	1	2	2
Orange	20,590	217	10.5	79	209	189
Palo Pinto	7,095	112	15.8	53	111	74
Panola	5,851	32	5.5	11	29	16
Parker	31,106	98	3.2	45	92	69
Parmer	3,268	4	1.2	0	4	4
Pecos	3,884	34	8.8	16	34	23
Polk	9,670	117	12.1	45	114	80
Potter	34,211	372	10.9	105	370	307
Presidio	2,247	14	6.2	10	14	12
Rains	2,374	20	8.4	6	15	10
Randall	31,181	466	14.9	135	444	299
Reagan	1,017	4	3.9	1	4	4

## CPS Children in Care During Fiscal Year 2012

County	Child Population	Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility	Point of Prevalence**	Children Entering Substitute Care (Total Removals)	Children in Substitute Care***	Children in Foster Care*
Real	604	9	14.9	1	8	7
Red River	2,730	34	12.5	11	34	22
Reeves	3,111	8	2.6	0	8	6
Refugio	1,739	6	3.5	2	5	4
Roberts	238	0	0.0	0	0	0
Robertson	4,212	40	9.5	18	40	19
Rockwall	25,042	48	1.9	16	47	24
Runnels	2,614	36	13.8	7	35	19
Rusk	12,632	108	8.5	44	94	42
Sabine	2,051	11	5.4	3	9	5
San Augustine	1,840	7	3.8	6	7	4
San Jacinto	6,410	82	12.8	33	74	68
San Patricio	18,070	111	6.1	62	112	83
San Saba	1,247	14	11.2	3	10	6
Schleicher	1,121	5	4.5	3	5	5
Scurry	4,325	28	6.5	9	29	24
Shackelford	816	0	0.0	0	0	0
Shelby	6,739	73	10.8	38	73	69
Sherman	879	1	1.1	0	1	1
Smith	54,893	463	8.4	231	455	300
Somervell	2,206	12	5.4	3	12	10
Starr	20,668	132	6.4	58	123	103
Stephens	2,280	8	3.5	2	8	8
Sterling	275	0	0.0	0	0	0
Stonewall	325	0	0.0	0	0	0
Sutton	1,109	6	5.4	3	6	4
Swisher	2,026	24	11.8	0	24	10
Tarrant	517,952	2,136	4.1	791	2,057	1,742
Taylor	32,799	331	10.1	130	323	224
Terrell	207	0	0.0	0	0	0
Terry	3,317	70	21.1	20	71	46
Throckmorton	345	1	2.9	0	1	1
Titus	9,999	61	6.1	24	59	36
Tom Green	26,599	557	20.9	169	538	379
Travis	259,016	1,584	6.1	647	1,496	956
Trinity	3,008	60	19.9	36	58	42
Tyler	4,251	21	4.9	7	17	9
Upshur	9,830	53	5.4	21	50	26
Upton	943	9	9.5	2	7	3
Uvalde	7,636	105	13.8	36	106	65
Val Verde	14,849	46	3.1	21	46	35
Van Zandt	12,663	160	12.6	43	152	100
Victoria	23,152	227	9.8	86	231	172
Walker	11,453	92	8.0	50	95	64
Waller	11,256	84	7.5	23	77	55
Ward	2,887	8	2.8	1	6	3
Washington	7,510	51	6.8	28	48	34
Webb	90,260	709	7.9	357	705	572



## CPS Children in Care During Fiscal Year 2012

County	Child Population	Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility	Point of Prevalence**	Children Entering Substitute Care (Total Removals)	Children in Substitute Care***	Children in Foster Care*
Wharton	11,007	69	6.3	10	66	39
Wheeler	1,364	14	10.3	7	12	6
Wichita	30,823	298	9.7	101	279	233
Wilbarger	3,411	29	8.5	17	29	23
Willacy	5,958	56	9.4	20	51	43
Williamson	129,411	504	3.9	139	483	327
Wilson	11,587	88	7.6	49	90	48
Winkler	2,102	7	3.3	4	6	5
Wise	15,837	119	7.5	43	111	83
Wood	8,708	132	15.2	68	130	103
Yoakum	2,519	10	4.0	3	9	6
Young	4,489	53	11.8	6	51	36
Zapata	4,920	54	11.0	15	57	45
Zavala	3,646	52	14.3	13	52	38
Unknown	0	0	0.0	2	1	0
Out of State	0	6	0.0	1	1	1
State Total	7,054,634	47,137	6.7	16,972	45,694	31,302

\* Children in foster care is by living arrangement and will not equal children in paid foster care.

\*\* Point of Prevalence: Rate of annual number of children in DFPS legal responsibility in Fiscal Year 2012 per 1,000 children in the child population.

\*\*\* Substitute care and foster care include children ages 0 to 20. Children age out of DFPS legal responsibility at age 18 but may remain in foster care. Youth ages 18 and over who are in foster care are counted in substitute care.

Population Data Source: Texas State Data Center, University of Texas (San Antonio) - based on Census 2010 data

## Legal Statuses Granted for Children in Fiscal Year 2012

County	Unique Children*	Possessory CVS	TMC**	PMC: Not Free For Adoption	PMC: Free For Adoption	Adoption Finalized	DFPS Responsibility Terminated***
Anderson	122	0	41	6	16	24	47
Andrews	45	0	18	2	10	3	14
Angelina	83	0	42	7	11	14	23
Aransas	83	0	39	3	10	10	36
Archer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Armstrong	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
Atascosa	171	0	90	4	37	28	33
Austin	15	0	10	1	0	3	2
Bailey	22	0	10	4	10	2	1
Bandera	55	0	20	0	20	12	12
Bastrop	192	0	112	10	21	25	65
Baylor	4	0	3	1	0	0	0
Bee	103	0	69	7	10	3	34
Bell	794	4	447	17	92	100	283
Bexar	4,679	1	2,198	95	936	884	1,231
Blanco	5	0	1	0	2	1	3
Borden	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
Bosque	33	0	24	0	1	3	7
Bowie	193	0	135	0	22	12	83
Brazoria	234	0	89	23	20	12	118
Brazos	160	0	73	16	22	10	68
Brewster	3	0	0	1	0	0	3
Briscoe	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Brooks	22	0	7	0	2	2	16
Brown	119	0	63	3	14	29	16
Burleson	31	0	18	0	4	2	7
Burnet	90	0	49	0	10	18	22
Caldwell	122	0	61	6	24	28	28
Calhoun	14	0	8	3	0	0	6
Callahan	17	0	4	2	0	3	9
Cameron	416	0	195	44	24	19	192
Camp	42	0	20	4	6	2	16
Carson	11	0	5	0	0	4	2
Cass	56	0	39	5	8	7	20
Castro	30	0	30	0	0	0	5
Chambers	66	0	37	4	1	8	20
Cherokee	174	0	100	5	19	13	54
Childress	17	0	9	0	5	5	2
Clay	7	0	2	0	2	2	1
Cochran	5	0	1	0	0	0	4
Coke	12	0	5	0	2	1	4
Coleman	26	0	9	5	4	1	10
Collin	358	0	168	24	59	33	137
Collingsworth	9	0	2	0	0	4	3
Colorado	23	0	4	0	7	5	8
Comal	182	0	79	17	26	32	58
Comanche	18	0	15	1	0	1	2
Concho	5	0	1	3	1	0	0

## Legal Statuses Granted for Children in Fiscal Year 2012

County	Unique Children*	Possessory CVS	TMC**	PMC: Not Free For Adoption	PMC: Free For Adoption	Adoption Finalized	DFPS Responsibility Terminated***
Cooke	67	0	27	0	20	4	18
Coryell	198	0	101	16	5	8	103
Cottle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crane	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Crockett	4	0	2	0	0	1	2
Crosby	13	0	6	0	1	5	2
Culberson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dallam	4	0	3	1	0	0	0
Dallas	3,316	56	1,628	219	315	273	1,321
Dawson	30	0	14	3	10	1	3
Deaf Smith	43	0	15	3	14	7	9
Delta	14	0	8	0	1	0	5
Denton	578	0	271	7	104	92	153
Dewitt	31	0	8	7	15	5	3
Dickens	5	0	0	0	2	0	3
Dimmit	31	0	5	3	12	5	7
Donley	10	0	4	4	0	0	7
Duval	17	0	7	0	2	1	8
Eastland	32	0	18	2	4	0	13
Ector	345	0	162	19	40	22	118
Edwards	7	0	0	2	5	0	0
Ellis	69	0	25	0	13	16	27
El Paso	647	0	298	37	118	89	211
Erath	52	0	23	2	7	6	20
Falls	16	0	9	0	7	0	1
Fannin	23	0	3	2	2	5	13
Fayette	64	0	31	3	16	10	22
Fisher	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Floyd	27	0	16	0	2	3	7
Foard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Bend	191	0	73	14	15	34	75
Franklin	8	0	6	0	0	2	1
Freestone	20	0	11	0	7	8	3
Frio	84	0	44	0	14	15	14
Gaines	26	0	8	1	3	3	12
Galveston	264	0	99	14	34	43	101
Garza	8	0	6	0	0	0	2
Gillespie	40	0	20	2	3	4	16
Glasscock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goliad	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Gonzales	23	0	8	1	7	2	7
Gray	114	0	26	23	26	11	41
Grayson	127	0	61	9	16	21	41
Gregg	207	0	85	4	43	19	66
Grimes	29	0	13	0	3	6	8
Guadalupe	211	0	119	5	33	21	71
Hale	83	0	50	1	8	7	22
Hall	11	0	4	3	2	1	1

## Legal Statuses Granted for Children in Fiscal Year 2012

County	Unique Children*	Possessory CVS	TMC**	PMC: Not Free For Adoption	PMC: Free For Adoption	Adoption Finalized	DFPS Responsibility Terminated***
Hamilton	10	0	3	2	0	2	3
Hansford	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Hardeman	9	0	4	3	0	1	1
Hardin	36	0	16	4	7	6	12
Harris	5,322	1	1,839	230	1,065	942	1,638
Harrison	93	0	45	5	5	2	57
Hartley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haskell	5	0	2	0	2	2	1
Hays	145	0	89	4	16	6	56
Hemphill	6	0	4	0	0	1	1
Henderson	203	0	79	15	25	29	73
Hidalgo	1,144	0	604	33	22	7	607
Hill	63	0	46	2	6	5	9
Hockley	66	0	34	3	13	8	20
Hood	90	0	54	5	13	5	25
Hopkins	54	0	26	6	7	9	13
Houston	41	0	21	4	4	3	13
Howard	90	0	60	6	9	8	13
Hudspeth	4	0	1	0	0	0	3
Hunt	229	0	131	2	41	37	70
Hutchinson	53	0	24	1	7	2	22
Irion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Jack	15	0	6	0	0	1	8
Jackson	2	0	0	0	1	2	0
Jasper	29	0	17	0	4	8	4
Jeff Davis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	374	0	207	16	75	44	129
Jim Hogg	24	0	15	1	4	0	9
Jim Wells	122	0	68	7	14	2	45
Johnson	314	0	154	2	62	49	80
Jones	7	0	2	0	3	0	2
Karnes	23	0	11	2	2	2	9
Kaufman	119	0	56	1	27	29	39
Kendall	47	0	13	2	17	9	12
Kenedy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
Kerr	172	0	44	5	30	64	48
Kimble	14	0	8	0	3	1	2
King	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kinney	5	0	3	0	0	0	2
Kleberg	59	0	19	3	20	11	11
Knox	5	0	4	0	0	0	1
Lamar	110	0	47	3	18	3	74
Lamb	16	0	5	0	1	0	11
Lampasas	62	0	31	3	8	6	23
Lasalle	24	0	12	0	13	0	2
Lavaca	25	0	16	0	2	4	3
Lee	52	0	16	5	11	6	21

## Legal Statuses Granted for Children in Fiscal Year 2012

County	Unique Children*	Possessory CVS	TMC**	PMC: Not Free For Adoption	PMC: Free For Adoption	Adoption Finalized	DFPS Responsibility Terminated***
Leon	23	0	12	1	6	1	5
Liberty	242	0	128	11	31	12	80
Limestone	47	0	20	0	12	13	9
Lipscomb	8	0	2	1	5	0	2
Live Oak	21	0	17	0	1	0	10
Llano	52	0	28	2	17	10	7
Loving	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lubbock	708	0	292	21	148	142	211
Lynn	5	0	1	0	0	1	3
Madison	40	0	18	2	1	6	17
Marion	24	0	11	0	3	6	7
Martin	2	0	1	0	0	0	1
Mason	5	0	0	0	2	1	3
Matagorda	45	0	22	1	8	2	19
Maverick	21	0	10	1	5	10	0
McCulloch	18	0	11	0	2	1	6
McLennan	408	0	174	23	78	66	103
McMullen	3	0	3	0	0	0	1
Medina	175	0	68	5	30	48	48
Menard	9	0	4	0	3	0	5
Midland	185	0	80	16	37	18	55
Milam	94	0	40	3	26	11	26
Mills	8	0	4	2	1	0	6
Mitchell	12	0	7	1	4	0	6
Montague	94	0	34	11	6	3	47
Montgomery	724	0	331	40	92	113	261
Moore	31	0	18	0	5	1	12
Morris	14	0	6	3	3	1	6
Motley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nacogdoches	145	0	66	8	41	14	29
Navarro	84	0	38	4	12	15	25
Newton	20	0	13	0	0	0	7
Nolan	75	0	52	0	2	3	30
Nueces	572	0	231	27	66	96	323
Ochiltree	12	0	6	1	1	1	4
Oldham	2	0	1	0	0	0	1
Orange	177	0	78	11	26	13	65
Palo Pinto	98	0	55	0	7	11	31
Panola	25	0	11	5	4	0	11
Parker	78	0	47	2	10	5	18
Parmer	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pecos	30	0	16	0	0	4	15
Polk	93	0	47	10	11	6	30
Potter	268	0	139	24	42	36	74
Presidio	14	0	10	2	0	0	7
Rains	18	0	8	0	2	3	5
Randall	370	0	180	29	25	57	128
Reagan	4	0	1	0	0	3	0

## Legal Statuses Granted for Children in Fiscal Year 2012

County	Unique Children*	Possessory CVS	TMC**	PMC: Not Free For Adoption	PMC: Free For Adoption	Adoption Finalized	DFPS Responsibility Terminated***
Real	6	0	1	0	3	0	2
Red River	30	0	12	0	9	4	13
Reeves	7	0	0	5	0	1	1
Refugio	4	0	2	0	0	0	3
Roberts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robertson	30	0	18	0	3	2	7
Rockwall	41	0	16	0	7	4	19
Runnels	27	0	7	0	5	3	14
Rusk	98	0	47	1	10	6	45
Sabine	9	0	3	0	3	3	3
San Augustine	6	0	6	0	3	0	0
San Jacinto	62	0	33	1	5	5	23
San Patricio	92	0	64	0	7	6	29
San Saba	9	0	3	0	0	1	5
Schleicher	5	0	3	0	0	0	2
Scurry	19	0	10	1	2	3	3
Shackelford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shelby	65	0	37	7	7	5	19
Sherman	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Smith	379	0	229	13	62	71	79
Somervell	11	0	3	2	1	3	5
Starr	102	0	60	4	2	0	54
Stephens	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Sterling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stonewall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sutton	6	0	3	2	0	0	1
Swisher	18	0	0	0	1	3	14
Tarrant	1,665	4	796	121	252	217	553
Taylor	251	0	135	29	17	18	90
Terrell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terry	55	1	19	3	15	12	11
Throckmorton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Titus	51	0	24	3	13	3	20
Tom Green	394	0	168	24	72	42	125
Travis	1,326	0	662	37	169	173	466
Trinity	53	0	38	1	2	1	23
Tyler	15	0	7	0	2	1	7
Upshur	46	0	22	1	4	6	18
Upton	8	0	2	0	0	0	6
Uvalde	92	0	36	2	25	14	27
Val Verde	30	0	23	2	1	3	4
Van Zandt	125	0	42	1	26	29	43
Victoria	158	0	85	6	21	19	44
Walker	84	0	55	2	8	3	31
Waller	72	0	25	7	3	11	28
Ward	7	0	1	0	1	0	5
Washington	48	0	28	2	8	3	14
Webb	571	0	354	23	35	46	199

## Legal Statuses Granted for Children in Fiscal Year 2012

County	Unique Children*	Possessory CVS	TMC**	PMC: Not Free For Adoption	PMC: Free For Adoption	Adoption Finalized	DFPS Responsibility Terminated***
Wharton	52	0	10	4	19	9	18
Wheeler	13	0	7	0	4	1	5
Wichita	250	0	99	21	29	32	100
Wilbarger	26	0	17	0	0	5	5
Willacy	43	0	20	8	2	3	11
Williamson	396	0	141	18	55	72	155
Wilson	77	0	49	3	16	2	16
Winkler	7	0	4	1	2	0	2
Wise	92	0	44	2	13	6	34
Wood	120	0	69	5	17	16	31
Yoakum	9	0	3	0	1	2	3
Young	30	0	8	0	14	1	10
Zapata	33	0	14	1	2	0	17
Zavala	35	0	15	0	10	6	5
Out Of State	74	0	6	0	0	**** 0	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>37,706</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>17,447</b>	<b>1,735</b>	<b>5,707</b>	<b>5,040</b>	<b>12,679</b>

\* Counts unique children in county of last legal status event recorded during the fiscal year.

\*\* Includes care, custody and control.

\*\*\* Includes conservatorship not obtained

\*\*\*\* Out of the 5,040 children adopted during FY12, 307 were placed out of state.

Note: CVS is conservatorship

TMC is temporary managing conservatorship

PMC is permanent managing conservatorship.

This table addresses Texas Family Code §261.004, Subsection (b) (12).

## Foster Care Expenditures

County	Paid Foster Care Clients	Foster Care Expenditures*	County	Paid Foster Care Clients	Foster Care Expenditures*
Anderson	91	\$1,306,881	Cooke	76	\$986,803
Andrews	27	472,530	Coryell	110	928,767
Angelina	84	816,067	Cottle	0	0
Aransas	76	1,130,408	Crane	1	28,844
Archer	0	0	Crockett	6	52,985
Armstrong	5	24,855	Crosby	12	145,052
Atascosa	155	2,109,743	Culberson	0	0
Austin	20	148,743	Dallam	8	283,741
Bailey	34	312,213	Dallas	2,444	26,647,969
Bandera	46	796,754	Dawson	20	243,008
Bastrop	140	1,368,528	Deaf Smith	36	423,296
Baylor	4	44,532	Delta	13	134,019
Bee	90	970,598	Denton	454	4,222,697
Bell	587	6,280,663	De Witt	27	484,201
Bexar	3,655	44,966,220	Dickens	8	170,840
Blanco	4	69,629	Dimmit	52	877,207
Borden	0	0	Donley	10	174,509
Bosque	31	288,968	Duval	25	334,362
Bowie	115	1,408,608	Eastland	37	326,510
Brazoria	200	2,656,973	Ector	314	4,433,217
Brazos	165	2,125,366	Edwards	5	48,551
Brewster	5	130,988	Ellis	52	720,294
Briscoe	2	20,780	El Paso	608	7,298,146
Brooks	18	406,486	Erath	40	394,583
Brown	111	1,333,102	Falls	16	219,465
Burleson	29	405,349	Fannin	19	361,374
Burnet	67	923,011	Fayette	42	439,422
Caldwell	69	831,181	Fisher	6	120,866
Calhoun	20	440,347	Floyd	22	282,802
Callahan	16	268,099	Foard	0	0
Cameron	330	3,687,632	Fort Bend	147	1,975,894
Camp	29	320,939	Franklin	3	13,350
Carson	7	62,672	Freestone	25	349,633
Cass	39	277,511	Frio	60	675,548
Castro	16	145,118	Gaines	18	318,938
Chambers	39	385,749	Galveston	167	2,248,520
Cherokee	147	1,356,707	Garza	17	198,539
Childress	20	322,523	Gillespie	38	560,241
Clay	6	174,806	Glasscock	0	0
Cochran	7	127,674	Goliad	2	46,569
Coke	8	41,487	Gonzales	17	223,021
Coleman	28	374,497	Gray	87	1,271,126
Collin	304	3,357,288	Grayson	120	1,305,463
Collingsworth	7	30,401	Gregg	210	3,044,668
Colorado	13	207,390	Grimes	25	343,643
Comal	120	1,384,907	Guadalupe	138	1,256,451
Comanche	16	130,553	Hale	74	991,832
Concho	9	\$143,986	Hall	16	\$220,081



## Foster Care Expenditures

County	Paid Foster Care Clients	Foster Care Expenditures*	County	Paid Foster Care Clients	Foster Care Expenditures*
Hamilton	15	\$225,691	Leon	20	\$267,663
Hansford	3	75,982	Liberty	147	1,896,969
Hardeman	8	18,412	Limestone	38	440,344
Hardin	42	442,252	Lipscomb	7	122,201
Harris	4,311	58,823,466	Live Oak	21	167,300
Harrison	86	1,034,089	Llano	45	468,099
Hartley	1	4,302	Loving	0	0
Haskell	7	68,941	Lubbock	608	8,733,088
Hays	89	1,228,663	Lynn	7	88,070
Hemphill	5	62,199	Madison	28	239,101
Henderson	148	1,826,589	Marion	6	94,430
Hidalgo	955	7,994,615	Martin	0	0
Hill	52	620,876	Mason	2	26,044
Hockley	82	1,165,294	Matagorda	34	399,844
Hood	85	999,062	Maverick	18	302,379
Hopkins	37	400,887	McCulloch	17	181,651
Houston	42	406,340	McLennan	346	4,791,334
Howard	66	744,581	McMullen	0	0
Hudspeth	1	3,721	Medina	148	1,873,844
Hunt	192	1,735,353	Menard	10	141,878
Hutchinson	22	386,512	Midland	143	1,779,534
Irion	3	1,661	Milam	61	668,045
Jack	10	171,850	Mills	7	156,379
Jackson	2	84,554	Mitchell	17	184,539
Jasper	36	500,645	Montague	77	714,285
Jeff Davis	0	0	Montgomery	505	6,549,864
Jefferson	326	2,722,811	Moore	19	396,969
Jim Hogg	13	94,251	Morris	13	200,615
Jim Wells	93	951,521	Motley	1	27,843
Johnson	315	3,732,378	Nacogdoches	161	1,718,052
Jones	8	120,103	Navarro	82	1,100,759
Karnes	32	497,684	Newton	19	386,575
Kaufman	77	880,630	Nolan	58	327,468
Kendall	33	377,473	Nueces	421	4,973,072
Kenedy	0	0	Ochiltree	11	150,355
Kent	4	48,393	Oldham	2	3,440
Kerr	132	1,622,558	Orange	185	1,552,428
Kimble	13	274,567	Palo Pinto	73	649,514
King	0	0	Panola	16	228,212
Kinney	3	8,312	Parker	68	959,854
Kleberg	55	859,295	Parmer	5	115,372
Knox	11	153,754	Pecos	22	229,706
Lamar	85	976,652	Polk	79	739,196
Lamb	23	332,670	Potter	306	4,674,298
Lampasas	56	788,797	Presidio	12	88,668
La Salle	17	318,078	Rains	10	113,124
Lavaca	21	164,941	Randall	284	4,354,797
Lee	51	\$661,416	Reagan	4	\$18,179

## Foster Care Expenditures

County	Paid Foster Care Clients	Foster Care Expenditures*	County	Paid Foster Care Clients	Foster Care Expenditures*
Real	7	\$148,453	Tom Green	382	5,229,689
Red River	22	290,509	Travis	934	11,696,686
Reeves	6	133,170	Trinity	42	308,525
Refugio	7	50,525	Tyler	9	78,935
Roberts	0	0	Upshur	26	310,514
Robertson	20	293,125	Upton	3	23,633
Rockwall	24	222,074	Uvalde	65	916,879
Runnels	20	245,555	Val Verde	39	464,784
Rusk	41	423,582	Van Zandt	99	1,219,846
Sabine	5	65,704	Victoria	169	2,275,806
San Augustine	4	20,950	Walker	61	828,964
San Jacinto	68	824,693	Waller	52	530,024
San Patricio	85	811,993	Ward	4	73,459
San Saba	6	167,882	Washington	34	378,374
Schleicher	5	23,435	Webb	569	6,325,867
Scurry	27	335,903	Wharton	39	386,927
Shackelford	0	0	Wheeler	6	72,001
Shelby	67	709,350	Wichita	233	2,618,272
Sherman	1	38,256	Wilbarger	23	273,856
Smith	288	3,071,229	Willacy	43	387,191
Somervell	12	97,869	Williamson	317	4,227,146
Starr	102	1,073,298	Wilson	48	512,570
Stephens	8	162,608	Winkler	5	122,973
Sterling	0	0	Wise	88	770,230
Stonewall	0	0	Wood	98	1,048,669
Sutton	4	39,077	Yoakum	6	60,428
Swisher	10	190,678	Young	36	359,573
Tarrant	1,709	19,615,634	Zapata	46	657,096
Taylor	217	2,362,665	Zavala	38	613,935
Terrell	0	0	Unknown	0	0
Terry	44	520,962	State Total	30,828	\$373,644,867
Throckmorton	0	0	Unduplicated Total Clients:		30,738
Titus	36	\$608,125			

Data as of 11/7/2012

\* Actual dollars, does not include completion factors, delayed billings or manual payments.

Note: 90 clients received foster care in more than one county.

