

## THE 2008 NCCPR *FLORIDA* RATE-OF-REMOVAL INDEX

Released March 6, 2008

For the past five years, NCCPR has published a rate-of-removal index which compares the propensity of *states* to adopt a “take-the-child-and-run” approach to child welfare. The index compares the number of removals of children in each state during the most recent year for which data are available to a Census Bureau estimate of the number of children living in poverty in that state. The result is the number of removals of children from their homes for every thousand impoverished children in that state.

But with Florida child welfare becoming increasingly decentralized, a statewide figure is not enough. Two years ago, using data obtained through a public records request, NCCPR prepared the first comparison of the propensity of districts *within* Florida to take away children. We compared these data for calendar year 2005 to the same key measures of child safety used by the federal government. We updated the report last year. **Now we are both updating the index to include data for all of Calendar Year 2007 and expanding the scope of the Index to include county-by-county data for the six counties in the original Suncoast Region.**

### CHANGES TO THE INDEX

This year’s index includes the following changes:

--Because DCF has changed district boundaries to conform with judicial circuits this index compares regions based on the span of responsibility for each DCF circuit administrator. (Some are responsible for one circuit, others for two contiguous circuits.)

This change in district lines has limited the ability to compare performance to previous years. Many circuits retain the same boundaries as previous districts, and some have boundaries that are similar, with only two or three small counties moved from one to another. But in some cases, counties are in districts that are very different from their predecessors.

In our charts comparing overall district performance, we note the district’s current name and its former name, when applicable. We believe that for these charts it is still possible to compare the performance of districts with similar boundaries as well as those where boundaries are identical.

In our second set of charts, called “The Panic Detector,” we believe past performance can be compared only in districts with identical boundaries, so we have included 2007 data for those districts only.

--Another change concerns the original six-county Suncoast Region. Most of those counties are as large, and sometimes larger, than entire districts, and the region is heavily decentralized, with little apparent regional control or direction. Therefore, in October 2007, NCCPR issued a separate *Rate of Removal Index* for that region. We now combine the two indexes – including ranking five of the six Suncoast counties as if they were their own districts. (We do not rank DeSoto County because it is so small, though data for DeSoto are listed in the tables). We refer to this as the “original” Suncoast Region because the region has since been expanded to include the Fort Myers area. But that area has functioned as a single cohesive entity, with its own circuit administrator, so we continue to report those data separately.

*Please see also the Caveats section for a discussion of missing data and why entry into care data from District 7 need to be viewed with particular caution.*

## **KEY FINDINGS**

**Once again, the data reveal a striking pattern: The districts that do the best job of keeping children safe often are those which take away, proportionately, the *fewest* children from their parents. Districts with higher rates of child removal often have worse safety outcomes.**

For example, the districts with the sixth and seventh highest rates of removal also had the worst records for allowing children to be reabused within six months. And, once again, the Miami district had the lowest rate of removal – and, by far, the best safety outcomes.

This does not mean that one can simply reduce removals and thereby make children safer. Rather, reducing removals is a *prerequisite* for keeping children safer, because it helps free up time and resources to find children in real danger.

As noted above, NCCPR has updated the month-by-month entry-into-care data for every district dating back to January, 2003, where district lines are still the same. These data continue show a knee-jerk response to the death of a child “known to the system” can set off a foster-care panic.

But overall, this year’s data suggest significant improvements. Statewide, removals appear to be down by 19 percent, the first significant decline in entries into care in Florida in nearly a decade. In 2006, Florida took children at a rate nearly 30 percent above the national average. Now the Florida rate is about equal to the national average – though both still are well above the rate in systems widely regarded as, relatively speaking, models. And, with one exception, entries are down in every district in the state where it is possible to compare. In some cases, the declines are significant.

Among the most notable changes is in Palm Beach County. Last year we noted that The rate of child removal in Palm Beach County in 2006 was 20 percent higher than 2005 – and an appalling 60 percent higher than 2004. All that additional destruction of families had done nothing to make children safer.

