Magna Scientia Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2582-9394
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/msarr
Journal homepage: https://msarr.magnascientiapub.com/

(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Check for updates

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF DATA ANALYTICS APPLICATIONS FOR ENHANCING ACCOUNTABILITY AND OUTCOME MEASUREMENT IN U.S. CHILD WELFARE SUPPORT AND CARE SYSTEMS

Tinotenda Mukaira [1,*], Mary Magdalene Yeboah [2] and Matthew Oman-Amoako [3]

[1] Northeastern University, Boston, USA.
[2] University of Ghana Business School, Ghana.
[3] Accra Institute of Technology, Ghana.
* Corresponding Author

Magna Scientia Advanced Research and Review, 2026, 18(01), 225–235

Publication history: Received on 22 August 2026; revised on 29 September 2026; accepted on 01 October 2026

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/msarr.2026.18.1.0199

Copyright © 2026Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

ABSTRACT

This is a critical review that examines the current trends in applications of data analytics for accountability and outcome determination in U.S. child welfare models. Analytics tools, such as data administrative dashboards, risk predictive models, and decision making support models, are gaining applicability by child welfare organization to enhance assessment of risk, performance stem surveillance, characterize service gaps, and for outcome tracking besides stability placement, reunification, readmission into care, and the maltreatment recurrence. Nevertheless, the review purports that data analytics entirely cannot serve as a technical solution. Child welfare information is determined by institutional processes, reporting trends, service levels, and outstanding demographic disparities and socioeconomic inequalities. Analytical tools, if when not validated carefully, and thoroughly examined through microscopic review lenses, can multiply instead of mitigating the disparities that exists. This paper is premised on privacy protection, transparency, accountability, expertise review, and family involvement as fundamental undertakings for responsible analytics applicability. It is premised that meaningful accountability is essential for ethical governance, capacity for corrective action, and a recognition that analytics ought to support, not eliminate, professional judgment in children issues decisions making, agencies and families.

Keywords: Data Analytics, Predictive Analytics, Child Welfare, Administrative Data, Algorithmic Governance, Data Justice

1 INTRODUCTION

In USA, child welfare support and care systems carry remarkable responsibilities for the permanency well-being and safety of the younger generation and their families (Cuccaro-Alamin et al., 2017). Decisions encompasses maltreatment report screening, undertaking investigations and allocating the children to appropriate foster care and reuniting parents to their children as wells as ensuring that permanency placement often under situation of fragmented information, litigation deadlines, unrelenting caseloads and child safety issues and concerns. In this regard data analytics plays a critical role in fostering this integration in child protection and safety (Kum et al., 2015).

Enormous volumes of administrative data are gathered by child welfare agencies covering reports, investigations, substantiations, placements, service referrals, court activity, case closures, and reentry into care (Shaw et al., 2018). These data can be used to recognize patterns of practice and outcomes, assist with risk assessment, support service planning, and monitor performance over time (Shaw et al., 2018; Kum et al., 2015). As Shaw et al. (2018) demonstrate, one of the most important features of administrative data is the capacity to examine system activity across big populations and over extended periods, a capability that is uniquely valuable for child welfare research and accountability.

This rising use of analytics is part of a broader shift toward evidence-based governance (Kum et al., 2015). The Child Abuse Mitigation and Treatment Act (CAPTA) and the Family First Mitigation Services Act of 2018 (FFPSA) establish the federal legislative model within which state child welfare accountability systems operate, requiring evidence-based program standards, standardized outcome reporting, and performance accountability to the HHS Administration for Children and Families through the Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSR). Within this model, data analytics offers agencies the tools to move beyond procedural compliance toward meaningful performance accountability.

However, analytics in child welfare is not without controversy. Child welfare data are not value-free. They are shaped by reporting patterns, agency practices, service availability, legal systems, and social inequalities. Families experiencing poverty, racial marginalization, immigration status challenges, or disability may have increased contact with public systems and mandatory reporters, fostering their visibility in administrative records. Predictive models trained on these records may replicate patterns of surveillance and intervention rather than accurately measuring actual risk. Redden (2020) frames this as a data justice issue, arguing that data systems can expand institutional authority over families already under public oversight.

A focus on racial equity is therefore essential to any serious examination of child welfare analytics. Berkman et al. (2022) argue that racism in child welfare raises fundamental ethical questions about harm. Dettlaff (2023) situates these concerns within the broader history of racialized family regulation in the United States, a history directly relevant to analytics because models can appear objective while reflecting biased data and unequal agency practices.

Presented by this paper is a practical view accountability applications for data analytics and outcome determination in USA child support, protection and care systems. The critical review digs beyond the empirical underpinnings evaluating the assumptions, limitations, and implications of how analytics has been applied, identifying not only what the evidence shows but where it falls short.