## DFPS Foster and Adoptive Homes

County	Foster Homes*	Foster/ Adoptive Homes**	Adoptive Homes***	County	Foster Homes*	Foster/ Adoptive Homes**	Adoptive Homes***
Anderson	0	0	0	Cooke	0	0	1
Andrews	0	1	0	Coryell	1	8	6
Angelina	0	8	1	Cottle	0	0	0
Aransas	0	2	0	Crane	0	0	0
Archer	0	0	0	Crockett	0	0	0
Armstrong	0	0	0	Crosby	0	0	0
Atascosa	0	2	2	Culberson	0	0	0
Austin	0	0	3	Dallam	0	0	1
Bailey	0	0	0	Dallas	25	93	24
Bandera	0	1	1	Dawson	0	1	0
Bastrop	2	4	4	Deaf Smith	0	1	0
Baylor	0	0	0	Delta	0	0	0
Bee	0	0	2	Denton	1	14	3
Bell	7	48	12	Dewitt	0	0	1
Bexar	4	94	80	Dickens	0	0	0
Blanco	0	0	1	Dimmit	0	1	2
Borden	0	0	0	Donley	0	2	0
Bosque	0	1	0	Duval	0	0	0
Bowie	0	9	4	Eastland	1	1	0
Brazoria	2	21	15	Ector	0	10	2
Brazos	2	8	4	Edwards	0	0	0
Brewster	0	0	1	Ellis	0	11	3
Briscoe	0	1	0	El Paso	2	42	9
Brooks	0	1	0	Erath	0	1	0
Brown	0	6	1	Falls	1	2	0
Burleson	0	2	1	Fannin	0	4	2
Burnet	0	3	1	Fayette	0	0	1
Caldwell	0	0	0	Fisher	0	1	0
Calhoun	1	1	0	Floyd	0	0	0
Callahan	0	0	0	Foard	0	0	0
Cameron	5	14	6	Fort Bend	6	25	24
Camp	0	0	0	Franklin	0	1	0
Carson	0	0	1	Freestone	0	0	1
Cass	0	5	2	Frio	0	2	0
Castro	0	5	0	Gaines	0	2	0
Chambers	0	2	1	Galveston	2	20	13
Cherokee	2	1	3	Garza	0	1	0
Childress	0	0	0	Gillespie	0	0	0
Clay	0	1	0	Glasscock	0	0	0
Cochran	0	0	0	Goliad	1	1	0
Coke	0	0	0	Gonzales	0	0	1
Coleman	0	1	1	Gray	0	1	0
Collin	2	22	6	Grayson	2	10	0
Collingsworth	0	0	0	Gregg	0	5	5
Colorado	0	0	0	Grimes	2	3	0
Comal	0	7	3	Guadalupe	0	6	4
Comanche	2	1	1	Hale	0	3	2
Concho	0	0	1	Hall	0	0	0

## DFPS Foster and Adoptive Homes

County	Foster Homes *	Foster/ Adoptive Homes**	Adoptive Homes***	County	Foster Homes *	Foster/ Adoptive Homes**	Adoptive Homes***
Hamilton	0	0	0	Leon	0	1	2
Hansford	0	1	0	Liberty	1	4	2
Hardeman	0	4	0	Limestone	0	1	2
Hardin	0	3	1	Lipscomb	0	0	0
Harris	23	146	169	Live Oak	0	0	0
Harrison	2	13	1	Llano	0	0	1
Hartley	0	1	0	Loving	0	0	0
Haskell	0	1	0	Lubbock	3	42	4
Hays	0	4	6	Lynn	0	1	0
Hemphill	0	1	0	Madison	0	1	1
Henderson	1	8	3	Marion	0	1	0
Hidalgo	0	15	3	Martin	0	0	0
Hill	0	0	2	Mason	0	1	0
Hockley	0	5	0	Matagorda	2	3	0
Hood	0	1	0	Maverick	0	1	3
Hopkins	0	0	1	Mcculloch	0	0	0
Houston	0	4	0	Mclennan	3	24	11
Howard	0	3	2	Mcmullen	0	0	0
Hudspeth	0	1	0	Medina	0	3	4
Hunt	0	10	1	Menard	0	0	0
Hutchinson	0	3	0	Midland	1	12	5
Irion	0	0	0	Milam	1	1	1
Jack	0	2	1	Mills	0	0	0
Jackson	0	2	0	Mitchell	0	0	0
Jasper	1	7	1	Montague	0	9	1
Jeff Davis	0	0	0	Montgomery	1	20	12
Jefferson	10	37	10	Moore	0	0	0
Jim Hogg	0	0	0	Morris	1	1	0
Jim Wells	0	0	2	Motley	0	0	1
Johnson	0	5	7	Nacogdoches	1	13	0
Jones	0	1	0	Navarro	0	1	0
Karnes	0	0	1	Newton	0	2	0
Kaufman	0	7	2	Nolan	0	1	0
Kendall	0	1	0	Nueces	0	11	8
Kenedy	0	0	0	Ochiltree	0	1	0
Kent	0	0	0	Oldham	0	0	0
Kerr	0	1	1	Orange	1	26	4
Kimble	0	1	0	Palo Pinto	0	0	0
King	0	0	0	Panola	0	2	0
Kinney	0	1	0	Parker	0	4	1
Kleberg	0	2	0	Parmer	0	0	0
Knox	0	0	0	Pecos	0	1	0
Lamar	0	0	0	Polk	0	5	0
Lamb	0	1	0	Potter	0	15	3
Lampasas	0	1	0	Presidio	0	0	0
Lasalle	0	0	0	Rains	0	2	0
Lavaca	0	4	0	Randall	1	26	2
Lee	0	2	1	Reagan	0	0	0

## DFPS Foster and Adoptive Homes

County	Foster Homes*	Foster/ Adoptive Homes**	Adoptive Homes***	County	Foster Homes *	Foster/ Adoptive Homes**	Adoptive Homes***
Real	0	0	0	Tom Green	0	18	4
Red River	0	1	1	Travis	1	23	18
Reeves	0	0	0	Trinity	1	0	1
Refugio	0	0	0	Tyler	1	4	0
Roberts	0	0	0	Upshur	0	0	3
Robertson	0	0	3	Upton	0	0	0
Rockwall	0	10	3	Uvalde	0	1	0
Runnels	0	2	1	Val Verde	0	0	2
Rusk	0	6	3	Van Zandt	0	7	5
Sabine	0	0	0	Victoria	2	9	0
San Augustine	0	3	0	Walker	0	5	1
San Jacinto	1	1	1	Waller	1	0	1
San Patricio	0	0	1	Ward	0	0	0
San Saba	0	0	0	Washington	2	5	1
Schleicher	0	1	0	Webb	2	7	2
Scurry	1	2	0	Wharton	1	5	3
Shackelford	0	0	0	Wheeler	0	1	1
Shelby	1	2	1	Wichita	0	11	2
Sherman	0	1	0	Wilbarger	0	0	1
Smith	4	10	4	Willacy	0	0	0
Somervell	0	0	0	Williamson	2	19	12
Starr	0	1	0	Wilson	0	2	2
Stephens	0	1	0	Winkler	0	0	0
Sterling	0	0	0	Wise	0	2	3
Stonewall	0	0	0	Wood	0	4	0
Sutton	1	5	0	Yoakum	0	1	0
Swisher	0	1	0	Young	0	5	0
Tarrant	10	55	31	Zapata	1	0	0
Taylor	0	9	2	Zavala	0	0	1
Terrell	0	0	0	Unknown	0	0	0
Terry	0	1	2	Out Of State	23	35	6
Throckmorton	0	0	0	State Total	181	1,356	668
Titus	0	1	0				

\* Includes 58 verified kinship homes.

\*\* Includes 23 legal risk homes and 392 verified kinship homes.

\*\*\* This number does not include homes open only for receipt of adoption subsidy.

## CPS Purchased Services For Children

County	Children Receiving Sub-Care Purchased Services	Expenditures For Sub-Care Purchased Services	Children In Substitute Care	Children Receiving In-Home Purchased Services	Expenditures For In-Home Purchased Services	Children Receiving In-Home Services
Anderson	25	\$31,910.98	147	8	\$1,192.91	204
Andrews	3	800.74	45	5	175.00	46
Angelina	45	40,928.46	111	28	2,370.04	183
Aransas	7	10,709.70	110	9	1,214.55	208
Archer	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	18
Armstrong	0	0.00	5	0	0.00	0
Atascosa	7	15,473.13	213	9	1,032.78	311
Austin	5	4,350.00	21	1	30.56	55
Bailey	3	4,027.20	33	0	0.00	5
Bandera	5	7,561.69	63	2	113.10	56
Bastrop	8	7,952.56	216	3	540.04	239
Baylor	0	0.00	4	0	0.00	11
Bee	18	8,339.97	125	8	721.64	276
Bell	82	92,533.49	885	34	6,702.82	1,011
Bexar	1,259	1,609,481.78	5,722	527	105,760.64	10,914
Blanco	1	3,000.00	6	0	0.00	9
Borden	0	0.00	3	0	0.00	0
Bosque	6	16,500.00	36	3	734.24	51
Bowie	32	14,889.54	201	20	1,640.55	287
Brazoria	71	45,905.11	296	50	9,827.75	664
Brazos	21	27,468.85	206	11	1,808.05	303
Brewster	0	0.00	5	0	0.00	36
Briscoe	0	0.00	2	0	0.00	7
Brooks	7	9,659.49	32	4	1,012.72	82
Brown	99	66,286.83	146	4	532.21	146
Burleson	2	428.70	44	0	0.00	16
Burnet	12	5,102.21	109	6	1,063.51	115
Caldwell	17	17,934.66	134	3	81.00	95
Calhoun	0	0.00	21	0	0.00	69
Callahan	1	3,000.00	19	1	27.00	56
Cameron	135	98,778.30	458	93	7,609.44	3,305
Camp	5	2,225.62	46	4	380.00	62
Carson	1	84.00	12	3	252.00	4
Cass	8	6,990.85	60	7	503.10	87
Castro	7	444.00	30	1	84.00	49
Chambers	3	656.55	76	9	1,310.84	52
Cherokee	11	10,561.92	200	7	627.27	188
Childress	8	7,355.32	24	4	618.30	35
Clay	3	1,253.70	9	0	0.00	10
Cochran	0	0.00	8	0	0.00	5
Coke	2	450.00	8	0	0.00	7
Coleman	4	3,114.10	37	1	35.00	46
Collin	189	71,902.86	409	12	4,031.54	913
Collingsworth	0	0.00	11	4	590.85	14
Colorado	2	3,417.39	25	0	0.00	60
Comal	1	95.00	211	6	1,010.32	511
Comanche	8	1,605.58	26	0	0.00	35
Concho	3	\$2,015.26	7	0	\$0.00	12

## CPS Purchased Services For Children

County	Children Receiving Sub-Care Purchased Services	Expenditures For Sub-Care Purchased Services	Children In Substitute Care	Children Receiving In-Home Purchased Services	Expenditures For In-Home Purchased Services	Children Receiving In-Home Services
Cooke	38	\$7,887.99	87	1	\$195.50	94
Coryell	4	9,300.00	200	1	508.95	316
Cottle	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	3
Crane	0	0.00	2	0	0.00	4
Crockett	1	97.46	8	1	91.55	19
Crosby	0	0.00	18	0	0.00	45
Culberson	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	17
Dallam	0	0.00	11	2	168.00	33
Dallas	1,596	924,795.23	3,875	101	28,579.49	5,663
Dawson	6	1,370.16	34	3	577.78	87
Deaf Smith	1	84.00	56	9	2,345.79	91
Delta	3	608.53	14	2	474.42	26
Denton	334	165,870.31	652	22	6,507.47	811
De Witt	1	400.00	49	0	0.00	41
Dickens	0	0.00	10	0	0.00	18
Dimmit	1	296.89	83	3	327.00	29
Donley	3	252.00	13	0	0.00	18
Duval	2	800.00	31	6	1,169.45	100
Eastland	9	6,210.82	49	3	81.00	81
Ector	111	88,148.13	422	54	6,508.63	753
Edwards	0	0.00	17	0	0.00	2
Ellis	61	32,892.11	76	4	1,876.92	294
El Paso	268	240,851.71	788	42	7,136.28	2,527
Erath	32	13,206.37	61	4	1,463.63	89
Falls	1	400.00	26	1	28.70	12
Fannin	12	3,906.58	27	0	0.00	43
Fayette	1	3,000.00	72	0	0.00	54
Fisher	1	1,280.61	6	0	0.00	26
Floyd	0	0.00	38	0	0.00	43
Foard	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
Fort Bend	50	42,365.27	233	23	4,147.97	840
Franklin	1	95.00	11	8	714.65	35
Freestone	7	12,800.00	31	0	0.00	16
Frio	0	0.00	96	6	231.00	119
Gaines	5	4,545.35	26	0	0.00	32
Galveston	49	43,999.51	305	11	974.08	870
Garza	3	162.00	20	0	0.00	58
Gillespie	8	7,323.65	53	4	226.20	61
Glasscock	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1
Goliad	1	400.00	2	0	0.00	15
Gonzales	0	0.00	25	1	27.00	41
Gray	13	7,866.00	128	17	2,652.40	120
Grayson	92	41,436.47	146	2	340.15	335
Gregg	41	35,693.55	276	36	3,959.35	334
Grimes	4	7,698.84	41	0	0.00	33
Guadalupe	7	7,368.17	244	19	2,289.00	427
Hale	5	6,953.00	120	9	882.36	168
Hall	1	\$510.00	16	4	\$563.40	32

## CPS Purchased Services For Children

County	Children Receiving Sub-Care Purchased Services	Expenditures For Sub-Care Purchased Services	Children In Substitute Care	Children Receiving In-Home Purchased Services	Expenditures For In-Home Purchased Services	Children Receiving In-Home Services
Hamilton	0	\$0.00	18	0	\$0.00	9
Hansford	0	0.00	4	0	0.00	9
Hardeman	0	0.00	9	0	0.00	12
Hardin	10	8,621.39	50	2	63.48	119
Harris	1,835	1,887,098.37	7,177	448	105,564.24	9,255
Harrison	20	7,661.92	124	16	872.00	123
Hartley	0	0.00	1	0	0.00	0
Haskell	0	0.00	8	2	54.00	18
Hays	17	11,062.09	173	5	1,051.78	251
Hemphill	1	84.00	6	0	0.00	7
Henderson	39	33,334.91	228	29	2,880.72	321
Hidalgo	222	119,225.84	1,237	225	32,907.74	4,338
Hill	10	10,765.50	74	1	338.88	93
Hockley	11	13,421.90	99	3	81.00	173
Hood	59	7,995.04	109	3	521.94	248
Hopkins	16	8,611.98	63	6	528.10	57
Houston	5	1,981.40	54	3	226.48	24
Howard	23	7,702.88	109	5	460.36	215
Hudspeth	0	0.00	1	0	0.00	6
Hunt	142	48,047.97	247	3	1,095.30	200
Hutchinson	1	260.00	56	1	84.00	93
Irion	0	0.00	5	0	0.00	4
Jack	1	3,750.00	15	0	0.00	39
Jackson	2	800.00	3	0	0.00	27
Jasper	10	4,066.54	44	13	1,382.98	158
Jeff Davis	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	5
Jefferson	222	184,453.50	398	29	4,815.25	607
Jim Hogg	2	450.00	25	5	501.42	75
Jim Wells	20	9,578.59	128	11	3,071.41	291
Johnson	187	80,979.96	393	15	1,597.90	787
Jones	5	991.22	11	4	108.00	55
Karnes	0	0.00	44	4	710.91	76
Kaufman	106	32,276.22	126	8	3,986.64	274
Kendall	3	3,226.20	46	3	169.65	62
Kenedy	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	4
Kent	0	0.00	4	0	0.00	6
Kerr	45	58,951.31	203	18	1,821.29	260
Kimble	1	11.50	17	0	0.00	16
King	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
Kinney	0	0.00	5	0	0.00	4
Kleberg	24	18,376.26	87	5	1,497.57	236
Knox	0	0.00	11	0	0.00	11
Lamar	16	4,761.50	114	19	1,741.49	170
Lamb	2	520.00	28	0	0.00	67
Lampasas	4	5,763.75	70	0	0.00	51
La Salle	0	0.00	28	0	0.00	26
Lavaca	11	7,085.35	27	0	0.00	40
Lee	4	\$788.70	65	0	\$0.00	67



## CPS Purchased Services For Children

County	Children Receiving Sub-Care Purchased Services	Expenditures For Sub-Care Purchased Services	Children In Substitute Care	Children Receiving In-Home Purchased Services	Expenditures For In-Home Purchased Services	Children Receiving In-Home Services
Leon	1	\$3,000.00	29	0	\$0.00	35
Liberty	59	28,008.96	271	12	5,136.11	235
Limestone	9	17,650.00	60	0	0.00	53
Lipscomb	1	1,875.00	8	1	27.00	5
Live Oak	0	0.00	29	3	140.10	89
Llano	5	950.00	59	2	226.20	45
Loving	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
Lubbock	294	327,104.40	856	115	11,549.77	1,747
Lynn	0	0.00	8	0	0.00	30
Madison	2	266.14	47	2	904.80	21
Marion	2	496.10	20	1	60.52	35
Martin	0	0.00	2	0	0.00	22
Mason	1	3,000.00	3	0	0.00	13
Matagorda	4	1,259.52	47	13	3,350.15	183
Maverick	4	5,250.00	30	1	508.96	67
McCulloch	3	3,800.00	18	0	0.00	36
McLennan	63	57,312.50	494	17	2,728.81	1,070
McMullen	0	0.00	2	0	0.00	9
Medina	27	24,274.32	206	9	335.24	212
Menard	1	400.00	12	0	0.00	11
Midland	108	61,576.53	206	16	1,342.91	415
Milam	6	4,426.28	96	2	343.28	176
Mills	5	396.00	8	0	0.00	16
Mitchell	7	2,941.63	16	1	35.00	77
Montague	7	3,659.66	100	0	0.00	167
Montgomery	240	169,068.68	838	59	9,744.49	1,297
Moore	1	36.48	43	5	1,186.05	92
Morris	2	737.87	16	5	698.95	37
Motley	0	0.00	2	0	0.00	2
Nacogdoches	35	15,403.71	199	15	2,367.71	96
Navarro	55	16,086.00	105	2	601.40	141
Newton	3	3,797.11	24	2	196.65	40
Nolan	1	79.07	79	5	571.15	155
Nueces	173	221,768.73	653	99	10,509.59	2,405
Ochiltree	0	0.00	15	0	0.00	16
Oldham	0	0.00	2	0	0.00	0
Orange	34	9,145.30	209	2	395.36	206
Palo Pinto	51	21,548.06	111	0	0.00	169
Panola	5	4,176.46	29	9	826.79	42
Parker	47	16,960.26	92	8	1,526.85	284
Parmer	0	0.00	4	1	84.00	22
Pecos	5	1,872.12	34	1	237.21	84
Polk	23	5,655.37	114	6	570.00	129
Potter	196	166,372.02	370	135	14,004.25	982
Presidio	0	0.00	14	0	0.00	25
Rains	6	12,339.06	15	3	285.00	25
Randall	59	30,799.65	444	26	2,300.40	457
Reagan	3	\$3,750.00	4	0	\$0.00	5

## CPS Purchased Services For Children

County	Children Receiving Sub-Care Purchased Services	Expenditures For Sub-Care Purchased Services	Children In Substitute Care	Children Receiving In-Home Purchased Services	Expenditures For In-Home Purchased Services	Children Receiving In-Home Services
Real	0	\$0.00	8	0	\$0.00	9
Red River	3	4,745.00	34	3	97.00	33
Reeves	1	1,023.00	8	1	158.14	51
Refugio	0	0.00	5	0	0.00	57
Roberts	0	0.00	0	1	84.00	0
Robertson	2	3,508.95	40	2	580.49	73
Rockwall	30	7,578.60	47	2	395.85	113
Runnels	2	4,524.43	35	0	0.00	30
Rusk	11	9,121.46	94	12	1,106.44	132
Sabine	1	481.84	9	0	0.00	25
San Augustine	3	1,612.73	7	1	27.00	24
San Jacinto	9	3,787.96	74	3	508.95	95
San Patricio	20	23,935.48	112	25	4,431.34	584
San Saba	5	5,362.74	10	3	710.56	21
Schleicher	0	0.00	5	0	0.00	13
Scurry	6	2,206.08	29	3	430.36	80
Shackelford	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	2
Shelby	16	14,212.82	73	5	1,799.04	57
Sherman	0	0.00	1	0	0.00	5
Smith	329	216,360.60	455	24	3,950.88	445
Somervell	6	3,413.72	12	0	0.00	26
Starr	9	5,304.68	123	18	6,150.33	395
Stephens	0	0.00	8	1	27.00	52
Sterling	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	1
Stonewall	2	3,750.00	0	0	0.00	7
Sutton	1	400.00	6	0	0.00	17
Swisher	0	0.00	24	2	168.00	30
Tarrant	540	474,721.72	2,053	180	40,585.69	5,408
Taylor	161	138,917.59	323	40	7,004.39	904
Terrell	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
Terry	1	84.00	71	0	0.00	110
Throckmorton	0	0.00	1	0	0.00	3
Titus	12	5,007.43	59	17	2,091.91	101
Tom Green	85	104,822.32	538	20	2,449.92	568
Travis	574	1,022,684.35	1,495	116	40,879.20	2,410
Trinity	18	4,703.29	58	11	901.42	91
Tyler	7	4,713.54	17	6	434.00	35
Upshur	15	9,836.44	50	10	945.20	100
Upton	0	0.00	7	0	0.00	19
Uvalde	3	6,158.14	106	1	56.55	171
Val Verde	2	3,750.00	46	2	265.50	91
Van Zandt	22	21,159.22	152	5	910.00	111
Victoria	30	11,322.35	231	10	1,098.90	276
Walker	8	6,083.24	94	4	204.78	135
Waller	5	4,391.18	77	2	143.66	121
Ward	8	2,611.11	6	0	0.00	46
Washington	2	863.00	48	0	0.00	44
Webb	101	\$100,595.09	705	61	\$8,645.70	2,478

## CPS Purchased Services For Children

County	Children Receiving Sub-Care Purchased Services	Expenditures For Sub-Care Purchased Services	Children In Substitute Care	Children Receiving In-Home Purchased Services	Expenditures For In-Home Purchased Services	Children Receiving In-Home Services
Wharton	10	\$11,732.11	66	9	\$1,827.83	102
Wheeler	1	3,000.00	12	0	0.00	22
Wichita	80	63,533.70	279	17	616.55	621
Wilbarger	3	3,919.65	29	2	70.00	56
Willacy	8	9,800.00	51	1	162.25	268
Williamson	54	90,059.42	483	74	23,978.49	847
Wilson	0	0.00	90	6	1,093.94	100
Winkler	2	750.00	6	0	0.00	24
Wise	52	28,060.46	111	0	0.00	169
Wood	17	11,572.17	130	10	830.00	77
Yoakum	0	0.00	9	0	0.00	16
Young	7	3,849.38	51	1	27.00	64
Zapata	3	4,288.50	57	0	0.00	142
Zavala	2	3,183.79	52	19	3,075.16	72
Unknown	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	13
<b>State Total</b>	<b>11,812</b>	<b>\$10,273,523.29</b>	<b>45,684</b>	<b>3,480</b>	<b>\$628,534.54</b>	<b>84,405</b>

*This table addresses Texas Family Code §261.004, Subsection (b) (5).*

## Texas Child Population (Age 0-17) by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Anderson	11,498	1,743	6,603	2,656	38	458
Andrews	4,431	65	1,498	2,770	22	76
Angelina	23,448	3,606	11,902	7,181	56	703
Aransas	4,505	55	2,276	1,985	17	172
Archer	2,159	13	1,832	268	10	36
Armstrong	396	5	330	51	3	7
Atascosa	13,238	82	3,437	9,592	21	106
Austin	7,331	731	3,687	2,726	22	165
Bailey	2,302	10	518	1,752	5	17
Bandera	4,003	35	2,777	1,109	18	64
Bastrop	20,398	1,359	8,286	9,976	50	727
Baylor	760	14	553	176	3	14
Bee	6,904	106	1,528	5,147	10	113
Bell	93,172	20,567	36,616	27,099	377	8,513
Bexar	477,922	31,504	95,605	329,412	820	20,581
Blanco	2,281	8	1,533	695	7	38
Borden	128	0	95	33	0	0
Bosque	4,102	77	2,700	1,227	10	88
Bowie	22,147	6,179	12,789	1,954	122	1,103
Brazoria	91,471	10,823	38,415	33,488	275	8,470
Brazos	43,546	6,326	18,299	16,011	90	2,820
Brewster	1,929	11	745	1,101	4	68
Briscoe	344	8	186	142	0	8
Brooks	1,983	4	114	1,854	2	9
Brown	9,115	313	5,597	2,876	36	293
Burleson	4,118	538	2,253	1,230	11	86
Burnet	10,064	174	6,100	3,517	30	243
Caldwell	10,088	511	2,995	6,325	22	235
Calhoun	5,726	108	1,670	3,638	7	303
Callahan	3,262	41	2,703	411	21	86
Cameron	137,876	285	6,450	130,061	103	977
Camp	3,396	546	1,490	1,205	8	147
Carson	1,545	15	1,294	190	8	38
Cass	7,036	1,334	4,965	494	25	218
Castro	2,497	53	586	1,833	8	17
Chambers	10,367	714	6,409	2,896	32	316
Cherokee	13,396	1,800	6,501	4,609	15	471
Childress	1,520	72	894	506	11	37
Clay	2,394	15	2,117	185	33	44
Cochran	885	19	243	615	0	8
Coke	661	1	459	187	1	13
Coleman	1,957	41	1,352	515	8	41
Collin	237,706	22,033	127,190	47,767	1,082	39,634
Collingsworth	840	23	377	414	10	16
Colorado	4,928	690	2,018	2,105	3	112
Comal	26,685	403	15,784	9,739	62	697
Comanche	3,337	9	1,809	1,464	9	46
Concho	568	4	306	254	1	3

## Texas Child Population (Age 0-17) by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Cooke	9,788	260	6,407	2,673	93	355
Coryell	22,088	2,983	11,798	5,052	118	2,137
Cottle	342	24	196	116	3	3
Crane	1,286	37	343	891	8	7
Crockett	970	0	203	761	2	4
Crosby	1,737	56	475	1,191	0	15
Culberson	658	1	91	555	1	10
Dallam	2,065	19	908	1,067	5	66
Dallas	667,394	149,685	121,647	350,694	1,672	43,696
Dawson	3,418	128	914	2,320	6	50
Deaf Smith	6,363	28	1,160	5,105	12	58
Delta	1,153	99	857	119	10	68
Denton	193,415	16,332	105,325	49,717	957	21,084
De Witt	4,478	354	1,952	2,017	9	146
Dickens	473	3	251	208	8	3
Dimmit	2,932	24	238	2,651	0	19
Donley	729	52	554	104	1	18
Duval	3,044	3	232	2,795	2	12
Eastland	4,197	48	3,011	1,061	15	62
Ector	40,880	1,642	10,893	27,371	159	815
Edwards	412	2	118	290	2	0
Ellis	44,792	4,236	24,086	15,058	133	1,279
El Paso	244,164	5,408	19,121	214,450	653	4,532
Erath	8,657	100	5,506	2,836	43	172
Falls	3,871	1,030	1,487	1,240	9	105
Fannin	7,539	360	5,684	1,137	81	277
Fayette	5,434	448	3,016	1,847	14	109
Fisher	827	22	492	302	0	11
Floyd	1,813	54	435	1,311	0	13
Foard	264	22	186	54	0	2
Fort Bend	184,786	40,765	53,600	54,440	397	35,584
Franklin	2,649	122	1,844	584	15	84
Freestone	4,644	691	2,854	998	25	76
Frio	4,226	11	459	3,715	8	33
Gaines	6,436	85	3,803	2,466	8	74
Galveston	75,257	10,542	36,453	23,523	229	4,510
Garza	1,272	72	504	673	9	14
Gillespie	5,119	11	3,125	1,883	13	87
Glasscock	329	6	192	130	0	1
Goliad	1,613	72	732	782	4	23
Gonzales	5,447	311	1,560	3,472	14	90
Gray	5,714	151	3,143	2,236	19	165
Grayson	29,242	1,957	19,606	5,794	451	1,434
Gregg	31,504	6,866	14,503	8,695	109	1,331
Grimes	6,083	904	2,952	2,064	12	151
Guadalupe	38,282	2,131	16,818	17,621	113	1,599
Hale	10,553	375	2,445	7,550	25	158
Hall	829	68	336	421	2	2