New leadership has changed all that. In 2007, fewer families in Palm Beach County were torn apart than in any year since 2004 – and just as the panic did not improve child safety, taking fewer children did not compromise safety. Indeed, Palm Beach County took children at just over half the rate of the regions that largely made up the former Districts 2 and 3. Yet children in Palm Beach County were 38 percent less likely to be reabused than the children in those other districts. (For more on this, see the discussion of time frames below)

In every district for which it is possible to compare – except one – fewer children were taken from their homes in 2007 than in 2006. The one exception reflects the ongoing tragedy in the Fort Myers area. (Formerly District 8, now Circuit 20). This is where in the months after the death of Michelle Fontanez made headlines, removals of children from their homes soared 50 percent. With other cases in the news throughout the year, and turmoil over who would run the

privatized “lead agency” in the district, the panic continued without let-up. In 2006, the number of children taken from their parents in District 8 soared by 28 percent, the highest one-year rate of increase in Florida. Then in 2007, another high profile tragedy made headlines, jump-starting the panic. Removals increased by another 18 percent - a 50 percent surge in two years.

And, just as was to be expected, safety outcomes became far, far worse. With workers overwhelmed with new cases – and quitting in droves – there was even less time to make good decisions. Reabuse of children left in their own homes increased by 15 percent and foster-care recidivism soared by 50 percent.

### **WHAT WE MEASURE: THIS IS NOT THE “SNAPSHOT NUMBER”...**

The measure of a district’s foster care population usually seen in news accounts is the so-called “snapshot number” indicating the number of children in foster care in a district on one particular day each year. That is a very important number, but it is a less accurate measure of a district’s propensity to remove children.

A district may have a high snapshot number even if it takes away very few children; if it hangs on to those it takes for a very long time. (That is, in itself, a serious problem, but not a measure of the district’s propensity to take away children in the first place). Conversely, a district can have a low snapshot number and still take away many children, but take them for only a very short period of time. Thus, a district which takes away many children in January, but returns most of them by August will have a low number if the “snapshot” is taken in September.

This also is why another measure of success, average length of stay in foster care, should be viewed with caution. A district with a low average length of stay may have achieved this simply by taking away far too many children and then returning a lot of them after only a very short time in foster care – much the worse for the experience.

Also, a district which took away a great many children a decade or more ago and let them languish in foster care may have a low snapshot number now simply because those children are “aging out” of the system at 18 – hardly a testament to a system’s success.

### **...RATHER, THIS INDEX USES REMOVALS OVER THE COURSE OF A YEAR**

So instead of measuring the foster care population on any given day, the *NCCPR Florida Rate-of-Removal Index* relies on DCF data, obtained through public records requests, listing the number of children removed over the course of a given year. DCF continues to respond to our requests promptly and thoroughly and we thank the agency for its cooperation.

### **HOW THE INDEX IS COMPILED**

We could have simply compared the number of children removed over the course of a year to a district’s total child population. But then all the districts with high rates-of-removal and high child poverty rates would complain that this was unfair because we didn’t consider the single largest risk factor for actual abuse (not to mention the factor most often confused with “neglect”) – poverty.

So, in order to factor that out, and come closer to an apples-to-apples comparison, we compare removals to a census bureau estimate of the number of impoverished children in each district as of 2005, the most recent year for which such data are available.

## **RANKINGS**

Data for 2007 are presented in order of circuit number and then in order of each circuit's propensity to remove children, with the circuit that took, proportionately, the most children, ranked first.

## **SAFETY DATA**

As a group that believes strongly in family preservation, we feel that a high rate-of-removal almost always is a sign of a bad system. But a low rate-of-removal is not necessarily a sign of a good system. A low rate-of-removal can be accomplished either by embracing safe, proven programs to keep families together, or by ignoring children in real danger. Fortunately, the Florida data offer clues about this as well.

There are two primary means for measuring how a child welfare system does in keeping children safe; both are used by the federal government in evaluating state performance. One is to track how often, when maltreatment is substantiated, the child is maltreated again within six months. The other measure is foster-care "recidivism." That is, how often, when a child is returned home from foster care, must that child be placed in foster care again within 12 months? The tables on the following pages compare rates-of-removal to these outcomes in each DCF district.

## **TIME FRAMES**

It's important to look carefully at the time frames involved in the safety data when comparing safety outcomes to entries into care. The reabuse data measure reabuse within six months. That means that if, for example, in Circuit X, ten children were reabused in September, the crucial decisions in their cases may have been made as early as March.

