

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**Final Report: New Hampshire Child and Family Services Review**

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the State of New Hampshire. The CFSR was conducted the week of June 9, 2003. The findings were derived from the following documents and data collection procedures:

- The Statewide Assessment, prepared by the State child welfare agency – the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF);
- The State Data Profile, prepared by the Children’s Bureau of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which provides State child welfare data for the years 1999 through 2001;
- Reviews of 50 cases at three sites throughout the State (it should be noted that three of the out-of-home placement cases reviewed were the placement and care responsibility of the Division for Juvenile Justice Services (DJJS) through its agreement with the child welfare agency); and
- Interviews or focus groups (conducted at all three sites and at the State-level) with stakeholders including, but not limited to children, parents, foster parents, all levels of child welfare agency personnel, collaborating agency personnel, service providers, court personnel, and attorneys.

A key finding of the New Hampshire CFSR is that the State is in substantial conformity with one of the seven outcomes and with five of the seven systemic factors. With regard to the outcomes, New Hampshire achieved substantial conformity with Well Being Outcome 2. The CFSR determined that DCYF effectively addresses the educational needs of children in foster care and in-home services cases.

The two weakest areas of State performance on the outcomes occurred for Permanency Outcome 1 (Children have permanency and stability in their living situations) and Well Being Outcome 1 (Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children’s needs). For permanency outcome 1, both case review findings and the State Data Profile indicate that DCYF is not effective in preventing foster care re-entries and in reunifying and achieving finalized adoptions for children in a timely manner. In addition, although the State met the national standard for the percentage of children in foster care for less than 12 months who experienced no more than 2 placements, case reviewers found that in a substantial percentage of the applicable cases reviewed, children experienced inappropriate placement changes.

With regard to Well Being Outcome 1, all of the indicators for the outcome were determined to be in need of improvement. Although performance on this outcome was fairly low in all sites, cases in Keene were more likely to be rated as having substantially achieved this outcome (75 percent) than were cases in Manchester (48%) or in Portsmouth (53%). The case review findings indicate that the agency did not consistently assess underlying parental issues that posed a risk to children, such as domestic violence, substance abuse, or sexual abuse, resulting in a lack of appropriate service provision.

With regard to the systemic factors, the State was determined to be in substantial conformity with the factors of Statewide Information System; Quality Assurance System; Training; Agency Responsiveness to the Community; and Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. The State did not achieve substantial conformity with the systemic factors of Case Review System or Service Array. With respect to the systemic factor of Case Reviews, the CFSR found that the State was not convening permanency hearings in accordance with Federal requirements. Rather than holding the child's first permanency hearing 12-months from the date that the child entered foster care, the State courts determined that the first permanency hearing should be convened 12 months after the adjudication hearing. Because adjudication hearings in the State often were delayed for several months, children's permanency hearings also were being delayed. Court-related delays were found to impede service provision before and during placement into foster care, negatively impacting safety and permanency for children.

The findings with regard to the State's performance on the safety and permanency outcomes are presented in table 1 at the end of the Executive Summary. Findings regarding well-being outcomes are presented in table 2. Table 3 presents the State's performance relative to the national standards, and table 4 provides information pertaining to the State's substantial conformity with the seven systemic factors assessed through the CFSR.

## **I. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES**

### **Safety Outcome 1: Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect**

Safety Outcome 1 incorporates two indicators. One pertains to the timeliness of initiating a response to a child maltreatment report (item 1) and the other relates to the recurrence of substantiated or indicated maltreatment for the same children (item 2).

New Hampshire did not achieve substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1. Although the outcome was substantially achieved in 97.7 percent of the cases reviewed (which is more than the 90 percent required for a rating of substantial conformity), the State Data Profile indicates that the State did not meet the national standard for the percentage of children in 2001 experiencing more than one substantiated or indicated child maltreatment report within a 6-month period. However, the State did meet the national standard for the percentage of children maltreated while in foster care in 2001.

A key CFSR finding with regard to this outcome is that DCYF initiates child maltreatment investigations and establishes face-to-face contact with alleged child victims in accordance with State-established timeframes. However, only 9 (18%) of the 50 cases were applicable for an assessment of this indicator. For the remainder of the cases reviewed, there was no maltreatment report during the

CFSR period under review. In addition, despite the case review finding of no maltreatment recurrence as it is measured for the CFSR (item 2), the maltreatment recurrence data reported in the State Data Profile indicate that New Hampshire did not meet the national standard for this measure. Stakeholders expressed concern that State statute requires a pattern of harm be established before reports of maltreatment can be substantiated.