## Texas Child Population (Age 0-17) by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Hamilton	1,790	13	1,413	332	8	24
Hansford	1,697	9	702	965	1	20
Hardeman	1,018	50	541	393	4	30
Hardin	14,333	924	12,054	993	24	338
Harris	1,171,213	213,908	257,986	613,534	1,993	83,792
Harrison	17,217	3,527	9,583	3,495	71	541
Hartley	1,322	8	883	404	6	21
Haskell	1,210	40	664	464	8	34
Hays	43,078	1,186	19,734	20,651	115	1,392
Hemphill	1,122	0	629	478	6	9
Henderson	18,071	1,220	12,526	3,656	75	594
Hidalgo	276,110	705	9,329	263,192	146	2,738
Hill	8,639	583	5,181	2,634	30	211
Hockley	6,277	217	2,282	3,665	23	90
Hood	11,029	49	8,564	2,088	62	266
Hopkins	9,087	629	5,744	2,310	41	363
Houston	4,822	1,280	2,568	768	18	188
Howard	7,854	358	3,234	4,022	42	198
Hudspeth	991	8	87	879	3	14
Hunt	22,135	2,015	13,858	5,211	160	891
Hutchinson	5,815	118	3,653	1,796	64	184
Irion	338	3	211	117	2	5
Jack	1,957	23	1,470	433	2	29
Jackson	3,559	269	1,739	1,491	8	52
Jasper	8,846	1,692	5,974	791	56	333
Jeff Davis	388	3	176	203	0	6
Jefferson	60,731	22,372	19,051	15,504	140	3,664
Jim Hogg	1,515	5	55	1,441	9	5
Jim Wells	11,941	44	1,678	10,132	22	65
Johnson	42,338	1,083	28,079	11,509	197	1,470
Jones	3,740	154	2,249	1,208	11	118
Karnes	2,934	57	959	1,873	14	31
Kaufman	31,438	3,186	18,856	8,159	163	1,074
Kendall	8,338	42	5,543	2,539	24	190
Kenedy	96	0	15	76	3	2
Kent	178	1	125	49	1	2
Kerr	10,128	151	5,395	4,284	21	277
Kimble	920	3	545	368	0	4
King	61	0	51	10	0	0
Kinney	689	5	171	502	2	9
Kleberg	8,369	233	1,242	6,701	5	188
Knox	936	63	447	400	5	21
Lamar	12,128	1,898	7,910	1,552	143	625
Lamb	4,035	173	1,122	2,681	4	55
Lampasas	4,926	109	3,196	1,331	33	257
La Salle	1,522	4	133	1,377	1	7
Lavaca	4,357	338	2,717	1,212	4	86
Lee	4,195	358	2,164	1,532	7	134

## Texas Child Population (Age 0-17) by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Leon	3,795	218	2,572	930	8	67
Liberty	19,812	1,790	12,045	5,377	51	549
Limestone	5,557	1,018	2,571	1,779	10	179
Lipscomb	899	5	464	402	8	20
Live Oak	2,270	18	1,084	1,136	6	26
Llano	3,119	32	2,428	564	15	80
Loving	7	0	4	3	0	0
Lubbock	70,284	5,843	29,576	32,002	229	2,634
Lynn	1,597	22	603	937	10	25
Madison	3,021	514	1,597	793	5	112
Marion	1,970	532	1,208	132	10	88
Martin	1,438	27	643	747	3	18
Mason	835	4	554	266	3	8
Matagorda	9,557	1,002	3,105	5,098	18	334
Maverick	18,421	19	393	17,723	226	60
McCulloch	2,004	36	1,104	837	2	25
McLennan	60,271	9,562	26,602	21,686	148	2,273
McMullen	121	2	54	65	0	0
Medina	12,056	80	4,359	7,389	38	190
Menard	436	0	206	230	0	0
Midland	38,364	2,476	14,866	19,765	129	1,128
Milam	6,448	675	3,240	2,394	12	127
Mills	1,163	21	842	284	1	15
Mitchell	1,816	74	860	852	6	24
Montague	4,557	20	3,570	840	33	94
Montgomery	132,405	5,989	79,222	40,466	478	6,250
Moore	7,140	67	1,748	4,611	22	692
Morris	3,035	709	1,720	464	13	129
Motley	249	2	177	67	2	1
Nacogdoches	16,124	3,027	7,794	4,669	51	583
Navarro	13,134	1,718	5,868	5,011	25	512
Newton	3,177	671	2,233	148	22	103
Nolan	3,978	207	1,818	1,858	7	88
Nueces	88,188	2,882	18,715	63,837	189	2,565
Ochiltree	3,380	8	1,112	2,214	17	29
Oldham	630	37	476	101	5	11
Orange	20,590	2,072	15,717	1,962	82	757
Palo Pinto	7,095	187	4,585	2,140	28	155
Panola	5,851	966	3,809	909	18	149
Parker	31,106	368	24,344	5,307	211	876
Parmer	3,268	17	816	2,419	2	14
Pecos	3,884	20	599	3,221	9	35
Polk	9,670	1,058	6,120	1,974	236	282
Potter	34,211	3,233	11,444	16,847	126	2,561
Presidio	2,247	11	181	2,006	4	45
Rains	2,374	48	1,879	366	28	53
Randall	31,181	897	20,710	8,181	138	1,255
Reagan	1,017	12	205	787	0	13

## Texas Child Population (Age 0-17) by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Real	604	6	331	252	5	10
Red River	2,730	530	1,748	350	18	84
Reeves	3,111	46	299	2,720	3	43
Refugio	1,739	100	567	1,042	2	28
Roberts	238	0	212	25	0	1
Robertson	4,212	982	1,945	1,179	11	95
Rockwall	25,042	1,572	16,509	5,565	110	1,286
Runnels	2,614	40	1,291	1,249	9	25
Rusk	12,632	1,878	7,247	3,027	56	424
Sabine	2,051	171	1,661	135	10	74
San Augustine	1,840	507	1,061	228	3	41
San Jacinto	6,410	668	4,269	1,262	21	190
San Patricio	18,070	220	5,564	11,857	37	392
San Saba	1,247	7	689	531	8	12
Schleicher	1,121	12	574	529	0	6
Scurry	4,325	96	1,855	2,277	9	88
Shackelford	816	6	669	120	1	20
Shelby	6,739	1,213	3,599	1,805	15	107
Sherman	879	3	359	506	4	7
Smith	54,893	10,223	26,760	15,453	161	2,296
Somervell	2,206	31	1,439	657	11	68
Starr	20,668	5	762	19,853	5	43
Stephens	2,280	36	1,433	761	12	38
Sterling	275	3	156	102	6	8
Stonewall	325	11	225	75	0	14
Sutton	1,109	0	322	780	0	7
Swisher	2,026	122	754	1,096	12	42
Tarrant	517,952	82,976	197,658	193,706	1,798	41,814
Taylor	32,799	2,680	17,169	11,161	105	1,684
Terrell	207	0	86	118	1	2
Terry	3,317	102	1,085	2,089	7	34
Throckmorton	345	3	279	57	0	6
Titus	9,999	805	3,305	5,632	42	215
Tom Green	26,599	838	11,613	13,224	82	842
Travis	259,016	21,793	92,810	121,752	542	22,119
Trinity	3,008	329	2,145	436	18	80
Tyler	4,251	395	3,480	232	26	118
Upshur	9,830	831	7,309	1,203	52	435
Upton	943	13	352	561	11	6
Uvalde	7,636	34	1,264	6,231	22	85
Val Verde	14,849	133	1,574	12,966	19	157
Van Zandt	12,663	355	9,798	2,060	99	351
Victoria	23,152	1,435	7,759	13,237	42	679
Walker	11,453	2,523	5,439	2,929	33	529
Waller	11,256	1,968	3,857	5,153	27	251
Ward	2,887	158	965	1,697	13	54
Washington	7,510	1,490	3,846	1,907	13	254
Webb	90,260	132	2,111	87,541	15	461



## Texas Child Population (Age 0-17) by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Wharton	11,007	1,463	3,759	5,625	10	150
Wheeler	1,364	36	688	610	2	28
Wichita	30,823	3,151	17,469	8,144	309	1,750
Wilbarger	3,411	283	1,646	1,358	29	95
Willacy	5,958	17	391	5,509	7	34
Williamson	129,411	8,255	67,786	41,247	369	11,754
Wilson	11,587	126	5,764	5,480	27	190
Winkler	2,102	33	645	1,372	9	43
Wise	15,837	114	10,925	4,344	96	358
Wood	8,708	372	6,552	1,481	40	263
Yoakum	2,519	10	685	1,792	6	26
Young	4,489	49	3,057	1,272	22	89
Zapata	4,920	2	111	4,790	2	15
Zavala	3,646	15	120	3,503	1	7
State Total	7,054,634	820,392	2,330,533	3,458,537	19,883	425,289

Population Data Source: Texas State Data Center, University of Texas (San Antonio). Based on Census 2010 data.

\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

\*\* Other includes anyone not categorized as African American, Anglo, Hispanic or Native American

## Removals by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Anderson	40	1	27	6	0	6
Andrews	18	2	6	8	0	2
Angelina	42	10	22	8	0	2
Aransas	39	0	18	20	0	1
Archer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Armstrong	3	0	0	3	0	0
Atascosa	90	7	18	65	0	0
Austin	10	0	7	3	0	0
Bailey	10	0	2	8	0	0
Bandera	23	0	17	6	0	0
Bastrop	113	24	44	37	0	8
Baylor	3	1	0	2	0	0
Bee	65	0	14	48	0	3
Bell	421	123	142	96	0	60
Bexar	2,163	230	265	1,579	0	89
Blanco	1	0	0	1	0	0
Borden	3	0	3	0	0	0
Bosque	16	0	8	6	1	1
Bowie	119	27	68	10	0	14
Brazoria	92	9	54	20	0	9
Brazos	73	34	20	14	0	5
Brewster	0	0	0	0	0	0
Briscoe	2	0	1	0	0	1
Brooks	12	0	1	11	0	0
Brown	62	3	42	13	0	4
Burleson	18	6	8	4	0	0
Burnet	47	1	29	16	0	1
Caldwell	61	0	12	46	0	3
Calhoun	8	0	3	5	0	0
Callahan	4	0	4	0	0	0
Cameron	191	2	10	175	0	4
Camp	16	3	9	4	0	0
Carson	5	0	4	0	0	1
Cass	35	9	21	4	0	1
Castro	30	2	1	26	0	1
Chambers	37	9	18	9	0	1
Cherokee	95	20	51	18	0	6
Childress	9	0	6	3	0	0
Clay	2	0	1	1	0	0
Cochran	2	0	0	2	0	0
Coke	5	0	2	3	0	0
Coleman	9	0	7	2	0	0
Collin	159	19	73	45	0	22
Collingsworth	2	0	2	0	0	0
Colorado	2	1	0	0	0	1
Comal	71	1	35	33	0	2
Comanche	15	0	12	3	0	0
Concho	3	2	1	0	0	0

## Removals by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Cooke	27	2	17	4	1	3
Coryell	99	8	66	8	0	17
Cottle	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crane	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crockett	2	0	2	0	0	0
Crosby	6	0	3	3	0	0
Culberson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dallam	3	0	1	1	0	1
Dallas	1,595	587	310	576	0	122
Dawson	14	0	7	7	0	0
Deaf Smith	14	0	1	13	0	0
Delta	8	0	8	0	0	0
Denton	271	35	136	76	1	23
De Witt	8	2	4	2	0	0
Dickens	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dimmit	5	0	0	4	0	1
Donley	4	0	1	0	0	3
Duval	7	0	0	7	0	0
Eastland	18	0	15	3	0	0
Ector	158	8	56	81	0	13
Edwards	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ellis	30	1	19	9	0	1
El Paso	297	23	34	233	0	7
Erath	23	1	10	11	0	1
Falls	9	3	6	0	0	0
Fannin	5	0	2	3	0	0
Fayette	31	1	20	5	0	5
Fisher	2	0	0	2	0	0
Floyd	15	1	2	12	0	0
Foard	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Bend	73	19	13	32	0	9
Franklin	6	0	5	1	0	0
Freestone	9	2	2	5	0	0
Frio	38	0	1	34	0	3
Gaines	8	0	0	8	0	0
Galveston	98	26	42	22	0	8
Garza	6	0	1	4	0	1
Gillespie	20	0	6	14	0	0
Glasscock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goliad	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gonzales	8	0	2	6	0	0
Gray	26	2	17	7	0	0
Grayson	61	1	38	10	2	10
Gregg	85	26	35	12	0	12
Grimes	13	1	7	5	0	0
Guadalupe	119	5	35	75	1	3
Hale	46	1	6	39	0	0
Hall	4	1	0	3	0	0

## Removals by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Hamilton	3	0	2	0	0	1
Hansford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hardeman	4	0	0	4	0	0
Hardin	16	5	9	2	0	0
Harris	1,780	798	329	524	3	126
Harrison	45	8	29	2	0	6
Hartley	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haskell	2	0	2	0	0	0
Hays	72	4	33	34	0	1
Hemphill	4	0	2	1	0	1
Henderson	73	7	52	9	0	5
Hidalgo	599	6	12	574	0	7
Hill	46	1	38	5	0	2
Hockley	34	2	4	22	0	6
Hood	52	0	46	5	0	1
Hopkins	24	0	18	1	0	5
Houston	21	3	14	3	0	1
Howard	58	0	29	23	0	6
Hudspeth	1	0	1	0	0	0
Hunt	129	21	79	23	0	6
Hutchinson	24	0	14	8	0	2
Irion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jack	8	0	7	0	0	1
Jackson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jasper	17	5	11	0	0	1
Jeff Davis	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	202	109	66	16	0	11
Jim Hogg	15	0	0	14	0	1
Jim Wells	68	0	0	63	0	5
Johnson	150	3	116	22	0	9
Jones	2	1	0	1	0	0
Karnes	11	0	2	9	0	0
Kaufman	58	18	33	6	0	1
Kendall	13	0	7	6	0	0
Kenedy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	4	0	4	0	0	0
Kerr	44	4	17	18	0	5
Kimble	8	0	8	0	0	0
King	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kinney	3	0	0	1	0	2
Kleberg	19	1	0	18	0	0
Knox	4	0	4	0	0	0
Lamar	47	4	35	1	0	7
Lamb	5	0	2	3	0	0
Lampasas	30	0	16	14	0	0
La Salle	12	0	0	11	0	1
Lavaca	16	0	10	5	0	1
Lee	16	4	4	6	0	2

## Removals by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Leon	12	5	3	2	0	2
Liberty	123	14	85	14	1	9
Limestone	20	6	9	4	0	1
Lipscomb	2	0	2	0	0	0
Live Oak	15	0	2	13	0	0
Llano	28	0	22	3	1	2
Loving	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lubbock	276	50	66	143	1	16
Lynn	1	0	0	1	0	0
Madison	20	7	11	1	0	1
Marion	9	1	8	0	0	0
Martin	1	0	0	1	0	0
Mason	0	0	0	0	0	0
Matagorda	22	4	1	10	0	7
Maverick	10	0	0	10	0	0
McCulloch	11	0	10	1	0	0
McLennan	157	30	71	39	0	17
McMullen	2	0	2	0	0	0
Medina	66	1	15	48	0	2
Menard	4	0	4	0	0	0
Midland	73	5	30	31	0	7
Milam	41	7	19	15	0	0
Mills	4	0	4	0	0	0
Mitchell	7	0	6	1	0	0
Montague	30	0	29	1	0	0
Montgomery	318	16	216	73	1	12
Moore	18	0	7	10	0	1
Morris	4	1	2	0	0	1
Motley	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nacogdoches	67	24	15	20	0	8
Navarro	37	11	25	0	0	1
Newton	13	5	8	0	0	0
Nolan	51	8	19	22	0	2
Nueces	211	15	42	135	0	19
Ochiltree	6	0	0	5	0	1
Oldham	1	0	1	0	0	0
Orange	79	14	60	1	0	4
Palo Pinto	53	2	38	12	0	1
Panola	11	0	10	0	0	1
Parker	45	0	31	12	0	2
Parmer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pecos	16	0	8	8	0	0
Polk	45	1	39	0	0	5
Potter	105	29	30	35	0	11
Presidio	10	1	0	9	0	0
Rains	6	0	6	0	0	0
Randall	135	11	65	44	0	15
Reagan	1	0	0	0	0	1

## Removals by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Real	1	0	1	0	0	0
Red River	11	1	7	0	0	3
Reeves	0	0	0	0	0	0
Refugio	2	0	0	2	0	0
Roberts	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robertson	18	11	4	2	0	1
Rockwall	16	0	11	5	0	0
Runnels	7	0	2	5	0	0
Rusk	44	5	30	8	0	1
Sabine	3	0	3	0	0	0
San Augustine	6	0	6	0	0	0
San Jacinto	33	0	27	2	0	4
San Patricio	62	0	11	51	0	0
San Saba	3	0	3	0	0	0
Schleicher	3	0	1	2	0	0
Scurry	9	0	3	6	0	0
Shackelford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shelby	38	8	16	9	0	5
Sherman	0	0	0	0	0	0
Smith	231	53	132	33	0	13
Somervell	3	0	1	2	0	0
Starr	58	0	0	58	0	0
Stephens	2	0	0	2	0	0
Sterling	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stonewall	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sutton	3	0	0	3	0	0
Swisher	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tarrant	787	219	247	252	1	68
Taylor	130	20	50	49	0	11
Terrell	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terry	20	3	3	13	0	1
Throckmorton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Titus	24	5	8	10	0	1
Tom Green	169	6	77	77	0	9
Travis	647	154	130	322	1	40
Trinity	36	9	23	2	0	2
Tyler	7	0	5	0	0	2
Upshur	21	4	12	3	0	2
Upton	2	0	0	2	0	0
Uvalde	36	1	7	26	0	2
Val Verde	21	0	1	19	0	1
Van Zandt	43	0	32	11	0	0
Victoria	86	7	13	55	0	11
Walker	49	15	21	9	0	4
Waller	23	12	11	0	0	0
Ward	1	0	1	0	0	0
Washington	28	13	3	12	0	0
Webb	357	6	16	332	0	3

## Removals by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Wharton	10	4	0	6	0	0
Wheeler	7	0	4	3	0	0
Wichita	100	17	61	13	0	9
Wilbarger	17	1	4	12	0	0
Willacy	20	0	1	19	0	0
Williamson	139	16	44	63	0	16
Wilson	49	3	14	31	0	1
Winkler	4	0	1	3	0	0
Wise	43	0	33	8	0	2
Wood	68	0	54	8	0	6
Yoakum	3	0	0	3	0	0
Young	6	0	4	2	0	0
Zapata	15	0	1	14	0	0
Zavala	13	0	0	13	0	0
Unknown	8	3	3	2	0	0
Out Of State	8	0	5	3	0	0
State Total	16,972	3,170	5,241	7,465	15	1,081

Note: Includes removals from all stages of service.

\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

\*\* Other includes anyone not categorized as African American, Anglo, Hispanic or Native American

## Confirmed Victims of Abuse/Neglect by Race/ Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Anderson	187	15	116	37	0	19
Andrews	47	4	17	22	0	4
Angelina	297	37	181	54	0	25
Aransas	127	1	50	64	0	12
Archer	13	0	12	1	0	0
Armstrong	4	0	4	0	0	0
Atascosa	251	7	54	184	0	6
Austin	34	3	15	14	0	2
Bailey	12	0	1	11	0	0
Bandera	47	2	34	9	0	2
Bastrop	254	23	119	101	0	11
Baylor	11	1	4	5	0	1
Bee	138	1	27	105	0	5
Bell	924	266	338	204	0	116
Bexar	6,205	570	815	4,505	4	311
Blanco	6	0	3	3	0	0
Borden	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bosque	61	0	46	11	1	3
Bowie	258	56	151	21	0	30
Brazoria	448	46	257	118	0	27
Brazos	346	104	102	111	0	29
Brewster	6	0	3	3	0	0
Briscoe	5	0	5	0	0	0
Brooks	41	0	1	39	0	1
Brown	131	6	88	26	0	11
Burleson	41	11	21	8	0	1
Burnet	135	6	84	39	0	6
Caldwell	125	4	43	76	0	2
Calhoun	50	0	17	30	0	3
Callahan	49	4	33	10	0	2
Cameron	1,819	8	52	1,729	0	30
Camp	32	5	17	8	0	2
Carson	16	0	14	0	0	2
Cass	81	25	47	4	0	5
Castro	40	0	3	36	0	1
Chambers	79	8	46	16	0	9
Cherokee	169	22	108	22	0	17
Childress	26	2	14	5	0	5
Clay	19	3	10	5	0	1
Cochran	12	1	2	9	0	0
Coke	3	0	2	1	0	0
Coleman	41	6	28	7	0	0
Collin	1,082	184	523	279	2	94
Collingsworth	14	0	9	5	0	0
Colorado	31	11	2	11	0	7
Comal	421	5	169	223	0	24
Comanche	44	0	37	3	0	4
Concho	7	0	4	3	0	0



## Confirmed Victims of Abuse/Neglect by Race/ Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Cooke	122	2	85	20	1	14
Coryell	214	28	115	44	0	27
Cottle	3	0	0	3	0	0
Crane	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crockett	16	0	8	7	0	1
Crosby	29	4	2	23	0	0
Culberson	10	0	0	10	0	0
Dallam	22	0	15	6	0	1
Dallas	5,107	1,824	945	1,952	4	382
Dawson	54	1	14	39	0	0
Deaf Smith	66	0	8	58	0	0
Delta	22	0	19	1	0	2
Denton	929	128	486	242	1	72
De Witt	35	2	10	21	0	2
Dickens	9	0	6	2	0	1
Dimmit	28	0	1	24	0	3
Donley	21	1	14	0	0	6
Duval	34	0	3	30	0	1
Eastland	59	0	41	15	0	3
Ector	633	42	202	342	0	47
Edwards	4	0	0	4	0	0
Ellis	208	19	125	53	0	11
El Paso	2,081	114	267	1,610	3	87
Erath	114	4	65	36	0	9
Falls	50	17	25	4	0	4
Fannin	52	2	30	16	0	4
Fayette	80	3	49	24	0	4
Fisher	17	0	6	10	0	1
Floyd	41	2	3	33	0	3
Foard	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Bend	535	172	94	213	0	56
Franklin	34	1	32	1	0	0
Freestone	38	2	23	12	0	1
Frio	124	0	2	117	0	5
Gaines	26	1	5	20	0	0
Galveston	451	98	193	125	0	35
Garza	44	2	14	24	0	4
Gillespie	55	0	33	19	0	3
Glasscock	2	0	1	0	0	1
Goliad	21	0	3	18	0	0
Gonzales	70	2	20	47	0	1
Gray	111	8	72	24	3	4
Grayson	453	25	277	76	3	72
Gregg	373	96	169	58	0	50
Grimes	54	4	47	3	0	0
Guadalupe	404	32	132	209	2	29
Hale	209	6	46	153	0	4
Hall	25	1	9	15	0	0

## Confirmed Victims of Abuse/Neglect by Race/ Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Hamilton	19	0	16	1	0	2
Hansford	5	0	3	2	0	0
Hardeman	12	2	10	0	0	0
Hardin	134	21	100	7	0	6
Harris	5,383	1,970	1,124	1,946	1	342
Harrison	184	20	129	11	0	24
Hartley	3	0	1	2	0	0
Haskell	18	0	13	5	0	0
Hays	315	9	107	188	0	11
Hemphill	11	0	6	0	0	5
Henderson	161	17	116	17	0	11
Hidalgo	2,685	9	71	2,579	0	26
Hill	144	8	107	19	0	10
Hockley	132	4	33	76	0	19
Hood	287	1	228	41	0	17
Hopkins	72	4	49	9	0	10
Houston	58	19	23	12	0	4
Howard	156	1	63	82	0	10
Hudspeth	4	0	1	2	0	1
Hunt	244	46	145	38	0	15
Hutchinson	69	0	42	20	0	7
Irion	4	0	3	1	0	0
Jack	17	0	14	1	0	2
Jackson	29	3	14	10	0	2
Jasper	111	13	88	2	0	8
Jeff Davis	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	661	357	185	74	0	45
Jim Hogg	45	0	8	36	0	1
Jim Wells	175	0	17	150	0	8
Johnson	691	17	483	151	2	38
Jones	36	2	18	12	0	4
Karnes	51	0	5	44	0	2
Kaufman	220	34	149	22	0	15
Kendall	64	0	46	17	0	1
Kenedy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	6	0	4	2	0	0
Kerr	190	10	104	65	0	11
Kimble	10	0	8	2	0	0
King	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kinney	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kleberg	82	0	15	65	0	2
Knox	5	0	3	2	0	0
Lamar	128	16	98	8	0	6
Lamb	51	1	7	39	0	4
Lampasas	59	1	27	25	0	6
La Salle	29	0	2	26	0	1
Lavaca	42	8	23	10	0	1
Lee	61	5	30	24	0	2

## Confirmed Victims of Abuse/Neglect by Race/ Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Leon	62	6	40	8	0	8
Liberty	303	24	211	38	1	29
Limestone	46	7	28	7	0	4
Lipscomb	11	0	9	2	0	0
Live Oak	77	0	16	61	0	0
Llano	50	1	36	10	1	2
Loving	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lubbock	1,328	184	365	703	1	75
Lynn	17	0	6	11	0	0
Madison	41	12	22	2	0	5
Marion	25	4	15	0	0	6
Martin	10	0	4	6	0	0
Mason	9	0	4	5	0	0
Matagorda	92	16	21	42	0	13
Maverick	39	0	2	37	0	0
McCulloch	44	0	32	12	0	0
McLennan	698	182	250	219	0	47
McMullen	9	0	4	4	0	1
Medina	146	1	39	99	0	7
Menard	15	0	6	9	0	0
Midland	366	40	145	144	1	36
Milam	107	18	47	37	0	5
Mills	7	0	6	1	0	0
Mitchell	59	3	27	24	0	5
Montague	74	0	71	1	0	2
Montgomery	794	48	535	153	1	57
Moore	93	0	47	36	0	10
Morris	24	2	16	0	0	6
Motley	6	0	5	0	0	1
Nacogdoches	181	50	58	44	0	29
Navarro	116	17	75	16	0	8
Newton	39	7	25	6	0	1
Nolan	147	20	57	61	0	9
Nueces	1,107	59	188	806	0	54
Ochiltree	32	0	10	21	0	1
Oldham	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange	435	62	335	11	0	27
Palo Pinto	176	4	123	42	0	7
Panola	47	9	34	2	0	2
Parker	267	6	213	37	0	11
Parmer	19	0	4	13	0	2
Pecos	48	0	13	35	0	0
Polk	141	9	111	5	0	16
Potter	666	73	215	323	0	55
Presidio	15	0	4	11	0	0
Rains	15	0	14	0	0	1
Randall	363	19	205	110	0	29
Reagan	2	0	0	1	0	1