2 METHODOLOGY

This paper is anchored on a critical narrative review design, which is appropriate because data analytics in child welfare spans multiple disciplines, including child protection social work, law, public administration, computer science, and human-computer interaction. Narrative and literature review approaches are useful for integrating heterogeneous bodies of evidence and synthesizing conceptual, methodological, and practice-based perspectives (Paul & Criado, 2020; Kraus et al., 2022). The multidisciplinary character of child welfare analytics is also evident in prior reviews examining predictive and prescriptive analytics and human-centered algorithmic systems in child welfare (Hall et al., 2024; Saxena et al., 2020).

The review focuses on published scholarly works from 2015 through to 2026, while integrating foundational seminal works relevant to theoretical improvements. Sources were determined based on three dimensions: first, child welfare relevance, foster care and child protection, or related public systems serving children; second, relevance to data, algorithms, analytics, administrative data, risk assessment, accountability, or outcome measurement; and third, provision of empirical, conceptual, legal, ethical, or policy applicability to U.S. child welfare support and care systems. General AI or public service analytics literature were considered only where it provided models directly relevant to child welfare accountability and governance.

The synthesis is conceptually categorized around administrative data use, predictive risk modeling, performance monitoring, outcome determination, algorithmic governance, transparency, racial bias, human supervision, data justice, and execution challenges. Because the studies varied in their methods, data sources, and outcome definitions, the literature was critically reviewed rather than statistically combined through meta-analysis (Paul & Criado, 2020; Kraus et al., 2022).

This review is informed by the author's professional experience in child protection, program monitoring and evaluation, public-sector accountability, and performance management in Zimbabwe and the United States. This practitioner background shaped the review's attention to the organizational processes through which analytic findings are

translated into service responses and corrective action. Professional experience was used as interpretive context rather than as empirical evidence, and the paper's conclusions are based on the literature included in the review.

3 CONCEPTUAL MODEL: DATA ANALYTICS IN U.S. CHILD WELFARE SUPPORT AND CARE SYSTEMS

Data analytics in child welfare denotes to the systematic application of data for decision-making, system performance monitoring, and outcome evaluation (Kum et al., 2015; Lery et al., 2016). It encompasses descriptive, predictive, and prescriptive paradigms. Descriptive analytics reflects past and current activity. Predictive forecasting generates estimates of future events. Prescriptive analytics provides recommendations based on data. These approaches are applied across the child welfare continuum from initial reports and investigations through placements, services, reunification, permanency, and reentry.

The most common application is descriptive analytics, used by agencies to determine caseloads, investigation results, placement activity, service referrals, and permanency timelines. Shaw et al. (2018) demonstrate that administrative data are particularly valuable when agencies and researchers seek to examine outcomes across big populations and over time. Predictive forecasting extends this by applying historical data to forecast future events such as repeated maltreatment reports, foster care entry, placement disruption, or reentry following reunification (Cuccaro-Alamin et al., 2017; Drake et al., 2020). Prescriptive analytics, though less developed in child welfare, offers potential for recommending services, placement supports, or resource allocation strategies.

As analytics use has expanded, so has the understanding of accountability. Traditional accountability determinants focus on procedural completion, visits conducted, assessments filed, and court reports submitted. Data analytics enables agencies to ask important questions about placement stability, service access, recurrence likelihood, reunification, and group-level disparities. Kum et al. (2015) describe big data as a resource for evidence-based governance in child welfare, framing data not as documentation but as a means of learning and informing public decision making. Lery et al. (2016) further argue that big data practice in child welfare requires clear principles ensuring that data are relevant, valid, ethical, and actionable.

Data analytics must therefore be understood as a socio-technical practice, one that depends not only on databases, models, and dashboards but on the workers, supervisors, families, courts, service providers, and communities who interpret and act on analytic outputs (Kawakami et al., 2022; Saxena et al., 2020). A dashboard becomes meaningful only when agencies take action based on what it displays. A risk score is useful only when interpreted alongside case evidence and professional judgment. In this sense, analytics is not a child welfare practice in isolation; it is a component of how the system identifies problems, assigns responsibility, and evaluates outcomes.

4 PREDICTIVE ANALYTICS, RISK ASSESSMENT, AND DECISION SUPPORT

Predictive forecasting is among the most significant and contested applications of data in child welfare (Cuccaro-Alamin et al., 2017; Redden, 2020). It employs historical records to estimate probabilities of future events, including repeated maltreatment reports, foster care entry, placement disruption, delayed permanency, or reentry following reunification. These tools are typically introduced to assist decision-making when choices must be made under time constraints and informational uncertainty.

The appeal of Predictive forecasting lies in the inherent complexity of child welfare risk assessment. Agencies receive enormous datasets of maltreatment reports, some involving genuine safety concerns and others involving complex family needs more appropriately addressed through support than removal. Caseworkers must make consequential determinations under pressure. Predictive tools can help structure available information and identify cases requiring closer examination. Cuccaro-Alamin et al. (2017) situate predictive risk modeling within the practical reality of child protective services, where workers face the task of making high-stakes decisions with limited information, and note that model outputs must always be understood within the context of agency decision making.