### **Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes when possible and appropriate**

Performance relevant to safety outcome 2 is assessed through 2 indicators. One indicator (item 3) addresses the issue of DCYF's efforts to prevent children's removal from their homes by providing services to the families that ensure children's safety while they remain in their homes. The other indicator (item 4) pertains to DCYF's effectiveness in reducing the risk of harm to the child.

New Hampshire did not achieve substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2. This determination is based on the finding that the outcome was substantially achieved in 83.0 percent of the cases reviewed, which does not meet the 90 percent required for a rating of substantial conformity.

Although the State did not achieve substantial conformity with safety outcome 2, a key finding of the CFSR was that in most of the cases reviewed, DCYF provided appropriate services to families to prevent the removal of children from their homes and made concerted efforts to address the risk of harm to children. However, in some cases, reviewers determined that the assessments conducted were not sufficient to address the safety issues in the home, which resulted in some children remaining at risk. This latter finding is consistent with the opinions of some stakeholders that DCYF is not as effective as it needs to be in assessing for underlying problems in the family, such as domestic violence, sexual abuse, and substance abuse.

### **Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.**

There are 6 indicators incorporated in the assessment of permanency outcome 1, although not all of them are relevant for all children. The indicators pertain to the agency's effectiveness in preventing foster care re-entry (item 5), ensuring placement stability for children in foster care (item 6), and establishing appropriate permanency goals for children in foster care in a timely manner (item 7). Depending on the child's permanency goal, the remaining indicators focus on the agency's efforts to achieve permanency goals (such as reunification, guardianship, adoption, and permanent placement with relatives) in a timely manner (items 8 and 9), or whether the agency is effective in ensuring that children who have other planned living arrangements are in stable placements and adequately prepared for eventual independent living (item 10).

New Hampshire did not achieve substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1. This determination is based on the following findings:

- The outcome was substantially achieved in 41.9 percent of the cases, which is less than the 90 percent required for an overall rating of substantial conformity.
- The State Data Profile indicates that for fiscal year (FY) 2001, the State did not meet the national standard for the percentage of children who (1) were re-entering foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode, (2) were reunified within 12 months of entry into foster care and (3) were discharged to finalized adoptions within 24 months of entry into foster care.

However, the State did meet the national standard for the percentage of children in FY 2001 who were in foster care for less than 12 months and who experienced 2 or fewer placements.

All indicators pertaining to Permanency Outcome 1 were rated as Areas Needing Improvement. The key concerns identified during the CFSR pertained to inconsistencies with regard to DCYF efforts to establish appropriate permanency goals and to file for termination of parental rights in a timely manner. In addition, case reviewers determined that in many cases the agency had not made diligent efforts to achieve reunifications or adoptions in a timely manner. Both case reviews and stakeholder comments indicated that there are multiple agency- and court-related barriers to achieving timely adoptions.

### **Permanency Outcome 2. The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.**

Permanency outcome 2 incorporates six indicators that assess agency performance with regard to (1) placing children in foster care in close proximity to their parents and close relatives (item 11); (2) placing siblings together (item 12); (3) ensuring frequent visitation between children and their parents and siblings in foster care (item 13); (4) preserving connections of children in foster care with

extended family, community, cultural heritage, religion, and schools (item 14); (5) seeking relatives as potential placement resources (item 15); and (6) promoting the relationship between children and their parents while the children are in foster care (item 16).

New Hampshire did not achieve substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2. This determination is based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 74.2 percent of the cases, which is less than the 90 percent required for substantial conformity. Cases in Keene and Manchester were more likely to have achieved substantial conformity with this outcome (86%) than cases in Portsmouth (56%).

A key CFSR finding is that DCYF makes concerted efforts to (1) place children in close proximity to their families, (2) place siblings together in foster care, and (3) preserve children's connections with their extended families. However, the CFSR also found that DCYF is less diligent with regard to its efforts to facilitate visitation between children in foster care with their siblings and parents. An additional finding is that concerns raised by the review with respect to this outcome pertained to lack of agency efforts to seek and assess relatives as placement resources and support or strengthen the parent-child relationship, particularly with respect to fathers and paternal relatives.

### **Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.**

Well Being Outcome 1 incorporates four indicators. One pertains to agency efforts to ensure that the service needs of children, parents, and foster parents are assessed and that the necessary services are provided to meet identified needs (item 17). A second indicator assesses agency effectiveness with regard to actively involving parents and children (when appropriate) in the case planning process (item 18). The two remaining indicators examine the frequency and quality of caseworker contacts with the children in their caseloads (item 19) and the children's parents (item 20).