## Confirmed Victims of Abuse/Neglect by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Real	13	0	10	3	0	0
Red River	30	4	13	7	0	6
Reeves	26	0	1	25	0	0
Refugio	18	3	2	13	0	0
Roberts	3	0	3	0	0	0
Robertson	68	30	23	9	0	6
Rockwall	77	5	49	13	0	10
Runnels	15	0	7	8	0	0
Rusk	144	18	88	28	0	10
Sabine	21	0	17	1	0	3
San Augustine	15	7	5	3	0	0
San Jacinto	79	1	62	7	2	7
San Patricio	312	13	84	214	0	1
San Saba	13	0	9	4	0	0
Schleicher	11	0	5	6	0	0
Scurry	69	2	26	39	0	2
Shackelford	4	0	2	2	0	0
Shelby	77	6	34	31	0	6
Sherman	1	0	0	0	0	1
Smith	493	114	258	87	0	34
Somervell	28	0	23	4	0	1
Starr	216	0	5	201	0	10
Stephens	25	0	14	10	0	1
Sterling	3	0	3	0	0	0
Stonewall	4	0	3	0	0	1
Sutton	7	0	1	6	0	0
Swisher	34	5	6	23	0	0
Tarrant	5,598	1,380	1,867	1,862	0	489
Taylor	707	59	341	271	0	36
Terrell	2	0	2	0	0	0
Terry	73	7	9	45	0	12
Throckmorton	4	0	4	0	0	0
Titus	89	9	33	39	0	8
Tom Green	427	13	157	228	0	29
Travis	3,045	595	581	1,725	2	142
Trinity	78	18	54	3	0	3
Tyler	48	6	35	1	0	6
Upshur	91	12	62	7	0	10
Upton	10	0	2	8	0	0
Uvalde	80	1	9	62	4	4
Val Verde	61	1	10	48	0	2
Van Zandt	170	3	137	24	0	6
Victoria	346	18	75	236	1	16
Walker	85	26	41	13	0	5
Waller	45	12	19	11	0	3
Ward	29	2	11	16	0	0
Washington	68	21	24	20	0	3
Webb	903	6	16	873	0	8

## Confirmed Victims of Abuse/Neglect by Race/Ethnicity:\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other**
Wharton	78	20	15	39	0	4
Wheeler	15	0	12	3	0	0
Wichita	541	64	326	107	0	44
Wilbarger	38	0	13	24	0	1
Willacy	151	0	3	148	0	0
Williamson	700	90	299	263	0	48
Wilson	84	0	32	39	0	13
Winkler	16	0	3	12	0	1
Wise	159	0	130	22	0	7
Wood	122	3	101	7	0	11
Yoakum	16	0	1	15	0	0
Young	44	0	33	7	0	4
Zapata	70	0	1	69	0	0
Zavala	42	0	0	42	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0
Out of State	16	6	9	1	0	0
State Total	64,366	10,151	20,095	30,034	41	4,045

\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

\*\* Other includes anyone not categorized as African American, Anglo, Hispanic or Native American

## Children Waiting for Adoption\* by Race/ Ethnicity:\*\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other***
Anderson	14	6	5	3	0	0
Andrews	10	0	3	7	0	0
Angelina	7	0	6	1	0	0
Aransas	10	0	7	3	0	0
Archer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Armstrong	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atascosa	33	0	13	20	0	0
Austin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bailey	8	0	1	7	0	0
Bandera	18	0	13	5	0	0
Bastrop	20	3	9	5	0	3
Baylor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bee	15	0	1	14	0	0
Bell	115	40	38	28	0	9
Bexar	917	116	97	689	0	15
Blanco	1	0	0	1	0	0
Borden	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bosque	2	0	0	2	0	0
Bowie	17	1	12	0	0	4
Brazoria	26	2	9	12	0	3
Brazos	39	16	14	9	0	0
Brewster	0	0	0	0	0	0
Briscoe	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brooks	7	0	0	7	0	0
Brown	15	1	11	2	0	1
Burleson	11	1	8	2	0	0
Burnet	6	0	3	3	0	0
Caldwell	12	0	5	7	0	0
Calhoun	1	0	1	0	0	0
Callahan	1	0	1	0	0	0
Cameron	44	0	1	43	0	0
Camp	7	5	2	0	0	0
Carson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cass	5	1	4	0	0	0
Castro	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chambers	3	2	1	0	0	0
Cherokee	23	9	13	0	0	1
Childress	6	0	2	3	0	1
Clay	2	0	2	0	0	0
Cochran	1	0	0	0	0	1
Coke	2	0	1	1	0	0
Coleman	5	0	2	3	0	0
Collin	56	11	25	11	0	9
Collingsworth	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colorado	6	6	0	0	0	0
Comal	24	0	10	14	0	0
Comanche	1	0	1	0	0	0
Concho	1	0	1	0	0	0

## Children Waiting for Adoption\* by Race/ Ethnicity:\*\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other***
Cooke	20	2	18	0	0	0
Coryell	7	2	1	1	0	3
Cottle	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crane	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crockett	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crosby	2	0	0	2	0	0
Culberson	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dallam	3	0	0	3	0	0
Dallas	439	185	79	154	0	21
Dawson	14	0	0	13	0	1
Deaf Smith	13	0	3	10	0	0
Delta	1	1	0	0	0	0
Denton	92	30	32	16	0	14
De Witt	22	5	1	14	0	2
Dickens	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dimmit	18	0	0	17	1	0
Donley	3	0	2	0	0	1
Duval	6	0	0	6	0	0
Eastland	4	0	2	1	0	1
Ector	48	8	16	19	0	5
Edwards	14	0	0	13	0	1
Ellis	7	1	5	1	0	0
El Paso	134	5	17	109	0	3
Erath	4	1	2	1	0	0
Falls	7	5	2	0	0	0
Fannin	1	0	1	0	0	0
Fayette	10	6	3	1	0	0
Fisher	0	0	0	0	0	0
Floyd	2	0	0	2	0	0
Foard	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Bend	20	10	2	7	0	1
Franklin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Freestone	6	0	3	3	0	0
Frio	13	0	2	11	0	0
Gaines	6	0	1	5	0	0
Galveston	32	10	11	10	0	1
Garza	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gillespie	11	0	2	9	0	0
Glasscock	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goliad	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gonzales	9	0	1	7	0	1
Gray	18	0	13	5	0	0
Grayson	18	4	10	2	0	2
Gregg	68	21	31	12	0	4
Grimes	13	1	8	4	0	0
Guadalupe	46	4	7	34	0	1
Hale	12	0	1	11	0	0
Hall	3	1	2	0	0	0

## Children Waiting for Adoption\* by Race/ Ethnicity:\*\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other***
Hamilton	1	0	1	0	0	0
Hansford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hardeman	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hardin	6	0	6	0	0	0
Harris	1546	880	201	389	3	73
Harrison	8	5	1	2	0	0
Hartley	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haskell	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hays	21	0	9	10	0	2
Hemphill	0	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson	16	1	13	0	0	2
Hidalgo	33	0	0	33	0	0
Hill	11	0	9	0	0	2
Hockley	17	2	2	12	0	1
Hood	8	2	5	1	0	0
Hopkins	2	0	0	1	0	1
Houston	8	2	5	1	0	0
Howard	19	0	10	8	0	1
Hudspeth	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hunt	12	7	4	0	0	1
Hutchinson	10	0	2	8	0	0
Irion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jack	1	0	1	0	0	0
Jackson	1	0	0	1	0	0
Jasper	4	1	3	0	0	0
Jeff Davis	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	59	33	20	1	0	5
Jim Hogg	5	0	0	5	0	0
Jim Wells	14	0	0	14	0	0
Johnson	52	6	35	7	0	4
Jones	3	0	1	2	0	0
Karnes	13	0	0	13	0	0
Kaufman	5	0	5	0	0	0
Kendall	11	0	4	7	0	0
Kenedy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kerr	22	4	9	9	0	0
Kimble	2	0	2	0	0	0
King	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kinney	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kleberg	10	0	2	8	0	0
Knox	2	2	0	0	0	0
Lamar	14	0	5	9	0	0
Lamb	3	0	0	3	0	0
Lampasas	6	0	2	4	0	0
La Salle	9	0	0	9	0	0
Lavaca	2	0	0	2	0	0
Lee	11	8	2	1	0	0



## Children Waiting for Adoption\* by Race/ Ethnicity:\*\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other***
Leon	5	0	3	0	0	2
Liberty	33	6	23	0	1	3
Limestone	10	4	2	1	0	3
Lipscomb	4	0	4	0	0	0
Live Oak	5	0	1	3	0	1
Llano	10	0	4	5	0	1
Loving	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lubbock	132	30	35	65	0	2
Lynn	1	0	1	0	0	0
Madison	4	0	1	3	0	0
Marion	3	0	2	1	0	0
Martin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mason	1	0	1	0	0	0
Matagorda	3	0	1	2	0	0
Maverick	4	0	1	3	0	0
McCulloch	2	0	2	0	0	0
McLennan	92	31	26	29	0	6
McMullen	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medina	37	0	10	24	0	3
Menard	6	0	3	3	0	0
Midland	45	12	12	17	0	4
Milam	17	0	12	5	0	0
Mills	1	0	1	0	0	0
Mitchell	5	0	0	5	0	0
Montague	8	0	7	0	0	1
Montgomery	108	5	65	26	0	12
Moore	7	2	4	1	0	0
Morris	3	0	2	1	0	0
Motley	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nacogdoches	42	9	27	2	0	4
Navarro	23	3	13	6	0	1
Newton	3	0	3	0	0	0
Nolan	2	0	1	1	0	0
Nueces	82	5	18	57	0	2
Ochiltree	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oldham	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange	22	1	16	4	0	1
Palo Pinto	8	0	4	2	0	2
Panola	2	0	2	0	0	0
Parker	20	0	14	4	0	2
Parmer	3	0	2	1	0	0
Pecos	1	0	1	0	0	0
Polk	12	1	5	3	0	3
Potter	45	14	19	10	1	1
Presidio	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rains	0	0	0	0	0	0
Randall	25	2	13	7	0	3
Reagan	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Children Waiting for Adoption\* by Race/ Ethnicity:\*\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other***
Real	3	0	1	2	0	0
Red River	6	1	5	0	0	0
Reeves	0	0	0	0	0	0
Refugio	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roberts	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robertson	6	0	4	2	0	0
Rockwall	1	0	1	0	0	0
Runnels	3	0	1	2	0	0
Rusk	6	3	3	0	0	0
Sabine	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Augustine	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Jacinto	7	2	4	0	0	1
San Patricio	11	2	2	7	0	0
San Saba	1	0	1	0	0	0
Schleicher	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scurry	2	0	1	1	0	0
Shackelford	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shelby	7	4	0	2	0	1
Sherman	0	0	0	0	0	0
Smith	28	10	11	3	0	4
Somervell	1	0	1	0	0	0
Starr	1	0	0	1	0	0
Stephens	1	0	1	0	0	0
Sterling	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stonewall	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sutton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swisher	6	4	0	2	0	0
Tarrant	248	70	83	63	0	32
Taylor	28	6	11	7	0	4
Terrell	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terry	11	0	0	11	0	0
Throckmorton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Titus	13	6	3	2	0	2
Tom Green	69	7	25	35	0	2
Travis	152	48	26	66	0	12
Trinity	2	0	2	0	0	0
Tyler	1	0	0	0	0	1
Upshur	6	1	2	0	1	2
Upton	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uvalde	21	0	1	19	0	1
Val Verde	12	0	1	11	0	0
Van Zandt	24	0	17	1	0	6
Victoria	38	1	14	22	0	1
Walker	6	1	2	0	0	3
Waller	2	1	0	0	0	1
Ward	2	0	2	0	0	0
Washington	9	5	1	1	0	2
Webb	92	0	2	90	0	0

## Children Waiting for Adoption\* by Race/ Ethnicity:\*\* Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	African American	Anglo	Hispanic	Native American	Other***
Wharton	11	3	5	3	0	0
Wheeler	2	0	2	0	0	0
Wichita	28	5	16	3	0	4
Wilbarger	0	0	0	0	0	0
Willacy	8	0	0	8	0	0
Williamson	69	16	15	29	0	9
Wilson	14	0	5	7	0	2
Winkler	2	0	0	2	0	0
Wise	20	0	16	2	0	2
Wood	19	1	13	4	0	1
Yoakum	1	0	0	0	0	1
Young	10	0	7	3	0	0
Zapata	11	0	1	10	0	0
Zavala	10	0	0	10	0	0
Out of State	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Total	6,471	1,797	1,628	2,687	7	352

\* "Waiting for Adoption" means children who are legally free for adoption and not yet in an adoptive placement.

\*\* As recommended by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to ensure consistency across all HHSC agencies, in 2012, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) adopted the HHSC methodology on how to categorize race and ethnicity. As a result, data broken down by race/ethnicity in 2012 and after is not directly comparable to race/ethnicity data in 2011 and before.

\*\*\* Other includes anyone not categorized as African American, Anglo, Hispanic or Native American

## Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Exit Type: Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	Family Reunification	Custody Given to Relative	Non-Relative Adoption	Relative Adoption	Children Emancipated	Other*
Anderson	71	15	25	20	4	5	2
Andrews	17	3	10	0	3	1	0
Angelina	37	6	12	8	6	4	1
Aransas	46	14	21	3	7	1	0
Archer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Armstrong	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atascosa	61	22	7	13	15	4	0
Austin	5	0	1	3	0	1	0
Bailey	3	0	0	2	0	1	0
Bandera	24	5	2	11	1	5	0
Bastrop	86	35	20	7	18	6	0
Baylor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bee	37	15	19	0	3	0	0
Bell	382	122	131	56	44	21	8
Bexar	2,112	669	381	421	463	163	15
Blanco	4	1	0	1	0	2	0
Borden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bosque	10	5	2	3	0	0	0
Bowie	95	39	40	7	5	4	0
Brazoria	130	50	52	8	4	12	4
Brazos	78	32	27	6	4	9	0
Brewster	3	0	0	0	0	3	0
Briscoe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brooks	18	4	11	2	0	1	0
Brown	45	9	3	15	14	4	0
Burleson	9	0	5	0	2	1	1
Burnet	40	7	13	4	14	2	0
Caldwell	55	15	7	18	10	5	0
Calhoun	6	4	0	0	0	2	0
Callahan	12	6	1	1	2	2	0
Cameron	210	114	59	14	5	13	5
Camp	18	4	10	0	2	2	0
Carson	6	1	1	4	0	0	0
Cass	27	10	8	1	6	2	0
Castro	5	5	0	0	0	0	0
Chambers	28	15	5	1	7	0	0
Cherokee	66	17	31	10	3	2	3
Childress	7	0	0	4	1	2	0
Clay	3	0	1	2	0	0	0
Cochran	4	4	0	0	0	0	0
Coke	5	0	4	1	0	0	0
Coleman	11	2	5	1	0	0	3
Collin	169	59	65	29	4	10	2
Collingsworth	7	3	0	0	4	0	0
Colorado	13	5	2	3	2	1	0
Comal	90	35	15	11	21	7	1
Comanche	3	0	1	1	0	1	0
Concho	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Exit Type: Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	Family Reunification	Custody Given to Relative	Non-Relative Adoption	Relative Adoption	Children Emancipated	Other*
Cooke	22	6	7	4	0	4	1
Coryell	111	42	52	0	8	6	3
Cottle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crane	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Crockett	3	1	1	0	1	0	0
Crosby	7	0	0	1	4	1	1
Culberson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dallam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dallas	1,579	438	737	145	128	112	19
Dawson	3	1	0	0	1	1	0
Deaf Smith	16	7	1	1	6	1	0
Delta	5	4	1	0	0	0	0
Denton	244	80	61	58	34	10	1
De Witt	8	0	2	2	3	1	0
Dickens	3	0	2	0	0	1	0
Dimmit	12	4	0	0	5	3	0
Donley	7	6	0	0	0	1	0
Duval	9	4	4	1	0	0	0
Eastland	13	5	8	0	0	0	0
Ector	140	51	56	14	8	9	2
Edwards	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ellis	43	13	7	8	8	5	2
El Paso	298	111	60	52	37	31	7
Erath	26	2	14	2	4	4	0
Falls	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Fannin	16	5	4	5	0	2	0
Fayette	32	11	8	7	3	3	0
Fisher	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Floyd	10	5	1	0	3	0	1
Foard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Bend	109	24	39	17	17	12	0
Franklin	4	0	2	0	2	0	0
Freestone	11	0	1	4	4	2	0
Frio	29	11	1	3	12	2	0
Gaines	15	10	2	2	1	0	0
Galveston	143	42	46	15	28	11	1
Garza	2	0	0	0	0	1	1
Gillespie	20	11	4	3	1	1	0
Glasscock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goliad	5	2	2	0	0	1	0
Gonzales	9	2	4	2	0	1	0
Gray	52	21	14	1	10	6	0
Grayson	62	17	19	14	7	4	1
Gregg	85	24	29	9	10	12	1
Grimes	14	6	2	4	2	0	0
Guadalupe	93	43	25	5	16	3	1
Hale	28	19	2	3	4	0	0
Hall	2	0	0	1	0	1	0

## Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Exit Type: Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	Family Reunification	Custody Given to Relative	Non-Relative Adoption	Relative Adoption	Children Emancipated	Other*
Hamilton	5	1	2	0	2	0	0
Hansford	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Hardeman	2	0	0	1	0	1	0
Hardin	18	7	4	5	1	1	0
Harris	2,564	663	702	460	482	218	39
Harrison	58	19	33	1	1	3	1
Hartley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haskell	3	1	0	0	2	0	0
Hays	62	31	19	3	3	6	0
Hemphill	2	0	0	0	1	1	0
Henderson	102	48	21	16	13	4	0
Hidalgo	612	302	268	5	2	31	4
Hill	14	2	6	3	2	1	0
Hockley	28	8	6	5	3	6	0
Hood	30	15	8	4	1	1	1
Hopkins	22	6	6	6	3	1	0
Houston	16	7	6	0	3	0	0
Howard	21	5	5	6	2	3	0
Hudspeth	3	2	0	0	0	1	0
Hunt	106	10	55	22	15	2	2
Hutchinson	24	13	7	2	0	2	0
Irion	4	0	1	0	0	1	2
Jack	9	5	3	1	0	0	0
Jackson	2	0	0	1	1	0	0
Jasper	12	0	4	8	0	0	0
Jeff Davis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	172	67	52	24	20	8	1
Jim Hogg	9	6	3	0	0	0	0
Jim Wells	47	16	26	2	0	2	1
Johnson	129	38	36	35	14	6	0
Jones	2	0	1	0	0	1	0
Karnes	11	6	2	2	0	1	0
Kaufman	66	22	11	18	11	4	0
Kendall	21	2	8	4	5	2	0
Kenedy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kerr	112	30	9	25	39	9	0
Kimble	3	0	0	1	0	2	0
King	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kinney	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Kleberg	22	0	9	9	2	2	0
Knox	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Lamar	77	17	52	2	1	3	2
Lamb	11	8	0	0	0	3	0
Lampasas	29	7	7	3	3	9	0
La salle	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Lavaca	7	0	3	4	0	0	0
Lee	27	20	1	4	2	0	0

## Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Exit Type: Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	Family Reunification	Custody Given to Relative	Non-Relative Adoption	Relative Adoption	Children Emancipated	Other*
Leon	6	2	3	1	0	0	0
Liberty	90	42	32	4	8	4	0
Limestone	22	2	2	8	5	5	0
Lipscomb	2	0	1	0	0	1	0
Live Oak	10	0	9	0	0	1	0
Llano	17	0	6	3	7	1	0
Loving	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lubbock	352	109	54	95	47	44	3
Lynn	4	2	0	1	0	1	0
Madison	23	6	8	2	4	2	1
Marion	12	3	1	4	2	2	0
Martin	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Mason	4	2	0	1	0	1	0
Matagorda	21	0	15	1	1	1	3
Maverick	10	0	0	4	6	0	0
McCulloch	7	4	1	1	0	1	0
McLennan	169	53	26	31	35	21	3
McMullen	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Medina	95	24	19	27	21	4	0
Menard	5	2	1	0	0	2	0
Midland	73	34	17	8	10	3	1
Milam	37	11	13	4	7	1	1
Mills	6	3	2	0	0	1	0
Mitchell	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
Montague	46	30	10	1	2	3	0
Montgomery	364	115	105	44	69	21	10
Moore	13	5	7	0	1	0	0
Morris	7	1	3	1	0	2	0
Motley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nacogdoches	43	11	14	2	12	4	0
Navarro	38	12	4	14	1	7	0
Newton	7	3	4	0	0	0	0
Nolan	33	19	10	2	1	1	0
Nueces	420	186	111	51	45	23	4
Ochiltree	5	2	0	0	1	2	0
Oldham	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Orange	75	30	30	13	0	2	0
Palo Pinto	41	20	5	6	5	4	1
Panola	11	2	8	0	0	1	0
Parker	22	10	3	2	3	3	1
Parmer	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Pecos	19	6	5	2	2	4	0
Polk	36	18	11	4	2	1	0
Potter	109	24	27	31	5	18	4
Presidio	7	0	7	0	0	0	0
Rains	8	4	1	3	0	0	0
Randall	185	62	48	38	19	15	3
Reagan	3	0	0	3	0	0	0

## Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Exit Type: Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	Family Reunification	Custody Given to Relative	Non-Relative Adoption	Relative Adoption	Children Emancipated	Other*
Real	2	1	0	0	0	1	0
Red River	17	4	8	4	0	1	0
Reeves	2	1	0	0	1	0	0
Refugio	3	2	1	0	0	0	0
Roberts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robertson	9	1	2	0	2	4	0
Rockwall	23	1	17	3	1	1	0
Runnels	17	7	5	2	1	2	0
Rusk	51	21	18	3	3	4	2
Sabine	6	2	1	3	0	0	0
San Augustine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Jacinto	28	15	6	2	3	2	0
San Patricio	35	10	15	5	1	4	0
San Saba	6	5	0	1	0	0	0
Schleicher	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Scurry	6	0	1	0	3	2	0
Shackelford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shelby	24	8	10	0	5	1	0
Sherman	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Smith	148	26	34	39	32	13	4
Somervell	8	2	2	2	1	0	1
Starr	54	34	12	0	0	7	1
Stephens	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sterling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stonewall	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sutton	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Swisher	17	3	10	3	0	1	0
Tarrant	766	275	201	156	61	68	5
Taylor	103	45	27	9	9	13	0
Terrell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terry	23	5	3	2	10	3	0
Throckmorton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Titus	23	9	8	1	2	3	0
Tom Green	167	54	55	22	20	16	0
Travis	638	277	143	78	95	35	10
Trinity	24	13	8	1	0	2	0
Tyler	8	3	4	1	0	0	0
Upshur	23	3	12	3	3	2	0
Upton	6	3	2	0	0	1	0
Uvalde	40	17	4	7	7	5	0
Val Verde	7	3	1	1	2	0	0
Van Zandt	72	16	24	18	11	2	1
Victoria	63	21	18	6	13	5	0
Walker	34	19	8	1	2	3	1
Waller	39	13	11	5	6	3	1
Ward	5	2	2	0	0	0	1
Washington	17	10	4	1	2	0	0
Webb	251	132	56	29	17	11	6



## Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Exit Type: Fiscal Year 2012

County	Total	Family Reunification	Custody Given to Relative	Non-Relative Adoption	Relative Adoption	Children Emancipated	Other*
Wharton	27	0	17	3	6	1	0
Wheeler	6	3	1	1	0	1	0
Wichita	131	43	41	23	9	11	4
Wilbarger	10	3	1	5	0	1	0
Willacy	14	6	5	2	1	0	0
Williamson	227	74	57	48	24	23	1
Wilson	18	10	6	2	0	0	0
Winkler	2	0	1	0	0	1	0
Wise	40	15	12	6	0	7	0
Wood	47	9	22	11	5	0	0
Yoakum	5	2	0	0	2	1	0
Young	9	3	4	1	0	1	0
Zapata	17	13	2	0	0	1	1
Zavala	10	0	3	4	2	1	0
Out Of State	6	0	6	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,625</b>	<b>5,873</b>	<b>5,135</b>	<b>2,682</b>	<b>2,358</b>	<b>1,363</b>	<b>214</b>

\* Other includes children absent without permission, children in court ordered or independant living placements, children for whom conservatorship was never obtained and children with a missing discharge reason.