Utility predictive model is fundamentally dependent on its applicability. According to Drake et al., (2020) modeling of predictive risk out to be evaluated in real practice settings and not on statistical relevance. The fundamental question is not whether a model has the ability to produce a risk score but whether that score improves decision making, service allocation, and child and family outcomes. Schwartz et al. (2017) demonstrate through the Broward County implementation that local institutional conditions, alongside supervisory culture, service availability, worker experience, and data system quality, significantly moderate whether analytic tools contribute to or complicate decision making. A model that performs well in one jurisdiction may not transfer to another.

Predictive forecasting can also serve system-level accountability. Russell & Mcgill (2015) employed predictive methods to examine demographic, policy, and practice factors driving foster care rates, enabling agencies to assess whether

elevated placement rates reflect genuine child risk, policy variation, or practice inconsistency. This system-level application extends Predictive forecasting beyond individual case screening toward population-level governance.

However, serious questions arise about what predictive models actually measure. Many models predict future system involvement reports, substantiations, removals, or returns to care rather than direct indicators of child harm. These outcomes are shaped by local practice, legislation, service availability, and reporting standards. A model predicting future system contact may therefore be replicating the behavior of the child welfare system rather than etermining actual safety or need. Hall et al. (2024) demonstrate that accuracy, equity, and bias must be evaluated simultaneously; overall model accuracy is insufficient if error rates differ significantly across demographic subgroups. False positives expose families to unnecessary investigation and system involvement. False negatives may leave children without needed support.

Prediction must therefore be linked to mitigation and service response. Lanier et al. (2020) connect Predictive forecasting to infant maltreatment mitigation and call for ethical norms in evidence-based child welfare policy, noting that a risk score is only useful if it enables timely and appropriate service delivery. Decision support instruments must retain transparent and subject to professional override. Saxena et al. (2020) argue for human-centered review of algorithmic systems in child welfare, and Kawakami et al. (2022) find that algorithmic models must align with frontline practice supporting worker inquiry rather than replacing worker judgment.

5 ADMINISTRATIVE DATA, PERFORMANCE SURVEILLANCE, AND OUTCOME MEASUREMENT

Accountability and outcome measurement in child welfare rely primarily on administrative data. Agencies capture reports, screening decisions, investigations, substantiations, removals, placements, services, court activity, permanency goals, exits from care, and reentries. Though generated for practice and compliance purposes, these records provide the empirical foundation for performance surveillance, research, and policy review. Shaw et al. (2018) demonstrate that administrative data are particularly valuable for examining child welfare outcomes at the demographic level and across time.

At the federal level, the Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSR) conducted by the HHS Administration for Children and Families establishes national performance standards for child safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes, providing the formal accountability model within which state-level data analytics systems operate (Shaw et al., 2018; Kum et al., 2015). These reviews require states to demonstrate measurable improvements in outcomes, including placement stability, reunification, adoption, guardianship, and reentry outcomes that administrative data analytics are uniquely positioned to monitor.

Performance surveillance through administrative data enables agencies to compare outcomes across offices, counties, providers, and demographic groups. This system-level perspective helps agencies identify trends not apparent in individual case review. Kum et al. (2015) connect this function to evidence-based governance, enabling agencies to test whether decisions produce the intended outcomes and adjust policy accordingly. Russell and Mcgill (2015) extend this by examining how demographic and policy factors drive foster care rates, providing agencies with tools to distinguish child safety from practice variation as drivers of placement decisions.

However, the meaning of administrative outcomes must be interpreted with care (Shaw et al., 2018). Administrative data documents system events rather than indicators of child and family well-being (Shaw et al., 2018; Folk et al., 2024). A permanency record indicates that a child achieved legal stability, but it does not confirm that the placement is emotionally supportive. A service referral indicates that a family was connected to resources; it does not confirm that those resources were accessible, culturally appropriate, or effective. While administrative data captures events such as placement changes or case closures, it cannot capture the subjective experience of children and families, including their sense of safety, trust in caregivers, cultural belonging, or recovery from trauma.

Service access is a particularly important component of outcome measurement. Child welfare-involved families may require housing, mental health services, substance use treatment, parenting support, domestic violence services, transportation, and kinship support. Administrative data can reflect referrals made and services completed, but may not indicate whether services were available when needed. Poor outcomes may reflect service system failures rather than family unwillingness, a distinction with direct implications for accountability and corrective action. Egbunu and Cudjoe-Mensah (2025) highlight the essence fortrauma-informed approaches in foster care, underscoring that placement stability is an insufficient measure of child well-being. Folk et al. (2024) further argue that intervention evaluations must assess feasibility, acceptability, and family engagement, not merely whether services were recorded as delivered.

Administrative data can also support equity surveillance. Agencies can disaggregate outcomes by race, ethnicity, age, disability, placement type, and geography, enabling identification of disparities in investigations, removal, placement stability, reunification, and reentry. Dettlaff (2023) and Berkman et al. (2022) make explicit that child welfare accountability must confront racial harm and disparities in system involvement. Quantitative patterns, however, require contextual interpretation through case review, worker feedback, family perspectives, and community engagement.