New Hampshire did not achieve substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1. This determination is based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved for 56.0 percent of the cases reviewed, which is less than the 90 percent required for a determination of substantial conformity. There was some difference across sites included in the onsite CFSR with regard to performance on this outcome. Cases in Keene were more likely to be rated as having substantially achieved this outcome (75 percent) than were cases in Manchester (48%) or in Portsmouth (53%).

All indicators for Well-Being Outcome 1 were rated as Areas Needing Improvement. Case reviewers determined that the agency was not consistently effective in (1) assessing children's and parent's needs and providing appropriate services to meet those needs, (2)

involving children and families in case planning, and (3) ensuring that the contact between caseworkers and the children and parents in their caseloads was of sufficient frequency and quality to meet the needs of the family.

**Well Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.**

There is only one indicator for well being outcome 2 and that pertains to agency effectiveness in addressing children’s educational needs (item 21).

New Hampshire achieved substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2 based on the finding that 94.8 percent of the cases reviewed were determined to have substantially achieved this outcome, which meets the 90 percent required for substantial conformity.

The CFSR found that DCYF made concerted efforts to assess children's educational needs and provide appropriate services to meet those needs effectively. Case review findings and stakeholder interviews indicate that foster parents have assumed primary responsibility for advocating for children with the educational system and for ensuring that children’s educational needs are being addressed. In addition, according to the Statewide Assessment, the agency has both a formal relationship with the Department of Education, through the James O. Consent decree, and informal relationships between DCYF staff, educational specialists, and the Department of Education that contribute significantly to meeting children’s educational needs.

**Well Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.**

This outcome incorporates two indicators; one assesses agency efforts to meet children’s physical health needs (item 22) and the other assesses agency efforts to address children’s mental health needs (item 23).

New Hampshire did not achieve substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 77.6 percent of the 49 applicable cases, which is less than the 90 percent required for a determination of substantial conformity. However, 100 percent of the applicable cases reviewed in Keene were rated as having substantially achieved this outcome compared to 73 percent of the cases in Manchester and 67 percent of the cases in Portsmouth. Stakeholders in Keene who were interviewed during the onsite CFSR noted that the local DCYF office participates in community and inter-agency collaboratives that expand both the availability of, and access to, services. These collaborative efforts may explain why all of the cases in that site were found to have substantially achieved this outcome.

A key CFSR finding is that DCYF generally is effective in addressing children's physical health needs, but is less effective in assessing and addressing their mental health needs. Case reviews and stakeholders comments suggest that children's mental health needs are not being consistently assessed when it is apparent that a mental health assessment is needed.

## **II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS**

### **Statewide Information System**

Substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System is determined by whether the State is operating a statewide information system that can identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for children in foster care.

New Hampshire is in substantial conformity with this factor because the State's information system, Bridges, meets these requirements.

### **Case Review System**

Five indicators are used to assess the State's performance with regard to the systemic factor of a Case Review System. The indicators examine the development of case plans and parent involvement in that process (item 25), the consistency of 6-month case reviews (item 26) and 12-month permanency hearings (item 27), the implementation of procedures to seek termination of parental rights (TPR) in accordance with the timeframes established in the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) (item 28), and the notification and inclusion of foster and pre-adoptive parents and relative caregivers in case reviews and hearings (item 29).

New Hampshire is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. Key CFSR findings indicate that DCYF is not consistent in involving parents in the case planning process or in holding permanency hearings for children in foster care in a timely manner. With regard to the timeliness of permanency hearings, stakeholders commenting on this issue noted that in New Hampshire, the courts convene the initial permanency hearing 12 months from the time of the adjudication hearing instead of 12 months from the time of the child's entry into foster care. Because adjudication hearings can be delayed, sometimes for several months, many children in foster care do not have a permanency hearing 12 months from the date that they entered foster care. The CFSR also found that permanency hearings are not being held on a consistent basis for cases involving Children in Need of Supervision (CHINS) or adjudicated delinquents. Another key finding with respect to this systemic factor is that there are numerous agency- and court-related delays pertaining to termination of parental rights (TPR).

Despite these concerns, the CFSR did determine that DCYF is effective in ensuring that there is a process for a review of the status of each child in foster care at least every 6 months. Stakeholders commenting on this issue noted that these reviews are held in a timely manner and facilitate substantive discussion of the status of each child. In addition, the CFSR found that foster parents, preadoptive parents, and relative caregivers are notified of reviews and hearings and in general they are given the opportunity to attend reviews and provide input in person or, if they are unable to attend, they can provide input in a written form.

### **Quality Assurance System**

The State's performance with regard to the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System is based on whether the State has developed standards to ensure the safety and health of children in foster care (item 30) and whether the State is operating a statewide quality assurance system that evaluates the quality and effectiveness of services and measures program strengths and areas needing improvement (item 31).