## Child Day Care Licensing Statistics as of August 31, 2012

County	Child Population Age 0-13	Licensed Child Care Centers	Total Child Care Centers Capacity	Licensed Child Care Homes	Licensed Child Care Homes Capacity	Listed Family Homes	Registered Child Care Homes
Anderson	9,054	11	1,182	2	24	18	4
Andrews	3,445	4	362	0	0	3	1
Angelina	18,302	35	3,166	3	36	8	4
Aransas	3,383	5	343	0	0	3	0
Archer	1,569	4	224	1	12	3	1
Armstrong	294	0	0	0	0	2	2
Atascosa	10,033	13	818	2	24	6	3
Austin	5,570	11	922	0	0	10	2
Bailey	1,836	3	158	0	0	1	0
Bandera	2,895	5	370	0	0	1	0
Bastrop	15,551	36	2,958	6	72	24	11
Baylor	603	3	160	0	0	2	1
Bee	5,371	7	770	1	12	5	1
Bell	75,604	163	14,786	25	297	85	126
Bexar	373,075	580	60,908	35	420	236	447
Blanco	1,687	4	209	0	0	2	0
Borden	82	1	13	0	0	0	0
Bosque	3,116	5	238	2	24	3	2
Bowie	17,084	40	3,882	4	48	40	11
Brazoria	71,661	147	17,283	11	132	63	65
Brazos	35,576	71	6,872	13	153	66	29
Brewster	1,505	4	295	1	12	9	0
Briscoe	276	0	0	0	0	1	0
Brooks	1,571	6	290	0	0	0	1
Brown	7,005	15	1,197	0	0	9	10
Burleson	3,113	6	335	1	12	4	2
Burnet	7,688	20	1,583	2	24	6	1
Caldwell	7,664	15	865	0	0	12	1
Calhoun	4,392	15	905	1	12	0	1
Callahan	2,461	4	148	1	12	5	1
Cameron	107,244	214	15,007	23	275	31	32
Camp	2,596	6	437	2	24	1	0
Carson	1,146	0	0	0	0	5	2
Cass	5,331	5	455	0	0	20	0
Castro	1,931	3	80	0	0	3	1
Chambers	7,779	15	1,397	2	24	6	3
Cherokee	10,484	13	1,143	1	12	14	3
Childress	1,168	3	84	3	36	14	3
Clay	1,763	4	168	1	12	1	3
Cochran	690	1	55	0	0	0	0
Coke	496	1	17	0	0	0	0
Coleman	1,518	3	134	4	48	2	2
Collin	183,830	330	47,963	102	1,203	244	196
Collingsworth	649	0	0	1	12	1	1
Colorado	3,782	8	608	3	36	6	4
Comal	19,914	43	4,447	4	48	17	14
Comanche	2,577	4	143	4	48	3	2
Concho	456	2	85	0	0	1	1

## Child Day Care Licensing Statistics as of August 31, 2012

County	Child Population Age 0-13	Licensed Child Care Centers	Total Child Care Centers Capacity	Licensed Child Care Homes	Licensed Child Care Homes Capacity	Listed Family Homes	Registered Child Care Homes
Cooke	7,519	8	643	9	108	14	14
Coryell	17,788	32	2,764	4	48	18	9
Cottle	267	1	34	0	0	0	0
Crane	994	1	40	0	0	1	0
Crockett	762	2	80	1	12	0	0
Crosby	1,342	0	0	0	0	2	1
Culberson	500	1	59	0	0	2	0
Dallam	1,666	1	54	2	24	6	2
Dallas	530,907	800	91,026	134	1,581	796	671
Dawson	2,697	2	322	3	36	9	0
Deaf Smith	5,068	6	450	1	8	20	1
Delta	861	0	0	1	11	2	0
Denton	151,149	244	32,313	93	1,116	208	192
De Witt	3,441	6	317	2	24	2	1
Dickens	370	1	20	0	0	0	1
Dimmit	2,266	5	309	0	0	3	0
Donley	552	0	0	2	24	3	1
Duval	2,342	6	225	0	0	0	2
Eastland	3,236	9	304	2	24	6	2
Ector	32,788	48	4,558	9	108	54	5
Edwards	324	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ellis	33,619	56	6,207	8	96	54	26
El Paso	187,555	278	26,240	147	1,757	346	95
Erath	6,849	13	909	6	72	9	15
Falls	3,008	3	217	1	12	5	1
Fannin	5,799	8	547	1	12	15	6
Fayette	4,040	9	487	6	72	11	3
Fisher	612	0	0	0	0	0	0
Floyd	1,392	2	227	0	0	1	1
Foard	185	1	35	0	0	0	0
Fort Bend	139,745	262	33,055	36	432	99	199
Franklin	2,069	4	269	1	12	4	0
Freestone	3,608	8	471	2	24	14	4
Frio	3,299	6	465	2	24	5	1
Gaines	5,143	2	102	3	36	2	1
Galveston	58,491	128	14,154	15	173	63	65
Garza	997	2	80	0	0	3	0
Gillespie	3,796	11	515	4	48	8	3
Glasscock	232	1	12	0	0	0	0
Goliad	1,183	2	141	0	0	2	0
Gonzales	4,322	7	350	1	12	11	1
Gray	4,562	11	845	0	0	5	0
Grayson	22,698	35	3,234	9	108	46	20
Gregg	24,896	56	6,369	5	60	36	20
Grimes	4,625	7	326	10	119	6	4
Guadalupe	28,729	34	3,037	9	104	29	34
Hale	8,359	7	664	8	96	10	4
Hall	626	1	47	0	0	1	0

## Child Day Care Licensing Statistics as of August 31, 2012

County	Child Population Age 0-13	Licensed Child Care Centers	Total Child Care Centers Capacity	Licensed Child Care Homes	Licensed Child Care Homes Capacity	Listed Family Homes	Registered Child Care Homes
Hamilton	1,335	3	165	4	48	3	6
Hansford	1,330	2	89	0	0	5	2
Hardeman	785	2	95	4	48	2	1
Hardin	11,034	13	1,537	1	12	4	4
Harris	926,013	1,545	173,198	183	2,178	916	1,524
Harrison	13,401	18	1,693	5	60	25	9
Hartley	1,032	1	150	0	0	1	1
Haskell	947	2	95	1	12	1	1
Hays	33,459	79	5,627	12	140	57	31
Hemphill	898	1	98	0	0	2	0
Henderson	13,897	16	1,667	3	36	18	3
Hidalgo	215,911	417	29,876	99	1,185	69	113
Hill	6,646	12	610	2	24	12	3
Hockley	4,962	9	514	6	72	4	1
Hood	8,449	18	1,368	6	72	9	10
Hopkins	7,048	9	1,026	5	60	15	1
Houston	3,724	2	267	2	24	8	4
Howard	6,228	11	1,095	1	12	5	2
Hudspeth	741	1	34	0	0	1	0
Hunt	16,978	25	2,543	4	48	36	10
Hutchinson	4,493	5	262	4	48	7	3
Irion	232	1	20	0	0	1	0
Jack	1,484	2	118	1	12	2	1
Jackson	2,758	6	305	6	72	17	2
Jasper	6,878	8	853	2	24	5	3
Jeff Davis	283	0	0	0	0	3	0
Jefferson	47,215	82	8,346	8	96	22	27
Jim Hogg	1,208	4	219	0	0	4	2
Jim Wells	9,264	23	1,011	2	24	6	2
Johnson	32,409	37	4,508	5	60	27	18
Jones	2,842	3	89	1	12	5	3
Karnes	2,265	5	152	1	12	4	3
Kaufman	23,972	35	4,237	4	48	41	21
Kendall	6,011	15	1,336	3	36	7	2
Kenedy	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	128	0	0	0	0	1	0
Kerr	7,748	15	1,411	4	48	15	4
Kimble	687	2	100	1	12	2	0
King	41	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kinney	493	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kleberg	6,602	12	676	1	12	5	5
Knox	749	3	94	0	0	0	1
Lamar	9,301	15	1,350	8	94	21	5
Lamb	3,145	3	127	1	12	4	0
Lampasas	3,658	4	307	4	48	4	6
La Salle	1,169	2	99	0	0	1	0
Lavaca	3,355	9	467	10	118	10	5
Lee	3,103	7	528	3	36	3	0

## Child Day Care Licensing Statistics as of August 31, 2012

County	Child Population Age 0-13	Licensed Child Care Centers	Total Child Care Centers Capacity	Licensed Child Care Homes	Licensed Child Care Homes Capacity	Listed Family Homes	Registered Child Care Homes
Leon	2,907	6	240	1	12	5	0
Liberty	15,158	19	1,405	1	12	12	5
Limestone	4,293	9	657	4	48	7	4
Lipscomb	676	0	0	0	0	0	0
Live Oak	1,715	3	102	1	12	3	2
Llano	2,385	7	354	1	12	6	0
Loving	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lubbock	56,177	120	12,033	37	444	67	38
Lynn	1,238	2	99	1	12	4	2
Madison	2,336	7	247	1	12	6	2
Marion	1,472	2	131	2	24	0	1
Martin	1,110	2	86	0	0	2	0
Mason	623	3	117	0	0	0	0
Matagorda	7,347	11	972	0	0	30	3
Maverick	14,141	20	1,889	0	0	10	6
McCulloch	1,539	4	243	3	36	5	0
McLennan	47,100	102	10,756	26	312	56	29
McMullen	92	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medina	9,079	13	866	0	0	4	10
Menard	330	1	20	0	0	0	0
Midland	30,280	64	6,523	9	105	38	8
Milam	4,889	6	358	6	72	11	0
Mills	855	0	0	3	36	1	4
Mitchell	1,402	2	62	0	0	1	2
Montague	3,550	7	305	3	36	3	3
Montgomery	101,769	156	18,603	17	192	64	25
Moore	5,594	6	327	0	0	2	4
Morris	2,287	3	140	2	24	7	3
Motley	188	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nacogdoches	12,711	16	2,091	2	24	9	4
Navarro	10,126	17	1,439	5	60	9	12
Newton	2,387	4	203	0	0	2	0
Nolan	3,127	9	651	1	12	6	3
Nueces	68,448	150	12,997	43	510	74	53
Ochiltree	2,710	6	350	0	0	3	0
Oldham	387	1	51	0	0	0	0
Orange	15,710	25	2,663	5	60	12	9
Palo Pinto	5,455	5	568	1	12	16	9
Panola	4,572	7	561	1	12	5	3
Parker	23,340	40	3,760	2	24	16	12
Parmer	2,524	1	48	1	12	2	0
Pecos	3,098	4	319	2	24	4	1
Polk	7,434	8	814	2	24	3	1
Potter	27,414	43	4,174	0	0	64	34
Presidio	1,657	1	30	0	0	7	1
Rains	1,695	2	96	1	12	3	1
Randall	24,116	44	4,603	3	36	55	48
Reagan	763	1	60	0	0	2	0

## Child Day Care Licensing Statistics as of August 31, 2012

County	Child Population Age 0-13	Licensed Child Care Centers	Total Child Care Centers Capacity	Licensed Child Care Homes	Licensed Child Care Homes Capacity	Listed Family Homes	Registered Child Care Homes
Real	432	3	139	0	0	2	0
Red River	2,070	1	72	4	48	10	1
Reeves	2,427	3	179	3	36	7	0
Refugio	1,332	2	79	0	0	1	2
Roberts	185	0	0	0	0	1	0
Robertson	3,226	4	336	2	24	5	1
Rockwall	18,680	22	3,330	8	96	16	2
Runnels	1,951	5	142	3	36	2	2
Rusk	9,820	13	922	4	48	12	4
Sabine	1,543	2	116	0	0	1	0
San Augustine	1,409	3	154	0	0	0	0
San Jacinto	4,774	3	173	0	0	5	0
San Patricio	13,906	30	2,031	3	36	10	2
San Saba	920	1	31	1	12	1	3
Schleicher	899	1	20	1	12	1	0
Scurry	3,399	5	421	3	36	2	2
Shackelford	624	1	51	0	0	2	0
Shelby	5,339	3	172	1	12	2	1
Sherman	638	1	51	0	0	2	1
Smith	42,820	89	8,465	7	84	49	7
Somervell	1,577	4	178	1	12	0	2
Starr	15,916	38	2,244	3	36	2	8
Stephens	1,757	1	152	1	12	2	3
Sterling	218	0	0	1	12	0	0
Stonewall	253	0	0	1	12	2	1
Sutton	872	2	63	1	12	1	1
Swisher	1,616	2	200	0	0	3	1
Tarrant	405,129	669	74,265	107	1,282	533	692
Taylor	26,133	52	5,320	2	24	47	46
Terrell	166	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terry	2,650	1	100	3	36	4	0
Throckmorton	255	1	12	0	0	0	0
Titus	7,792	8	1,156	0	0	7	2
Tom Green	21,116	52	5,213	4	48	40	22
Travis	209,876	469	44,082	49	585	277	172
Trinity	2,303	6	372	0	0	0	0
Tyler	3,248	7	383	2	24	1	0
Upshur	7,507	5	462	3	36	10	0
Upton	717	1	20	0	0	0	0
Uvalde	5,941	14	899	2	24	6	2
Val Verde	11,645	18	1,414	3	36	21	3
Van Zandt	9,547	11	1,157	4	48	14	4
Victoria	18,136	38	3,023	22	262	25	13
Walker	8,885	22	1,932	0	0	22	2
Waller	8,746	13	862	0	0	9	9
Ward	2,241	3	225	0	0	5	0
Washington	5,805	12	1,100	4	48	8	4
Webb	70,578	102	7,421	32	381	315	36

## Child Day Care Licensing Statistics as of August 31, 2012

County	Child Population Age 0-13	Licensed Child Care Centers	Total Child Care Centers Capacity	Licensed Child Care Homes	Licensed Child Care Homes Capacity	Listed Family Homes	Registered Child Care Homes
Wharton	8,643	17	1,902	2	24	24	4
Wheeler	1,060	1	80	0	0	1	0
Wichita	24,188	54	4,234	23	276	25	40
Wilbarger	2,690	7	425	2	24	5	6
Willacy	4,600	9	599	3	36	2	9
Williamson	101,222	235	28,323	59	706	226	125
Wilson	8,587	17	1,237	2	24	4	5
Winkler	1,618	2	77	1	12	3	2
Wise	12,006	24	1,507	0	0	11	7
Wood	6,612	12	650	2	24	6	3
Yoakum	2,015	1	34	2	24	5	0
Young	3,530	9	494	1	12	1	5
Zapata	3,908	6	339	0	0	2	0
Zavala	2,882	6	465	0	0	1	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>State Total</b>	<b>5,517,274</b>	<b>9,601</b>	<b>975,868</b>	<b>1,774</b>	<b>21,147</b>	<b>6,774</b>	<b>5,837</b>

*Population Data Source: Texas State Data Center, University of Texas (San Antonio) - based on Census 2010 data*

## Residential Child Care Licensing Statistics as of August 31, 2012

County	Child Population Age 0-17	Child Placing Agencies (CPA)	Homes Verified by CPAs	General Residential Operations	Independent Foster and Group Homes	Residential Treatment Centers	Maternity Homes	Total Residential	Total Residential Capacity
Anderson	11,498	0	10	0	0	0	0	10	40
Andrews	4,431	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	19
Angelina	23,448	3	23	0	0	0	0	26	72
Aransas	4,505	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	25
Archer	2,159	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5
Armstrong	396	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atascosa	13,238	0	16	0	0	0	0	16	45
Austin	7,331	0	6	0	0	1	0	7	51
Bailey	2,302	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	24
Bandera	4,003	0	10	1	0	0	0	11	162
Bastrop	20,398	0	46	1	0	0	0	47	185
Baylor	760	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bee	6,904	0	11	1	0	0	0	12	181
Bell	93,172	8	219	2	0	1	1	231	793
Bexar	477,922	39	1,006	14	0	7	0	1,066	4,150
Blanco	2,281	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	1
Borden	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bosque	4,102	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	15
Bowie	22,147	0	19	0	0	0	0	19	52
Brazoria	91,471	1	137	3	0	3	0	144	708
Brazos	43,546	3	54	1	0	1	0	59	197
Brewster	1,929	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Briscoe	344	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	3
Brooks	1,983	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	6
Brown	9,115	8	71	1	0	0	0	80	349
Burleson	4,118	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	6
Burnet	10,064	1	12	0	0	0	0	13	41
Caldwell	10,088	0	22	0	0	2	0	24	277
Calhoun	5,726	0	10	0	0	0	0	10	39
Callahan	3,262	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	23
Cameron	137,876	7	152	6	0	0	0	165	1,378
Camp	3,396	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	28
Carson	1,545	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Cass	7,036	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	33
Castro	2,497	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	18
Chambers	10,367	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	15
Cherokee	13,396	0	20	0	0	0	0	20	55
Childress	1,520	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
Clay	2,394	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	27
Cochran	885	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coke	661	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coleman	1,957	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	16
Collin	237,706	4	209	1	0	0	0	214	544
Collingsworth	840	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colorado	4,928	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	8
Comal	26,685	1	55	4	0	1	0	61	339
Comanche	3,337	1	11	0	0	0	0	12	34
Concho	568	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	6



## Residential Child Care Licensing Statistics as of August 31, 2012

County	Child Population Age 0-17	Child Placing Agencies (CPA)	Homes Verified by CPAs	General Residential Operations	Independent Foster and Group Homes	Residential Treatment Centers	Maternity Homes	Total Residential	Total Residential Capacity
Cooke	9,788	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	7
Coryell	22,088	0	38	0	0	0	0	38	141
Cottle	342	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crane	1,286	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crockett	970	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crosby	1,737	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	8
Culberson	658	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dallam	2,065	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Dallas	667,394	48	715	5	0	4	0	772	2,631
Dawson	3,418	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	24
Deaf Smith	6,363	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
Delta	1,153	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	7
Denton	193,415	1	169	1	0	0	0	171	479
De Witt	4,478	0	7	1	0	0	0	8	68
Dickens	473	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dimmit	2,932	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5
Donley	729	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	14
Duval	3,044	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	6
Eastland	4,197	0	13	0	0	0	0	13	44
Ector	40,880	1	49	0	0	0	0	50	148
Edwards	412	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ellis	44,792	2	86	2	0	0	0	90	453
El Paso	244,164	8	190	6	0	0	0	204	862
Erath	8,657	1	13	1	0	0	0	15	116
Falls	3,871	0	10	0	0	1	0	11	61
Fannin	7,539	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	20
Fayette	5,434	0	4	0	0	1	0	5	32
Fisher	827	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Floyd	1,813	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	13
Foard	264	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Bend	184,786	3	274	2	0	5	0	284	1,065
Franklin	2,649	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	17
Freestone	4,644	0	8	1	0	0	0	9	74
Frio	4,226	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	39
Gaines	6,436	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	15
Galveston	75,257	1	98	2	0	1	0	102	349
Garza	1,272	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Gillespie	5,119	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	18
Glasscock	329	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goliad	1,613	0	9	1	0	0	0	10	54
Gonzales	5,447	1	6	0	0	1	0	8	93
Gray	5,714	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	20
Grayson	29,242	0	25	1	0	0	0	26	67
Gregg	31,504	2	39	0	0	0	0	41	111
Grimes	6,083	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	20
Guadalupe	38,282	1	76	0	0	1	0	78	234
Hale	10,553	0	17	0	0	0	0	17	51
Hall	829	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Residential Child Care Licensing Statistics as of August 31, 2012

County	Child Population Age 0-17	Child Placing Agencies (CPA)	Homes Verified by CPAs	General Residential Operations	Independent Foster and Group Homes	Residential Treatment Centers	Maternity Homes	Total Residential	Total Residential Capacity
Hamilton	1,790	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Hansford	1,697	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Hardeman	1,018	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	14
Hardin	14,333	0	10	0	0	0	0	10	41
Harris	1,171,213	51	1,498	21	4	23	1	1,598	5,794
Harrison	17,217	0	21	2	0	1	0	24	176
Hartley	1,322	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	11
Haskell	1,210	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Hays	43,078	2	73	1	0	2	0	78	502
Hemphill	1,122	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
Henderson	18,071	0	33	0	0	0	0	33	95
Hidalgo	276,110	7	129	1	0	0	0	137	602
Hill	8,639	0	8	1	0	0	0	9	90
Hockley	6,277	0	15	0	0	2	0	17	112
Hood	11,029	1	8	0	0	0	0	9	23
Hopkins	9,087	1	15	0	0	0	0	16	39
Houston	4,822	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	29
Howard	7,854	1	12	0	0	0	0	13	28
Hudspeth	991	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
Hunt	22,135	0	36	1	0	1	0	38	182
Hutchinson	5,815	0	11	0	0	0	0	11	40
Irion	338	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jack	1,957	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5
Jackson	3,559	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	16
Jasper	8,846	0	18	0	0	0	0	18	57
Jeff Davis	388	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	84
Jefferson	60,731	6	107	4	0	0	0	117	502
Jim Hogg	1,515	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jim Wells	11,941	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	30
Johnson	42,338	0	58	0	0	0	0	58	201
Jones	3,740	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	24
Karnes	2,934	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	7
Kaufman	31,438	0	78	1	0	0	0	79	245
Kendall	8,338	1	20	1	0	1	0	23	158
Kenedy	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent	178	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	12
Kerr	10,128	4	21	3	0	1	0	29	283
Kimble	920	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	11
King	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kinney	689	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
Kleberg	8,369	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	37
Knox	936	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lamar	12,128	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	15
Lamb	4,035	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	10
Lampasas	4,926	0	17	1	0	0	0	18	119
La Salle	1,522	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lavaca	4,357	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	30
Lee	4,195	0	17	0	0	0	0	17	71

## Residential Child Care Licensing Statistics as of August 31, 2012

County	Child Population Age 0-17	Child Placing Agencies (CPA)	Homes Verified by CPAs	General Residential Operations	Independent Foster and Group Homes	Residential Treatment Centers	Maternity Homes	Total Residential	Total Residential Capacity
Leon	3,795	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	17
Liberty	19,812	0	14	0	0	0	0	14	40
Limestone	5,557	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	21
Lipscomb	899	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Live Oak	2,270	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	12
Llano	3,119	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	7
Loving	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lubbock	70,284	11	191	4	0	1	1	208	812
Lynn	1,597	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	3
Madison	3,021	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
Marion	1,970	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4
Martin	1,438	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Mason	835	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Matagorda	9,557	0	5	0	0	1	0	6	40
Maverick	18,421	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	11
McCulloch	2,004	1	16	0	0	0	0	17	66
McLennan	60,271	4	91	3	0	1	0	99	648
McMullen	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medina	12,056	1	30	1	0	0	0	32	119
Menard	436	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Midland	38,364	4	64	1	0	0	0	69	212
Milam	6,448	0	10	1	0	0	0	11	76
Mills	1,163	0	10	0	0	1	0	11	150
Mitchell	1,816	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Montague	4,557	0	11	0	0	0	0	11	17
Montgomery	132,405	8	187	5	0	0	0	200	678
Moore	7,140	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Morris	3,035	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	16
Motley	249	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Nacogdoches	16,124	1	40	0	0	1	0	42	174
Navarro	13,134	2	53	0	0	2	0	57	242
Newton	3,177	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	20
Nolan	3,978	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	10
Nueces	88,188	9	127	2	0	0	0	138	548
Ochiltree	3,380	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	7
Oldham	630	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	437
Orange	20,590	0	48	0	0	0	0	48	162
Palo Pinto	7,095	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	9
Panola	5,851	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	16
Parker	31,106	0	45	1	0	0	0	46	183
Parmer	3,268	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	8
Pecos	3,884	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Polk	9,670	0	20	0	0	0	0	20	101
Potter	34,211	6	63	1	0	0	0	70	212
Presidio	2,247	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rains	2,374	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	27
Randall	31,181	3	90	4	0	0	0	97	440
Reagan	1,017	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2

## Residential Child Care Licensing Statistics as of August 31, 2012

County	Child Population Age 0-17	Child Placing Agencies (CPA)	Homes Verified by CPAs	General Residential Operations	Independent Foster and Group Homes	Residential Treatment Centers	Maternity Homes	Total Residential	Total Residential Capacity
Real	604	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	6
Red River	2,730	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	7
Reeves	3,111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Refugio	1,739	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	12
Roberts	238	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robertson	4,212	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	4
Rockwall	25,042	0	33	0	0	0	0	33	75
Runnels	2,614	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	14
Rusk	12,632	0	16	0	0	0	0	16	51
Sabine	2,051	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Augustine	1,840	0	12	0	0	0	0	12	37
San Jacinto	6,410	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	24
San Patricio	18,070	0	22	2	0	1	0	25	200
San Saba	1,247	1	7	1	0	0	0	9	94
Schleicher	1,121	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Scurry	4,325	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	26
Shackelford	816	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	12
Shelby	6,739	1	26	0	0	0	0	27	130
Sherman	879	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
Smith	54,893	11	114	3	0	3	1	132	616
Somervell	2,206	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	7
Starr	20,668	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	32
Stephens	2,280	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	15
Sterling	275	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
Stonewall	325	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	6
Sutton	1,109	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	21
Swisher	2,026	0	7	0	0	0	0	7	19
Tarrant	517,952	27	720	5	0	1	1	754	2,314
Taylor	32,799	7	72	4	0	0	0	83	324
Terrell	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terry	3,317	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	6
Throckmorton	345	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Titus	9,999	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	24
Tom Green	26,599	1	43	3	0	0	0	47	228
Travis	259,016	27	384	6	0	2	0	419	1,317
Trinity	3,008	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	22
Tyler	4,251	0	10	1	0	1	0	12	93
Upshur	9,830	0	13	0	0	0	0	13	48
Upton	943	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	6
Uvalde	7,636	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	15
Val Verde	14,849	1	8	0	0	0	0	9	22
Van Zandt	12,663	0	46	0	0	0	0	46	158
Victoria	23,152	3	39	2	0	1	0	45	271
Walker	11,453	0	11	2	0	1	0	14	317
Waller	11,256	0	13	0	0	0	0	13	47
Ward	2,887	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Washington	7,510	0	10	1	0	0	0	11	53
Webb	90,260	2	71	2	0	0	0	75	376

## Residential Child Care Licensing Statistics as of August 31, 2012

County	Child Population Age 0-17	Child Placing Agencies (CPA)	Homes Verified by CPAs	General Residential Operations	Independent Foster and Group Homes	Residential Treatment Centers	Maternity Homes	Total Residential	Total Residential Capacity
Wharton	11,007	0	17	0	0	0	0	17	57
Wheeler	1,364	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	1
Wichita	30,823	4	37	1	0	0	0	42	155
Wilbarger	3,411	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Willacy	5,958	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Williamson	129,411	7	278	4	0	1	1	291	1,109
Wilson	11,587	0	32	0	0	0	0	32	108
Winkler	2,102	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Wise	15,837	0	20	0	0	0	0	20	50
Wood	8,708	0	12	1	0	0	0	13	95
Yoakum	2,519	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5
Young	4,489	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	11
Zapata	4,920	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	20
Zavala	3,646	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
Out of State	0	0	65	0	0	0	0	65	125
State Total	7,054,634	362	9,849	157	5	80	6	10,459	41,420

Population Data Source: Texas State Data Center, University of Texas (San Antonio) - based on Census 2010 data

## Youth Served in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs Fiscal Year 2012

County	STAR	CYD	SYSN	YRP*	TOTAL	County	STAR	CYD	SYSN	YRP*	TOTAL
Anderson	102	0	3	0	105	Cooke	27	0	35	0	62
Andrews	7	0	0	0	7	Coryell	46	0	40	0	86
Angelina	160	0	21	0	181	Cottle	3	0	0	0	3
Aransas	97	0	0	0	97	Crane	3	0	0	0	3
Archer	2	0	0	0	2	Crockett	4	0	1	0	5
Armstrong	2	0	0	0	2	Crosby	37	0	0	0	37
Atascosa	128	0	0	0	128	Culberson	1	0	0	0	1
Austin	69	0	30	0	99	Dallam	15	0	2	0	17
Bailey	21	0	0	0	21	Dallas	796	2,030	441	0	3,267
Bandera	67	0	11	0	78	Dawson	4	0	3	0	7
Bastrop	184	0	22	0	206	Deaf Smith	113	0	29	0	142
Baylor	14	0	0	0	14	Delta	47	0	0	0	47
Bee	91	0	0	0	91	Denton	563	0	108	0	671
Bell	319	0	136	0	455	De Witt	50	0	0	0	50
Bexar	1,405	796	293	0	2,494	Dickens	1	0	0	0	1
Blanco	31	0	0	0	31	Dimmit	8	0	0	0	8
Borden	0	0	0	0	0	Donley	5	0	0	0	5
Bosque	31	0	0	0	31	Duval	3	0	0	0	3
Bowie	123	0	0	0	123	Eastland	42	0	0	0	42
Brazoria	334	0	81	0	415	Ector	111	0	21	0	132
Brazos	222	0	52	0	274	Edwards	13	0	0	0	13
Brewster	3	0	0	0	3	Ellis	98	0	43	0	141
Briscoe	1	0	0	0	1	El Paso	751	1,350	112	0	2,213
Brooks	3	0	0	0	3	Erath	178	0	16	0	194
Brown	30	0	23	0	53	Falls	12	0	0	0	12
Burleson	179	0	0	0	179	Fannin	105	0	0	0	105
Burnet	28	0	67	0	95	Fayette	68	0	17	0	85
Caldwell	114	0	4	0	118	Fisher	4	0	0	0	4
Calhoun	90	0	0	0	90	Floyd	8	0	0	0	8
Callahan	3	0	0	0	3	Foard	0	0	0	0	0
Cameron	413	2,232	134	0	2,779	Fort Bend	168	0	86	0	254
Camp	12	0	0	0	12	Franklin	7	0	0	0	7
Carson	5	0	0	0	5	Freestone	18	0	0	0	18
Cass	31	0	0	0	31	Frio	4	0	0	0	4
Castro	52	0	0	0	52	Gaines	23	0	0	0	23
Chambers	21	0	0	0	21	Galveston	398	804	3	0	1,205
Cherokee	151	0	0	0	151	Garza	2	0	0	0	2
Childress	3	0	0	0	3	Gillespie	46	0	46	0	92
Clay	5	0	0	0	5	Glasscock	0	0	0	0	0
Cochran	9	0	0	0	9	Goliad	8	0	0	0	8
Coke	7	0	3	0	10	Gonzales	88	0	0	0	88
Coleman	43	0	0	0	43	Gray	32	0	0	0	32
Collin	553	0	237	0	790	Grayson	281	0	33	0	314
Collingsworth	7	0	0	0	7	Gregg	218	0	9	0	227
Colorado	62	0	15	0	77	Grimes	144	0	0	0	144
Comal	541	0	17	0	558	Guadalupe	176	0	8	0	184
Comanche	13	0	0	0	13	Hale	49	0	12	0	61
Concho	0	0	0	0	0	Hall	3	0	0	0	3