The time lag is even greater for the recidivism measure. This measure looks at children returned to foster care in 2007, after they were sent home in the previous 12 months. That means that, to a great extent, the crucial decisions in these cases, returning the children home in the first place, may well have been made in 2006.

This means, for example, that the foster care recidivism figure for Palm Beach County in the chart below is more a reflection of the policies of 2006, when the district was in the midst of a foster-care panic, than the reforms underway in the district now. The impact of reform, if any, may be reflected in next year's figure for this measure.

## **THE "PANIC DETECTOR"**

The final tables arrange the rate-of-removal data for each district where boundaries are unchanged, and the original Suncoast counties, month-by-month for each year from 2003 through 2007. (For the remaining districts, we show the data through 2006.) Where there is a sharp rise in removals during the same month from one year to the next for at least two months

in a row, that suggests a foster-care panic. Figures that meet this criterion are in bold and the boxes are shaded. We've also used shading to note cases in which annual increases exceed 20 percent in single year or 50 percent over two years. The final column in the table also notes other significant increases or decreases in child removals.

### **COMPARING THE FLORIDA DATA TO NCCPR'S NATIONAL RATE-OF-REMOVAL INDEX**

These data are roughly comparable to the data in NCCPR's national *Rate-of-Removal Index*. So readers now can compare a *district's* total to other states or the national average. But this still should be done with caution because it is more difficult to accurately estimate the number of impoverished children in a smaller jurisdiction. Also, the entry-into-care data in NCCPR's national index are for the year ending September 30, 2006, so they are not as recent as the available Florida data.

### **IMPORTANT CAVEATS – SPECIAL CAUTION CONCERNING CIRCUIT 7 DATA**

- DCF switched to a new computer system in 2007. DCF cautions that all data for the last six months of the year are preliminary. But there also is a more serious problem: In at least one category, data are missing entirely for up to 12 counties. A chart listing the counties and the missing data is included with the other tables below.

In the case of reabuse of children left in their own homes, data from 12 counties are missing – in fact the names of the counties don't even appear on the table sent to NCCPR. All except one are very small counties, mostly in the former Districts 2 and three. With one exception, it is unlikely that these data, if available, would significantly affect how well these districts compare on safety. That exception is Flagler County which might be big enough to exert a small change the figure for Circuit 7.

For foster care recidivism data are missing for two counties, Flagler and Hamilton. Again, the Flagler figure might have a small impact in Circuit 7.

For entries into care, data are missing only for Flagler County. But that means the entry figure for District 7, of which Flagler is a part, are suspect. If, in fact, Flagler County removed children at the same rate as the largest county in this district, Volusia, removals for this district would increase by 63, District 7's rate-of-removal would increase by about two per thousand impoverished children, and the district's rank would move from ninth to seventh.

Furthermore, while entry into care data are entirely missing for only one county, the fact that there are problems in 11 other counties in another category raise questions about whether they have reported all of their entries into care. Again, because the counties are small, this is unlikely to have a dramatic effect, **but it may turn out that the statewide total in this Index underestimates removals by several hundred.**

- The child poverty estimate has a relatively wide margin of error. Therefore, the rankings cannot be used to suggest that a district is better or worse than one with a similar rate-of-removal. Rather, this index can be used to spot the outliers - those doing particularly well or particularly poorly, and to detect trends. Similarly, small differences in safety outcomes among districts or small changes from year to year are not significant; they easily can result from

random chance. That is particularly true in smaller districts and when looking at foster-care recidivism, where the raw number of children is likely to be relatively low.

- The rate of removal tables don't reveal trends over time. A district that still has a rate-of-removal at or a little above the state average, but has been steadily and safely reducing needless removal of children may be a better "role model" than a district which removed proportionately fewer children in 2007, but now is in the midst of a foster-care panic. Trend data back to January, 2003 are available in the "panic detector" table.

- One cannot say, based on these data, that district X "took Y percent of its poor children from their parents in 2006." That would be inaccurate because, while the overwhelming majority of children taken from their parents are poor, not all of them are. Thus, we are comparing a pool of children – those removed from their parents – which is mostly poor, to a general population that is entirely poor. One can say only that, for example, according to this index, in 2006, DCF in Circuit 4 appeared nearly four times more prone to resort to foster care than their counterparts in District 11 – and District 11 has better safety outcomes.

