SCAN
Policies Database

State Child Abuse & Neglect (SCAN) Policies Database

DATA USER'S GUIDE

September 2022

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

State Child Abuse & Neglect (SCAN) Policies Database
DATA USER'S GUIDE

September 2022

Elizabeth Weigensberg, Nuzhat Islam, Jean Knab, Mary Grider, Jeremy Page, and Addison Larson

This report is in the public domain. Permission to reproduce is not necessary. Suggested citation:

Weigensberg, E., Islam, N., Knab, J. Grider, M., Page, J., & Larson A. (2022). *State Child Abuse and Neglect (SCAN) Policies Database Data User's Guide*. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

DISCLAIMER
The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, the Administration for Children and Families, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

This report and other reports sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation are available at www.acf.hhs.gov/opre.

✉ Sign-up for OPRE News

🐦 **Follow OPRE on Twitter @OPRE_ACF**

👍 **Like OPRE's page on Facebook OPRE.ACF**

📷 **Follow OPRE on Instagram @opre_acf**

in **Connect on LinkedIn company/opreacf**

Mathematica Progress Together   Child TRENDS   National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect NDACAN   Children's Bureau   OPRE

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Overview

Introduction

The State Child Abuse and Neglect (SCAN) Policies Database compiles data on the definitions and policies that states use in their surveillance of child maltreatment, along with data on associated risk and protective factors. The SCAN Policies Database is funded by the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation in collaboration with the Children's Bureau in the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The project team is led by Mathematica in partnership with Child Trends.

Although federal law is the foundation of the child welfare system, states drive much of the structure of their own systems. The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) (42 U.S.C.A. § 5106g), as amended in 2010, identifies certain acts or behaviors as child maltreatment. States must comply with the broader CAPTA definitions, but within those parameters, states have their own legal definitions. State laws—and the policies states set to enforce these laws—have different definitions of child abuse and neglect and different policies for reporting and responding to child maltreatment.

Data on the definitions and related policies for child abuse and neglect—state by state and over time—can help researchers, analysts, policymakers, child welfare agencies, and others broaden their understanding of differences between states and how these differences may influence rates of child maltreatment.

Purpose

The project's purpose is to review and compile information from selected child abuse and neglect definitions and related policies in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to create a database of those definitions and policies that can be used for analysis.

The database is a resource for researchers, analysts, and others who are interested in examining differences between states in their definitions and policies on child maltreatment and how they change over time. A primary benefit of these data is to allow researchers to link the analytic files to other data sources, such as the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS), the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS), other federal and state administrative data, and survey data. When data from the SCAN Policies Database are linked with other data sources, the linked data can be used to answer important questions about how variations in states' definitions and policies are associated with the incidence of child maltreatment, the child welfare system response, and ultimately, the safety and well-being of children.

Highlights

The scope of the SCAN Policies Database includes information about state definitions and policies related to child abuse and neglect for all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The SCAN Policies Database 2019 represents data, collected,

reviewed, and verified between May 2019 and July 2020, and the data reflect the state definitions and policies for the calendar year 2019. The SCAN Policies Database 2021 represents data collected, reviewed, and verified between July 2021 and January 2022, and the data reflect the state definitions and policies for the calendar year 2021. The scope of the topics in the SCAN Policies Database includes states' definitions of child abuse and neglect as well as information about policies related to reporting, screening, and investigating child maltreatment. Key aspects of the child welfare systems' response and context are also included.

Access to database

The SCAN Policies Database can be accessed via https://www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com or the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect at https://www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov/.

Contents

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Introduction to the SCAN Policies Database

The State Child Abuse and Neglect (SCAN) Policies Database compiles data on the definitions and policies that different states use in their surveillance of child maltreatment, along with data on associated risk and protective factors. The SCAN Policies Database is funded by the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation in collaboration with the Children's Bureau in the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The project team is led by Mathematica in partnership with Child Trends.

Background

Although federal law is the foundation of the child welfare system, states drive much of the structure of their own systems. The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) (42 U.S.C.A. § 5106g), as amended in 2010, identifies certain acts or behaviors as child maltreatment. States must comply with the broader CAPTA definitions, but within those parameters, states have their own legal definitions. State laws—and the policies states set to enforce these laws—have different definitions of child abuse and neglect and different policies for reporting and responding to child maltreatment.

Data on the definitions and related policies for child abuse and neglect—state by state and over time—can help researchers, analysts, policymakers, child welfare agencies, and others broaden their understanding of differences between states and how these differences may influence rates of child maltreatment.

Purpose

The project's purpose is to review and compile information from selected definitions and policies in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (referred to throughout as states), to create a database of those definitions and policies (the SCAN Policies Database) that can be used for analysis. The SCAN Policies Database has information about state's definitions of child abuse and neglect, plus information about related policies on reporting, screening, and investigating child maltreatment. The database also includes selected information about the child welfare system's responses to child maltreatment plus information about the context of the child welfare system. More detailed information about the content is provided below.

The database is a resource for researchers, analysts, and others who are interested in examining differences between states in their definitions and policies on child maltreatment and how they change over time. A primary benefit of these data is to allow researchers to link the analytic files to other data sources, such as the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS), the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS), other federal and state administrative data, and survey data. When data from the SCAN Policies Database are linked with other data sources, the linked data can be used to answer important questions about how variations in states' definitions and policies are associated with the incidence of child maltreatment, the child welfare system response, and ultimately, the safety and well-being of children.

Data access

Given the utility of the SCAN Policies Database when merged with datasets available through the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN), the SCAN Policies Database team and NDACAN have both agreed to disseminate the data. The SCAN Policies Database can be accessed in the following ways: (1) using an interactive data feature to explore data on the SCAN Policies Database website, (2) downloading the full data file in comma-delimited format from the SCAN Policies Database website, or (3) downloading the full dataset from NDACAN in one of several formats compatible with common statistical software, including SAS, SPSS, Stata, and a tab-delimited format for import into spreadsheet programs and R. The contents of the full data files and data use documentation are identical across both sources.

The full data files available for download include the following files: (1) SCAN Policies Database 2019, (2) SCAN Policies Database 2021, and (3) an appended SCAN Policies Database file that includes data from 2019 and 2021 in one file. The appended SCAN Policies Database file is structured so the variable names are consistent across years, and each state has a row of data for each year of data collection. For variables that were new in 2021, a period (.) is used to indicate data was not collected in 2019. The appended data file allows data users to easily analyze data from both years of data collection and assess changes over time.

Data use resources

This data user's guide has detailed information about the data set, including the process used to collect and review the data, the scope of information included in the data set, guidance on using the data, such as how to link the data with other data sources, and notes about specific topics. This data user's guide has four appendices. Appendix A provides a glossary of key terms. Appendix B summarizes the decisions made on the scope and variables to include in the SCAN Policies Database after a data quality assessment. Appendix C describes corrections made to selected data elements in the 2019 SCAN Policies Database, based on information from the 2021 review process. Appendix D summarizes the changes to data between the 2019 and 2021 data sets that reflect changes to state laws and policies during this time period. There is one data user's guide that is updated with and applicable for all rounds of data collection for the SCAN Policies Database.

Several additional data use resources are available to support users of the SCAN Policies Database:

- **Codebook:** The codebook provides information about each variable in the data set, including variable names, labels, definitions, protocol number, variable type, and frequencies. The codebook has four appendices. Appendix A provides a glossary of key terms. In the SCAN Policies Database 2019 codebook, Appendix B summarizes the corrections made to seleted data elements in the 2019 SCAN Policies Database, based on information from the 2021 review process. In the SCAN Policies Database 2021 codebook, Appendix B summarizes the changes to data between the 2019 and 2021 data sets that reflect changes to state laws and policies during this time period. Appendix C contains supplemental notes that are important for accurately interpreting and using the data. Appendix D is a comprehensive list of all state statutes and policy documentation sources

used to collect data for the SCAN Policies Database for each state, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. There are separate codebooks to summarize the data from each round of data collection.

- **Data collection protocol:** The protocol has the questions used to collect information about states' statutes and policies as part of the data review and coding process. Appendix A provides a glossary of key terms. There are separate data collection protocols for each round of data collection for the SCAN Policies Database.

This data user's guide, along with the other data use resources, can be found on the SCAN Policies Database website (https://www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com/data-use-resources) or from NDACAN (https://www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov/).

Technical assistance

Users with general inquiries and those who access the SCAN Policies Database from the SCAN Policies Database website (https://www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com) who need technical assistance can submit a request to SCANPoliciesDatabase@mathematica-mpr.com.

Other data users who access the SCAN Policies Database from NDACAN (https://www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov/) can receive technical assistance by submitting a request to NDACANsupport@cornell.edu. NDACAN staff provide free user support for the data sets that they distribute. They can address issues such as importing data to an analysis program, clarifying variable labels, or solving problems with the data as delivered. NDACAN staff cannot, however, replace the role of a statistical analyst or a faculty advisor. Before writing to NDACANsupport@cornell.edu for assistance with the data, please review the support resources provided on the User Support page of NDACAN's website (https://www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov/user-support/user-support.cfm).

