

**Juan F. v. Malloy Exit Plan
Quarterly Report
October 1, 2012 - December 31, 2012
Civil Action No. 2:89 CV 859 (SRU)**

Submitted by:
DCF Court Monitor's Office
300 Church St, 4th Floor
Wallingford, CT 06492
Tel: 203-741-0458
Fax: 203-741-0462
E-Mail: Raymond.Mancuso@CT.GOV

Table of Contents
***Juan F.* v Malloy Exit Plan Quarterly Report**
October 1, 2012 - December 31, 2012

Section	Page
Highlights	3
<u><i>Juan F.</i></u> Exit Plan Outcome Measure Overview Chart (October 1, 2012 - December 31, 2012)	8
<u><i>Juan F.</i></u> Pre-Certification Review-Status Update Fourth Quarter 2012	9
Monitor's Office Case Review for Outcome Measure 3 and Outcome Measure 15	12
<u><i>Juan F.</i></u> Action Plan Monitoring Report	29
<i>Appendix 1</i> - Commissioner's Highlights from: The Department of Children and Families Exit Plan Outcome Measures Summary Report: Fourth Quarter Report (October 1, 2012 - December 31, 2012)	43

**Juan F. v Malloy Exit Plan Quarterly Report
October 1, 2012 - December 31, 2012**

Highlights

- The Court Monitor's quarterly review of the Department's efforts to meet the Exit Plan Outcome Measures during the period of October 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012 indicates the Department achieved 15 of the 22 Outcome Measures. The seven measures not met include: Outcome Measure 3 (Case Planning), Outcome Measure 7 (Reunification), Outcome Measure 8 (Adoption), Outcome Measure 10 (Sibling Placements), Outcome Measure 15 (Children's Needs Met), Outcome Measure 17 (Worker-Child Visitation In-Home)¹, and Outcome Measure 18 (Caseload Standards).
- During the Fourth Quarter 2012, Pre-Certification Reviews of Outcome Measure 7 (Reunification) and Outcome Measure 4 (Search for Relatives) were in progress. At the time of this report, the analysis of Outcome Measure 7 data is nearly complete and the Outcome Measure 4 data is being collected. Reports on each of these Outcome Measures will be included in the First Quarter 2013 Quarterly Report. The table of Pre-Certification results can be found beginning on page 9.
- As outlined in the last quarterly report, the changes initiated by the Department continue to evolve and mature. An excellent working relationship between Commissioner Katz and the *Juan F.* Plaintiffs has emerged. Honest and frank conversations occur regarding the significant issues that must be addressed to formally exit from the Consent Decree. The Department has made tremendous progress in reducing the use of congregate care and increasing the utilization of family-based resources. The utilization of relative/kinship homes has increased from a baseline of 19.0% to 28.3% over the last two years. Unfortunately, a portion of the savings occurring from these changes has not been re-invested into the community services that are necessary to adequately support, provide treatment, and monitor the thousands of children being diverted from congregate care. Further, almost 40.0% of the Department cases (low risk) are being diverted to the less formal community-based Differential Response System (DRS) track. Close to 10.0% of the Department's caseload has been reduced due to the effort. It is very concerning that the state has chosen to reduce and freeze staffing without acknowledging that the complexity of Investigation and Ongoing staff caseloads have increased significantly due to the removal of low-risk cases to DRS. The lack of sufficient staffing will impact Commissioner Katz's ability to fully implement and sustain the important and long overdue changes she has instituted. In a recent letter to the Legislature, the Court Monitor's Office has outlined these concerns and listed several considerations for additional funding including; additional foster family supports (especially for family/kinship), outpatient mental health services, domestic violence services, substance abuse services, housing

¹ Outcome Measure 17 Worker-Child Visitation In-Home - Current automated reporting indicates the measure as statistically achieved, however this does not accurately reflect performance findings. The Outcome Measure 17 Pre-Certification Review indicated that compliance is not achieved. While DCF reports are numerically accurate based upon the algorithms utilized, user error in selection of narrative entry types, and a failure to demonstrate that workers are meeting the specific steps called for with the definition of 'visit' calls into question the automated report findings. As such, the Monitor will not indicate achievement of the measure based solely on the current reporting.

vouchers for the Supportive Housing Programs, mid-intensity in-home services, adolescent transition services and staffing needs.

- Statewide, the Fourth Quarter 2012 result for Outcome Measure 3 (Case Planning) is 53.7%. This is an increase over the prior quarter's result of 47.8% and represents 29 of the 54 case plans achieving the score of "Appropriate Case Plan". The Department has been unable to make consistent progress on this important measure over the last two quarters. Region I achieved the highest combined regional performance with 71.4% across all sample cases scored. While 90.7% of case plans were approved timely, five case plans were not approved by the Social Work Supervisors. None of these five unapproved case plans were of the quality required to pass the review nor otherwise demonstrated supervisory oversight to the degree that the Court Monitor reviewer requested an override. Given the critical importance of supervisory oversight in the complex work of child welfare, this issue was again called to the attention of the Department.