6 ACCOUNTABILITY, TRANSPARENCY, AND GOVERNANCE

Since data analytics in child welfare drives decisions with significant consequences for family life, accountability is central to its responsible use (Kum et al., 2015; Lery et al., 2016). Data systems can foster accountability by fostering transparency around agency actions, demonstrating how reports are screened, cases prioritized, services assigned, and outcomes distributed across groups. But accountability extends beyond data collection. It requires explicit policies on data use, analytic instruments evaluation, and agency responses when data reveal poor performance or inequitable outcomes.

Traditional accountability in child welfare is compliance-centered, focused on completing required activities, including visits, assessments, case plans, and court reports (Kum et al., 2015). These activities remain important, but do not adequately reflect whether children are safer and families better served. A case may satisfy procedural requirements while masking inadequate or inappropriate service delivery. Data analytics enables agencies to move from documenting activity to measuring performance, connecting agency practice to placement stability, reunification, reentry, and recurrence of maltreatment.

Transparency is essential to this shift (Saxena et al., 2020). When a predictive model or algorithmic decision-support instrument influences case decisions, workers and supervisors must understand what the instrument measures, what data it incorporates, and how its output should inform, not determine, professional judgment. Families must also have visibility into when data-informed tools are affecting their cases. Saxena et al. (2020) demonstrate that algorithms used in child welfare services require human-centered review because they affect workers, families, and institutional practice.

Governance provides the structural conditions for responsible data use, covering data quality, privacy, model validation, bias testing, documentation, training, and public reporting (Lery et al., 2016; Hall et al., 2024). Without governance, analytics can create an illusion of objectivity while obscuring the decisions embedded in model design and data selection. Kum et al. (2015) emphasize that the value of big data for evidence-based governance depends on agencies' ability to examine data in relation to both their own responsibilities and family circumstances. Model governance is particularly critical when predictive tools are employed. Agencies must validate models before adoption and monitor them continuously thereafter. Hall et al. (2024) establish that accuracy, equity, and bias must be evaluated simultaneously in child welfare analytics.

Governance must also address vendor-developed systems. Public agencies cannot transfer their legal and ethical obligations to private contractors. Any vendor-developed system deployed in child welfare must be subject to the same transparency, validation, and equity review standards as agency-developed tools. Absence of open-source code access should not be treated as a barrier to accountability but as a governance requirement that vendors must meet as a condition of public procurement.

The governance principles referred to in this section are relevant to child welfare analytics, but other issues such as transparency, standardization of reporting, independent scrutiny and institutional accountability are also relevant to wider child-protection policy considerations (Saxena et al., 2020; Lery et al., 2016). This convergence indicates a greater understanding that there is a need for accountability mechanisms that are clearly defined and applicable to organizations whose decisions and/or operations have a material impact on children. Although comparisons should be useful within these contexts, they should not be considered strict or complete, as the standards of review, data environments, institutional responsibilities, and legal mandates for online-platform regulation and public child welfare systems vary.

Privacy is a primary governance concern (Lery et al., 2016; Redden, 2020). Child welfare records contain confidential information about children, caregivers, allegations, services, health, education, and legal proceedings. Data linkage can enhance outcome measurement, but it also expands surveillance. Responsible governance requires restricted access, clearly stated purposes, and avoidance of secondary data uses unconnected to child welfare service delivery. Accountability ultimately requires corrective action. Data analytics is only as effective as the agency's willingness to use findings to drive practice change, minimize harm, and produce equitable outcomes.

7 EQUITY, BIAS, AND DATA JUSTICE

Equity is among the most critical dimensions of child welfare analytics (Hall et al., 2024; Redden, 2020). Child welfare data are produced by systems that exhibit racial, socioeconomic, and geographic disparities shaped by reporting patterns, investigation decisions, service access, and agency responses. Predictive models trained on historical data may capture these institutional patterns, amplifying rather than addressing existing inequities. The more contact families have with public systems, the more administrative records they generate, and the more records, the higher the predicted risk. Redden (2020) identifies this dynamic as a data justice issue, arguing that predictive systems can intensify surveillance of families already well-known to public agencies.

Racial bias is at the core of this concern. Berkman et al. (2022) argue that racism in child welfare raises fundamental ethical questions about harm. Dettlaff (2023) locates these concerns within the broader history of racialized family regulation in the United States. Abdurahman's (2021) analysis of predictive forecasting in New York City's Administration for Children's Services illustrates how algorithmic systems can function as instruments of racialized surveillance even when designed with ostensibly neutral technical criteria, a finding that reinforces the essence forequity-centered governance models. A model may appear objective while reflecting biased reporting patterns and unequal agency practice. Technical assessment does not substitute for racial equity review.