**TABLES BEGIN ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE**

## NCCPR FLORIDA RATE-OF REMOVAL INDEX, CALENDAR YEAR 2007

Current name	Former name	Children living in poverty 2005	Children removed from their homes, 2007	Rate-of-removal (per thousand impoverished children)	Rank	% of children reabused within six months, 2007	% of children returned to foster care within 12 months, 2007
Circuit 1	District 1	29,651	1127	38.0	3	11.9	14.3
Circuits 2,14	Mostly District 2	28,725	966	33.6	6	13.7	15.2
Circuits 3,8	Mostly District 3	26,907	859	31.9	7	13.6	11.5
Circuit 4	Mostly District 4	42,047	1792	42.6	1	9.2	11.8
Circuit 5	District 13	37,014	1403	37.9	4	11.8	19.1
Circuit 7	Not comparable	26,173	795*	30.3*	9*	10.9	12.7
Circuit 9	Not comparable	57,426	854	14.9	19	9.1	12.4
Circuit 10	District 14	36,111	948	26.3	13	11.0	22.8
Circuit 11,16	District 11	133,385	1538	11.5	20	5.5	9.8
Circuit 15	District 9	43,087	757	17.6	17	8.4	12.8
Circuit 17	District 10	64,747	1039	16.0	18	9.9	17.8
Circuit 18	Not comparable	25,559	795	31.1	8	13.0	19.4
Circuit 19	District 15	20,769	514	24.7	14	11.8	19.8
Circuit 20	District 8	34,513	957	27.7	10	10.3	18.3
Original Suncoast	Suncoast	113,047	3101	27.4	11	11.7	13.4
<b>State total / Average</b>		<b>719,161</b>	<b>17,445</b>	<b>24.3</b>		<b>10.7</b>	<b>14.8</b>
<b>Suncoast counties</b>							
DeSoto		2,331	29	12.4	n/a	12.0	25.0
Hillsborough		50,458	1133	22.5	15	10.8	12.8
Manatee		10,056	389	38.7	2	11.6	14.0
Pasco		13,484	267	19.8	16	12.9	17.7
Pinellas		28,806	1074	37.3	5	12.0	13.4
Sarasota		7,912	209	26.4	12	12.1	10.0

*See following page for data in rank order*

**NCCPR FLORIDA RATE-OF REMOVAL INDEX, CALENDAR YEAR 2007, BY RANK**

Current name	Former name	Children living in poverty 2005	Children removed from their homes, 2007	Rate-of-removal (per thousand impoverished children)	Rank	% of children reabused within six months, 2007	% of children returned to foster care within 12 months, 2007
Circuit 4	Mostly District 4	42,047	1792	42.6	1	9.2	11.8
Manatee	Manatee	10,056	389	38.7	2	11.6	14
Circuit 1	District 1	29,651	1127	38	3	11.9	14.3
Circuit 5	District 13	37,014	1403	37.9	4	11.8	19.1
Pinellas	Pinellas	28,806	1074	37.3	5	12	13.4
Circuits 2,14	Mostly District 2	28,725	966	33.6	6	13.7	15.2
Circuits 3,8	Mostly District 3	26,907	859	31.9	7	13.6	11.5
Circuit 18	Not comparable	25,559	795	31.1	8	13	19.4
Circuit 7	Not comparable	26,173	858*	30.3*	9*	10.9	12.7
Circuit 20	District 8	34,513	957	27.7	10	10.3	18.3
Original Suncoast	Suncoast	113,047	3101	27.4	11	11.7	13.4
Sarasota	Sarasota	7,912	209	26.4	12	12.1	10
Circuit 10	District 14	36,111	948	26.3	13	11	22.8
Circuit 19	District 15	20,769	514	24.7	14	11.8	19.8
Hillsborough	Hillsborough	50,458	1133	22.5	15	10.8	12.8
Pasco	Pasco	13,484	267	19.8	16	12.9	17.7
Circuit 15	District 9	43,087	757	17.6	17	8.4	12.8
Circuit 17	District 10	64,747	1039	16	18	9.9	17.8
Circuit 9	Not comparable	57,426	854	14.9	19	9.1	12.4
Circuit 11,16	District 11	133,385	1538	11.5	20	5.5	9.8
<b>State total Average</b>		<b>719,161</b>	<b>17,445</b>	<b>24.3</b>		<b>10.7</b>	<b>14.8</b>