Acknowledgement of source

Authors should acknowledge NDACAN and the original collector of the data when they publish manuscripts that use data provided by NDACAN. Users of these data are requested to include the following statement or an adaptation of it:

> The data used in this publication were made available by the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, and have been used with permission. The State Child Abuse and Neglect (SCAN) Policies Database was prepared by Elizabeth Weigensberg, Nuzhat Islam, Jean Knab, Mary Grider, Jeremy Page, and Addison Larson. Funding for the project was provided by the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation in collaboration with the Children's Bureau in the Administration for Children and Families at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (Award Number: HHSP233201500035I/HHSP23337023T). The collector of the original data, the funder, NDACAN, Cornell University and their agents or employees bear no responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here.

The bibliographic citation for this data collection is as follows:

Weigensberg, E., Islam, N., Knab, J. Grider, M., Page, J., & Larson A (2022). *State Child Abuse and Neglect (SCAN) Policies Database* [Data set]. National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect. https://doi.org/10.34681/rpq4-m848

A link to the collection of bibliographic citations for this data set can be found at the Child Abuse and Neglect Digital Library (canDL) at https://www.zotero.org/groups/421939/candl/library.

Publication submission requirement

Users of the SCAN Policy Database who obtain the data from NDACAN are required, in accordance with the terms of the data license for this data set, to notify NDACAN of any published work or report based wholly or in part on these data. A copy of any completed manuscript, thesis abstract, or reprint should be emailed to NDACANsupport@cornell.edu. Such copies will be used to provide NDACAN's funding agency with essential information about the use of NDACAN resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about research activities among data users and contributors.

Content of the SCAN Policies Database

This section describes the scope of the SCAN Policies Database and provides a description of the six content domains and their variables. The section concludes with a summary of several considerations and decisions made on what information to include in the scope of the database.

Scope

The scope of the SCAN Policies Database includes information about state definitions and policies related to child abuse and neglect for all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The SCAN Policies Database 2019 data represents data, collected, reviewed, and verified between May 2019 and July 2020, and the data reflect the state definitions and policies for the calendar year 2019. The SCAN Policies Database 2021 represents data collected, reviewed, and verified between July 2021 and January 2022, and the data reflect the state definitions and policies for the calendar year 2021. The scope of the topics in the SCAN Policies Database includes states' definitions of child abuse and neglect as well as information about policies related to reporting, screening, and investigating child maltreatment. Key aspects of the child welfare systems' response and context are also included. The scope of the 2021 SCAN Policies Database includes all data collected for the first round of data collection in 2019, plus a few additional variables on new topics or policies. These topics were included based on their relevance to help inform improved understanding of states' child maltreatment incidence and related risk and protective factors. Topics were selected based on input from research experts and stakeholders from federal, state, and local agencies and were informed by a pilot data collection and review process.

Description of domains and variables

The content in the SCAN Policies Database is organized by six domains. The codebook, data collection protocol, and data file are also organized by these domains. Short descriptions of the variables within each domain are also provided.

1. Definitions of child maltreatment

This domain includes variables that capture nuances in how states define child abuse and neglect. Specific types of child maltreatment are identified as distinct variables, which indicate whether or not a state has this type of child maltreatment included as part of its documented definition of child abuse or neglect. State definitions of child maltreatment primarily come from state statutes. Selected sections of the state statues, which were used to code these variables, can be found on the SCAN Policies Database website (https://www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com/definitions).

Three variables (Def_Subtype_Abuse, Def_Subtype_Neglect, and Def_Subtype_Other) provide qualitative information that specifies whether any of the subtypes of maltreatment are considered part of the statutory definition for a broader category of child abuse, neglect, or other type of maltreatment. For example, a state's definition of child neglect may include subtypes of maltreatment, such as inadequate clothing, inadequate shelter, inadequate food, medical

neglect, educational neglect, or abandonment. This gives more detail on how states may categorize subtypes of child maltreatment.

This domain also includes variables that specify what other information is included in states' definitions of child maltreatment, including the extent or type of harm, whether the perpetrator is identified, and the child's age. Qualitative variables describe where this information may vary by type of child maltreatment for each state.

Additional variables identify whether each state has any documented exceptions to definitions of child maltreatment and, if the state has a safe haven exemption, the conditions for this exemption. New variables added in this domain in 2021 provide information about states' definitions of fatalities and near-fatalities due to child abuse or neglect and whether the state conducts child fatality reviews or other similar case reviews for child fatalities or near-fatalities due to child abuse or neglect.

2.   Laws or policies related to reporting child maltreatment

This domain includes variables for the laws and policies related to the reporting of child maltreatment. Variables describe the context of states' reporting systems, specifically whether states have centralized reporting or, if not, how they are decentralized. Additional variables specify the statutory standard for reporting child maltreatment and whether a state has universal mandated reporting.

There are also series of variables that capture the type of individuals specified in states' definitions for mandated reporters, whether training is required for mandated reporters, and whether mandated reporters are subject to penalties for failing to report child abuse and neglect. There are also a few variables describing whether the state has penalties for false reporting of child abuse and neglect and if the state allows immunity for reporters of suspected child abuse and neglect.

In addition, this domain includes variables that describe what information is requested when the suspected child abuse and neglect is reported, including whether the reporter can remain anonymous. The domain also includes a variable specifying whether tribes are involved in accepting reports of tribal cases.

In 2021, new variables were added in this domain to provide information about whether states require all notifications of substance-exposed newborns to be submitted as reports of child maltreatment. In addition, a new variable was added to identify whether the state accepts reports of risk without an allegation of child maltreatment (such as "risk-only" reports).

3.   Laws or policies related to screening reports of child maltreatment

This domain provides information about state laws and policies related to screening reports of child maltreatment. Variables describe the context of states' screening processes, including whether states have a centralized screening unit or whether their screening is decentralized. Several variables describe the information required to "screen-in" a report of suspected child abuse or neglect as well as what decision process, activities, or information is used as part of the screening process. The domain also includes variables regarding who conducts screening

of reports, including their qualifications, and whether tribes are involved in the screening of tribal cases.

4. Laws or policies related to investigation of child maltreatment reports

This domain describes information about state laws and policies related to the investigation of alleged child abuse and neglect. Variables provide information about what activities or information are required as part of the investigation process. The domain also includes variables for who conducts investigations of reports, including their qualifications. Variables in this domain also capture information on whether investigations can lead to criminal penalties as well as what level of evidence is required for substantiation of child maltreatment.

Another variable was added in this domain in 2021 to describe whether an investigation determination can result in an "inconclusive" finding.

5. Laws or policies related to child welfare response

This domain provides information about laws and policies related to the response of child welfare systems to child maltreatment reports. Several variables provide information about the states' use of differential or alternative response, including eligibility for such a response, and when referrals are provided for community services for these families.

Variables in this domain also provide information about (1) whether the child welfare system provides in-home services, specifically for unsubstantiated cases or for families after reunification; (2) foster care services, including whether tribes provide foster care for tribal cases and whether a state extends foster care for youth older than age 18; (3) permanency options, specifically kinship guardianship, subsidized guardianship, and subsidized adoption; and (4) staff who conduct foster care case management and the qualifications of foster care case managers.

In addition, new variables were added in this domain in 2021 to identify whether the child welfare agency has staff roles or functions specifically dedicated to addressing disproportionality, equity, or both and how these staff are involved in the child welfare process.

6. Context information regarding child welfare system

This domain has information about whether states' child welfare systems are administered by the state or county, and whether states operate under a legal consent decree or other court-ordered monitoring.

Updates for 2021

The SCAN Policies Database for 2021 includes any changes to data elements since 2019, which will allow users to identify whether a definition or policy changed for a state during this period. A summary of data elements that changed from 2019 to 2021 is in Appendix D.

The SCAN Policies Database for 2021 includes a few updates to response categories for existing data elements and incorporates a few new topics that were added based on recommendations from experts. The new data elements are organized within the current

domain structure for the database. The new topics and associated data elements include the following:

Domain	Topics/Data Elements
Definitions	• State definition of fatalities due to child abuse or neglect • State definition of near-fatalities due to child abuse or neglect • Whether the state conducts child fatality reviews or other similar case reviews for child fatalities due to child abuse or neglect • Whether the state conducts case reviews or other similar reviews for near-fatalities due to child abuse or neglect
Reporting	• Whether the state requires all notifications of substance-exposed newborns to be submitted as reports of child maltreatment • Whether the state accepts reports of risk without an allegation of child maltreatment
Screening	• Whether the state requires or recommends a degree in social work or a related field for staff who conduct screening
Investigation	• Whether the state requires or recommends a degree in social work or a related field for staff who conduct investigations • Whether an investigation determination can result in an "inconclusive" finding
Child welfare response	• Whether the state requires or recommends a degree in social work or a related field for case management staff • Whether the child welfare agency has staff roles or functions specifically dedicated to addressing disproportionality and/or equity and how these staff are involved in the child welfare response

Considerations of scope

The geographic scope of the SCAN Policies Database covers the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Because child welfare policies can vary within states, especially for states with county-administered child welfare systems, consideration was given to determine whether county-level policy information would be feasible to include in the scope of the database. Ultimately, the decision to focus on state-level data instead of county-level data was based on recommendations from experts and the results of a pilot test, which assessed the feasibility of collecting and reviewing county-level statutes and policies. The SCAN Policies Database team's pilot test found that most counties had limited documentation and that their documentation did not show meaningful variation from state policies and definitions. Focusing the scope of the SCAN Policies Database at the state level also made it consistent with the geographic scope of unrestricted NCANDS and AFCARS data, which could be linked with the new database to address key questions about the incidence of child maltreatment.