Equity issues also apply to immigrant children and families who may be in contact with child welfare and who may be affected by immigration enforcement, language barriers, service access, and the threat of separation from their families. Lovato & Sepp (2025) contended that the unique experiences and needs of immigrant families must be acknowledged within the context of child welfare reform, and that service delivery and equity for families participating in multiple public sectors needs to be enhanced. In the context of child welfare analytics, the notion implies that data on immigration and history of system involvement are not necessarily easy-to-interpret measures of family risk.

Outcome selection also affects bias. Many models predict future reports, substantiations, removals, or reentries outcomes shaped by agency practice and reporting activity rather than direct indicators of child harm. Glaberson (2019) cautions that Predictive forecastingcan obscure structural causes framing poverty, housing instability, or prior system contact as individual family risk factors rather than as consequences of systemic inequality. Equity analysis must therefore examine both model outputs and agency responses. Hall et al. (2024) demonstrate that predictive and prescriptive analytics in child welfare must be evaluated simultaneously for accuracy, equity, and bias with particular attention to differential error rates across racial, socioeconomic, geographic, and disability groups.

Data analytics can also promote equity if directed toward discovering and addressing inequities (Hall et al., 2024; Stapleton et al., 2022). Agencies can disaggregate outcomes by race, ethnicity, age, disability, geography, and pathway to services, illuminating disparities in screening, investigation, removal, placement, reunification, and reentry. Measurement alone is insufficient. When data reveal inequitable outcomes, agencies must review policy, supervision, service availability, and local practice. Stapleton et al. (2022) highlight that families affected by predictive systems must have the opportunity to understand how decisions are made, verify information, and provide context, particularly important given that administrative records may be incomplete, outdated, or shaped by prior system assumptions.

Equity-centered analytics in child welfare should not only measure disparities in outcomes but actively generate accountability for the institutional practices that produce them, shifting the analytical gaze from family risk to agency responsibility.

8 HUMAN OVERSIGHT AND FRONTLINE PRACTICE

The essence for human judgment in child welfare decisions is fundamental to responsible analytics use (Kawakami et al., 2022; Saxena et al., 2020). Data tools can identify patterns but cannot account for family relationships, cultural context, trauma histories, service barriers, or immediate safety dynamics. A risk score can assist in structuring an investigation, but should not determine its outcome. Professional judgment, legal standards, and direct contact with children and families must remain the basis of child welfare decisions.

Human oversight is especially valuable as structured risk-assessment data can sometimes transform complex family situations into more simplistic indicators. Although risk assessments can be beneficial, they can include biased signals and reduce the complexity of child welfare cases, and caseworkers' narrative notes can also capture information that is not captured in structured data fields (Moon et al., 2024). The results argue for the utilization of algorithmic output as a decision support tool, with the caveat of using case narratives, direct engagement with families, and professional judgement.

Frontline workers operate in complex practice environments, checking prior records, interviewing children and caregivers, assessing safety, consulting with supervisors, and coordinating services. Kawakami et al. (2022) demonstrate that the effectiveness of human-AI partnerships in child welfare depends on workers' understanding and confident use of algorithmic tools. An instrument is helpful when it helps workers structure information; it is harmful when it substitutes a score for case-specific reasoning. Saxena et al. (2020) argue that algorithms in child welfare must be evaluated through a human-centered lens, assessing their impact on worker discretion, family involvement, and decision accountability. Workers must understand what an instrument measures, what data it uses, and what its limitations are. Without this understanding, oversight becomes symbolic rather than meaningful.

Two particular risks warrant attention (Kawakami et al., 2022; Saxena et al., 2020). First, automation bias the tendency to over-weight algorithmic outputs because they appear objective, can minimize attention to family strengths or recent situational changes. Second, algorithm aversion, rejecting tools that workers do not trust or understand, can prevent the appropriate use of available evidence. Both risks diminish accountability. Agencies need training, supervision, and documentation standards to support balanced and critical use of analytic tools.

Family voice is equally essential to human oversight (Stapleton et al., 2022). Families must have the opportunity to review their situation, correct inaccurate records, and provide context for concerns surfaced through data. Administrative records may not capture why a service was missed, why a prior report was made, or what supports are currently in place. Fair interpretation requires family context. A well-designed analytic system supplements professional judgment and is supplemented by family knowledge. The relationship is bidirectional and essential to accountable practice.

Challenges and Limitations

Several challenges limit the reliability and utility of data analytics in child welfare. The first is data quality. Child welfare records are created under significant operational pressure. Workers may enter information rapidly, employ varying documentation practices, or omit important context from structured data fields. Incomplete or inconsistent data produces unreliable conclusions when used to build dashboards or predictive models. Shaw et al. (2018) demonstrate the value of administrative data for child welfare research, but only when records are appropriately interpreted and systematically maintained.

A second challenge is that administrative data reflects system contact rather than family need (Redden, 2020; Glaberson, 2019). Reports, investigations, removals, and reentries are shaped by reporting behavior, local policy, agency practice, and service availability, not solely by family circumstances. This creates a fundamental limitation for predictive analytics: a model predicting future system involvement with reasonable accuracy may be modeling system behavior rather than child safety. Drake et al. (2020) underscore that predictive risk models are valuable only when embedded in child welfare decision-making practice that connects risk identification to meaningful service response.