**MISSING COUNTIES**

DCF was unable to provide data for the following counties

Missing County	Entries into care	Foster care	Recidivism	Reabuse
Baker				x
Calhoun				x
Dixie				x
Flagler	x		x	x
Franklin				x
Gilchrist				x
Gulf				x
Hamilton		x		x
Jefferson				x
Lafayette				x
Liberty				x
Union				x

*See following page for month-by-month entry-into-care data from January 2003 through December 2007*

**THE PANIC DETECTOR: CHANGES IN REMOVALS FROM YEAR TO YEAR**

Year	Circuit 1/District 1	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	Significant annual changes
2003	1	131	92	108	104	128	95	94	140	109	142	94	97	1334	
2004	1	138	105	123	132	136	138	75	137	102	93	107	110	1396	
2005	1	139	89	151	111	92	116	121	141	<b>137</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>134</b>	1473	
2006	1	<b>164</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>153</b>	108	123	154	141	113	139	1679	+13%
2007	1	116	124	119	71	86	74	89	100	73	121	83	72	1128	-33%
2003	Former D2	74	74	53	93	65	68	78	84	100	127	82	71	969	
2004	2	<b>104</b>	61	<b>98</b>	<b>107</b>	63	58	92	105	78	92	55	<b>96</b>	1009	
2005	2	<b>116</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>127</b>	102	<b>114</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>129</b>	95	116	73	<b>1328</b>	<b>+33%</b>
2006	2	82	121	135	105	119	122	131	113	107	108	93	60	1296	
2003	Former D3	78	75	86	89	84	89	78	90	77	76	64	46	932	
2004	3	58	65	68	92	74	49	63	56	75	46	81	64	791	-15%
2005	3	<b>112</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>	66	75	91	67	<b>115</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>69</b>	81	65	<b>1014</b>	<b>+28%</b>
2006	3	84	76	95	92	60	80	68	108	95	90	84	60	992	
2003	Former D4	164	144	137	153	162	121	127	150	145	170	121	126	1720	
2004	4	138	175	125	165	149	149	118	171	101	151	108	<b>184</b>	1734	
2005	4	<b>261</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>148</b>	147	<b>208</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>199</b>	148	<b>2356</b>	<b>+36%</b>
2006	4	198	177	234	206	179	<b>227</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>224</b>	165	168	161	149	2301	
2003	Former D7	183	194	236	170	161	159	162	252	291	247	167	130	2352	
2004	7	192	172	208	174	<b>189</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>188</b>	223	154	200	152	<b>205</b>	2226	
2005	7	<b>220</b>	148	<b>222</b>	<b>197</b>	176	168	163	<b>239</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>175</b>	180	2371	
2006	7	192	215	184	172	176	193	182	159	181	170	149	112	2085	-12%
2003	Circuit 20/former D8	62	55	57	73	57	74	59	63	74	61	56	71	762	
2004	8	59	75	57	47	41	64	48	42	40	43	55	33	604	-21%
2005	8	63	66	51	58	59	65	46	52	60	18	42	55	635	
2006	8	56	59	<b>81</b>	<b>84</b>	42	54	<b>71</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>69</b>	59	<b>810</b>	<b>+28%</b>
2007	8	80	67	<b>103</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>93</b>	78	74	74	63	74	957	<b>+18%</b>
2003	Circuit 15, former D9	75	62	63	94	83	89	81	72	95	82	62	76	934	
2004	9	73	59	51	45	80	51	43	57	48	54	69	50	680	-27%
2005	9	74	68	<b>67</b>	<b>65</b>	70	<b>73</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>897</b>	<b>+32%</b>
2006	9	<b>118</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>113</b>	76	65	84	73	69	64	<b>1083</b>	<b>+20%</b>
2007	9	56	77	113	128	96	57	41	25	27	41	54	42	757	-30%
2003	Circuit 17, former D10	75	81	76	88	120	110	76	90	79	103	81	68	1047	
2004	10	<b>127</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>96</b>	93	126	83	<b>107</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>121</b>	69	<b>92</b>	1291	<b>+33%</b>
2005	10	<b>130</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>135</b>	96	<b>119</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>128</b>	82	97	79	1315	
2006	10	<b>148</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>155</b>	85	107	117	92	117	112	129	106	102	1393	
2007	10	106	107	94	101	125	73	70	86	64	69	59	85	1039	-26%