Because states' definitions and policies on child abuse and neglect can change over time, the SCAN Policies Database team considered whether effective start dates could be collected for the current definitions and policies. When we collected, reviewed, and verified data, we included effective start dates. However, there were high levels of missing data and when we contacted states to verify the data, we encountered uncertainty about the start dates. Thus, the decision was made to not include effective start dates in the database. More details about this decision can be found in Appendix B.

The intent of the SCAN Policies Database is to periodically update the data to reflect changes in states' definitions and policies over time. Future updates of the data may also include additional topics, such other policies or associated risk and protective factors related to the incidence of child abuse and neglect.

Data Collection Procedures

This section describes the sample, data sources, data collection, and coding of state definitions and policies for the SCAN Policies Database.

Sample

All 50 states, plus the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Data sources and data collection

The data collection process was designed to collect publicly available documents that describe a state's definitions and policies related to the incidence of child abuse and neglect. The resources collected included state laws and regulations that provided definitions of child maltreatment as well as policy documents or training manuals that covered the topics included in the scope of the database—specifically, mandated reporting, screening, investigations, and the child welfare response. A full list of topics is available in the data collection protocol (https://www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com/data-use-resources).

To collect the resources, the SCAN Policies Database team searched for documents on state child welfare agency websites and the Child Welfare Information Gateway, a website sponsored by the Children's Bureau at ACF. To update sources for the 2021 data collection, the team searched for updated or new documents from state child welfare agency websites. The SCAN Polices Database team also downloaded the most current state laws and regulations from LexisNexis. Publicly available, centralized resources of information on certain topics such as whether states had child welfare systems that were state- or county-administered[1] or that operated under a consent decree or other legal agreement[2] were also used.

To confirm that the most current and complete set of statutes and policies documentation were collected, the SCAN Policies Database team reached out to child welfare agency representatives from each state. These state contacts were initially identified in 2019 by soliciting recommendations from the Director of Regional Program, ACYF at ACF regional offices, and existing contacts of the SCAN Policies Database team, as well as by conducting Internet searches of states' child welfare agency websites. For the 2021 data collection process, the team reached out to state contacts who engaged in the project during the first round of data collection in 2019 to confirm whether they or someone else could serve as our primary contact. The SCAN Policies Database team provided state contacts with a list of the topics included in the scope of the data collection protocol along with a list of the identified state statutes and policy documentation that were collected from publicly available sources. Each state contact was then asked if there were any outdated documents that should be excluded or other

---

[1] The Child Welfare Information Gateway (https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/factsheets/services/) was used to identify whether states had state- or county-administered child welfare systems.
[2] Several resources were used to identify whether states had consent decrees and other legal agreements, including resources from Casey Family Programs (https://www.casey.org/consent-decree-summary/), the National Center for Youth Law (https://youthlaw.org/legal-advocacy-impact-litigation), Children's Rights (https://www.childrensrights.org/our-campaigns/class-actions/), and the Child Welfare Information Gateway (https://www.childwelfare.gov/topics/management/reform/litigation/).

documents that should be included. For both rounds of data collection and review in 2019 and 2021, of the 52 states in the sample, 50 states participated in the document confirmation process (Table 1). One variable in the data file (DocumentsConfirmed) allows data users to determine whether a state participated in the documentation confirmation process. The set of documents that were used to code information in the data collection protocol for each state are listed in Appendix D of the codebook for each round of data collection (https://www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com/data-use-resources).

For the initial round of data collection and review, referred to as the SCAN Policies Database 2019, the state resources were collected between May 2019 and June 2020. Most of the resources were collected in summer 2019; some state contacts provided additional resources up through June 2020.

For the second round of data collection and review, referred to as the SCAN Policies Database 2021, the state resources were collected between July 2021 and January 2022. Most of the resources were collected in summer 2021; some state contacts provided additional resources up through January 2022.

Table 1. Time period and state confirmation for each round of data collection and review

Round of data collection and review	Time period of document collection and review	Number of states that confirmed documents
SCAN Policies Database 2019	May 2019 – June 2020	50
SCAN Policies Database 2021	July 2021 – January 2022	50

Data collection protocol and coding process

To ensure the systematic coding of state definitions and policies, the SCAN Policies Database team created a structured data collection protocol for the document reviewers and coders (https://www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com/data-use-resources). The protocol was organized into six domains:

1. **Definitions:** Definitions of child maltreatment
2. **Reporting:** Laws or policies related to reporting child maltreatment
3. **Screening:** Laws or policies related to screening reports of child maltreatment
4. **Investigation:** Laws or policies related to investigation of child maltreatment reports
5. **Child welfare response:** Laws or policies related to child welfare response
6. **Child welfare system context:** Context information regarding child welfare system

Each domain of the protocol included a series of questions about a state's definitions or policies. The SCAN Policies Database team searched the state documents through a combination of manual searching and use of the cross-document searching capabilities of the NVivo 12 coding software. Using these methods to review the documents, the team tagged and annotated the documents in NVivo to capture and save information provided within the documentation to support answers to each question in the protocol.

The SCAN Policies Database team used multiple strategies to ensure the quality of the coded data. The coders, who were Mathematica and Child Trends employees, were trained on the

data collection process, the coding protocol, and key child welfare policies. In addition to the coders, the coding team included eight child welfare experts from Mathematica and Child Trends. The child welfare experts conducted a quality assurance review of the information coded for each state to ensure its accuracy. All coders and child welfare experts were required to meet a minimum coding proficiency of 80 percent agreement with a review of a state that had been coded previously and verified by the state child welfare agency. Finally, the SCAN Policies Database team sent a copy of the coded information to the identified state child welfare agency contacts for them to verify and provide any corrections. The data for the SCAN Policies Database 2019 were verified by states between December 2019 and July 2020 (Table 2). For the SCAN Policies Database 2021, the data were verified by states between September 2021 and January 2022. For both rounds of data collection and review in 2019 and 2021, of the 52 states contacted, 47 states provided verification. A field (Verified) in the data file allows data users to determine whether a state's coding was verified by the state.

Table 2. Time period and state verification for each round of data collection and review

Round of data collection and review	Time period of state verification	Number of states that verified the data
SCAN Policies Database 2019	December 2019 – July 2020	47
SCAN Policies Database 2021	September 2021 – January 2022	47

Data File

This section describes how the data were prepared, the structure of the data file, and key information about variables in the data file.

Data preparation

The data was largely derived from the original coding by the SCAN Policies Database team, which was verified by states. In some cases, the team created more categorical or dichotomous variables from open-ended responses, or more response categories for existing variables, after the data were verified by states. In those cases, the team did not rely solely on coders' open-ended text. Instead, they went back to the source materials to ensure that the variables or responses were coded systematically across states. The data collection protocol was then updated to include the new questions or response categories.

Data structure

The data files for the SCAN Policies Database 2019 and SCAN Policies Database 2021 each include 52 records, one for each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The data in the SCAN Policies Database 2019 and SCAN Policies Database 2021 reflect the state definitions and policies for calendar years 2019 and 2021, respectively.

The appended data file includes data from both SCAN Policies Database 2019 and 2021. The appended data file includes 104 records, since there are two rows of data, one for each year, for each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. For variables that were new in 2021, a period (.) is used to indicate data was not collected in 2019.

Data version

Updated versions of the SCAN Policies Database are possible when corrections are identified based on information obtained during subsequent rounds of data collection. The data files include a variable called "Version" indicating the version of the database. All records for a given year within the data file will have the same version.

As of the release of this document, the current versions are:

- SCAN Policies Database 2019 version 2 (2019v2): Second release of 2019 data
- SCAN Policies Database 2021 version 1 (2021v1): Initial release of 2021 data

Some variables in the SCAN Policies Database 2019 were updated based on information obtained during the collection of data for the SCAN Policies Database 2021. Appendix C describes these corrections in the 2019 SCAN Policies Database. Version 2 of the SCAN Polices Database 2019 incorporates these updates and replaces the prior version of these data.

Variables

There are several different types of variables in the data set: (1) variables taken directly from protocol questions, (2) paradata that indicate the process by which the data were collected, and (3) key identifiers. Each is described in more detail below.