## Youth Served in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs Fiscal Year 2012

County	STAR	CYD	SYSN	YRP*	TOTAL	County	STAR	CYD	SYSN	YRP*	TOTAL
Hamilton	5	0	0	0	5	Leon	21	0	0	0	21
Hansford	5	0	15	0	20	Liberty	15	0	0	0	15
Hardeman	71	0	0	0	71	Limestone	18	0	0	0	18
Hardin	49	0	0	0	49	Lipscomb	4	0	0	0	4
Harris	1,168	2,111	569	0	3,848	Live Oak	64	0	1	0	65
Harrison	169	0	38	0	207	Llano	28	0	0	0	28
Hartley	6	0	0	0	6	Loving	0	0	0	0	0
Haskell	16	0	0	0	16	Lubbock	329	870	136	0	1,335
Hays	404	0	80	0	484	Lynn	27	0	0	0	27
Hemphill	1	0	0	0	1	Madison	66	0	0	0	66
Henderson	168	0	0	0	168	Marion	22	0	0	0	22
Hidalgo	547	1,677	300	0	2,524	Martin	2	0	0	0	2
Hill	47	0	20	0	67	Mason	25	0	0	0	25
Hockley	28	0	0	0	28	Matagorda	122	0	16	0	138
Hood	13	0	0	0	13	Maverick	119	0	0	0	119
Hopkins	106	0	9	0	115	McCulloch	30	0	0	0	30
Houston	20	0	0	0	20	McLennan	295	692	8	0	995
Howard	16	0	16	0	32	McMullen	1	0	0	0	1
Hudspeth	3	0	0	0	3	Medina	93	0	0	0	93
Hunt	263	0	93	0	356	Menard	21	0	28	0	49
Hutchinson	40	0	0	0	40	Midland	167	0	0	0	167
Irion	0	0	0	0	0	Milam	101	0	0	0	101
Jack	17	0	3	0	20	Mills	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson	62	0	0	0	62	Mitchell	22	0	0	0	22
Jasper	25	0	0	0	25	Montague	9	0	0	0	9
Jeff Davis	2	0	0	0	2	Montgomery	702	0	15	0	717
Jefferson	273	0	0	0	273	Moore	11	0	0	0	11
Jim Hogg	3	0	0	0	3	Morris	11	0	0	0	11
Jim Wells	152	0	0	0	152	Motley	2	0	0	0	2
Johnson	60	0	2	0	62	Nacogdoches	66	0	29	0	95
Jones	51	0	0	0	51	Navarro	47	0	23	0	70
Karnes	9	0	0	0	9	Newton	17	0	0	0	17
Kaufman	23	0	1	0	24	Nolan	27	0	0	0	27
Kendall	52	0	26	0	78	Nueces	801	1,378	101	0	2,280
Kenedy	0	0	0	0	0	Ochiltree	24	0	10	0	34
Kent	3	0	0	0	3	Oldham	1	0	0	0	1
Kerr	165	0	12	0	177	Orange	79	0	0	0	79
Kimble	29	0	0	0	29	Palo Pinto	36	0	0	0	36
King	0	0	0	0	0	Panola	22	0	0	0	22
Kinney	4	0	0	0	4	Parker	21	0	2	0	23
Kleberg	349	0	32	0	381	Parmer	14	0	0	0	14
Knox	6	0	0	0	6	Pecos	16	0	0	0	16
Lamar	313	0	1	0	314	Polk	57	0	12	0	69
Lamb	8	0	0	0	8	Potter	141	833	12	0	986
Lampasas	8	0	3	0	11	Presidio	18	0	0	0	18
La Salle	1	0	0	0	1	Rains	18	0	0	0	18
Lavaca	43	0	0	0	43	Randall	77	0	10	0	87
Lee	13	0	0	0	13	Reagan	2	0	0	0	2

## Youth Served in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs Fiscal Year 2012

County	STAR	CYD	SYSN	YRP*	TOTAL	County	STAR	CYD	SYSN	YRP*	TOTAL
Real	3	0	0	0	3	Tom Green	300	0	62	0	362
Red River	15	0	0	0	15	Travis	668	1,136	287	0	2,091
Reeves	19	0	0	0	19	Trinity	12	0	16	0	28
Refugio	25	0	0	0	25	Tyler	44	0	0	0	44
Roberts	5	0	0	0	5	Upshur	62	0	0	0	62
Robertson	72	0	0	0	72	Upton	1	0	0	0	1
Rockwall	194	0	17	0	211	Uvalde	76	0	0	0	76
Runnels	26	0	0	0	26	Val Verde	458	0	16	0	474
Rusk	30	0	43	0	73	Van Zandt	158	0	0	0	158
Sabine	20	0	0	0	20	Victoria	509	0	28	0	537
San Augustine	43	0	28	0	71	Walker	11	0	26	0	37
San Jacinto	32	0	1	0	33	Waller	10	0	5	0	15
San Patricio	286	0	11	0	297	Ward	9	0	0	0	9
San Saba	15	0	0	0	15	Washington	110	0	9	0	119
Schleicher	3	0	0	0	3	Webb	347	0	192	0	539
Scurry	58	0	0	0	58	Wharton	202	0	38	0	240
Shackelford	1	0	0	0	1	Wheeler	12	0	0	0	12
Shelby	51	0	0	0	51	Wichita	371	0	173	0	544
Sherman	2	0	2	0	4	Wilbarger	70	0	44	0	114
Smith	329	0	2	0	331	Willacy	139	0	0	0	139
Somervell	12	0	0	0	12	Williamson	660	0	31	0	691
Starr	136	0	0	0	136	Wilson	101	0	4	0	105
Stephens	10	0	1	0	11	Winkler	2	0	0	0	2
Sterling	3	0	0	0	3	Wise	59	0	1	0	60
Stonewall	3	0	0	0	3	Wood	29	0	0	0	29
Sutton	5	0	0	0	5	Yoakum	4	0	0	0	4
Swisher	6	0	0	0	6	Young	21	0	0	0	21
Tarrant	1,188	991	280	0	2,459	Zapata	25	0	0	0	25
Taylor	388	0	119	0	507	Zavala	57	0	0	0	57
Terrell	1	0	0	0	1	Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
Terry	39	0	0	0	39	Out of State	1	0	0	0	1
Throckmorton	1	0	0	0	1	State Total	26,834	16,900	5,273	0	49,007
Titus	89	0	0	0	89						

*STAR - Services to At-Risk Youth*

*CYD - Community Youth Development - Services are provided in select ZIP codes 75216, 75217, 76106, 76707, 77081, 77506, 77550, 78207, 78415, 78501, 78744, 79107, 79415 and 79924..*

*SYSN - Statwide Youth Services Network*

*YRP\* - Youth Resiliency Program*

*\* This program was eliminated as a result of budget cuts during the 82nd legislative session.*



## Families (Primary Caregivers) Served in Child Abuse/Neglect Prevention Programs Fiscal Year 2012

County	CBCAP	FSP*	TFTS	Total	County	CBCAP	FSP*	TFTS	Total
Anderson	0	0	0	0	Cooke	0	0	0	0
Andrews	0	0	0	0	Coryell	0	0	0	0
Angelina	0	0	0	0	Cottle	0	0	0	0
Aransas	0	0	0	0	Crane	0	0	0	0
Archer	0	0	0	0	Crockett	3	0	0	3
Armstrong	0	0	0	0	Crosby	0	0	11	11
Atascosa	28	0	0	28	Culberson	0	0	0	0
Austin	0	0	0	0	Dallam	0	0	0	0
Bailey	0	0	0	0	Dallas	0	0	0	0
Bandera	4	0	0	4	Dawson	0	0	0	0
Bastrop	0	0	0	0	Deaf Smith	0	0	0	0
Baylor	0	0	0	0	Delta	0	0	0	0
Bee	0	0	0	0	Denton	0	0	0	0
Bell	0	0	0	0	De Witt	0	0	0	0
Bexar	111	0	500	611	Dickens	0	0	0	0
Blanco	0	0	5	5	Dimmit	0	0	0	0
Borden	0	0	0	0	Donley	0	0	0	0
Bosque	0	0	0	0	Duval	0	0	0	0
Bowie	0	0	0	0	Eastland	26	0	6	32
Brazoria	0	0	0	0	Ector	0	0	0	0
Brazos	0	0	279	279	Edwards	0	0	0	0
Brewster	0	0	0	0	Ellis	0	0	0	0
Briscoe	0	0	0	0	El Paso	178	0	0	178
Brooks	0	0	0	0	Erath	0	0	0	0
Brown	0	0	179	179	Falls	0	0	0	0
Burleson	0	0	4	4	Fannin	0	0	0	0
Burnet	0	0	0	0	Fayette	0	0	0	0
Caldwell	0	0	0	0	Fisher	0	0	0	0
Calhoun	0	0	0	0	Floyd	0	0	0	0
Callahan	0	0	1	1	Foard	0	0	0	0
Cameron	0	0	0	0	Fort Bend	0	0	0	0
Camp	0	0	0	0	Franklin	0	0	0	0
Carson	0	0	0	0	Freestone	0	0	0	0
Cass	0	0	0	0	Frio	12	0	0	12
Castro	0	0	0	0	Gaines	0	0	0	0
Chambers	0	0	0	0	Galveston	0	0	0	0
Cherokee	0	0	0	0	Garza	0	0	0	0
Childress	0	0	0	0	Gillespie	0	0	0	0
Clay	0	0	0	0	Glasscock	0	0	0	0
Cochran	0	0	0	0	Goliad	0	0	0	0
Coke	0	0	0	0	Gonzales	0	0	0	0
Coleman	0	0	5	5	Gray	0	0	0	0
Collin	0	0	0	0	Grayson	0	0	0	0
Collingsworth	0	0	0	0	Gregg	0	0	0	0
Colorado	0	0	0	0	Grimes	0	0	5	5
Comal	0	0	0	0	Guadalupe	0	0	0	0
Comanche	3	0	10	13	Hale	0	0	33	33
Concho	2	0	1	3	Hall	0	0	0	0

## Families (Primary Caregivers) Served in Child Abuse/Neglect Prevention Programs Fiscal Year 2012

County	CBCAP	FSP*	TFTS	Total	County	CBCAP	FSP*	TFTS	Total
Hamilton	0	0	0	0	Leon	0	0	1	1
Hansford	0	0	0	0	Liberty	0	0	0	0
Hardeman	0	0	0	0	Limestone	0	0	0	0
Hardin	0	0	0	0	Lipscomb	0	0	0	0
Harris	0	0	0	0	Live Oak	0	0	0	0
Harrison	0	0	0	0	Llano	0	0	0	0
Hartley	0	0	0	0	Loving	0	0	0	0
Haskell	0	0	0	0	Lubbock	0	0	254	254
Hays	0	0	0	0	Lynn	0	0	3	3
Hemphill	0	0	0	0	Madison	0	0	15	15
Henderson	0	0	0	0	Marion	0	0	0	0
Hidalgo	0	0	0	0	Martin	0	0	0	0
Hill	0	0	0	0	Mason	0	0	0	0
Hockley	0	0	11	11	Matagorda	0	0	0	0
Hood	0	0	0	0	Maverick	0	0	0	0
Hopkins	0	0	0	0	McCulloch	0	0	17	17
Houston	0	0	0	0	McLennan	0	0	0	0
Howard	0	0	0	0	McMullen	0	0	0	0
Hudspeth	0	0	0	0	Medina	0	0	0	0
Hunt	0	0	0	0	Menard	0	0	0	0
Hutchinson	0	0	0	0	Midland	0	0	0	0
Irion	0	0	0	0	Milam	0	0	0	0
Jack	0	0	0	0	Mills	0	0	11	11
Jackson	0	0	0	0	Mitchell	0	0	0	0
Jasper	0	0	0	0	Montague	2	0	0	2
Jeff Davis	0	0	0	0	Montgomery	0	0	0	0
Jefferson	0	0	0	0	Moore	0	0	0	0
Jim Hogg	0	0	0	0	Morris	0	0	0	0
Jim Wells	0	0	0	0	Motley	0	0	0	0
Johnson	0	0	0	0	Nacogdoches	0	0	0	0
Jones	0	0	0	0	Navarro	0	0	0	0
Karnes	56	0	0	56	Newton	0	0	0	0
Kaufman	0	0	0	0	Nolan	0	0	0	0
Kendall	0	0	0	0	Nueces	0	0	0	0
Kenedy	0	0	0	0	Ochiltree	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	0	0	0	Oldham	0	0	0	0
Kerr	0	0	0	0	Orange	0	0	0	0
Kimble	0	0	0	0	Palo Pinto	0	0	0	0
King	0	0	0	0	Panola	0	0	0	0
Kinney	0	0	0	0	Parker	0	0	0	0
Kleberg	0	0	0	0	Parmer	0	0	0	0
Knox	0	0	0	0	Pecos	0	0	0	0
Lamar	0	0	0	0	Polk	0	0	0	0
Lamb	0	0	0	0	Potter	0	0	0	0
Lampasas	0	0	0	0	Presidio	0	0	0	0
La Salle	0	0	0	0	Rains	0	0	0	0
Lavaca	0	0	0	0	Randall	0	0	0	0
Lee	0	0	0	0	Reagan	0	0	0	0

## Families (Primary Caregivers) Served in Child Abuse/Neglect Prevention Programs Fiscal Year 2012

County	CBCAP	FSP*	TFTS	Total	County	CBCAP	FSP*	TFTS	Total
Real	18	0	0	18	Tom Green	99	0	248	347
Red River	0	0	0	0	Travis	0	0	0	0
Reeves	0	0	0	0	Trinity	0	0	0	0
Refugio	0	0	0	0	Tyler	0	0	0	0
Roberts	0	0	0	0	Upshur	0	0	0	0
Robertson	0	0	19	19	Upton	0	0	0	0
Rockwall	0	0	0	0	Uvalde	0	0	0	0
Runnels	10	0	4	14	Val Verde	0	0	0	0
Rusk	0	0	0	0	Van Zandt	0	0	0	0
Sabine	0	0	0	0	Victoria	0	0	0	0
San Augustine	0	0	0	0	Walker	0	0	0	0
San Jacinto	0	0	0	0	Waller	0	0	0	0
San Patricio	0	0	0	0	Ward	0	0	0	0
San Saba	0	0	9	9	Washington	0	0	12	12
Schleicher	0	0	0	0	Webb	0	0	0	0
Scurry	0	0	0	0	Wharton	0	0	0	0
Shackelford	0	0	0	0	Wheeler	0	0	0	0
Shelby	0	0	0	0	Wichita	22	0	0	22
Sherman	0	0	0	0	Wilbarger	0	0	0	0
Smith	0	0	0	0	Willacy	0	0	0	0
Somervell	0	0	0	0	Williamson	0	0	0	0
Starr	0	0	0	0	Wilson	0	0	0	0
Stephens	0	0	0	0	Winkler	0	0	0	0
Sterling	0	0	0	0	Wise	0	0	0	0
Stonewall	0	0	0	0	Wood	0	0	0	0
Sutton	0	0	0	0	Yoakum	0	0	0	0
Swisher	0	0	0	0	Young	3	0	0	3
Tarrant	0	0	208	208	Zapata	0	0	0	0
Taylor	0	0	0	0	Zavala	0	0	0	0
Terrell	0	0	0	0	Unknown	0	0	0	0
Terry	0	0	19	19	Out of State	0	0	0	0
Throckmorton	0	0	0	0	State Total	577	0	1,870	2,447
Titus	0	0	0	0					

*CBCAP - Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention*

*FSP\* - Family Strengthening Program*

*TFTS - Texas Families: Together and Safe*

*\* This program was eliminated as a result of budget cuts during the 82nd legislative session.*



## Definitions

### Adult Protective Services Program

**Abuse (In-Home)** - The negligent or willful infliction of injury, unreasonable confinement, intimidation, or cruel punishment with resulting physical or emotional harm or pain by a caretaker, family member, or other individual with whom the person who is elderly or disabled has an ongoing relationship.

**Adult** - A person 18 or older, or an emancipated minor.

**Aged or Elderly Person** - A person 65 or older.

**Allegation (In-Home)** - An assertion that a person who is elderly or who is an adult with a disability is in a state of, or at risk of, harm due to abuse, neglect, or exploitation.

**Allegation (Facility Investigations Program)** - A report by an individual that a person receiving services in a state operated and/or contracted setting that serves children and adults with mental illness or intellectual disabilities has been or is in a state of abuse, neglect, or exploitation.

**Alleged Perpetrator - (In-Home)** A person who is reported to be responsible for the abuse, neglect or exploitation of a person who is elderly or who is an adult with a disability.

**Alleged Perpetrator- (Facility Investigations Program)** - Staff employed in a state operated and/or contracted setting that serves persons with mental illness or intellectual disabilities who is reported to have abused, neglected or exploited a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting.

**Alleged Victim - (In-Home)** An elderly person or an adult with a disability who has been reported to adult protective services staff to be in a state of or at risk of abuse, neglect, or exploitation.

**Alleged Victim (Facility Investigations Program)** - A person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting who is alleged to have been abused, neglected, or exploited.

**APS** - Adult Protective Services

**APS In-Home** - The term used to refer to investigations and service delivery related to abuse, neglect, and exploitation of persons who are elderly and adults with disabilities who generally live in non-institutional settings, such as private homes, small foster homes, and legally unlicensed room and board facilities. APS in-home caseworkers investigate exploitation in licensed facilities when the alleged perpetrator is not affiliated with the institution and has an ongoing relationship with the alleged victim. In previous years Adult Protective Services in-home cases have been referred to as “community” cases. To avoid confusion with investigations in community facility centers, the title “community” is no longer used when referring to the APS in-home program area.

**APS Facility Investigations Program** - Investigations conducted by APS related to abuse, neglect, or exploitation of persons with disabilities served by state operated mental health and intellectual disability facilities and/or state contracted settings.

**Capacity to Consent** - Having the mental and physical ability to understand the current problems and the services offered and to accept or reject those services, knowing the consequences of the decision.

**Caretaker** - A guardian, representative payee, or other person who by act, words, or course of conduct has acted so as to cause a reasonable person to conclude that he has accepted the responsibility for protection, food, shelter, or care for a person who is elderly or an adult with a disability.

**Client (In-Home)** - A person who is elderly or an adult with a disability who has been determined in a validated finding to be in need of protective services.

**Confidentiality** - Records relating to the department’s protective clients are not open to public inspection.

**Confirmed (Facility Investigations)** - There is a preponderance of credible evidence to support that abuse, neglect, or exploitation occurred.

**Court-Authorized Entry** - To carry out an investigation of reported abuse, neglect, or exploitation, the court may authorize the department to enter the premises of an elderly person or an adult with a disability.

**Designated Perpetrator - (In-Home)** A person who has been determined in a validated finding to have abused, neglected or exploited an elderly person or an adult with a disability.

**Designated Perpetrator (Facility Investigations Program)** - Staff working in a state operated and/or contracted setting serving persons with mental health, intellectual, or developmental disabilities who has been determined in a confirmed finding to have abused, neglected or exploited a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting.

**Designated Victim (In-Home)** - An elderly person or an adult with a disability for whom a finding of self-neglect or suicidal threat or abuse, neglect, or exploitation by a caretaker, family member or person with an ongoing relationship has been validated.

**Designated Victim (Facility Investigations Program)** - A person served a state operated and/or contracted setting serving persons with mental health, intellectual, or developmental disabilities who has been abused, neglected, or exploited.

**Developmental Disability** - A severe, chronic disability of an individual that:

- results from an intellectual and/or physical impairment;
- begins before age 22;
- is likely to be life-long;
- results in major limitations in three or more areas of everyday functioning (self-care, receptive and expressive language, learning, mobility, self-direction, capacity for independent living, and economic self-sufficiency); and
- reflects the individual's need for special services that are individually planned and coordinated.

**Disabled Person** - A person with a physical, mental, intellectual, or developmental disability that substantially impairs the person's ability to provide adequately for the person's care or protection and who is 18 years of age or older or under 18 years of age and who has had the disabilities of minority removed.

**Purchased Client Services (PCS)** - Purchased client services provided in accordance with §48.002(5) of the Human Resources Code, includes, but is not limited to, emergency shelter, medical and psychiatric assessments, in-home care, residential care, heavy housecleaning, minor home repairs, money management, transportation, emergency food, medication, and other supplies. Specific purchased client services are only provided if those specific services are not available through other state and local resources. A person who is elderly or an adult with disabilities is eligible to receive purchased client services from Adult Protective Services in accordance with §§48.002(5) and 48.202 of the Human Resources Code when a service plan has been developed by the department under these sections that indicates that purchased client services are needed to remedy abuse, neglect, or exploitation. All other available resources must be used where feasible before emergency client services are initiated.

**Emancipated Minor** - A person under age 18 who has the power and capacity of an adult. This includes a minor who has had the disabilities of minority removed by a court of law or a minor who, with or without parental consent, has been married.

**Emotional or Verbal Abuse (In-Home)** - Any use of verbal communication or other behavior to humiliate, intimidate, vilify, degrade, or threaten with harm.

**Emotional or Verbal Abuse (Facility Investigations Program)** - Any act or use of verbal or other communication, including gestures to curse, vilify or degrade a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting, or threaten a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting with physical or emotional harm. The act or communication must result in observable distress or harm to the person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting, or

be of such nature that a reasonable person would consider it harmful or causing distress.

**Exploitation (In-Home)** - The illegal or improper act or process of a caretaker, family member, or other individual who has an ongoing relationship with a person who is elderly or disabled using the resources of the person who is elderly or disabled for monetary or personal benefit, profit, or gain without the informed consent of the person who is elderly or disabled.

**Exploitation (Facility Investigations Program)** - The illegal or improper act or process of using a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting or the resources of a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting for monetary or personal benefit, profit, or gain when the alleged perpetrator is an employee, agent, or contractor.

**Facility** - State Supported Living Centers (SSLC), State Hospitals, privately operated ICF/IDD, and the Rio Grande State Center.

**Facility Non-Institutional Settings** - Home and Community-Based Waiver (HCS-W) services, Texas Home Living Waiver program and Community Centers. Community Centers may contract to provide a number of services including privately operated Intermediate Care Facilities for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF-IID), home and community-based services (HCS) and adult day programs.

**False Reports** - A person commits an offense if the person knowingly or intentionally reports information that the person knows is false or lacks factual foundation. Such an offense is a Class B misdemeanor.

**Immunity** - A person filing a report, participating in an investigation, testifying, or participating in any judicial proceeding arising from a petition, report, or investigation is immune from civil or criminal liability. A person, including an authorized department volunteer, medical personnel, or law enforcement officer, who participates in an investigation or the provision of services is also immune as long as the person is acting in good faith.

**Incapacitated Person** - An adult individual who, because of a physical or mental condition is substantially unable to provide food, clothing, or shelter for himself or herself, to care for the individual's own physical health, or to manage the individual's own financial affairs; a missing person; or a person who must have a guardian appointed to receive funds due the person from any governmental source. (A minor is also a legally incapacitated person.)

**Incidence of Maltreatment** - Ratio of the number of validated APS in-home cases in a geographic area to the total population in that area of persons who are elderly and persons who have disabilities.

**Inconclusive (Facility Investigations)** - There is not a preponderance of credible evidence to indicate that abuse, neglect, or exploitation did or did not occur due to lack of witnesses or other available evidence.

**Information Management Protecting Adults and Children in Texas (IMPACT)** - The browser-based software application by which Adult Protective Services (APS) and Child Protective Services (CPS) staff document cases.

**Intake Priorities (In-Home)** - In establishing priorities, the department defines the time frames for beginning an investigation and for conducting a face-to-face interview with the alleged victim. Adult Protective Services' priorities are based on the degree of severity and immediacy of the alleged harm to the individual.

**Priority I** - APS reports that allege the victim is in a state of serious harm or is in danger of death from abuse or neglect. The caseworker must attempt a face-to-face visit with the alleged victim within 24 hours of the department's receipt of a Priority I report, which may include, but is not limited to, the following:

1. Serious injuries. Examples: spinal injury, fractured ribs puncturing lung, head injury, severe burns, broken hip, internal injuries.
2. Lack of life-sustaining medication.
3. Serious threats by caretaker to harm or kill alleged victim.
4. Lack of basic physical necessities severe enough to result in freezing, starvation, or dehydration.
5. Need for immediate medical attention to treat conditions that could result in irreversible physical harm, e.g.,

- unconsciousness, acute pain, severe respiratory distress, gangrene, hemorrhaging, severe malnutrition.
- 6. Suicide threats or attempts unless there is clearly no immediate danger to the alleged victim.
- 7. Sexual abuse when there is danger of repeated abuse.
- 8. No caretaker is available; the alleged victim is unable to perform critical personal care activities, and his needs cannot be met by community care services.

**Priority II** - APS reports that allege the victim is abused, neglected, or exploited and as a result is at risk of serious harm. The caseworker must attempt a face-to-face visit with the alleged victim within three calendar days of the department's receipt of a Priority II report. For example, if the intake was received on September 1, the caseworker must attempt a face-to-face visit on or before September 4. Priority II reports may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Critical need for mental health or medical treatment. Examples: suicidal but no immediate danger, overly aggressive behavior, open bedsores or other open wounds, malnutrition, sprains, fractures, or disease or illness of an acute nature.
2. Falling or being pushed, hit, or scratched, which is reported to have resulted in bruises, other injuries, or severe mental anguish.
3. Inadequate attention to physical needs. Examples: insufficient food or medicine.
4. Illegal or improper use of alleged victim's income or resources to the degree that alleged victim is unable to meet basic subsistence needs or is threatened with substantial loss of income or resources.
5. Unreasonable confinement.
6. Sexual abuse of the alleged victim by the caretaker, but clearly no immediate danger of repeated abuse.
7. Caretaker has threatened physical violence that would cause harm to the alleged victim.
8. Living conditions that pose a serious health or safety hazard. Examples: fecal contamination, dead animals, major structural damage to shelter.
9. Imminent eviction from a nursing home because the alleged victim's representative has failed to use the alleged victim's income to pay for his care.
10. Threatened loss of caretaker when the alleged victim is dependent for basic needs.

**Priority III** - Consists of all other APS reports that allege the victim is in a state of abuse or neglect. The caseworker must attempt a face-to-face visit with the alleged victim within seven calendar days of the department's receipt of a Priority III report. For example, if the intake was received on September 1, the caseworker must attempt a face-to-face visit on or before September 8. Priority III reports may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Verbal or emotional abuse. Examples: harassment, cursing, degrading remarks, intimidation.
2. Marginal care or threatened withdrawal of care by caretaker when the alleged victim needs some assistance with his basic activities of daily living.
3. Falling or being pushed, hit, or scratched when such actions are not reported to result in bruises, other injuries, or severe mental anguish.
4. Need for mental health or medical treatment that is not urgent. Examples: mild depression, delusional thinking that is not dangerous to the alleged victim or others, poor nutrition, or disease or illness that is not acute.