Bias is a third challenge. Racial, socioeconomic, and geographic inequities in historical reporting and intervention patterns can be reproduced by analytic tools if equity protections are not built into model design and evaluation. Redden (2020) frames this as a data justice issue, and Glaberson (2019) cautions against technical categorizations obscuring structural causes of family system involvement. Model performance depends on the conditions under which training data were produced, conditions that are inseparable from the social and institutional context of child welfare practice.

Transparency presents a fourth challenge (Saxena et al., 2020). Many predictive tools employ complex statistical or machine learning approaches that are difficult for workers, families, courts, and regulators to interpret. When a risk score or algorithmic recommendation influences case decisions, the agency must be able to explain what the instruments measures and how its output was used. Saxena et al. (2020) conclude that algorithms in child welfare must be evaluated by human-centered standards because their outputs affect real decisions about real families.

Privacy is a fifth challenge. Child welfare data contain sensitive information about children, allegations, services, health, education, and court involvement. Linking data across systems can enhance outcome measurement, but also expands surveillance beyond child welfare purposes. Agencies must restrict data access, clearly state analytical purposes, and ensure families are not subject to secondary uses that exceed the scope of child welfare service delivery.

A sixth challenge relates to the relatively small capacities of child welfare agencies to implement. Admin dashboards and predictive models can provide insight into service gaps, service performance issues and populations needing extra support, but analytic results do not result in organizational accountability. Cuccaro-Alamin et al. (2017) and Drake et al. (2020) note that there is a need to assess predictive models in real-world child welfare decision-making contexts, rather than just based on statistical accuracy. Therefore, agencies must have lines of responsibility that are clearly defined, have response time limits, have enough resources, have appropriate paths for service delivery, and have documentation and monitoring of follow-up actions.

The operating context of child welfare services also influences implementation capacity. Slaugh et al. (2025) show that there are severe management problems in investigations and pre-removal services, foster care, and adoption, and that the outcomes of child welfare services rely on the capacity of services, interorganizational coordination, and design of service workflows. They have an operations-research outlook and see implementation capacity as part of an analytics governance model, rather than an administrative matter.

Key factors that influence the effectiveness of child welfare analytics are also institutional factors, such as data quality, worker understanding, supervisory practices, availability of services, and processes used to interpret model results. Kawakami et al. (2022) have shown that workers' knowledge and experience with algorithmic tools shape the way in which they are used in practice. Likewise, it is argued by Lery et al. (2016) that child welfare data practices need to be relevant, valid, ethical and actionable. Then capacity to implement analytics should be viewed as part of the analytics governance process and not just as an operational issue. Predictive tools can help raise the visibility of risks and/or service gaps, but if the tools are not accompanied by appropriate organizational structures, then outcomes for children and families may be improved and corrective action may be taken, but service delivery may not occur in a timely fashion.

9 DISCUSSION

The literature reviewed indicates that data analytics can support accountability in U.S. child welfare support and care systems, but only under specific conditions. The fundamental question is not whether to use analytics but how tools are designed, validated, governed, and integrated into practice in ways that genuinely improve outcomes for children and families rather than simply documenting system activity.

This review makes three specific contributions to the existing literature (Hall et al., 2024; Saxena et al., 2020; Redden, 2020). First, it synthesizes evidence across technical, ethical, and governance dimensions into a unified critical model, arguing that accountability in child welfare analytics requires their simultaneous integration, not sequential consideration. Second, it advances a reconceptualization of accountability from compliance-based documentation to performance-based governance, connecting analytic outputs to measurable child and family outcomes and corrective action capacity. Third, it identifies implementation capacity as the critical but understudied bridge between analytics and accountability, a gap that points toward the essence foranalytics-driven project management models as the organizational infrastructure required to translate data insights into equitable child welfare outcomes.

One key conclusion is that data analytics should not be treated as a technical solution. Child welfare data are produced by institutional processes shaped by agency practices, community surveillance patterns, local policy, service capacity, and court processes. Analytic tools that are not critically examined may replicate historical system behavior rather than illuminate genuine family need or child risk. The concerns raised by Redden (2020) about data justice are not separable from technical performance evaluation; they are a component of it. Berkman et al. (2022), Dettlaff (2023), Glaberson (2019), and Abdurahman (2021) all make clear that racially biased patterns in child welfare data must be confronted within any evaluation of analytic systems.

Predictive forecasting can support decision-making when embedded within clear practice models, as demonstrated by Cuccaro-Alamin et al. (2017), Drake et al. (2020), and Schwartz et al. (2017). But prediction becomes problematic when not connected to mitigation and service capacity. A high-risk designation is only beneficial as a result of timely and appropriate support. Predictive forecasting used without attention to service availability can increase surveillance without improving child safety or family stability.