1. Variables from protocol questions

Variables taken directly from protocol questions reflect the coded responses to the questions in the data collection protocol. These variables are listed in the codebook with an accompanying protocol number that maps to the corresponding question in the protocol. In the protocol, each question is named with a prefix that identifies its associated domain. The six domains are listed below, with the identifying prefix in parentheses:

- Definitions of child maltreatment (D)
- Reporting (R)
- Screening (S)
- Investigations (I)
- Child welfare response (W)
- Child welfare context (C)

2. Paradata

Paradata provide information about the process by which the data were collected. The following variables represent the paradata included in the SCAN Policies Database:

- **DocumentsConfirmed** is a variable that equals 1 if the state confirmed the documents used as sources for coding information for the SCAN Policies Database and 0 if the state did not.

- **Verified** is a variable that equals 1 if representatives of the state child welfare agency confirmed the coding of the state policies and definitions for the SCAN Policies Database and 0 if the agency did not confirm the coding.

- **Year** is a variable that is 2019 or 2021 for all records to reflect the year that the definitions and policies were in place.

- **Version** is a variable that is 1 if it is the first version of the data file or 2 if it is an updated version of the data file. Data files can be updated with new versions if corrections have been made to previously released data.

3. Key identifiers

There are several key identifiers that can be used to identify a particular state and to merge the data with other common data sets:

- **State** is a string variable with the state's two-letter postal abbreviation.
- **StateFIPS** is a string variable with the state's FIPS code.

- **RegionCode** is a numeric variable with the Census Bureau's region code for all states except Puerto Rico, which is given a unique identifier of 999 because it is not part of a census region.

Variable characteristics

The codebook has the following detailed information about each variable in the SCAN Policies Database:

- **Variable name:** Used to identify the data element in the data set.
- **Variable label:** A brief description of the variable.
- **Definition:** A more detailed description of the variable.
- **Protocol number:** Identifies the question in the data collection protocol that was used to review documentation on states' definitions and policies.
- **Variable type:** Either numeric or string.
- **Universe:** The total number of cases possible for each variable in the data set. The universe for all variables is 52, which represents each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.
- **N:** The total number of cases with valid values for the variable.
- **Frequencies:** The frequencies for each value are presented for all numeric variables.

Variable responses

Most of the variable response categories were pre-established. As noted, in some cases the SCAN Policies Database team added categories when a critical mass of open-ended responses across states suggested we should include more options. The data collection protocol reflects these updates.

In some cases, there was not enough information to code a particular response, even with a state representative reviewing the data. In those cases, the response was coded as unknown (88). Logical skips, which are reflected in the data as 66, were used when a question was not applicable to a particular state given a related response on a preceding question.

Open-ended responses

A substantial number of variables in the data file allow for open-ended responses. As noted, the SCAN Policies Database team created new variables or response categories when they could easily be categorized for the data user. The team retained many open-ended responses from the coders to give data users more information. Data users can consider whether and how to incorporate this information in their analyses.

Instructions for Use

The SCAN Policies Database is available from both the SCAN Policies Database website and the NDACAN website.

Data formats

Although the data available on each site are the same, the data formats and tools for exploring the data are different.

Data formats or tools	SCAN Policies Database website	NDACAN
Online tools for exploring or subsetting the data	X	
Comma-delimited data file	X	
Tab-delimited data file		X
Text data file		X
Code for importing and labeling a text data file in Stata, SAS, and SPSS		X
Data file formats with labeling for Stata, SAS, and SPSS		X
Instructions and code for importing SPSS and tab-delimited files into R		X

Importing data to common statistical packages

The comma-delimited (.csv) data file provided by the SCAN Policies Database website may be imported into the user's preferred statistical package by using the import function for that package. Users who wish to work with the data in Excel may open the comma-delimited file in Excel and select "File" from the main menu, then select "Save As" to save the file in Excel (.xlsx) format. Because labels are not included in .csv files, users should refer to the codebook. The codebook may be used to obtain the definition of each variable and the meaning of the numeric codes.

NDACAN provides the SCAN Policies Database in a variety of data file formats. A tab-delimited (.tab) data file is available for use in spreadsheet programs. NDACAN also provides text data files along with code that can be used to import data in Stata (.do), SAS (.sas), and SPSS(.sps). Data in file formats native to Stata (.dta), SAS (.sas7bdat), and SPSS (.sav) as provided by NDACAN can be opened directly in these statistical packages, with variable labels as well as value labels and formats. Guidance for using the import programs as well as instructions for importing the data into R can be found on the NDACAN User Support webpage.

Merging with other data

The SCAN Policies Database can be merged with other data sets by using one of the following geographic identifiers:

- State: Two-letter state abbreviation
- StateFIPS: Two-digit state Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) code
- RegionCode: Census region code

For example, the NCANDS Child File, which is available via a restricted data license from NDACAN, contains the two-letter state abbreviation in the variable StaTerr. Variables from the SCAN Policies Database can be merged by using the variables State and StaTerr.

Similarly, the AFCARS Foster Care File contains the two-letter state abbreviation in the variable St, but also contains the State FIPS code in the variable State. Therefore, the SCAN Policies Database can be merged with this file by using either of the following combinations of linking variables:

- State (from SCAN Policies Database): St (from AFCARS)
- StateFIPS (from SCAN Policies Database): State (from AFCARS)

The SCAN Policies Database can also be merged with state administrative data or survey data that contain state or census region codes. See the NDACAN User Support page for examples of merging data using different statistical packages.

APPENDIX A

Glossary of Key Terms

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Appendix A: Glossary of Key Terms

This glossary defines several key terms used in the SCAN Policies Database. The terms are organized alphabetically within each of the six topic domains, which reflect the organizational structure of the data file, codebook, and data collection protocol. This glossary is not an exhaustive list of all terms used in the database. Instead, it highlights several terms that may be unfamiliar to data users.

The SCAN Policies Database codebook (https://www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com/data-use-resources) also provides a resource for users to understand the definitions of specific variables. For more information about these or other child welfare terms, please refer to the glossary produced by the Child Welfare Information Gateway (https://www.childwelfare.gov/glossary/).

Alternative or differential response: An approach used by some child protection or child welfare agencies to provide different options to respond to reports of child abuse and neglect, other than an investigation to assess whether child maltreatment occurred. This response can be referred to as an alternative response, a differential response, or a dual-track or multiple-track response system. Different factors are used to determine eligibility for alternative or differential response. Such factors often include assessment of the level of risk for the child and the family's need for support services.

Centralized reporting: A child maltreatment reporting method, usually a hotline, designed to facilitate reporting to one entity that will accept reports of suspected child abuse and neglect from all locations across a state (see *reporting*).

Consent decree: A legal order that results from a lawsuit against the child welfare agency. Consent decrees often have requirements for the child welfare agency to implement corrective actions and monitor improvements related to the reason for the lawsuit.

Cultural broker: A person who draws on established community relationships and provides culturallysensitive brokering, support, and advocacy to families who are involved with or at risk of being involved with the child welfare system. Cultural brokers also help identify and address concerns about disproportionality and disparities in the child welfare system.

Factitious disorder by proxy: A type of child maltreatment, also known as Munchausen by proxy or medical child abuse, that results when a parent or caretaker misrepresents information, simulates an illness, or seeks medical treatment for a child who is not really sick with the alleged illness.

Failure to thrive: A type of child maltreatment that is a medically diagnosed condition in which a child fails to develop physically. Also referred to as nonorganic failure to thrive. This condition is typically indicated by a child's weight, height, and motor development falling significantly below age-appropriate ranges with no medical or organic cause.

Guardianship: A legal permanency option granted by the court when the parental rights of the child are transferred to an adult nonparent to serve as the child's caretaker.

In-home services: Services provided to children and families who were reported for alleged child maltreatment and determined as needing supports to address the children's safety needs. The children are not in foster care or in the custody of the child welfare agency. These services

can be provided to children who are able to remain at home, without needing out-of-home or foster care, or to children who have been reunified with their families and returned home from being in out-of-home or foster care. In-home services can be provided directly by the child welfare agency or by another service provider on behalf of a child welfare agency.

Institutional abuse or neglect: A type of child maltreatment that occurs while the child is in an institution, facility, or agency that is responsible for the child's welfare, such as foster care, out-of-home care, or any public or private residential home.

Investigation: A response by the child protection or child welfare agency that gathers information to determine whether the reported child maltreatment occurred. The investigation assesses whether child maltreatment occurred or whether the child is at risk of child maltreatment and results in a formal determination or disposition, such as whether or not the report of child maltreatment was substantiated (see *substantiation*).

Kinship guardianship: State laws and policies that allow for a family member, or "kin", to become the legal permanent guardian for a child who has been placed in out-of-home or foster care (see *guardianship*).

Mandated reporting: A state law requiring certain people to report known or suspected child abuse and neglect. Some states require all people to report child maltreatment (see *universal mandated reporting*), while other states identify specific professionals as mandated reporters (see *reporting*).

Reporting: The process in which a person who knows of or suspects child abuse or neglect notifies authorities, such as child protection or child welfare agencies, of the alleged child maltreatment and provides information that is known about the alleged child victim, perpetrator, and child maltreatment.