**Priority IV** - APS reports that allege exploitation when there is no danger of imminent impoverishment or deprivation of basic needs. The caseworker must attempt a face-to-face visit with the alleged victim within 14 calendar days from the date the department receives a Priority IV report. For example, if the intake was received on September 1, the caseworker must attempt a face-to-face visit on or before September 15. Priority IV reports may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Lack of appropriate contribution to food and shelter expenses by household members.



2. Misuse of a nursing home resident's personal needs allowance by someone who is not affiliated with the nursing home. (If the alleged perpetrator is an employee of the nursing home, the report is referred to the Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services.)
3. Improper use of income or resources but the alleged victim's needs are still met.
4. Exploitation that is not ongoing and is not likely to recur.

#### **Intake Priorities for Facility Investigations Program -**

**Priority I** - Priority I reports have a serious risk that a delay in the investigation will impede the collection of evidence, or allege that the victim has been subjected to maltreatment by an act or omission that caused or may have caused serious physical or emotional harm. Priority I reports include, but are not limited to: death, sexual abuse, serious physical abuse injury, serious verbal or emotional abuse, or incitement to harm self or others. The investigator must attempt a face-to-face contact with the alleged victim within 24 hours of receipt of the report by the department.

**Priority II** - Priority II reports have some risk that a delay in investigation will impede the collection of evidence, or allege that the victim has been subjected to maltreatment by act or omission that caused or may have caused non-serious physical injury, or emotional harm not included in Priority I. Priority II reports include, but are not limited to, the following: non-serious physical injury, non-serious verbal/emotional abuse, and/or exploitation. The investigator must attempt a face-to-face contact with the alleged victim within three calendar days of receipt of the report by the department.

**Priority III** - Priority III reports allege maltreatment that would otherwise be classified as Priority I or II but the alleged incident occurred more than 30 days prior to the date of the report and there is no known or perceived risk. The investigator must attempt a face-to-face contact with the alleged victim within seven calendar days of receipt of the report by the department. Investigations in SSLCs and the ICF-IID component of the Rio Grande State Center can only be PI or PII.

**Institution** - An establishment that furnishes, in one or more facilities, food and shelter to four or more persons who are unrelated to the proprietor of the establishment and provides minor treatment under the direction and supervision of a physician licensed by the Texas State Board of Medical Examiners, or other services that meet some need beyond the basic provision of food, shelter, and laundry.

**Invalid (In-Home)**- based on the standard of preponderance of the evidence, it is more likely than not that the abuse, neglect or exploitation did not occur.

**Least Restrictive Alternative** - An action or service that protects a client while allowing personal autonomy to the fullest degree possible.

**Neglect (In-Home)** - The failure to provide for one's self the goods or services, including medical services, which are necessary to avoid physical or emotional harm or pain or the failure of a caretaker to provide the goods or services.

**Neglect (Facility Investigations Program)** - When the alleged perpetrator is an employee, agent, or contractor of a state operated and/or contracted facility serving persons with mental health, intellectual, or developmental disabilities, neglect is defined as a negligent act or omission by any individual responsible for providing services to a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting, which caused or may have caused physical or emotional injury or death to a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting or which placed a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting at risk of physical or emotional injury or death. Neglect includes, but is not limited to, the failure to:

1. establish or carry out an appropriate individual program plan or treatment plan for a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting, if such failure results in a specific incident or allegation involving a person served by a facility or program;
2. provide adequate nutrition, clothing, or health care to a specific person served in a state operated and/or

contracted setting residential or inpatient program; or

3. provide a safe environment for a specific person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting, including the failure to maintain adequate numbers of appropriately trained staff if such failure results in a specific incident or allegation involving a person served by a facility or program.

**Objection to Medical Treatment** - Medical treatment may not be ordered for clients who object to treatment on religious grounds.

**Physical Abuse (Facility Investigations Program)** - When the alleged perpetrator is an employee, agent, or contractor of a state operated and/or contracted facility serving persons with mental health, intellectual, or developmental disabilities, physical abuse is defined as:

1. an act or failure to act performed knowingly, recklessly, or intentionally, including incitement to act, which caused or may have caused physical injury or death to a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting;
2. an act of inappropriate or excessive force or corporal punishment, regardless of whether the act results in a physical injury to a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting; or
3. the use of chemical or bodily restraints on a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting not in compliance with federal and state laws and regulations.

**Protective Services (In-Home)** - The services furnished by the department or by a protective services agency to a person who is elderly or who has a disability and has been determined to be in a state of abuse, exploitation, or neglect. These services may include social casework, case management, and arranging for psychiatric and health evaluation, home care, day care, social services, health care, and other services consistent with chapter 48 of the Human Resource Code. Protective services are provided in In-Home cases and to recipients of HCSW services.

**Reporter** - A person who makes a referral to Adult Protective Services staff about a situation of alleged abuse, neglect, or exploitation of a person who is elderly or has a disability.

**Sexual Abuse (In-Home)** - Any involuntary or non-consensual sexual conduct including conduct that would constitute an offense under Section 21.08, Penal Code, or Chapter 22, Penal Code.

**Sexual Abuse (Facility Investigations Program)** - any sexual activity, by an employee, agent, or contractor of a state operated and/or contracted facility serving persons with mental health, intellectual, or developmental disabilities, including but not limited to:

1. kissing a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting with sexual intent;
2. hugging a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting with sexual intent;
3. stroking a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting with sexual intent;
4. fondling a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting with sexual intent;
5. engaging in with a person served served in a state operated and/or contracted setting:
  - sexual conduct as defined in the Texas Penal Code, §43.01; or
  - any activity that is obscene as defined in the Texas Penal Code, §43.21;
6. requesting, soliciting, or compelling a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting with to engage in:
  - sexual conduct as defined in the Texas Penal Code, §43.01; or
  - any activity that is obscene as defined in the Texas Penal Code, §43.21;
7. in the presence of a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting:
  - engaging in or displaying any activity that is obscene, as defined in the Texas Penal Code §43.21; or

- requesting, soliciting, or compelling another person to engage in any activity that is obscene, as defined in the Texas Penal Code §43.21;
8. committing sexual exploitation as defined in §711.15 of this title (relating to “How is sexual exploitation defined?”) against a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting;
  9. committing sexual assault as defined in the Texas Penal Code §22.011, against a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting;
  10. committing aggravated sexual assault as defined in the Texas Penal Code, §22.021, against a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting; and
  11. causing, permitting, encouraging, engaging in, or allowing the photographing, filming, videotaping, or depicting of a person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting if the employee, agent, or contractor knew or should have known that the resulting photograph, film, videotape, or depiction of the person served in a state operated and/or contracted setting is obscene as defined in the Texas Penal Code, §43.21, or is pornographic.

**Unable to Determine (In-Home)** - a preponderance of the available evidence is insufficient to support a finding of Valid or Invalid.

**Unconfirmed (Facility Investigations Program)** - there is a preponderance of credible evidence to support that abuse, neglect, or exploitation did not occur.

**Unfounded (Facility Investigations Program)**- evidence gathered indicates that the allegation is spurious or patently without factual basis.

**Valid (In-Home)** - based on the standard of preponderance of the evidence, it is more likely than not that the abuse, neglect or exploitation occurred.

## Child Protective Services Program

**CPS Abuse and Neglect Definitions**-The principal governing legislation for CPS investigations is Chapter 261 of the Texas Family Code (TFC). The TFC definitions of abuse or neglect investigated by CPS are:

**Physical Abuse** - Physical injury that results in substantial harm to the child, or the genuine threat of substantial harm from physical injury to the child, including an injury that is at variance with the history or explanation given and excluding an accident or reasonable discipline by a parent, guardian, or managing or possessory conservator that does not expose the child to a substantial risk of harm; failure to make a reasonable effort to prevent an action by another person that results in physical injury that results in substantial harm to the child; the current use by a person of a controlled substance as defined by Chapter 481, Health and Safety Code, in a manner or to the extent that the use results in physical injury to a child; or causing, expressly permitting, or encouraging a child to use a controlled substance as defined by Chapter 481, Health and Safety Code.

**Sexual Abuse** - Sexual conduct harmful to a child's mental, emotional, or physical welfare, including conduct that constitutes the offense of indecency with a child under Section 21.11, Penal Code, sexual assault under Section 22.011, Penal Code, or aggravated sexual assault under Section 22.021, Penal Code; failure to make a reasonable effort to prevent sexual conduct harmful to a child; compelling or encouraging a child to engage in sexual conduct as defined by Section 43.01, Penal Code; causing, permitting, encouraging, engaging in, or allowing the photographing, filming, or depicting of the child if the person knew or should have known that the resulting photograph, film, or depiction of the child is obscene (as defined by the Penal Code) or pornographic; or causing, permitting, encouraging, engaging in, or allowing a sexual performance by a child as defined by 43.25, Penal Code.

**Emotional Abuse** - Mental or emotional injury to a child that results in an observable and material impairment in the child's growth, development, or psychological functioning; causing or permitting the child to be in a situation in which the child sustains a mental or emotional injury that results in an observable and material impairment in the child's growth, development, or psychological functioning; or the current use by a person of a controlled substance as defined by Chapter 481, Health and Safety Code, in a manner or to the extent that the use results in mental, or emotional injury to a child.

**Neglectful Supervision** - Placing the child in or failing to remove the child from a situation that a reasonable person would realize requires judgment or actions beyond the child's level of maturity, physical condition, or mental abilities and that results in bodily injury or a substantial risk of immediate harm to the child; or placing a child in or failing to remove the child from a situation in which the child would be exposed to a substantial risk of sexual conduct harmful to the child.

**Medical Neglect** - Failing to seek, obtain, or follow through with medical care for a child, with the failure resulting in or presenting a substantial risk of death, disfigurement, or bodily injury or with the failure resulting in an observable and material impairment to the growth, development, or functioning of the child.

**Physical Neglect** - Failure to provide the child with food, clothing, or shelter necessary to sustain the life or health of the child, excluding failure caused primarily by financial inability unless relief services had been offered and refused.

**Refusal to Assume Parental Responsibility** - Failure by the person responsible for a child's care, custody, or welfare to permit the child to return to the child's home without arranging for the necessary care for the child after the child has been absent from the home for any reason, including having been in residential placement or having run away.

**Abandonment** - The leaving of a child in a situation where the child would be exposed to a substantial risk of physical or mental harm, without arranging for necessary care for the child, and a demonstration of an intent not to return by a parent, guardian, or managing or possessory conservator of the child.

**Children in Foster Care** - All children in DFPS' legal responsibility who are in a placement paid by DFPS or other public facility. These placements include foster homes, foster group homes, institutions, residential treatment facilities, and juvenile facilities. This is a subset of Children in Substitute Care.

**Children in Substitute Care** - Children in Substitute Care - Children under 18 years of age in DFPS' legal responsibility who are removed and placed outside their own home (home of origin). This includes foster homes, institutions, foster group homes, residential treatment facilities, hospitals, adoptive homes, juvenile facilities, kinship care placements, and independent living arrangements. Also included are the youth who age out of DFPS' legal responsibility and continue in foster care placements to complete vocational training by age 19 or to graduate from high school before they turn 22 years old.

**Kinship care**- The term used to describe those situations in which children, who are no longer able to live with their own parents, are cared for by relatives or other people known as “fictive kin” that have a significant relationship with the child or the child's family, such as a God Parent or family friend.

**Verified Kinship Caregiver (Foster Parent)** - A verified kinship caregiver is licensed or verified as a foster parent to provide 24-hour residential care for a child, in accordance with Chapter 42 of the Human Resources Code and related regulations. Verification as a foster parent is offered by either DFPS through the CPS Foster and Adoptive Home Development program (FAD); or a private child-placing agency.

**Children in the Legal Responsibility of the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services** - All children for whom the courts have appointed the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services legal responsibility by temporary or permanent managing conservatorship or other court ordered legal basis. These children may be residing in an out-of-home placement or may have been returned to their own home (home of origin). When there is an immediate danger to the physical health or safety of a child, the Texas Family Code(TFC) provides three options for intervention by DFPS into a family: (1) emergency removal of the child from the home prior to obtaining a court order; (2) removal of the child after obtaining an ex parte order; or, (3) removal of the child after notice and hearing. Within 14 days from the date the child is taken into possession, a Full Adversary Hearing is held at which time the child is either returned home or if there is a continuing danger, temporary orders for managing conservatorship are issued. Within 12 months from the order appointing DFPS as the child's temporary managing conservator, the court must either return the child to the parent and dismiss the suit, appoint a parent, relative, or DFPS as managing conservator on a permanent basis, or grant a one-time extension of the lawsuit, not to exceed 180 days.

**CPS Investigations of Child Abuse and Neglect** - The agency is required by state law to conduct civil investigations of reports of suspected child abuse or neglect. The objectives of the investigation are to ensure child safety, determine whether abuse or neglect occurred, determine whether children are at risk for abuse or neglect in the future, provide child or family needed safety services and refer the family to services available in the community, if needed. At the conclusion of the investigation, staff must assign a disposition to each allegation to specify conclusion regarding the occurrence of abuse or neglect. The dispositions that staff must use are: Reason to Believe, Ruled Out, Unable to Complete, or Unable to Determine.

**Intake Priorities** - To establish time frames for investigations, CPS assigns each report of child abuse and neglect to one of two priority groups. The level of identified risk and child safety concerns determine the priority assigned. Initial assessment regarding the immediacy of risk and severity of harm to the child are based on information provided by the reporter and other available information about the alleged perpetrators, child vulnerability, prior history, specific nature of the harm, and whether the harm has occurred.

The two priority groups are as follows:

**Priority I** - Intake reports that concern children who appear to face an immediate risk of abuse or neglect that could result in death or serious harm. CPS must initiate the investigation within 24 hours of receiving a Priority I report.

**Priority II** - All reports of abuse or neglect that are not assigned as Priority I are assigned as Priority II. These are reports that contain allegations of abuse or neglect in which there does not appear to be an immediate threat of serious harm or death. CPS must initiate the investigation within 72 hours of receiving a Priority II report. The initial priority may be changed if information gathered during the intake stage indicates that the abuse or neglect is either more or less serious than originally reported.

**Service Level** - DFPS seeks to place each child in the department's conservatorship with a foster caregiver who is well qualified to meet the child's needs. To achieve this, the department participates in a statewide system for classifying the needs of children and the capabilities of foster caregivers in four Service Levels:

**a) What is the description of the Basic Service Level?**

The Basic Service Level consists of a supportive setting, preferably in a family, that is designed to maintain or improve the child's functioning, including:

- (1) routine guidance and supervision to ensure the child's safety and sense of security;
- (2) affection, reassurance, and involvement in activities appropriate to the child's age and development to promote the child's well-being;
- (3) contact, in a manner that is deemed in the best interest of the child, with family members and other persons significant to the child to maintain a sense of identity and culture; and
- (4) access to therapeutic, habilitative, and medical intervention and guidance from professionals or paraprofessionals, on an as-needed basis, to help the child maintain functioning appropriate to the child's age and development.

**b) What is the description of the Moderate Service Level?**

(a) The Moderate Service Level consists of a structured supportive setting, preferably in a family, in which most activities are designed to improve the child's functioning including:

- (1) more than routine guidance and supervision to ensure the child's safety and sense of security;
- (2) affection, reassurance, and involvement in structured activities appropriate to the child's age and development to promote the child's well-being;
- (3) contact, in a manner that is deemed in the best interest of the child, with family members and other persons significant to the child to maintain a sense of identity and culture; and
- (4) access to therapeutic, habilitative, and medical intervention and guidance from professionals or paraprofessionals to help the child attain or maintain functioning appropriate to the child's age and development.

(b) In addition to the description in subsection (a) of this section, a child with primary medical or habilitative needs may require intermittent interventions from a skilled caregiver who has demonstrated competence.

**c) What is the description of the Specialized Service Level?**

(a) The Specialized Service Level consists of a treatment setting, preferably in a family, in which caregivers have specialized training to provide therapeutic, habilitative, and medical support and interventions including -

- (1) 24-hour supervision to ensure the child's safety and sense of security, which includes close monitoring and increased limit setting;
- (2) affection, reassurance, and involvement in therapeutic activities appropriate to the child's age and development to promote the child's well-being;
- (3) contact, in a manner that is deemed in the best interest of the child, with family members and other persons significant to the child to maintain a sense of identity and culture; and
- (4) therapeutic, habilitative, and medical intervention and guidance that is regularly scheduled and professionally designed and supervised to help the child attain functioning appropriate to the child's age and development.

(b) In addition to the description in subsection (a) of this section, a child with primary medical or habilitative needs may require regular interventions from a caregiver who has demonstrated competence.

**d) What is the description of the Intense Service Level?**

(a) The Intense Service Level consists of a high degree of structure, preferably in a family, to limit the child's access to environments as necessary to protect the child. The caregivers have specialized training to provide intense therapeutic and habilitative supports and interventions with limited outside access, including -

- (1) 24-hour supervision to ensure the child's safety and sense of security, which includes frequent one-to-

one monitoring with the ability to provide immediate on-site response.

- (2) affection, reassurance, and involvement in therapeutic activities appropriate to the child's age and development to promote the child's well-being;
  - (3) contact, in a manner that is deemed in the best interest of the child, with family members and other persons significant to the child, to maintain a sense of identity and culture;
  - (4) therapeutic, habilitative, and medical intervention and guidance that is frequently scheduled and professionally designed and supervised to help the child attain functioning more appropriate to the child's age and development; and
  - (5) consistent and frequent attention, direction, and assistance to help the child attain stabilization and connect appropriately with the child's environment.
- (b) In addition to the description in subsection (a) of this section, a child with developmental delays or intellectual disabilities needs professionally directed, designed and monitored interventions to enhance mobility, communication, sensory, motor, and cognitive development, and self-help skills.
- (c) In addition to the description in subsection (a) of this section, a child with primary medical or habilitative needs requires frequent and consistent interventions. The child may be dependent on people or technology for accommodation and require interventions designed, monitored, or approved by an appropriately constituted interdisciplinary team.

**Permanency Goal Definitions** - Permanency goals for children must be one of the following:

- 1) **Family Preservation** - identifies a child's own home as the safe and permanent living situation toward which CPS services are directed, without removing the child from the home.
- 2) **Family Reunification** - identifies that the child was removed from his or her home and that with CPS assistance, the family appears able and willing to reduce the risk of abuse or neglect enough for the child to return home and live there safely for the foreseeable future.
- 3) **Alternative Family Placement with Long Term Commitment** - indicates that the child has been removed from the home, family reunification is not appropriate, and a family has been found or is being sought as follows:
  - (A) adoption and care by a relative;
  - (B) permanent conservatorship and care by a relative;
  - (C) adoption and care by an unrelated family;
  - (D) permanent conservatorship and care by an unrelated family;
  - (E) care by a foster family with DFPS having permanent conservatorship;
  - (F) care in some other family arrangement with DFPS having permanent conservatorship;
- 4) **Another Planned Living Arrangement with Support of a Family** - indicates that the youth has been removed from the home, family reunification or another higher ranking permanency goal is not appropriate, and CPS will provide services directed toward:
  - (A) preparation for independent living, for youth who are at least 16 years old and have no developmental disability; or
  - (B) preparation for adult living with community assistance in the most integrated setting, for youth who are at least 18 years old and who have a developmental disability.

**Recidivism** - Refers to the re-occurrence of child abuse or neglect involving confirmed victims where the second incidence occurs within six months of the first incidence.

**Reports of Child Abuse and Neglect** - The agency receives many reports of children who are in situations that are not optimal for their growth or development, but do not appear to involve child abuse or neglect as defined by law. Only the reports that appear to meet the statutory definition of abuse or neglect are required by state law to be

investigated by the agency.

**Risk Assessment of Child Abuse/Neglect** - CPS workers investigate allegations of abuse and neglect and make assessments regarding risk. The terms “at risk” and “not at risk” are conclusions regarding whether there is a reasonable likelihood that the child will be abused or neglected in the foreseeable future. The decision to provide services is based on the assessment of risk, not on the disposition of the allegations. Risk assessment is a casework process in which the worker explores individual and family functioning associated with the recurrence of abuse or neglect, and individual and family strengths and resources associated with protective capacities. There are four possible risk findings:

- **No Significant Risk Factors** - No significant risk factors were identified in the family’s current situation or history.
- **Risk Factors Controlled** - Risk factors were identified; however, family strengths and available resources are sufficient to provide for the safety of the child without CPS assistance.
- **Risk Indicated** - Risk factors were identified, and there are not sufficient family strengths and available resources to manage the risk conditions without CPS assistance.
- **Risk Assessment Not Applicable**- This finding is documented if the investigation involved school personnel or an only child who died, or the investigation was administratively closed or given a disposition of “unable to complete”.

By using a risk-based system for provision of services, CPS is able to identify children in need of protection and direct its resources to those most in need.



## Child Care Licensing Program

### Daycare

- Licensed Child-Care Centers
- Licensed Child-Care Homes
- Registered Child-Care Homes
- Listed Family Homes

### 24-Hour Residential Care

- Foster Family Homes
- Foster Group Homes
- General Residential
- Child-Placing Agencies
- Maternity homes

### Definitions:

**Abuse** - An intentional, knowing, or reckless act or omission by someone working under the auspices of an operation that causes or may cause emotional harm or physical injury to, or the death of, a child served by the operation. See the Texas Family Code, §261.401(a)(1) and DFPS Rules, 40 TAC, §§745.8553 745.8557.

**Administrative Review** - An informal review meant to give certain individuals or operations the opportunity to dispute a specific Licensing decision or action.

**Adverse Actions** - A type of remedial action that Licensing may impose to address a deficiency. This action may require closure of an operation or the addition of permanent restrictions or conditions to a permit. The four types of adverse actions are - denial, adverse amendment, suspension, and revocation.

**Application Process** - The application process for licensed and registered operations involves a pre-application interview, inquiry meeting, or orientation; the submission of the application materials; public notice and hearing requirements for residential child-care operations; reviewing the application for compliance with minimum standards, rules and statutes; accepting the application as completed or returning it if incomplete; and the decision to issue or deny. Listed homes are not required to attend a pre-application interview or orientation.

**Background Checks** - Searches of different databases that are conducted on an individual. There are three types of background checks: criminal history checks conducted by the Department of Public Safety for crimes committed in the State of Texas, criminal history checks conducted by the FBI for crimes committed anywhere in the U.S., and central registry checks conducted by DFPS. The central registry is a database of people who have been found by Child Protective Services, Adult Protective Services, or Licensing to have abused or neglected a child or vulnerable adult. Background checks are conducted on child care providers, foster and adoptive parents (and their household members), and child-placing staff. Background checks are also conducted on employees at licensed operations as well as at registered and listed family homes. Rules are in place to dictate which types of background checks are required of each person. For more information about these requirements, see 40 Texas Administrative Code §§.745.615.

**Before or After-school Program** - A type of licensed center that provides care before or after or before and after the customary school day and during school holidays, for at least two hours a day, three days a week, to children who attend pre-kindergarten through grade six.

**Branch Office** - Office space used by a child-placing agency (CPA) separate from the main office or Texas headquarters for the CPA. A branch office is at a location other than the location for which the CPA is licensed/certified. A branch office operates under the license issued to the CPA and performs many of the same functions as the main office of the CPA.

**Capacity** - The maximum number of children that a permit holder may care for at one time.

**Care Types** - The type of care offered by a licensed center or general residential operation based on the months, days, and hours of operation, the ages of the children in care, or the services provided. Care types for Licensed Centers include Child Care Program, Before or After School Program, School Age Program, and Temporary Shelter Program. Care types for General Residential Operations include Child Care Services Only, Emergency Care Services Only, Multiple Services, or Residential Treatment Center. This information reflects the law that was in effect through August 31, 2011.

**Caregiver** - A person whose duties include the supervision, guidance, and protection of a child or children.

**Central Registry** - A subset of data within the IMPACT system of people who have been found by CPS, APS, or CCL to have abused or neglected a child or vulnerable adult.

**Child-Care Administrator** - A person who supervises and exercises direct control over a general residential child-care operation, and who is responsible for the operation's program and personnel, regardless of whether he or she has an ownership interest in the operation or shares duties with anyone.

**Child-Care Facility** - An establishment subject to regulation by Licensing that provides assessment, care, training, education, custody, treatment, or supervision for a child who is not related by blood, marriage, or adoption to the owner or operator of the facility, for all or part of the 24-hour day, whether or not the establishment operates for profit or charges for its services. A child-care facility includes the people, administration, governing body, activities on or off the premises, operations, buildings, grounds, equipment, furnishings, and materials.

**Child Care Licensing (CCL)** - The division within DFPS that regulates child day care operations, residential child-care operations, other child-care activities, and the licensing of child-care administrators and child-placing agency administrators.

**Child Care Licensing Law** - Chapter 42 of the Human Resources Code.

**Child-Placing Agency (CPA)** - A person, including an organization, other than the parents of a child who plans for the placement of or places a child in a child-care operation, foster home or adoptive home. A CPA is a licensed residential child-care operation that verifies and regulates its own foster homes and approves adoptive homes subject to DFPS minimum standard rules.

**Child-Placing Agency Administrator** - A person who supervises and exercises direct control over a child-placing agency and who is responsible for the operation's program and personnel, regardless of whether he or she has an ownership interest in the operation or shares duties with anyone.

**CLASS** - Child Care Licensing Automation Support System. A case-management computer application used by DFPS licensing staff and is the system of record for many licensing activities.

**Complete Application** - A packet of materials submitted by an applicant that contains all of the documentation required to apply for a permit.

**Corrective Action** - A type of remedial action that Licensing may impose to help an operation improve compliance without requiring it to close. The two types of corrective actions include evaluation and probation. Corrective actions are not imposed on listed family homes.

**CPA Adoptive Home** - A person or persons approved by a CPA to adopt a child or children.

**CPA Foster Family Home** - A home verified by a child-placing agency to provide care for six or fewer children up to the age of 18 years. The Child-Placing Agency issues verifications, inspects, and may investigate its homes to ensure compliance with minimum standards. Also known as an agency foster family home.

**CPA Foster Group Home** - A home verified by a child-placing agency to provide care for seven to 12 children up to the age of 18 years. The child-placing agency issues verifications, inspects, and may investigate its homes to ensure compliance with minimum standards. Also known as an agency foster group home.

**Deficiency** - Any failure to comply with a minimum standard rule, law, specific terms associated with a permit, or

condition of a remedial action. Also referred to as a violation.

**Director** - An adult designated to have daily, on-site responsibility for a licensed day care facility, including maintaining compliance with the minimum standards and licensing laws.

**e-Application** - An electronic version of the application for a permit to operate a child-care operation.

**Enforcement Team Conferences** - A conference held to thoroughly review the investigations and inspections of a child-placing agency and all of its agency homes to monitor and enforce compliance by the child-placing agency with rules and standards. Enforcement Team Conferences also began for residential treatment centers starting in fiscal year 2011.

**Evaluation** - A type of corrective action in which a corrective action plan is imposed that may include conditions beyond the minimum standard rules and the basic permit requirements. During the evaluation period, inspections are conducted more frequently to assist the operation in meeting conditions, improving compliance, and assessing risk to children in care.