Administrative data correspondingly present a double character. They are required for performance surveillance and outcome determination, as Shaw et al. (2018) demonstrate, but may restrict the definition of success to what is easily measured. Recurrence, reunification, placement stability, and reentry are important indicators, but they do not fully capture trauma recovery, family trust, cultural safety, or service quality. A robust accountability system must integrate administrative data with family perspectives, service-quality evidence, and qualitative assessment.

This Literature indicates that the value of child welfare analytics is related to the ability to interpret the information from a dashboard or predictive model, set up accountability, activate needed services and assess corrective action. Implementation capacity is thus an important bridge from analytic visibility to accountable practice. If this is not the case, then analytics can be used to record differences or service failures, but not to catalyze meaningful institutional change.

Human oversight remains indispensable. Kawakami et al. (2022) and Saxena et al. (2020) demonstrate that algorithmic tools must support frontline practice rather than supplant it. Workers must be equipped to question, override, and contextualize model outputs. This requires not only instruments design but training, supervision, and documentation standards that create meaningful, not merely symbolic, human oversight of analytic systems.

Future Research Directions

Future research should move beyond technical model evaluation to examine whether data analytics in practice actually improve child welfare outcomes. Longitudinal studies are needed to assess whether analytic tools increase child safety, reduce unnecessary removals, facilitate reunification, increase service access, or reduce disparities over time. Most existing studies evaluate model design, prediction performance, or ethical concerns rather than downstream practice and outcome effects.

Greater attention out to be paid to implementation variability. Predictive models may perform variedly across agencies due to staffing variabilities, data quality deviations, service availability, supervision, and litigation processes. Drake et al. (2020) propose a practical evaluation model that situates analytic tools within real decision environments. Comparative studies of adoption, governance, and utilization across agencies would help account for this variability and identify conditions that support or undermine effective analytics use.

Mixed-methods approach is needed. Quantitative studies can assess model performance, service use, placement stability, reentry, and disparities. Qualitative research can illuminate how data-informed decision-making is experienced by workers, supervisors, families, and community advocates. Kawakami et al. (2022) demonstrate that human interpretation significantly shapes algorithmic instruments use in practice. Future research should build on this by studying worker trust, questioning behavior, documentation practices, and model override patterns.

Family voice must be centered in evaluation. Child welfare data systems typically extract data from families without involving them in system design or evaluation. Future research should examine whether families are aware of analytic instruments use, understand how data influences decisions affecting them, and have meaningful opportunities to correct inaccurate records. Administrative data may carry important context that only families can supply.

Equity-focused research remains essential. Hall et al. (2024) demonstrate that accuracy, equity, and bias must be evaluated simultaneously. Future research should examine differential false positive and false negative rates across racial, ethnic, disability, immigration status, and geographic populations. Proxy variables, including prior reports, neighborhood characteristics, and public benefit involvement, warrant particular scrutiny for their role in generating surveillance patterns.

A particularly important direction for future research is the development and evaluation of analytics-driven project management models that translate data insights into organizational action. While the literature has extensively examined what analytics can measure in child welfare, comparatively little attention has been paid to how child welfare organizations should design, implement, and continuously improve the project management systems that convert analytic outputs into practice changes, service improvements, and equitable outcomes. Research in this area would directly address the implementation capacity gap identified throughout this review and represents a significant opportunity to advance both child welfare accountability theory and practice.

10 CONCLUSION

Data analytics has become fundamentally critical basis for accountability enhancement and outcome determination in U.S. child welfare support and care systems. Administrative data, predictive models, dashboards, and decision-support tools can identify patterns that are not visible in individual case review, highlighting where placements are unstable, services are delayed, reentry is occurring, or outcomes are diverging across groups. The evidence reviewed demonstrates that analytics produces the best accountability outcomes when it captures both family outcomes and agency responsibilities, connects prediction to meaningful service response, addresses implementation capacity alongside analytic capacity, and maintains equity review, transparency, and human oversight as non-negotiable governance conditions.

The central finding of this review is that data analytics cannot be a technical solution to child welfare accountability; it is a governance setback. The institutional approaches, historical injustices, and organizational constraints that shape child welfare data must be understood and addressed as part of any analytic accountability model. Analytics should augment professional judgment, without substituting it. With careful design, ethical governance, equity consideration, and sustained organizational commitment, data analytics can serve as a powerful instruments for detecting practice gaps, informing corrective undertakings, and coming up with more equitable outcomes for young ones, kinsmen, and communities.

STATEMENTS ON COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

REFERENCES

[1] Abdurahman, J. K. (2021). Calculating the souls of Black folk: Predictive forecasting the New York City administration for children's services. Columbia Journal of Race and Law Forum, 11, 75.

[2] Berkman, E., Brown, E., Scott, M., & Adiele, A. (2022). Racism in child welfare: Ethical considerations of harm. Bioethics, 36(3), 298–304.