Safe haven: A policy where a parent can voluntarily relinquish a child, usually a newborn, to lawfully designated locations, such as hospitals, fire stations, or other safe settings. When a child is safely surrendered in this way, the parent is protected from criminal prosecution. The voluntary relinquishment of a child that follows the safe haven policy requirements may be exempt from the state's definitions of child maltreatment.

Screening: The process in which child protection or child welfare agency staff review information received from a report of child maltreatment to determine whether there is sufficient information to "screen-in" a report to pursue next steps, such as opening an investigation or referring the case for an alternative response. The screening process typically considers whether there is sufficient information about a variety of factors, including whether the report provides enough information to identify the alleged child victim and whether the alleged child maltreatment meets the state's definitions for child abuse or neglect.

Shaken baby syndrome: A type of child maltreatment that involves a serious head or brain injury resulting from violent shaking or impacting of the head of an infant or small child, which can result in death or permanent neurologic disability. Also known as abusive head trauma or shaking impact syndrome.

State- and county-administered child welfare systems: The framework for administration of child welfare services and programs, which can be administered at the state or county levels.

State- administered systems are more centralized, while county-administered systems are decentralized and can have more variability across counties.

Subsidized adoption: State program that provides financial assistance or subsidies for caregivers to adopt children from foster care who have special needs.

Subsidized guardianship: State program that provides financial assistance or subsidies for caregivers who take legal guardianship of children (see *guardianship*).

Substantiation: A decision made at the conclusion of an investigation of a report of alleged child maltreatment, when there is sufficient and credible evidence that the child maltreatment occurred or that there is risk of child maltreatment. The term for a substantiated investigation decision can vary by jurisdiction. It can also be referred to as a founded, indicated, or confirmed report of child maltreatment (see *investigation*).

Tribes: The original or first inhabitants of North America and their communities, including Indigenous, First Nation, American Indian, Indian, Native American, Native, and Alaska Native communities. The project did not limit this definition to only federally recognized tribes, so it is inclusive of all tribes based on each states' definitions and policies.

Universal mandated reporting: A state law that requires all people, regardless of profession, to report known or suspected child maltreatment (see *reporting*).

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

APPENDIX B

**Summary of Scope and Variable Decisions
Based on Data Quality Assessment**

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Appendix B: Summary of Scope and Variable Decisions Based on Data Quality Assessment

After concluding each round of data collection in 2019 and 2021, the SCAN Policies Database team reviewed and assessed the quality of the data collected for all variables. The team refined the scope of the variables included in the data set and modified a few variables during the data quality review efforts.

The team revised several variables based on the quality assessment. Specifically, several categorical variables were created based on information that was originally collected with open-text responses. In some cases, a few variables were condensed or combined if the collected information overlapped in content.

Some variables were dropped from the scope of the data set because they did not capture responses (N = 0) or they did not capture information on variability from one state to another. For example, a large number of unknown response categories were included in the original scope of the data collection protocol, but were ultimately dropped because the variables did not yield any responses or clarify why the information was unknown.

During the first data collection in 2019, the effective start dates of the child maltreatment definitions and policies were dropped from the scope of the data set. The team collected and coded effective start dates to the best of its ability and solicited targeted input from the states through the verification process to review or correct the dates. However, throughout the data collection, review, and verification process, there were uncertainties both within the SCAN Policies Database team about coding the correct data and from the state agency contacts who verified the data. During the data verification process, the state contacts provided minimal feedback on the date variables, often saying that this information was not known. The limited feedback from the state contacts on the date variables suggested that either they did not closely review the dates or they did not know this information. In addition, after reviewing the quality of the data collected on the effective start dates, the team found a high percentage of missing data for these variables. Further, the date range across these variables greatly varied, which lead to uncertainty about whether the dates reflected initial implementation dates of laws or policies or if they depicted dates of recent amendments. The team decided to omit the date variables, given the concerns about the reliability of these data.

To capture changes in state laws and policies across time, the 2019 and 2021 data sets contain the date of data collection, which can be used as the time point of reference. As a supplementary resource, the SCAN Policies Database website provides data users with state statutes (https://www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com/definitions) that contain statutory text on definitions of child maltreatment. These documents contain the full legislative history of changes in the state laws, with corresponding dates for all states.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

APPENDIX C

**Corrections Made to Selected Data Elements in the 2019 SCAN
Policies Database Based on Information from the 2021 Review**

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Appendix C: Corrections Made to Selected Data Elements in the 2019 SCAN Policies Database Based on Information from the 2021 Review

During the review and confirmation process for the 2021 round of data collection, the project team identified information or received documents or other feedback from state contacts that warrant corrections to selected data elements from the 2019 SCAN Policies Database. To provide the most accurate data possible to data users, the 2019 data files have been updated to incorporate these corrections in a new version. The SCAN Policies Database 2019 version 2 data files were released in September 2022, via NDACAN and the SCAN Policies Database website (www.scanpoliciesdatabase.com).

This appendix summarizes the corrections to the 2019 SCAN Policies Database, which have been incorporated into version 2 of these data. In addition to summarizing the corrections overall and by domain, the appendix includes a detailed list of each variable with corrections and identifies the states that had corrections for that variable.

Summary of corrections

Across all domains, 829 data elements[3] were corrected in the 2019 data files, which represents corrections to 4.5 percent of all data elements in the 2019 SCAN Policies Database. In total, 262 variables had at least one data element (or state) with a correction, which is 74 percent of variables. However, among those variables with corrections, nearly half (48.5 percent) have corrections for only one or two states. Also, the variables with the greatest number of corrections were those that captured information about the qualifications of staff, including staff who conduct investigations, screening, and case management.

Table C.1 presents the number and percentage of both data elements and variables with corrections for each domain. The child welfare response domain had the highest number of data elements (220) with corrections and the reporting domain has the higher number of variables (68) with corrections.

Table C.1. Number and percentage of data elements and variables with corrections, by domain

Domain	Number (%) of data elements with corrections	Number of data elements	Number (%) of variables with corrections	Number of variables
Definitions	91 (2.4%)	3,796	45 (61.6%)	73
Reporting	154 (2.9%)	5,304	68 (66.7%)	102
Screening	177 (6.3%)	2,808	44 (81.5%)	54
Investigations	185 (5.7%)	3,224	53 (85.5%)	62
Child welfare response	220 (7.1%)	3,120	50 (83.3%)	60
Child welfare system context	2 (1.3%)	156	2 (66.7%)	3
Total across all domains	**829 (4.5%)**	**18,408**	**262 (74.0%)**	**354**

---

[3] Data elements are defined as each state's response to a variable. For example, a variable that has responses from all states, plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, would have 52 data elements.

Data elements with corrections

To help data users easily identify which data elements have been corrected, Table C.2 includes a detailed list of all variables with corrections. For each variable, the table depicts the number and name of states with corrections for that variable.

Table C.2. List of variables with corrections and states with corrections

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with corrections	Name of state
Definitions	Def_InadequateShelter	1	Pennsylvania
Definitions	Def_Malnourishment	2	Nevada, Pennsylvania
Definitions	Def_DrugAlcMisuse	2	Alabama, Missouri
Definitions	Def_PrenatalExposure	1	Nevada
Definitions	Def_IllicitSubstance	2	Kansas, Missouri
Definitions	Def_GenitalMutilation	2	North Dakota, Wyoming
Definitions	Def_DV	2	California, Wyoming
Definitions	Def_FactitiousDisorder	7	District of Columbia, Indiana, Maine, Minnesota, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, Texas
Definitions	Def_InstitutionalAbuseNeglect	4	Alabama, Kansas, Minnesota, West Virginia
Definitions	Def_Other	2	Connecticut, New Jersey
Definitions	Def_OtherSpecify	2	Connecticut, New Jersey
Definitions	Def_Subtype_Abuse	2	California, Virginia
Definitions	Def_Subtype_Neglect	1	California
Definitions	Def_Subtype_Other	1	Kentucky
Definitions	DefHarm_Environment	3	Louisiana, Missouri, Virginia
Definitions	DefHarm_NotSpecified	1	Maine
Definitions	DefHarm_Other	1	Maine
Definitions	DefHarm_VaryByType	1	New York
Definitions	DefHarm_VaryByTypeSpecify	1	New York
Definitions	DefPerp	1	Idaho
Definitions	DefPerp_Parent	1	Idaho
Definitions	DefPerp_Guardian	1	Idaho
Definitions	DefPerp_Caregiver	3	Connecticut, Idaho, Puerto Rico
Definitions	DefPerp_FamilyMember	4	Alabama, Idaho, Mississippi, New Jersey
Definitions	DefPerp_HouseholdMember	2	Alabama, Idaho
Definitions	DefPerp_PersonResponsible	2	Alabama, Idaho
Definitions	DefPerp_AnyAdult	3	Alabama, Idaho, Utah
Definitions	DefPerp_Other	2	Idaho, Puerto Rico
Definitions	DefPerp_OtherSpecify	1	Massachusetts
Definitions	DefPerp_VaryByType	4	California, Idaho, Illinois, Missouri
Definitions	DefPerp_VaryByTypeSpecify	3	California, Illinois, Missouri
Definitions	DefAge_Specify	3	Nebraska, North Carolina, Utah

