## Four Types of Child Death Review Teams Under Current North Carolina Statutes\*

This chart highlights some aspects of review teams; statutory requirements are in Article 14 of the N.C. Juvenile Code (G.S. §7B-1400 – 1414) and G.S. §143B-150.20

|   | Local Community Child   | Local Child Fatality   | State Child Fatality   | State Child Fatality Review  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
|   | Protection Teams (CCPT)<br>[Also designated as Citizen<br>Review Panels, see note<br>below**]   | Prevention Team (CFPT)   | Prevention Team (State CFPT or "State Team")   | <b>Team</b> (State CFRT or "DSS Intensive<br>Review")  |
| DHHS Division and/or<br>local agency providing<br>support | NC Division of Social Services;<br>local social services agency   | NC Division of Family and Child<br>Well Being; local health<br>department  | NC Division of Public Health   | NC Division of Social Services   |
| Local or State  | Local – in every county (many meet with the local CFPT)   | Local – in every county (many meet with the local CCPT)  | State – chaired by Chief Medical<br>Examiner   | State administered, but uses<br>local CFPT & CCPT members  |
| Types of cases<br>reviewed; description                   | Reviews selected active CPS<br>cases and all fatalities with<br>suspected or confirmed child<br>abuse/neglect AND CPS<br>involvement or a DSS report in<br>last 12 months. Teams identify<br>and respond to gaps and<br>deficiencies in public systems. | Reviews all additional types of<br>deaths when CCPT determines<br>it will not. Teams identify and<br>respond to gaps and<br>deficiencies in public systems.<br>CFPTs have several additional<br>required members that CCPTs<br>don't have.                                   | Reviews deaths of children<br>attributed to abuse/neglect or<br>reported as abused or<br>neglected. In practice, team<br>also reviews some other<br>fatalities that are investigated<br>by the statewide Medical<br>Examiner system. Gets some<br>aggregate information from<br>local CFPTs. | Reviews fatality cases with DSS<br>involvement in the last 12<br>months. Conducts longer more<br>in-depth reviews of<br>abuse/neglect fatalities than<br>CCPT or State Team.<br>Recommendations are focused<br>on improving coordination<br>between local and state<br>entities. |
| Where reports are directed                                | Makes recommendations to<br>Board of County<br>Commissioners; reports on<br>activities to local social services<br>board; answers annual survey<br>done by CCPT State Advisory<br>Board related to Citizen Review<br>Panels (see note below).           | Makes recommendations to<br>Board of County<br>Commissioners; reports on<br>activities to the local board of<br>health; reports findings to the<br>state-level Team Coordinator;<br>aggregate reports go to State<br>Child Fatality Prevention Team<br>via Team Coordinator. | Provides reports and makes<br>recommendations to Child<br>Fatality Task Force.   | After consultation with D.A.<br>produces report available to<br>public.  |

\*Chart updated 2/9/2022.

\*\*CITIZEN REVIEW PANELS: All 100 CCPTs have been designated via DSS policy (not by statute) to serve as federally required Citizen Review Panels (CRPs). Federal law requires a minimum of three Citizen Review Panels but due to this designation North Carolina has 100 CRPs. The general purpose of CRPs under federal law is to examine policies, procedures, and practices of state and local child protection agencies and, where appropriate, specific cases (including fatalities) to evaluate effectiveness and adherence to law and policies in order to ensure protection of children. A CCPT State Advisory Board works with N.C. State University to conduct an annual survey of local CCPTs used to produce a report with recommendations to the NC Division of Social Services. The NC Division of Social Services prepares a written response to this report, and both the report and response (related to federal reporting requirements for Citizen Review Panels) are included in the state's Annual Progress and Services Report to U.S. DHHS, Administration for Children and Families.