**Exempt from Regulation** - Certain facilities or programs can operate legally without receiving a permit from Licensing. A facility or program exempt from regulation is not required to comply with Licensing's statutes and rules.

**Follow-Up Inspection** - Inspections that include evaluating individual standards, conditions, or restrictions, rather than evaluating an entire subchapter of minimum standards

**Foster Family Home (Independent)** - A licensed operation that provides residential child-care for six or fewer children up to the age of 18 years. An independent foster family home is not affiliated with a CPA but is monitored and regulated directly by the DFPS Licensing Division. See CPA foster family home for a home verified (monitored and regulated) by a child-placing agency (CPA).

**Foster Group Home (Independent)** - A licensed operation that provides residential care for seven to 12 children up to the age of 18 years. An independent foster group home is not affiliated with a CPA but is monitored and regulated directly by the DFPS Licensing Division. See CPA foster group home for a home verified (monitored and regulated) by a child-placing agency (CPA).

**General Residential Operation** - A residential child-care operation that provides child care for 13 or more children under age 18 and may provide various treatment services or programmatic services. Residential Treatment Centers, a subset of general residential operations, provide care exclusively for children requiring treatment services for emotional disorders.

**Illegal Operation** - An operation that provides child care that is subject to regulation, but does not have a permit.

**IMPACT** - Information Management Protecting Adults and Children in Texas, a case-management computer application used by DFPS staff. IMPACT is the statewide automated child welfare information system (SACWIS) for Texas.

**Inspection** - The physical presence of licensing staff at an operation to determine an operation's compliance with the child-care licensing law and DFPS rules. Inspection Types: Monitoring, Investigation, Follow-up, Other, and Sampling. See specific definitions in this section.

**Investigation** - An action conducted by licensing staff when a report is received alleging a violation of the minimum standards/law or abuse/neglect. An investigation is conducted to determine the validity of the allegations and to ensure the protection of children in care.

**Investigation Inspection** - Inspections that include the investigation of reports alleging abuse, neglect, violation of the law, violations of administrative rule, minimum standard rules, or a combination of these

**Issuance** - The Licensing division issues a permit to an operation after it determines that an operation or home has met minimum standards and is approved to operate as a child-care operation.

**Licensed Child-Care Center** - An operation providing care for seven or more children under age 14 for less than 24

hours per day at a location other than the permit holder's home. A licensed center may also be referred to as a day-care center and includes the care types Child Care Program, Before or After-School Program, School-Age Program, and Temporary Shelter Program.

**Licensed Child-Care Home** - A child day-care operation that is licensed. The primary caregiver provides care in the caregiver's own residence for children from birth through age 13. The total number of children in care varies with the ages of the children, but the total number of children in care at any given time, including the children related to the caregiver, must not exceed 12.

**Listed Family Home** - Listed Family Homes provide child care on a regular basis (at least 4 hours per day, 3 or more days a week, for 3 or more consecutive weeks) for one to three unrelated children. The total number of children in care at any given time, including the children related to the caregiver, must not exceed 12. Care is provided in the caregiver's home. Providers are required to go through an application process that includes a criminal background check and issuance of a certificate. Listed family home providers must be at least 18 years old. However, there are no orientation classes or training requirements for listed family homes. Until 9/1/2011, listed family homes currently were not routinely inspected; however, reports alleging more than 3 children are in care or reports alleging abuse or neglect of children in care were investigated by CCL.

**Maternity Home** - A licensed operation that provides care for four or more minor and/or adult women and their children during pregnancy and/or during the six-week postpartum period.

**Minimum Standard Rules** - The rules from Title 40 of the Texas Administrative Code which serve as the minimum requirements that a permit holder must meet to maintain their permit and which are enforced by DFPS to protect the health, safety, and well-being of children. These include all rules in 40 TAC Chapters 727, 743, 744, 746, 747, 748, 749, and 750.

**Monetary Actions** - A type of remedial action. These actions are fines or penalties that Licensing may impose as provided by the Human Resources Code, §42.075 and §42.078. There are two types of monetary actions - administrative penalties and civil penalties.

**Monitoring Frequency** - The interval between routine inspections at a child-care operation. The Licensing division determines how frequently to inspect an operation based on risk assessment factors focused on the health, safety, and well-being of children in care.

**Monitoring Inspection** - Inspections that include evaluation of at least one entire subchapter of the applicable minimum standards and may include evaluation of additional individual laws, administrative rules, or minimum standard rules, or any conditions or restrictions.

**Neglect** - Neglect is an act or omission that constitutes a breach of a duty by a person working under the auspices of an operation that causes or may cause substantial emotional harm or substantial physical injury to a child. See the Texas Family Code §261.401, DFPS Rules, 40 TAC, §§745.8553, 745.8555, and 745.8559.

**Operation** - A person or entity offering a program that may be subject to regulation by Child Care Licensing. An operation includes the building and grounds where the program is offered, any person involved in providing the program, and any equipment used in providing the program. The term "operation" is used to refer to any entity providing child care and is usually accompanied by a qualifier to describe the type of care being referenced (for example, "illegal operation" or "daycare operation").

**Other Inspection** - Inspections conducted for purposes other than determining compliance with pre-identified minimum standards.

**Permit** - A license, certificate, registration, listing or any other written authorization granted by Licensing to operate a child-care facility, child-placing agency, general residential operation, listed family home, registered home or maternity home. This also includes a Licensed Administrator's permit.

**Probation** - A type of corrective action in which Licensing imposes a corrective action plan that is more restrictive and intense than an evaluation corrective action plan. It may include conditions beyond the requirements of the

minimum standards and the basic permit requirements. During the probationary period, inspections are conducted more frequently to assist the operation in meeting conditions, improving compliance, and assessing risk to children in care.

**Provider** - A person or entity associated with an operation. This term generally implies a degree of responsibility for the operation, and refers to applicants, operations that are subject to regulation, or permit holders.

**Registered Child-Care Home** - Registered Child Care Homes provide care in the caregiver's home for up to 6 children under age 14, and may also take in six additional school-aged children before and/or after the customary school day. The number of children allowed in a home is determined by the ages of the children. No more than 12 children can be in care at any time, including children of the caregiver. The application process requires that a provider complete an orientation class and receive clearances on background checks. A registration certificate is issued after CCL staff completes an on-site inspection to ensure the provider is meeting minimum standards. Registered homes are inspected by CCL at least once every 2 years or if a report is received related to child abuse/neglect or standards violations.

**Remedial Actions** - An action Licensing may impose if an operation is deficient in a minimum standard, rule, law, a specific term associated with the operation's permit, or a condition of evaluation, probation, or suspension. There are four types of remedial actions: corrective, adverse, judicial, and monetary.

**Report** - An expression of dissatisfaction or concern about an operation, made known to DFPS staff, that alleges a possible violation of minimum standards, rules, law, or abuse/neglect, and that involves potential risk to a child or children in care.

**Reporter** - The person who reports to DFPS an expression of dissatisfaction or concern that alleges a possible violation of minimum standards, rules, law, or abuse/neglect, and that involves potential risk to a child or children in care.

**Residential Child-Care - (24-Hour Residential Child-Care)** The care, custody, supervision, assessment, training, education, or treatment of an unrelated child or children up to the age of 18 years for 24 hours a day, that occurs in a place other than the child's own home. See DFPS Rules, 40 TAC, §745.35.

**Residential Treatment Center (RTC)** - A general residential operation that exclusively provides care and treatment services for emotional disorders for 13 or more children up to the age of 18 years.

**Sampling Inspection** - Licensing inspects a percentage of agency foster homes annually to determine compliance with applicable law, rules, and minimum standards, and to ensure that the child-placing agency is appropriately managing the foster home. The homes inspected are selected through a random sampling process, and the inspections are called "sampling" inspections.

**School-Age Program** - A licensed center that provides supervision along with recreation or skills instruction or training, and may provide transportation before or after the customary school day, for at least two hours a day, three days a week, to attending pre-kindergarten through grade six. A school-age program may also operate during school holidays, the summer period, or any other time when school is not in session.

**Self-Report** - An account from an operation of a serious incident that occurred at the operation. All regulated operations are required to make reports to Licensing about certain types of incidents that could pose a risk to children in care.

**Small Employer Based Child-Care** - A child-care facility that is operated by a small employer to provide care to not more than 12 children of the employer's employees and is located on the employer's premises. A "small employer" means a corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship, or other legal entity that employs fewer than 100 full-time employees.

**SOAH** - The State Office of Administrative Hearings is the state agency that conducts administrative hearings to satisfy a child-care provider's rights to due process regarding either a substantiated finding of abuse/neglect or a remedial action.

**Suspension** - A temporary closure of an operation that may be voluntary or involuntary. Voluntary suspensions are

usually at the request of an operation, and licensing staff must inspect the operation prior to reopening to ensure compliance with standards. Involuntary, or emergency, suspension is imposed by Licensing for a maximum of 30 days based on serious and immediate risk of harm to children.

**Team Inspections** - Inspections that are conducted by at least two licensing staff. At least one of the unannounced annual inspections of a 24-hour residential child-care facility must be conducted by a team of at least two CCL monitoring staff. Other operation types may also have team inspections. Whenever possible, members of the inspection team are from different CCL units, to facilitate objectivity, and consistency in regulation.

**Technical Assistance** - Training, information, and consultation that licensing staff offer to a permit holder, applicant, and operation employees to help them comply with the minimum standard rules and applicable law.

**Temporary Shelter Care Providing Child Care**- A child-care program at a temporary shelter, such as a family violence or homeless shelter, providing care for seven or more children under age 14 while the resident parent is away from the shelter. The child care program operates for at least four hours a day three days a week.

<b>Crosswalk</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
<b>Introduction</b>		
DFPS Mission, Vision and Values	vii	vii
DFPS Regional Boundaries and Regional Headquarter Locations	viii	viii
<b>Statewide Intake</b>		
Statewide Intake Overview	1	1
Legal Responsibility for Statewide Intake	2	2
Number of Contacts Received	3	3
Total Number of Contacts Received by Method of Receipt	3	3
Number of Contacts Over Time	3	3
Number of Contacts by Type of Contact	3	3
Source of Reports of Abuse/Neglect by Program	4	4
Total Phone Calls - English Queue	5	5
Total Phone Calls - All Calls	5	5
<b>Adult Protective Services</b>		
Adult Protective Services In-Home Overview	7	7
Legal Responsibility for Adult Protective Services	8	8
Fiscal Year 2004 and 2012 Pre- and Post-Reform Statistics APS	9	Removed
Map - Texas Adult Population Ages 65 and Over	10	9
Map - Texas Adult Population with a Disability Ages 18 to 64 Years	11	10
APS In-Home Intake Reports* by Priority	12	11
Source of Report for APS In-Home Intake Reports	13	11
APS In-Home Intake Reports by Region	13	11
APS In-Home Intakes, Completed Investigations and Validated Cases Fiscal Years 2011 - 2013	13	12
Incidence of Maltreatment per 1,000 Adults in Texas Adult Population by Region	12	12
Map - Adult Protective Services Validated In-Home Investigations	14	13
Completed APS In-Home Investigations by Region	15	14
APS In-Home Daily Caseload	15	14
Completed APS In-Home Investigations by Region and Disposition	16	15
Recidivism of APS In-Home Cases Fiscal Years 2009-2013	16	15
Recidivism* of APS In-Home Cases by Region	16	15
Characteristics of Validated APS Victims in Completed In-Home Investigations	17	16
Perpetrator Characteristics In Validated APS In-Home Investigations	18	17
Perpetrators in Validated In-Home Investigations	19	18
Number of Referrals Made to Law Enforcement in Completed APS In-Home Cases by Region	19	18
APS Victims of Family Violence in Validated In-Home Investigations by Region	19	18
Validated Allegations in APS In-Home Investigations by Type of Abuse/Neglect/Financial Exploitation	20	19
Duration of Service Delivery Stages for APS In-Home Cases During Fiscal Year 2013	20	19
Completed Service Delivery Stages in APS In-Home Cases During Fiscal Year 2013	New 2013	20
Non-Purchased Client Services Delivered for APS In-Home Cases by Region	21	20
<b>APS Facility Investigations</b>		
Adult Protective Services Facility Investigations Overview	23	21
Legal Responsibility for Adult Protective Services	24	22
Source of Report for Completed Facility Investigations	25	23
Average Length of Completed Facility Investigations by Region	25	23
Number of Facility Investigations Referred to Law Enforcement by Setting	25	23
Types of Confirmed Allegations in Facility Investigations	25	23
Characteristics of Victims in Confirmed Facility Investigations	26	24
Characteristics of Perpetrators in Confirmed Facility Investigations	26	24
Completed Facility Investigations	27	25
Completed Facility Investigations by Setting	27	25
Disposition of Completed Facility Investigations by Setting	27	25

<b>Child Protective Services</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Child Protective Services Overview	29	27
Legal Responsibility for Child Protective Services	30	28
Concepts Guiding Risk Determination	32	30
Notes about CPS Data	New 2013	30
Fiscal Year 2004 and 2012 Pre- and Post-Reform Statistics CPS	33	Removed
Map - Texas Child Population Ages Birth through 17 Years	36	33
Map - Child Protective Services Completed Investigations	37	34
CPS Average Daily Caseload FY 2013	New 2013	35
CPS Average Daily Caseload FY 2012	34	36
CPS Average Daily Caseload FY 2011	35	Removed
CPS Total Initial Intakes and Screened Out Cases	38	37
Risk Assessment Finding of Completed Child Abuse/Neglect Investigations	38	37
Number of Completed Investigations During FY Where Family Violence Indicated in the Risk Assessment	38	37
Case Action for Risk Indicated Completed Investigations	39	38
Source of Report for Completed Child Abuse/Neglect Investigations by Fiscal Year	39	38
Child Abuse/Neglect Allegation Dispositions	39	38
Number of Child Abuse/Neglect Completed Investigations	40	39
Case Action for Families in Completed Investigations	40	39
Children in Cases Opened for Services as a Result of a Completed Investigation	42	40
Point Prevalence Rate of Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children in Texas Population per Region	42	40
Confirmed Allegations of Child Abuse/Neglect by Type of Abuse	41	41
Race/Ethnicity of Selected CPS Statistics Compared to Texas Child Population	43	42
Map - Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	44	43
Profile of Confirmed Child Abuse/Neglect Victims	45	44
Alleged and Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	46	45
Annual Number of Families Receiving Preservation Services	48	45
Characteristics Of Perpetrators In Confirmed Investigations of Child Abuse/Neglect	47	46
Map - Children in Foster Care by County	50	47
Number of Children Removed from Home by Fiscal Year	51	48
Point of Prevalence for Children Entering Substitute Care per 1,000 Children in Texas Population by Region	51	48
Where are Children in DFPS Care?	52	49
Demographics of Children in Foster Care on August 31 by Fiscal Year	53	50
Point of Prevalence for Children in Sub Care per 1,000 Children in Texas Population by Region on Aug. 31, 2013	54	51
Legal Status of Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility on August 31, 2013	55	51
Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility, in Substitute Care or in Foster Care Placements on August 31, 2013	54	52
Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility, in Substitute Care or in Foster Care Placements during FY	New 2013	52
Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility by Living Arrangement on August 31, by Fiscal Year	56	53
Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility in Non-Foster Care Placements on August 31, by Fiscal Year	56	53
Children in Substitute Care Placements by Living Arrangement Categories on August 31, 2013	57	54
Permanency Goal of Children in Substitute Care for Whom DFPS had Legal Responsibility on August 31, 2013	58	55
Number of DFPS Foster, Foster/Adoptive and Adoptive Homes on August 31, 2013	58	55
CPS Outcomes Based on Data from Fiscal Year 2013	62	56
Length of Time in Substitute Care for Children In DFPS Custody on August 31, 2013	63	57
Children Placed In Adoptive Homes By Region	59	58
Demographics of 5,451 Children Placed in Adoptive Homes	59	58
Children with Disabling Conditions Placed in Adoptive Homes	60	59
Children with a Consummated Adoption by Type of Agency by Fiscal Year	60	59
Children with a Consummated Adoption by Region	60	59
Demographics of 5,364 Children with a Consummated Adoption	61	60
Race/Ethnicity of Children and Adoptive Parents for Adoptions Consummated by Fiscal Year	61	60
Status of Children Who Exited DFPS Legal Custody	64	61
Average Length of Time in Months for Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Type of Exit, Race/Ethnicity	64	61
Average Length of Time in Months for Children Who Exited DFPS Custody by Type of Exit and Region	64	61
Average Number of Out-of-Home Placements for Children Who Exited DFPS Custody	65	62
Length of Time in Care for Children Who Exited DFPS Custody to a Permanent Home	65	62
Average Monthly Number of Children and Young Adults, FTEs in Paid Foster Care by Service Levels	66	63



	2012	2013
Foster Care Expenditures by Source	66	63
Monthly Average Number of Children and Young Adults in Paid Foster Care by Payment Source	67	64
Percent of Change in the Monthly Average Number of Children and Young Adults in Paid Foster Care by FY	67	64
Monthly Average Number of Children and Young Adults in Paid Foster Care by Payment Source and Region	67	64
Families and Children Receiving Kinship Caregiver Monetary Assistance	68	65
Families and Children Kinship Caregiver Monetary Assistance Payments	68	Removed
Number of Children Provided Adoption Subsidy by Payment Source and Fiscal Year	69	65
Percent Change Children Provided Adoption Subsidy Monthly Total by Fiscal Year	69	66
Number of Children Provided Adoption Subsidy by Region	69	66
Number of Children Provided Permanency Care Assistance by Fiscal Year	70	67
Number of Children Provided Permanency Care Assistance by Region	70	67
Average Number of Children and Families Receiving Purchased Services per Month	71	68
Average Monthly Number and Percent of Children Receiving CPS Purchased Services by Region	71	68
Family Team Meetings Conducted by Race/Ethnicity	72	69
Family Group Conferences Conducted by Race/Ethnicity	72	69
Circles of Support Conducted by Race/Ethnicity	73	70
Preparation for Adult Living (PAL) Services Youth Ages 16 through 20	73	70
Fiscal Year 2004 and 2012 Daily Statistics	74	Removed
DFPS Child Abuse/Neglect Related Fatalities	New 2013	71
DFPS Child Abuse/Neglect Related Fatalities by Region	New 2013	71
<b>Child Day Care Licensing</b>		
Child Day Care Licensing Overview	75	73
Legal Responsibility for Child-Care Licensing	76	74
Map - Texas Child Population Ages Birth through 13 Years	77	75
Child Day Care Operations in Texas on August 31, 2013	78	76
Child Day Care Operations in Texas on August 31, 2013	New 2013	76
Child Day Care Operations and Homes Regulated by Fiscal Year	79	Removed
Regional Count of Child Day Care Operations by Fiscal Year	New 2013	77
Licensing of Child Day Care Operations by Region	80	78
Licensing of Child Day Care Operations by Region	81	79
Inspections by Operation Type	82	80
Inspections in Child Day Care Operations by Type of Inspection	83	81
Investigations in Child Day Care Operations	84	82
Investigations in Child Day Care Operations Fiscal Year 2013	85	82
Non-Abuse/Neglect Investigations in Child Day Care Operations	New 2013	83
Abuse/Neglect Investigations in Child Day Care Operations	New 2013	83
Illegal Operations Identified and Resolution	New 2013	84
Adverse Actions and Corrective Actions Initiated in Child Day Care Operations by Region	86	85
Adverse Actions and Corrective Actions Initiated in Child Day Care Operations by Region	87	86
Background Checks for Day Care Licensing Child Care Operations	88	87
State's Top 10 Standards Deficiencies for Child Day Care Operations	89	88
<b>Residential Child Care Licensing</b>		
Residential Child Care Licensing Overview	91	89
Legal Responsibility for Child-Care Licensing	92	90
Fiscal Year 2004 and 2012 Pre- and Post-Reform Statistics RCL	93	Removed
Map - Texas Child Population Ages Birth through 17 Years	94	91
Residential Child Care Licensing Operations in Texas as of August 31	95	92
Residential Child Care Licensing Operations in Texas on August 31, by Fiscal Year	96	92
Region Count of Residential Child Care Operations by Fiscal Year	New 2013	93
Region Count of Residential Child Care Operations by Fiscal Year	New 2013	94
Licensing of Residential Child Care Operations by Region	98	95
Inspections by Operation Type	99	96
Inspections in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations by Type of Inspection	100	97
Inspections in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations by Type of Inspection	New 2013	98

	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Investigations in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations	101	98
Investigations in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations	102	99
Non-Abuse/Neglect Investigations in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations	New 2013	99
Abuse/Neglect Investigations in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations	New 2013	100
Adverse and Corrective Actions in Residential Child Care Licensing Operations by Region	103	101
Background Checks for Residential Child Care Licensing Operations	104	102
Child Care Administrator Credential Exam	104	102
State's Top 10 Standards Deficiencies for Residential Child Care Licensing Operations	105	103
<b>Division of Prevention and Early Intervention</b>		
Legal Responsibility for the Division of Prevention and Early intervention	107	105
Prevention and Early Intervention - Expenditures and Staffing as of 1/11/2014	109	107
STAR (Services To At-Risk) Youth Who are Registered and Received a Service by Fiscal Year	110	108
STAR (Services To At-Risk) Youth by Presenting Problem	110	108
Community Youth Development (CYD) Youth Served by Fiscal Year	111	109
Community Youth Development (CYD) Average Monthly Clients Served Fiscal Year 2013	111	109
Texas Youth and Runaway Hotlines Incoming Calls by Fiscal Year	112	110
Characteristics of Hotline Callers	112	110
Number of Families (Primary Caregivers) Served in the Child Abuse/Neglect Prevention Programs	113	111
Characteristics of Families Served in the Child/Abuse Prevention Programs	New 2013	111
Number of Youth Served in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs	114	112
Characteristics of Youth Served in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs	114	112
Prevention and Early Intervention Performance Outcomes, Outputs and Efficiencies by Fiscal Year	115	113
<b>Finance</b>		
Texas Department of Family and Protective Services Agency Funding Summary	117	115
Categorization of Client Services Contracts	118	116
Texas Department of Family and Protective Services Cost per Service* by Fiscal Year	122	120
Purchased Client Services Delivered in APS In-Home Validated Cases by Region	123	121
CPS Expenditures Fiscal Year 2013	124	122
CPS Children in Residential Child Care Facilities Fiscal Year 2013	124	122
Prevention and Early Intervention Expenditures Fiscal Year 2013	124	122
<b>County Charts</b>		
APS In-Home Population And Case-Related Statistics	125	123
Population with a Disability Ages 18-64	125	123
Population Ages 65 Plus	125	123
Total APS Intakes	125	123
Total APS Completed Investigations	125	123
Validated APS Investigations	125	123
Closed Service Delivery Stages	125	123
APS Facility Investigations	131	129
Intakes	131	129
Complete Investigation	131	129
Confirmed Investigations	131	129
CPS Calls, Reports, Intake or Investigation Workers, and Response Time	134	138
Initial Intakes Alleging Abuse/ Neglect	134	138
Child Abuse/ Neglect Reports Assigned for Investigation	134	138
CPS Workers Responsible for Intake or Investigation by Office Location	134	138
Investigation initiation response time in completed investigations	134	138
Completed CPS Abuse/Neglect Investigations	140	156
Alleged Victims of Child Abuse/ Neglect	140	156
Alleged Victims in Unconfirmed Investigations	140	156
Alleged Victims in Ruled Out Investigations	140	156
Alleged Victims Provided Services	140	156
Alleged Victims Not Provided Services	140	156
Children Removed From Home	140	156

	2012	2013
Number of Child Abuse/Neglect Completed Investigations Fiscal Year 2013	New 2013	144
Case Action for Families in Completed Investigations: Fiscal Year 2013	New 2013	150
Confirmed CPS Victims and Investigations	146	162
Child Population	146	162
Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect	146	162
Confirmed Victims of Child Abuse/Neglect per 1,000 Children	146	162
Total CPS Completed Investigations	146	162
Confirmed CPS Investigations	146	162
Percent Investigations Confirmed	146	162
Child Abuse/Neglect Related Fatalities Fiscal Year 2013	155	174
Child Abuse/Neglect Related Fatalities	155	174
Child/Abuse Related Fatalities in Foster Care at Time	155	174
5 Year Outcome for Children Returned Home from Substitute Care or Served in FBSS	152	181
Total Children Served In Fiscal Year 2007	152	181
Subsequently Confirmed Victims In Fiscal Years 2007 - 2013	152	181
CPS Children in Care During Fiscal Year 2013	156	184
Child Population	156	184
Children in DFPS Legal Responsibility	156	184
Point of Prevalence	156	184
Children Entering Substitute Care (Total Removals)	156	184
Children in Substitute Care	156	184
Children in Foster Care	156	184
Legal Statuses Granted for Children in Fiscal Year 2013	162	214
Unique Children	162	214
Possessory CVS	162	214
TMC	162	214
PMC: Not Free For Adoption	162	214
PMC: Free For Adoption	162	214
Adoption Finalized	162	214
DFPS Responsibility Terminated	162	214
Foster Care Expenditures	168	223
Paid Foster Care Client	168	223
Foster Care Expenditures	168	223
DFPS Foster and Adoptive Homes	171	220
Foster Homes	171	220
Foster/Adoptive Homes	171	220
Adoptive Homes	171	220
CPS Purchased Services For Children	174	226
Children Receiving Sub-Care Purchased Services	174	226
Expenditures For Sub-Care Purchased Services	174	226
Children In Substitute Care	174	226
Children Receiving In-Home Purchased Services	174	226
Expenditures For In-Home Purchased Services	174	226
Children Receiving In-Home Services	174	226
Annual Number of Families Receiving Preservation Services Fiscal Year 2013	New 2013	175
Texas Child Population (Age 0-17) by Race/Ethnicity	180	132
Removals by Race/Ethnicity	186	190
Confirmed Victims of Abuse/Neglect by Race/Ethnicity	192	168
Children Waiting for Adoption by Race/Ethnicity	198	196
Children Leaving DFPS Responsibility by Exit Type	204	202
Average Length of Time in Months for Children Who Exit DFPS Legal Custody by Type of Exit: FY 2013	New 2013	208
Child Day Care Licensing Statistics	210	232
Child Population Age 0-13	210	232
Licensed Child Care Centers	210	232
Total Child Care Centers Capacity	210	232
Licensed Child Care Homes	210	232

	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Licensed Child Care Homes Capacity	210	232
Listed Family Homes	210	232
Registered Child Care Homes	210	232
Residential Child Care Licensing Statistics	216	238
Child Population Age 0-17	216	238
Child Placing Agencies (CPA)	216	238
Homes Verified by CPAs	216	238
General Residential Operations	216	238
Indepent Foster and Group Homes	216	238
Residential Treatment Centers	216	238
Maternity Homes	216	238
Total Residential	216	238
Total Residential Capacity	216	238
Youth Served in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Programs	222	244
Families (Primary Caregivers) Served in Child Abuse/Neglect Prevention Programs	225	247
<b>Definitions</b>		
Adult Protective Services Program	229	251
Child Protective Services Program	236	258
Child Care Licensing Program	241	263
Texas Family Code References	New 2013	268