NCCPR FLORIDA RATE-OF-REMOVAL INDEX/10

Year	District	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	
2003	Circuit 11/16, former D11	202	161	158	224	258	211	189	185	171	191	132	144	2226	
2004	11	116	109	127	123	165	143	92	95	95	131	113	113	1422	-36%
2005	11	97	111	181	113	113	135	104	107	149	113	96	103	1422	
2006	11	<b>156</b>	<b>158</b>	136	112	116	143	<b>158</b>	<b>162</b>	159	<b>156</b>	<b>112</b>	102	1670	+18%
2007	11	107	137	192	98	136	128	135	111	119	145	125	105	1538	
2003	Former D12	69	91	79	63	82	61	43	66	67	70	28	27	746	
2004	12	58	45	46	57	34	38	38	43	32	36	38	40	505	-32%
2005	12	46	44	69	31	<b>63</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>51</b>	41	<b>66</b>	<b>63</b>	42	38	<b>606</b>	+20%
2006	12	56	32	55	56	62	60	45	46	42	68	44	41	607	
2003	Circuit 5, former D13	137	95	130	106	140	96	132	98	127	144	135	110	1450	
2004	13	138	<b>161</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>169</b>	132	130	121	<b>192</b>	<b>1915</b>	+32%
2005	13	<b>231</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>224</b>	182	<b>236</b>	157	189	<b>207</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>180</b>	136	86	<b>2241</b>	+17%
2006	13	139	182	167	140	167	120	89	133	101	112	100	99	1549	-30%
2007	13	111	120	140	130	113	<b>139</b>	<b>128</b>	106	127	113	86	90	1403	
2003	Circuit 10, former D14	156	92	109	142	117	95	141	115	135	150	87	108	1447	
2004	14	137	114	139	96	93	76	100	56	61	87	127	149	1235	-15%
2005	14	129	<b>132</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>119</b>	84	90	86	1455	+18%
2006	14	109	91	87	150	<b>142</b>	<b>158</b>	130	117	121	117	100	<b>109</b>	1431	
2007	14	<b>138</b>	<b>118</b>	99	92	86	76	67	72	48	46	41	65	948	-33%
2003	Circuit 19, former D15	53	57	53	58	63	62	66	61	58	72	46	65	714	
2004	15	69	75	81	58	38	34	53	64	22	49	<b>92</b>	<b>78</b>	713	
2005	15	<b>90</b>	75	98	62	<b>61</b>	<b>44</b>	54	<b>88</b>	<b>74</b>	50	63	63	822	+15%
2006	15	75	71	50	53	65	55	50	65	45	68	55	63	715	-13%
2007	15	46	48	64	52	34	52	48	49	30	28	40	23	514	-27%
2003	Suncoast	381	323	345	414	395	318	451	354	420	391	342	255	4389	
2004	Suncoast	317	344	380	358	329	376	277	308	328	359	226	332	3934	-10%
2005	Suncoast	344	328	<b>419</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>441</b>	349	<b>377</b>	<b>409</b>	<b>504</b>	320	244	309	4418	+12%
2006	Suncoast	380	369	385	378	337	328	341	329	325	315	289	200	3976	-10%
2007	Suncoast	334	266	245	243	274	261	274	279	256	284	195	171	3,101	-22%
2003	State Total	1840	1596	1690	1871	1915	1648	1777	1820	1948	2026	1497	1394	21022	
2004	State Total	1724	1696	1823	1730	1642	1621	1488	1633	1355	1592	1413	1738	19455	
2005	State Total	2052	1806	2213	1830	1971	1740	1750	1995	2223	1683	1598	1492	22353	
2006	State Total	1957	1931	2030	1854	1833	1923	1754	1830	1772	1800	1544	1359	21587	
2007	State Total	1724	1527	1710	1587	1620	1455	1468	1431	1271	1456	1124	1073	17446	-19%

Data for Suncoast Region counties on following page.