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with corrections	Name of state
Definitions	DefAge_VaryByType	4	Indiana, Louisiana, North Carolina, Texas
Definitions	DefAge_VaryByTypeSpecify	4	Indiana, Louisiana, North Carolina, Texas
Definitions	Exempt_FinancialIssues	1	Maine
Definitions	Exempt_Discipline	1	Colorado
Definitions	Exempt_SubstanceExposed	1	Tennessee
Definitions	Exempt_Religious	1	Hawaii
Definitions	Exempt_Other	1	Virginia
Definitions	Exempt_OtherSpecify	1	Virginia
Definitions	SafeHaven_AgeSpecify	3	Maine, Mississippi, Tennessee
Definitions	SafeHaven_NoIntentReturn	1	Colorado
Definitions	SafeHaven_ChildUnharmed	3	Alabama, Iowa, North Carolina
Definitions	SafeHaven_Other	1	Missouri
Definitions	SafeHaven_OtherSpecify	1	Missouri
Reporting	CentralizedReporting	1	Virginia
Reporting	CentralizedReporting_Specify	1	Virginia
Reporting	DecentralizedReporting	1	Virginia
Reporting	Reporter_FosterParent	1	Colorado
Reporting	Reporter_BusDriver	3	Colorado, Connecticut, Iowa
Reporting	Reporter_AfterSchool	1	Colorado
Reporting	Reporter_ChildcareStaff	1	Colorado
Reporting	Reporter_SUDProvider	2	North Dakota, West Virginia
Reporting	Reporter_EMTEmergency	1	Missouri
Reporting	Reporter_OtherCourt	1	Colorado
Reporting	Reporter_ShelterStaff	3	Colorado, Hawaii, West Virginia
Reporting	ReporterTrainingReq	1	South Dakota
Reporting	ReporterTraining_FosterParent	2	Indiana, South Dakota
Reporting	ReporterTraining_TeacherSchool	2	Oklahoma, South Dakota
Reporting	ReporterTraining_BusDriver	2	Connecticut, Iowa
Reporting	ReporterTraining_MedicalDental	1	South Dakota
Reporting	ReporterTraining_SUDProvider	1	South Dakota
Reporting	ReporterTraining_MHProf	2	Indiana, South Dakota
Reporting	ReporterTraining_Police	1	South Dakota
Reporting	ReporterTraining_EMTEmergency	1	South Dakota
Reporting	ReporterTraining_Judges	1	Oklahoma
Reporting	ReporterTraining_DAAttorneys	1	Oklahoma
Reporting	ReporterTraining_GALCASA	1	Oklahoma
Reporting	ReporterTraining_OtherCourt	1	South Dakota
Reporting	ReporterTraining_Other	1	South Dakota
Reporting	ReporterPenalty	2	California, Maine
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_FosterParent	3	Colorado, Maine, Ohio

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with corrections	Name of state
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_TeacherSchool	1	Maine
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_BusDriver	4	Colorado, Connecticut, Iowa, Maine
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_AfterSchool	2	Colorado, Maine
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_ChildcareStaff	2	Colorado, Maine
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_CampStaff	1	Maine
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_Coach	1	Arkansas
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_MedicalDental	1	Maine
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_SUDProvider	2	North Dakota, West Virginia
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_MHProf	1	Maine
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_Police	1	Maine
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_EMTEmergency	2	Maine, Missouri
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_GALCASA	1	Maine
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_OtherCourt	1	Colorado
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_ShelterStaff	3	Colorado, Hawaii, West Virginia
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_Images	1	Maine
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_Clergy	2	California, Maine
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_Volunteer	1	Arkansas
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_Other	1	Maine
Reporting	Penalty_Criminal	1	Maine
Reporting	Penalty_Civil	2	Maine, Oregon
Reporting	Penalty_Professional	2	Maine, Oklahoma
Reporting	Penalty_Other	5	Connecticut, Maine, Mississippi, Utah, Virginia
Reporting	Penalty_OtherSpecify	4	Connecticut, Mississippi, Utah, Virginia
Reporting	FalseReportPenalty	6	Alabama, Delaware, Hawaii, Nevada, South Dakota, West Virginia
Reporting	FalseReportPenalty_Criminal	6	California, Delaware, Nevada, Puerto Rico, South Dakota, West Virginia
Reporting	FalseReportPenalty_Civil	4	Delaware, Nevada, South Dakota, West Virginia
Reporting	FalseReportPenalty_Professional	4	Delaware, Nevada, South Dakota, West Virginia
Reporting	FalseReportPenalty_Other	4	Delaware, Nevada, South Dakota, West Virginia
Reporting	FalseReportPenalty_OtherSpecify	1	Washington
Reporting	FalseReportPenalty_Unknown	5	Delaware, Nevada, Puerto Rico, South Dakota, West Virginia
Reporting	ReportInfo_MaltreatmentDate	1	Tennessee
Reporting	ReportInfo_Perpetrator	1	Michigan
Reporting	ReportInfo_Reporter	2	Arizona, Michigan
Reporting	ReportInfo_Parent	7	Connecticut, Florida, Maine, Puerto Rico, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with corrections	Name of state
Reporting	ReportInfo_FamilyMember	7	Indiana, Kentucky, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia
Reporting	ReportInfo_PriorMaltreatment	6	Hawaii, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, Wisconsin
Reporting	ReportInfo_Other	4	Hawaii, Maine, Nevada, Virginia
Reporting	ReportInfo_OtherSpecify	3	Hawaii, Maine, Nevada
Reporting	ReportAnonymous	3	Hawaii, Maryland, West Virginia
Reporting	TribalReport	5	Alabama, California, Connecticut, Kentucky, Ohio
Reporting	TribalReport_Specify	4	Alabama, California, Ohio, Oklahoma
Screening	ScreenInfo_ChildName	6	Alaska, Arizona, Kansas, North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas
Screening	ScreenInfo_ChildAddr	7	Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas
Screening	ScreenInfo_MalType	3	Alaska, Arizona, South Dakota
Screening	ScreenInfo_MalDate	4	Alaska, Kansas, New Jersey, Texas
Screening	ScreenInfo_Perp	5	Alaska, Kansas, Texas, Virginia, Wyoming
Screening	ScreenInfo_Other	4	Arizona, Colorado, Nebraska, North Dakota
Screening	ScreenInfo_OtherSpecify	4	Arizona, Colorado, Nebraska, North Dakota
Screening	ScreenInfo_Unknown	4	Alaska, Arizona, North Dakota, South Dakota
Screening	ScreenProcess_SupReview	3	Kansas, New York, Virginia
Screening	ScreenProcess_Individual	4	Connecticut, New Jersey, Virginia, Wisconsin
Screening	ScreenProcess_SupReviewReq	5	Hawaii, Kansas, New Jersey, New York, Virginia
Screening	ScreenProcess_TeamReq	1	Massachusetts
Screening	ScreenProcess_IndDecisionReq	4	Connecticut, New Jersey, Virginia, Wisconsin
Screening	ScreenProcess_Statewide	3	Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia
Screening	ScreenReq_RiskAssess	4	California, Colorado, Idaho, Nebraska
Screening	ScreenReq_PriorCPS	2	Hawaii, Indiana
Screening	ScreenReq_Other	2	Iowa, Virginia
Screening	ScreenReq_OtherSpecify	2	Iowa, Virginia
Screening	ScreenReq_RiskAssessCases	4	California, Colorado, Nebraska, Puerto Rico
Screening	ScreenReq_PriorCPSCases	3	Alabama, Hawaii, Indiana
Screening	ScreenReq_OtherCases	4	Alabama, Iowa, Virginia, Washington
Screening	ScreenReq_RiskAssessCase_Specify	1	Colorado
Screening	ScreenReq_OtherCases_Specify	3	Alabama, Virginia, Washington
Screening	ScreenRiskAssess_SDM	3	California, Colorado, Nebraska