New Hampshire is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The CFSR determined that DCYF has implemented standards to protect the health and safety of children in foster care and that the State's quality assurance (QA) system evaluates the quality of services, identifies strengths and needs for improvement through quality review reports, and monitors follow-up to the reports.

### **Training**

The systemic factor of training incorporates an assessment of the State's new worker training program (item 32), ongoing training efforts for child welfare agency staff (item 33), and training for foster and adoptive parents (item 34).

New Hampshire is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of training. The CFSR determined that both the initial training and ongoing training for DCYF staff who deliver services to children and families are effective, support the goals and objectives of the Child and Family Services Plan, and support the development of the knowledge and skills necessary for effective service delivery.

The CFSR also found that the State provides comprehensive pre-placement and ongoing training to foster and adoptive parents that is effective in preparing them to parent effectively the children in their care. In addition, the State has supported the development of a Foster Parents Association that provides training and support to foster parents throughout the State.

## **Service Array**

The assessment of the systemic factor of service array addresses three questions: (1) Does the State have in place an array of services that meet the needs of children and families served by the child welfare agency (item 35)? (2) Are these services accessible to families and children throughout the State (item 36)? And (3) Can services be individualized to meet the unique needs of the children and family served by the child welfare agency (item 37)?

New Hampshire is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array. The CFSR determined that the services available in the State are not adequate to enable children to remain safely with their parents when reasonable and help children in foster and adoptive placements achieve permanency. In addition, the CFSR found that existing services are not consistently available throughout the State. Key services that were noted to be lacking were substance abuse treatment and mental health services.

Despite these concerns, the CFSR also determined that DCYF is effective in tailoring services to meet the individual needs of children and families. Stakeholder comments generally agreed with information in the Statewide Assessment indicating that DCYF promotes a family-centered approach to case planning that focuses on meeting individualized needs.

## **Agency Responsiveness to the Community**

The systemic factor of agency responsiveness to the community incorporates the extent of the State's consultation with external stakeholders in developing and implementing the Child and Family Services Plan (items 38 and 39), and the extent to which the State coordinates child welfare services with services or benefits of other Federal or federally assisted programs serving the same population (item 40).

New Hampshire is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community.

Item 38 is rated as an Area Needing Improvement because although DCYF staff participate in a variety of State level interagency committees and advisory boards, the major concerns of local stakeholders, consumers, foster care providers, the courts, and other public and private child- and family-serving agencies are not frequently included in the goals and objectives of the CFSP.

Item 39 is rated as a Strength because DCYF develops annual reports of progress and services in consultation with their advisory groups and other stakeholders. The Citizen's Review Panel also develops an annual report

Item 40 is rated as a Strength because services are coordinated with a range of Federal and federally assisted programs through inter-agency collaboratives.

### **Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention**

The assessment of this systemic factor focuses on the State's standards for foster homes and child care institutions (items 41 and 42), the State's compliance with Federal requirements for criminal background checks for foster and adoptive parents (item 43), the State's efforts to recruit foster and adoptive parents that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of foster children (item 44), and the State's activities with regard to using cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate permanent placements for waiting children (item 45).

New Hampshire is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. The CFSR found that all foster-family homes and child care institutions are uniformly required to meet the State's licensing and certification standards, and that criminal background checks and reviews of child maltreatment histories are consistently completed for foster families and child care institution staff. These clearances include checks in States where applicants previously lived.

The CFSR also found that DCYF conducts recruitment activities throughout the State and works with community partners to help recruit foster and adoptive homes that reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of the children in care and that the agency uses a variety of methods to facilitate the placement of children with adoptive families across jurisdictional lines.