**SUNCOAST REGION PANIC DETECTOR**

<b>DeSoto</b>	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	
2003	2	1	4	5	15	1	4	5	9	12	9	3	<b>70</b>	
2004	21	11	18	13	5	7	0	5	1	1	4	4	<b>90</b>	
2005	8	4	8	4	18	4	12	11	7	6	0	2	<b>84</b>	
2006	1	2	12	2	6	2	2	11	2	2	2	1	<b>45</b>	
2007	0	0	5	2	2	0	4	3	4	7	1	1	<b>29</b>	
<b>Hillsborough</b>	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	
2003	181	135	123	169	136	109	193	151	170	143	165	122	<b>1797</b>	
2004	116	119	138	140	147	190	125	132	168	167	88	<b>145</b>	<b>1675</b>	
2005	<b>147</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>215</b>	175	<b>182</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>276</b>	145	108	141	<b>2074</b>	<b>+24%</b>
2006	196	163	144	147	157	121	139	131	128	155	151	97	<b>1729</b>	<b>-12%</b>
2007**	133	97	64	107	83	111	107	110	85	90	91	55	<b>1133</b>	<b>-41%</b>
<b>Manatee</b>	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	
2003	22	20	36	45	25	41	50	32	35	36	18	22	<b>382</b>	
2004	<b>36</b>	<b>30</b>	33	37	24	24	14	18	17	25	19	41	<b>318</b>	<b>-16%</b>
2005	28	28	31	23	26	22	10	<b>32</b>	<b>32</b>	22	13	34	<b>301</b>	
2006	<b>40</b>	<b>38</b>	25	39	28	<b>32</b>	<b>32</b>	35	<b>59</b>	<b>49</b>	19	15	<b>411</b>	<b>+35%</b>
2007**	54	39	20	24	54	32	36	32	42	38	11	7	<b>389</b>	
<b>Pasco</b>	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	
2003	61	52	42	50	68	52	73	38	40	64	45	20	<b>605</b>	
2004	40	53	60	52	53	42	43	49	30	48	47	<b>49</b>	<b>566</b>	
2005	<b>55</b>	41	62	50	48	35	37	37	50	47	32	36	<b>530</b>	
2006	26	36	42	35	44	47	25	25	25	30	34	13	<b>382</b>	<b>-29%</b>
2007**	28	19	38	25	16	18	21	32	24	15	10	21	<b>267</b>	<b>-32%</b>
<b>Pinellas</b>	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	
2003	87	102	106	120	108	99	104	103	128	99	82	71	<b>1209</b>	
2004	92	104	103	97	73	85	75	81	91	99	49	64	<b>1013</b>	<b>-16%</b>
2005	85	96	<b>122</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>116</b>	81	79	73	<b>1193</b>	<b>+18%</b>
2006	86	92	<b>143</b>	<b>146</b>	88	108	112	113	85	73	83	80	<b>1209</b>	
2007**	95	102	104	70	101	94	94	84	92	100	75	63	<b>1074</b>	
<b>Sarasota</b>	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total	
2003	29	13	34	22	43	15	27	22	37	36	23	14	<b>315</b>	
2004	11	26	23	15	31	28	18	15	20	18	18	32	<b>255</b>	<b>-19%</b>
2005	18	10	20	28	18	22	22	20	22	19	17	19	<b>235</b>	
2006	<b>32</b>	<b>36</b>	22	15	18	26	31	28	22	23	18	10	<b>281</b>	<b>+20%</b>
2007**	14	9	19	17	20	6	16	21	13	41	8	25	<b>209</b>	<b>-26%</b>

**Sources:**

*Children removed from their homes and safety outcomes:* Florida Department of Children and Families response to NCCPR public records request.

*Impoverished children:* U.S. Census Bureau, *Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates: Estimates for Florida Counties, 2005*, available online at: <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe/county.html>

**Funding for this publication, and NCCPR's other national advocacy activities, comes from the Annie E. Casey Foundation. We thank the Foundation for its support, but acknowledge that the views expressed in this publication are those of NCCPR alone and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of our funders.**