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with corrections	Name of state
Screening	ScreenRiskAssess_Other	5	California, Colorado, Nebraska, New Mexico, Virginia
Screening	ScreenRiskAssess_OtherSpecify	2	New Mexico, Virginia
Screening	ScreenInfo_Statewide	3	Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee
Screening	Screener_Caseworker	2	Colorado, Georgia
Screening	Screener_Supervisor	3	Colorado, Georgia, Maine
Screening	Screener_SpecialUnit	6	Colorado, Georgia, Kansas, Minnesota, New Jersey, West Virginia
Screening	Screener_Other	1	Colorado
Screening	Screener_OtherSpecify	1	Colorado
Screening	ScreenerQual_Associate	3	Georgia, Ohio, South Dakota
Screening	ScreenerQual_Bachelor	9	Arizona, Michigan, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, West Virginia
Screening	ScreenerQual_Master	8	Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, South Dakota, Washington
Screening	ScreenerQual_Training	1	Arizona
Screening	ScreenerQual_TrainingSpecify	1	Arizona
Screening	ScreenerQual_Experience	13	Arizona, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Michigan, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia
Screening	ScreenerQual_ExperienceSpecify	13	Arizona, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Michigan, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia
Screening	ScreenerQual_Other	4	Idaho, Kentucky, New Jersey, West Virginia
Screening	ScreenerQual_OtherSpecify	4	Idaho, Kentucky, New Jersey, West Virginia
Screening	ScreenerQual_Unknown	4	Arizona, New Mexico, South Carolina, West Virginia
Screening	TribalScreen	5	Arizona, Connecticut, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky
Screening	TribalScreen_Specify	4	Indiana, Kansas, North Dakota, Oklahoma
Investigations	InvPenalty_Criminal	1	Washington
Investigations	InvestReq_HomeVisit	1	South Dakota
Investigations	InvestReq_HomeStudy	3	Michigan, Oregon, Washington
Investigations	InvestReq_PerpCrim	3	New York, South Dakota, West Virginia
Investigations	InvestReq_PerpPriorCPS	2	Indiana, South Dakota
Investigations	InvestReq_MedEval	3	Hawaii, South Dakota, Virginia
Investigations	InvestReq_MHEval	2	Hawaii, South Dakota
Investigations	InvestReq_PerpInterview	1	Maine

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with corrections	Name of state
Investigations	InvestReq_Reporter	3	Connecticut, Florida, Maine
Investigations	InvestReq_Other	2	Alabama, Washington
Investigations	InvestReq_OtherSpecify	2	Alabama, Washington
Investigations	InvestReq_PriorCPSCases	2	Kansas, Puerto Rico
Investigations	InvestReq_HomeVisitCases	3	Puerto Rico, South Dakota, Utah
Investigations	InvestReq_VictimCases	2	Puerto Rico, Utah
Investigations	InvestReq_OtherChildrenCase	3	Maryland, Puerto Rico, Texas
Investigations	InvestReq_RiskAssessCases	2	Arizona, Puerto Rico
Investigations	InvestReq_HomeStudyCases	4	Michigan, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Washington
Investigations	InvestReq_ParentCases	1	Puerto Rico
Investigations	InvestReq_PerpCrimCases	4	Kansas, New York, South Dakota, West Virginia
Investigations	InvestReq_PerpPriorCPSCases	5	Indiana, Kansas, Nebraska, Puerto Rico, South Dakota
Investigations	InvestReq_MedEvalCases	6	Florida, Hawaii, Iowa, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia
Investigations	InvestReq_MHEvalCases	4	Hawaii, Iowa, South Dakota, Tennessee
Investigations	InvestReq_PerpInterviewCases	4	Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, Tennessee
Investigations	InvestReq_ReporterCases	6	Connecticut, Florida, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Tennessee
Investigations	InvestReq_OtherCases	3	Alabama, Pennsylvania, Washington
Investigations	InvestReq_PriorCPSCases_Specify	1	Kansas
Investigations	InvestReq_HomeVisitCases_Specify	1	Utah
Investigations	InvestReq_VictimCases_Specify	1	Utah
Investigations	InvestReq_OtherChildrenCase_Spec	2	Maryland, Texas
Investigations	InvestReq_RiskAssessCase_Specify	1	Arizona
Investigations	InvestReq_HomeStudyCases_Specify	2	Michigan, Washington
Investigations	InvestReq_PerpCrimCases_Specify	3	Kansas, New York, West Virginia
Investigations	InvestReq_PerpPriorCPSCases_Spec	2	Kansas, Nebraska
Investigations	InvestReq_MedEvalCases_Specify	5	Florida, Hawaii, Iowa, Tennessee, Virginia
Investigations	InvestReq_MHEvalCases_Specify	2	Iowa, Tennessee
Investigations	InvestReq_PerpInterviewCase_Spec	3	Mississippi, Nebraska, Tennessee
Investigations	InvestReq_ReporterCases_Specify	3	Maryland, Mississippi, Tennessee
Investigations	InvestReq_OtherCases_Specify	3	Alabama, Pennsylvania, Washington
Investigations	InvestStaff_Supervisor	3	Maine, Nebraska, Washington
Investigations	InvestStaff_SpecialUnit	7	Hawaii, Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Ohio, Washington, West Virginia
Investigations	InvestStaff_LawEnforcement	2	Minnesota, Virginia
Investigations	InvestStaff_Other	1	Virginia
Investigations	InvestQual_Associate	4	Kansas, Ohio, South Dakota, Texas

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with corrections	Name of state
Investigations	InvestQual_Bachelor	10	Alaska, Arizona, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia
Investigations	InvestQual_Master	8	Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Hawaii, Mississippi, New Jersey, South Carolina, Washington
Investigations	InvestQual_Training	3	Alabama, Iowa, New Jersey
Investigations	InvestQual_TrainingSpecify	2	Iowa, New Jersey
Investigations	InvestQual_Experience	14	Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia
Investigations	InvestQual_ExperienceSpecify	14	Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia
Investigations	InvestQual_Other	5	Idaho, Kentucky, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia
Investigations	InvestQual_OtherSpecify	4	Idaho, Kentucky, New Jersey, West Virginia
Investigations	InvestQual_Unknown	5	New Jersey, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia
Investigations	EvidenceLevel	2	Hawaii, Ohio
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityMaltreatment	3	Alabama, California, Georgia
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_Fatality	4	Alabama, California, Georgia, Nevada
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_SubExposed	3	Alabama, California, Georgia
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_PhysicalAbuse	6	Alabama, California, Georgia, Nevada, Oklahoma, Virginia
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_SexAbuse	5	Alabama, California, Georgia, Hawaii, Nevada
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_Neglect	6	Alabama, California, Georgia, Nevada, Oklahoma, Washington
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_Abandoned	3	Alabama, California, Georgia
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_Other	7	Alabama, California, Georgia, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, Virginia
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_OtherSpecify	7	Alabama, Georgia, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, Virginia, Wisconsin
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRisk	3	Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRiskTool	5	Hawaii, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with corrections	Name of state
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRiskToolSpec	3	Hawaii, Maine, Nebraska
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRisk_No	3	Connecticut, Minnesota, Nebraska
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRisk_Low	2	Minnesota, Nebraska
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRisk_Moderate	2	Minnesota, Nebraska
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRisk_Other	5	Alabama, Connecticut, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRiskOtherSpec	4	Alabama, Connecticut, Nebraska, Ohio
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRisk_Unknown	4	Alabama, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio
Child welfare response	AltResp_Eligibility_NoSafetyCon	1	Colorado
Child welfare response	AltResp_Eligibility_PriorReports	2	Colorado, Nebraska
Child welfare response	AltResp_Eligibility_Other	3	Alabama, Hawaii, Texas
Child welfare response	AltResp_Eligibility_OtherSpecify	3	Alabama, Hawaii, Texas
Child welfare response	AltResp_Process_AtScreening	1	Nebraska
Child welfare response	AltResp_Process_AfterScreenIn	2	Maine, North Dakota
Child welfare response	AltResp_Process_Other	3	Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska
Child welfare response	AltResp_Process_OtherSpecify	3	Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska
Child welfare response	AltResp_ServiceReferral_No	1	Ohio
Child welfare response	AltResp_ServiceReferral_AllCases	2	Connecticut, Hawaii
Child welfare response	AltResp_ServiceReferral_Interest	3	Hawaii, Nebraska, Ohio
Child welfare response	AltResp_ServiceReferral_Risk	2	Nebraska, Ohio
Child welfare response	AltResp_ServiceReferralOther	1	Alabama
Child welfare response	AltResp_ServiceReferralOtherSpec	1	Alabama
Child welfare response	InHome_Unsubstantiated	7	Alabama, Georgia, Maine, Minnesota, Nevada, Ohio, Tennessee
Child welfare response	InHome_PostReunification	5	Alabama, Maine, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Tennessee

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with corrections	Name of state
Child welfare response	TribalFoster	5	Connecticut, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Texas
Child welfare response	TribalFoster_Specify	2	Indiana, Maryland
Child welfare response	CaseManagement_State	4	Minnesota, Mississippi, New Mexico, Texas
Child welfare response	CaseManagement_Provider	5	Florida, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Texas
Child welfare response	CaseManagement_Tribal	3	Maryland, Minnesota, Texas
Child welfare response	CaseManagement_Unknown	4	Minnesota, Mississippi, New Mexico, Texas
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_Associate	3	Ohio, South Dakota, Texas
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_Bachelor	11	Alaska, Arizona, Louisiana, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_Master	11	Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, South Carolina, South Dakota, Washington
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_Training	6	Iowa, Kentucky, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, Texas
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_TrainingSpecify	6	Iowa, Kentucky, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, Texas
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_Experience	12	Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_ExperienceSpec	12	Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_Other	7	Alaska, Idaho, Kentucky, Nevada, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_OtherSpecify	7	Alaska, Idaho, Kentucky, Nevada, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_Unknown	7	Louisiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia
Child welfare system context	ConsentDecree	1	Maine
Child welfare system context	ConsentDecree_Specify	1	Maine

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

APPENDIX D

**Changes to Data Between the 2019 and 2021 SCAN Policies Datasets
That Reflect Changes to State Laws and Policies**

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Appendix D: Changes to Data Between the 2019 and 2021 SCAN Policies Datasets That Reflect Changes to State Laws and Policies

A key objective of the SCAN Policies Database is to identify changes in states' laws and policies over time. This appendix summarizes the changes in state laws and policies that occurred between data collection for the 2019 and 2021 SCAN Policies Database. In addition to summarizing the changes overall and by domain, this appendix includes a detailed list of each variable with changes over this time and identifies states that had changes for that variable.