## Comparison of Current Child Fatality Prevention System with Recommended Strengthened System

|   | Current CFP System   | Recommended Strengthened System   |
|---|--|---|
| STATE-LEVEL<br>SUPPORT AND<br>LEADERSHIP<br>FOR CFP SYSTEM<br>DATA AND<br>INFORMATION | <ul> <li>State-level support is located in different areas of DHHS with separate roles and limited connections with one another</li> <li>There is no one office or individual in charge of coordinating support for the CFP System statewide</li> <li>Each of four teams has different ways of handling data and information</li> <li>There is no formal data/information system that connects system components or easily allows for data aggregation, disaggregation, analysis, and production of meaningful reports</li> <li>The depth of review information collected is much less than would be collected through a national data system used by 48 states</li> <li>Team reviews are required for all child deaths</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>State-level support would be located in one state office within DHHS to streamline and optimize efforts (but OCME staff would stay at OCME)</li> <li>The state office would have a team to support the work of local teams and coordinate the CFP system, including data collection &amp; reporting</li> <li>All teams will use the National Fatality Review Case Reporting System used by 48 other states.</li> <li>The new data system will easily allow for data aggregation, disaggregation, analysis, and production of meaningful reports at the local and state level.</li> <li>A greater depth of information will be collected to help identify trends and concerns in order to drive prevention actions and policy</li> <li>Team reviews would be required for at least nine categories of deaths</li> </ul> |
| TYPES OF<br>DEATHS<br>REVIEWED  | [There are over 1200 deaths per year in NC]  | <ul> <li>where a review is most likely to yield prevention opportunities</li> <li>Fewer reviews would allow for limited resources to be devoted to quality reviews of cases most in need of reviews and would strengthen reviews of infant deaths which make up 2/3 of all child deaths</li> </ul>  |
| NUMBERS AND<br>TYPES OF<br>TEAMS<br>PERFORMING<br>REVIEWS                             | <ul> <li>4 types of teams perform child death reviews: 2 state teams, 2 local teams (in all counties)</li> <li>3 types of teams may review the same death</li> <li>1 type of state team utilizes members of local teams to perform its team reviews, with technical assistance from state-level staff</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Functions of four teams would be consolidated into one local team – counties could choose to have one team in their county or join others to have a multi-county team</li> <li>All relevant local and state-level information is examined in one local review as most relevant information is at the local level.</li> <li>There may be different procedures and different participants for different types of death reviewed in order to optimize effectiveness</li> <li>State-level CFP staff can provide technical assistance for certain types of reviews or in certain situations – e.g., can continue to assist with intensive-type reviews currently done by CFRT</li> </ul>  |
| CITIZEN REVIEW<br>PANELS  | All 100 local Community Child Protection Teams have been designated via policy as federally required Citizen Review Panels   | A more effective way to meet federal requirements for Citizen Review<br>Panels will be developed and implemented (Federal law requires 3 panels) to<br>carry out the intended purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of local and<br>state child protective services agencies.   |
| WHERE<br>INFORMATION<br>IS REPORTED   | <ul> <li>Each of 4 teams has different requirements and practices with respect to reporting on activities, findings, and/or recommendations coming from team reviews</li> <li>There are gaps and challenges with information learned from team reviews reaching relevant and appropriate leaders and organizations who can implement system or policy change or prevention initiatives</li> <li>There is no mechanism or requirement for a report that addresses the functioning of the child fatality prevention system as a whole</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Combining 4 teams into one and having a state office with an integrated information system will ensure that relevant and appropriate information reaches appropriate local and state audiences</li> <li>The Task Force report will be expanded to address whole-system functioning</li> <li>The Task Force report will be required to be distributed to more than the Governor and General Assembly to include other state leaders</li> </ul>  |
| CHILD FATALITY<br>TASK FORCE  | Statutory provisions addressing the Child Fatality Task Force were put in place to address what was originally meant to be a temporary organization but is now 31 years old  | Updated provisions addressing the Child Fatality Task Force would formalize<br>the long-functioning three-committee system of the Task Force and clarify<br>other aspects of Task Force functioning   |

## Four Types of Child Death Review Teams Under Current North Carolina Statutes\*

This chart highlights some aspects of review teams; statutory requirements are in Article 14 of the N.C. Juvenile Code (G.S. §7B-1400 – 1414) and G.S. §143B-150.20