[3] Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Foust, R., Vaithianathan, R., & Putnam-Hornstein, E. (2017). Risk assessment and decision making in child protective services: Predictive risk modeling in context. Children and Youth Services Review, 79, 291–298.

[4] Dettlaff, A. J. (2023). Confronting the racist legacy of the American child welfare system: The case for abolition. Oxford University Press.

[5] Drake, B., Jonson-Reid, M., Ocampo, M. G., Morrison, M., & Dvalishvili, D. (2020). A practical model for considering the use of predictive risk modeling in child welfare. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 692(1), 162–181.

[6] Egbunu, A. S., & Cudjoe-Mensah, Y. M. (2025). Evaluating the role of social work in mitigating childhood trauma: Case studies from foster care facilities in the USA. EPRA International Journal of Socio-Economic and Environmental Outlook, 12(5).

[7] Folk, J. B., Valencia-Ayala, C., Holloway, E. D., Anvar, S., Czopp, A., & Tolou-Shams, M. (2024). Feasibility and acceptability of a family-based telehealth intervention for families impacted by the child welfare system. JMIR Formative Research, 8, e57939.

[8] Glaberson, S. K. (2019). Coding over the cracks: Predictive forecastingand child protection. Fordham Urban Law Journal, 46, 307.

[9] Hall, S. F., Sage, M., Scott, C. F., & Joseph, K. (2024). A systematic review of sophisticated predictive and prescriptive analytics in child welfare: Accuracy, equity, and bias. Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 41(6), 831–847.

[10] Kawakami, A., Sivaraman, V., Cheng, H. F., Stapleton, L., Cheng, Y., Qing, D., & Holstein, K. (2022). Improving human-AI partnerships in child welfare: Understanding worker practices, challenges, and desires for algorithmic decision support. Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 1–18.

[11] Kraus, S., Breier, M., Lim, W. M., Dabić, M., Kumar, S., Kanbach, D., Mukherjee, D., Corvello, V., Piñeiro-Chousa, J., Liguori, E., Palacios-Marqués, D., Schiavone, F., Ferraris, A., Fernandes, C., & Ferreira, J. J. (2022). Literature reviews as independent studies: Guidelines for academic practice. Review of Managerial Science, 16, 2577–2595. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-022-00588-8

[12] Kum, H. C., Stewart, C. J., Rose, R. A., & Duncan, D. F. (2015). Using big data for evidence-based governance in child welfare. Children and Youth Services Review, 58, 127–136.

[13] Lanier, P., Rodriguez, M., Verbiest, S., Bryant, K., Guan, T., & Zolotor, A. (2020). Preventing infant maltreatment with predictive analytics: Applying ethical principles to evidence-based child welfare policy. Journal of Family Violence, 35(1), 1–13.

[14] Lery, B., Haight, J. M., & Alpert, L. (2016). Four principles of big data practice for effective child welfare decision making. Journal of Public Child Welfare, 10(4), 466–474.

[15] Lovato, K., & Sepp, S. (2025). Understanding the needs of immigrant families involved in the public child welfare system: A case for transformation. Families in Society, 106(2), 370–387.

[16] Moon, E. S. Y., Saxena, D., Maharaj, T., & Guha, S. (2024). Beyond predictive algorithms in child welfare. Proceedings of the 50th Graphics Interface Conference, 1–13.

[17] Paul, J., & Criado, A. R. (2020). The art of writing literature review: What do we know and what do we need to know? International Business Review, 29(4), 101717. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2020.101717

[18] Redden, J. (2020). Predictive forecastingand child welfare: Toward data justice. Canadian Journal of Communication, 45(1), 101–111. https://doi.org/10.22230/cjc.2020v45n1a3479

[19] Russell, J., & Mcgill, S. (2015). Demographics, policy, and foster care rates: A Predictive forecasting approach. Children and Youth Services Review, 58, 118–126.

[20] Saxena, D., Badillo-Urquiola, K., Wisniewski, P. J., & Guha, S. (2020). A human-centered review of algorithms used within the U.S. child welfare system. Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 1–15.

[21] Schwartz, I. M., York, P., Nowakowski-Sims, E., & Ramos-Hernandez, A. (2017). Predictive and prescriptive analytics, machine learning, and child welfare risk assessment: The Broward County experience. Children and Youth Services Review, 81, 309–320.

[22] Shaw, T. V., Lee, B. R., & Farrell, J. L. (2018). Administrative data and child welfare research. Routledge.

[23] Slaugh, V. W., Dierks, L., Scheller-Wolf, A., Trapp, A. C., & Ünver, M. U. (2025). Child welfare services in the United States: An operations research perspective. Nonprofit Operations and Supply Chain Management: Theory and Practice, 321–347.

[24] Stapleton, L., Lee, M. H., Qing, D., Wright, M., Chouldechova, A., Holstein, K., & Zhu, H. (2022). Imagining new futures beyond predictive systems in child welfare: A qualitative study with impacted stakeholders. Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness,

[25] Accountability, and Transparency, 1162–1177.