This appendix provides an overview of changes in data elements from 2019 version 2 to 2021 for all numeric variables. This comparison excluded string variables because most changes to these variables were due to non-substantive revisions (for example, editing, minor text refinements based on input from state contacts, or revising information in the open text response if a newly created categorical variable captured it). Data users who conduct analysis with string variables should review those data to determine if there are any substantive changes of importance for their analysis.

Summary of changes over time

Across all domains, 159 numeric data elements[4] changed between the 2019 version 2 and 2021 data files, which represents changes to 1.07 percent of all numeric data elements in the 2021 SCAN Policies Database. In total, 109 numeric variables that had at least one data element (or state) with a change from 2019 to 2021, which is 37.99 percent of variables.

Table D.1 presents the number and percentage of data elements and variables with changes from 2019 to 2021 for each domain. The reporting domain had the highest number of data elements (59) and variables (35) with changes between 2019 and 2021.

Table D.1. Number and percentage of changes from 2019 to 2021 among numeric data elements and variables, by domain

Domain	Number (%) of numeric data elements with changes	Number of numeric data elements	Number (%) of numeric variables with changes	Number of numeric variables
Definitions	26 (0.82%)	3,172	16 (26.23%)	61
Reporting	59 (1.22%)	4,836	35 (37.64%)	93
Screening	27 (1.27%)	2,132	18 (43.90%)	41
Investigations	7 (0.31%)	2,236	6 (13.95%)	43
Child welfare response	38 (1.55%)	2,444	33 (70.21%)	47
Child welfare system context	2 (1.92%)	104	1 (50.00%)	2
Total across all domains	**159 (1.07%)**	**14,924**	**109 (37.99%)**	**287**

---

[4] Data elements are defined as each state's response to a variable. For example, a variable that has responses from all states, plus Washington DC, and Puerto Rico, would have 52 data elements.

Data elements with changes between 2019 and 2021 data sets

To help data users easily identify the data elements that changed between the 2019 version 2 and 2021 data sets, Table D.2 lists all variables with changes. For each variable, the table depicts the number and name of states with changes for that variable.

Table D.2. List of variables with changes from 2019 to 2021 and the states with those changes

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with change	Name of state
Definition	Def_FailuretoThrive	1	Nevada
Definition	Def_DrugAlcMisuse	1	Colorado
Definition	Def_PrenatalExposure	2	Arkansas, New Mexico
Definition	Def_GenitalMutilation	1	Kentucky
Definition	Def_DV	1	Oregon
Definition	Def_FactitiousDisorder	1	Oregon
Definition	Def_InstitutionalAbuseNeglect	1	Oregon
Definition	Def_Other	1	Oregon
Definition	DefHarm_Other	1	Montana
Definition	DefPerp_AnyAdult	3	Iowa, Oregon, Virginia
Definition	DefPerp_Other	4	Connecticut, Kentucky, Massachusetts, West Virginia
Definition	DefPerp_VaryByType	1	West Virginia
Definition	DefAge_Specify	3	California, Mississippi, Texas
Definition	DefAge_VaryByType	1	Mississippi
Definition	Exempt_SubstanceExposed	1	Kentucky
Definition	SafeHaven_AgeSpecify	3	Arizona, Oklahoma, Utah
Reporting	CentralizedReporting	2	Maryland, North Dakota
Reporting	DecentralizedReporting	2	Maryland, North Dakota
Reporting	Reporter_FosterParent	1	Ohio
Reporting	Reporter_Coach	1	Arkansas
Reporting	Reporter_ShelterStaff	1	Arkansas
Reporting	Reporter_Images	1	Hawaii
Reporting	Reporter_Clergy	1	Hawaii
Reporting	Reporter_Volunteer	2	Arkansas, Kansas
Reporting	Reporter_Other	2	Hawaii, Nevada
Reporting	ReporterTrainingReq	1	New York
Reporting	ReporterTraining_FosterParent	3	Illinois, Louisiana, Ohio
Reporting	ReporterTraining_BusDriver	1	Louisiana
Reporting	ReporterTraining_AfterSchool	2	Louisiana, New York
Reporting	ReporterTraining_ChildcareStaff	2	Illinois, Louisiana
Reporting	ReporterTraining_CampStaff	3	Illinois, Louisiana, New York
Reporting	ReporterTraining_Coach	3	Arkansas, Illinois, Louisiana
Reporting	ReporterTraining_MedicalDental	1	Illinois

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with change	Name of state
Reporting	ReporterTraining_SUDProvider	2	Illinois, New York
Reporting	ReporterTraining_MHProf	1	Illinois
Reporting	ReporterTraining_Police	1	Illinois
Reporting	ReporterTraining_EMTEmergency	2	Illinois, New York
Reporting	ReporterTraining_DAAttorneys	1	New York
Reporting	ReporterTraining_OtherCourt	1	New York
Reporting	ReporterTraining_ShelterStaff	1	New York
Reporting	ReporterTraining_Clergy	1	Illinois
Reporting	ReporterTraining_Volunteer	2	Arkansas, New York
Reporting	ReporterTraining_Other	7	California, Illinois, Indiana, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, Tennessee
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_ShelterStaff	1	Arkansas
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_Images	1	Hawaii
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_Clergy	1	Hawaii
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_Volunteer	1	Kansas
Reporting	ReporterPenalty_Other	2	Hawaii, Nevada
Reporting	ReportInfo_Parent	1	Wisconsin
Reporting	ReportInfo_PriorMaltreatment	1	Oregon
Reporting	TribalReport	3	Colorado, Kansas, Maine
Screening	ScreenInfo_ChildName	1	Minnesota
Screening	ScreenInfo_Perp	1	North Dakota
Screening	ScreenInfo_Other	1	Minnesota
Screening	ScreenRequired	1	North Dakota
Screening	ScreenReq_RiskAssess	1	North Dakota
Screening	ScreenReq_PriorCPS	1	North Dakota
Screening	ScreenReq_Other	1	North Dakota
Screening	ScreenReq_RiskAssessCases	2	Idaho, North Dakota
Screening	ScreenReq_PriorCPSCases	1	North Dakota
Screening	ScreenReq_OtherCases	4	Illinois, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota
Screening	ScreenRiskAssess_SDM	3	Idaho, New Mexico, North Dakota
Screening	ScreenRiskAssess_Other	2	Idaho, North Dakota
Screening	ScreenInfo_Statewide	1	North Dakota
Screening	Screener_Caseworker	1	North Dakota
Screening	Screener_Supervisor	1	North Dakota
Screening	Screener_SpecialUnit	1	North Dakota
Screening	Screener_Other	1	North Dakota
Screening	TribalScreen	3	Colorado, Kansas, Maine
Investigation	InvestReq_MedEval	1	Iowa
Investigation	InvestReq_MHEval	1	Iowa
Investigation	InvestReq_VictimCases	1	Iowa

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with change	Name of state
Investigation	InvestReq_OtherCases	1	Iowa
Investigation	InvestStaff_Supervisor	1	Nevada
Investigation	EvidenceLevel	2	New York, North Dakota
Child welfare response	AlternativeResponse	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityMaltreatment	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_Fatality	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_SubExposed	2	Nebraska, New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_PhysicalAbuse	2	Nebraska, New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_SexAbuse	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_Neglect	2	Nebraska, New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_Abandoned	2	Nebraska, New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_Inelig_Other	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRisk	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRiskTool	1	Iowa
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRisk_No	1	Iowa
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRisk_Low	1	Iowa
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRisk_Moderate	1	Iowa
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRisk_Other	1	Iowa
Child welfare response	AltResp_EligibilityRisk_Unknown	1	Iowa
Child welfare response	AltResp_Eligibility_NoSafetyCon	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_Eligibility_PriorReports	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_Eligibility_Other	2	Nevada, New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_Process_AtScreening	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_Process_AfterScreenIn	1	New Mexico

Domain	Variable name	Number of state with change	Name of state
Child welfare response	AltResp_Process_Other	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_ServiceReferral_No	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_ServiceReferral_AllCases	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_ServiceReferral_Interest	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_ServiceReferral_Risk	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	AltResp_ServiceReferralOther	1	New Mexico
Child welfare response	ExtendedFosterCare	1	Idaho
Child welfare response	ExtendedFosterCare_Age	1	Idaho
Child welfare response	SubGuardianship	1	Arkansas
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_Master	1	Michigan
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_Experience	1	Michigan
Child welfare response	CaseManagerQual_Unknown	1	Tennessee
Child welfare context	ConsentDecree	2	Arizona, Hawaii

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.