**Table 1. CFSR Ratings for Safety and Permanency Outcomes and Items for New Hampshire**

| Outcomes and Indicators  | Outcome Ratings                   |  |                                | Item Ratings    |                         |                               |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
|  | <i>In Substantial Conformity?</i> | <i>Percent Substantially Achieved*</i> | <i>Met National Standards?</i> | <i>Rating**</i> | <i>Percent Strength</i> | <i>Met National Standards</i> |
| Safety Outcome 1-Children are first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect             | No                                | 97.7                                   | 1 met, 1 not met               |                 |                         |                               |
| Item 1: Timeliness of investigations   |                                   |  |                                | Strength        | 89                      |                               |
| Item 2: Repeat maltreatment  |                                   |  |                                | ANI             | 100                     | No                            |
| Safety Outcome 2 - Children are safely maintained in their homes when possible and appropriate | No                                | 83.0                                   |                                |                 |                         |                               |
| Item 3: Services to prevent removal  |                                   |  |                                | Strength        | 85                      |                               |
| Item 4: Risk of harm   |                                   |  |                                | Strength        | 85                      |                               |
| Permanency Outcome 1- Children have permanency and stability in their living situations        | No                                | 41.9                                   | 1 met, 3 not met               |                 |                         |                               |
| Item 5: Foster care re-entry   |                                   |  |                                | ANI             | 80.0                    | No                            |
| Item 6: Stability of foster care placements  |                                   |  |                                | ANI             | 84                      | Yes                           |
| Item 7: Permanency goal for child  |                                   |  |                                | ANI             | 65                      |                               |
| Item 8: Reunification, guardianship and placement with relatives                               |                                   |  |                                | ANI             | 63                      | No                            |
| Item 9: Adoption   |                                   |  |                                | ANI             | 36                      | No                            |
| Item 10: Other planned living arrangement  |                                   |  |                                | ANI             | 67                      |                               |
| Permanency Outcome 2 - The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved     | No                                | 77.4                                   |                                |                 |                         |                               |
| Item 11: Proximity of placement  |                                   |  |                                | Strength        | 100                     |                               |
| Item 12: Placement with siblings   |                                   |  |                                | Strength        | 94                      |                               |
| Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care                                     |                                   |  |                                | ANI             | 71                      |                               |
| Item 14: Preserving connections  |                                   |  |                                | Strength        | 90                      |                               |
| Item 15: Relative placement  |                                   |  |                                | ANI             | 76                      |                               |
| Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents  |                                   |  |                                | ANI             | 76                      |                               |

\*90 percent of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the State to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

\*\*Items may be rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement (ANI).

**Table 2. CFSR Ratings for Child and Family Well Being Outcomes and Items**

| <b>Outcomes and Indicators</b>  | <b>Outcome Ratings</b>            |  | <b>Item Ratings</b>           |                 |                         |                               |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
|   | <i>In Substantial Conformity?</i> | <i>Percent Substantially Achieved*</i> | <i>Met National Standards</i> | <i>Rating**</i> | <i>Percent Strength</i> | <i>Met National Standards</i> |
| Well Being Outcome 1 – Families have enhanced capacity to provide for children's needs                  | No                                | 56.0                                   |                               |                 |                         |                               |
| Item 17: Needs/services of child, parents, and foster parents   |                                   |  |                               | ANI             | 60                      |                               |
| Item 18: Child/family involvement in case planning  |                                   |  |                               | ANI             | 59                      |                               |
| Item 19: Worker visits with child   |                                   |  |                               | ANI             | 74                      |                               |
| Item 20: Worker visits with parents   |                                   |  |                               | ANI             | 65                      |                               |
| Well Being Outcome 2 – Children receive services to meet their educational needs                        | Yes                               | 94.8                                   |                               |                 |                         |                               |
| Item 21: Educational needs of child   |                                   |  |                               | Strength        | 95                      |                               |
| Well Being Outcome 3 – Children receive services to meet their physical and mental health needs are met | No                                | 77.6                                   |                               |                 |                         |                               |
| Item 22: Physical health of child   |                                   |  |                               | Strength        | 89                      |                               |
| Item 23: Mental health of child   |                                   |  |                               | ANI             | 79                      |                               |

\*90 percent of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the State to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

\*\*Items may be rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement (ANI).

\*\*\*Well Being Outcome 3 – Both applicable items must be rated a strength for the outcome to be substantially achieved.

**Table 3: New Hampshire's Performance on the Six Outcome Measures for Which National Standards have been Established (2001 data)**

| <b>Outcome Measure</b>   | <b>National Standard</b> | <b>New Hampshire Data</b> |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Of all children who were victims of a substantiated or indicated maltreatment report in the first 6 months of CY 2001, what percent were victims of another substantiated or indicated report within a 6-month period? | 6.1% or less             | 8.3%                      |
| Of all children who were in foster care in the first 9 months of CY 2001, what percent experienced maltreatment from foster parents or facility staff members?   | .57% or less             | .10%                      |
| Of all children who entered foster care in FY 2001, what percent were re-entering care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode?  | 8.6% or less             | 13.3%                     |
| Of all children reunified from foster care in FY 2001, what percent were reunified within 12 months of entry into foster care?   | 76.2% or more            | 48.8%                     |
| Of all children who were adopted from foster care in FY 2001, what percent were adopted within 24 months of their entry into foster care?  | 32.0% or more            | 5.2%                      |
| Of all children in foster care during FY 2001 for less than 12 months, what percent experienced no more than 2 placement settings?   | 86.7% or more            | 88.7%                     |