This quarter, individual regions and individual offices fluctuated in areas of strength within various elements of case planning. However, as in the third quarter, only two of the eight domain areas, Identifying Information and Permanency Planning, were above the ninety percentile range for compliance at the statewide level and the overall level for appropriate case planning fell well below the Exit Plan goal of 90.0%. The full report on Outcome Measure 3 begins on page 12.

- Outcome Measure 15 was achieved at a rate of 53.7%. This is a rate almost identical to that of the third quarter's 53.6% statewide performance. This translates to 29 of the 54 cases reviewed being assessed as having all of the priority needs of the children and families that were identified during the period under review met timely and adequately. Similar to Outcome Measure 3 (Case Planning), this critical measure has not shown improvement over the preceding quarters. Two offices did meet or exceed this mark during the quarter: Bridgeport and New Haven achieved the 80.0% requirement. The two highest performing regions were Region II with 77.8% and Region I with 71.4%.

Addressing the priority needs of the *Juan F.* class is essential to concluding the Consent Decree and as indicated earlier in the summary, the emerging need to ensure that children diverted from intensive levels of congregate care are provided timely quality community resources remains a concern. Wait-lists and the lack of service availability combined with ongoing case management deficits contribute to families and children not receiving the services they require. The Department is proceeding with plans to develop some additional service programs and these are vital, but the services being implemented will not be sufficient to meet the core service needs of the children served by the Department. The tables on pages 19 and 24 indicate that a total of 279 instances of unmet needs are identified in the 54 review cases. As with all previous quarterly reporting, these include both internal and external issues such as: delays in making a referral, improperly assessing the need, lack of available service, service providers unable to meet a child or family's individualized need(s), lack of communication between providers and DCF and the refusal by clients to utilize services.

The most problematic areas for meeting the service needs for the children and families sampled in the 54 cases were in the domains of Permanency: DCF Case Mgmt - Contracting

or Providing Services to Achieve the Permanency Goal during the Prior Six Months (statewide score of 48.2 % which is up slightly from last quarter's 43.5%) and Well-Being: Mental Health, Behavioral and Substance Abuse Services (statewide score of 67.9% which is almost identical to last quarter's finding of 67.7%). All other individual domain areas were above the 80.0% threshold. The full report on Outcome Measure 15 begins on page 18.

- As of February 2013, there were 244 *Juan F.* children placed in residential facilities. This is a decrease of 8 children compared to the 252 children reported last quarter. Compared to August 2011 there has been a decrease of 210 children in residential care. The number of children residing in residential care for greater than 12 months was 64, which is a decrease of 12 children in comparison to the 76 reported last quarter and 62 less children than August 2011 (126).
- The Department continues to reduce the number of *Juan F.* children residing and receiving treatment in out-of-state residential facilities. As of March 2013, the number of children decreased by 29 for a total of 54 children compared to the 83 children reported for December 2012. One year ago the March 2012 total was 163.
- The number of children age 12 years old or younger in congregate care was reduced to 43 children as of February 2013. This increase was primarily due to SAFE Home and Group Home placements.
- As of February 2013, there were 5 children aged 1 to 5 years of age residing in Congregate Care placements. Two of these children were placed due to complex medical conditions.
- The number of children utilizing SAFE Home temporary placements decreased to 31 as of February 2013 compared with the 49 reported as of November 2012. The number of children in SAFE Home overstay status (>60 days), was 29 children. The Fourth Quarter data indicates that 67.7% (21 of 31) of the children are in overstay status. There were 7 children with lengths of stay in excess of six months as of February 2013. The lack of sufficient foster/adoptive resources or the need for ongoing reunification efforts remain the significant barriers to timely discharge for these children.
- There were 73 youth in STAR programs as of February 2013, 5 less than the 78 reported in November 2012. The number of youth in overstay status (>60 days) in STAR placements was 42 youth, compared with the 40 youth noted last quarter. Well over a half (57.5%) of the youth (42 of 73) in STAR programs were in overstay status as of February 2013. There were 10 children with lengths of stay longer than six months as of February 2013. The lack of sufficient and appropriate treatment/placement services especially family-based settings for older youth hamper efforts to reduce the utilization of STAR services and manage short lengths of stay.
- The Division of Foster Care's monthly report for December 2012 indicates that there are 2,166 licensed DCF foster homes. This is a decrease of 79 homes when compared with the Third Quarter 2012 report. The Department's most recent utilization review indicated that there were 1,124 vacant beds. While it is concerning that the Department continues a pattern of net loss each quarter it is noteworthy that utilization of relative/kinship homes has increased to 28.3%

from a baseline of 19% in 2011. The number of approved private provider foster care homes is 886. The number of private provider foster homes currently available for placement is 74. The Department's goal as outlined in the Stipulation Regarding Outcome Measures 3 and 15 required (1) a statewide gain of 350 foster homes by June 30, 2009; and (2) an additional statewide gain of 500 foster homes by June 30, 2010. The baseline set in June 2008 and revised during the Second Quarter 2011 is 3,287 foster homes. The Department's status as of June 2012 is 3,052 homes, a net loss of 235 homes compared with the baseline set in June 2008. Additional foster care and adoptive resources remain an essential component required to address the needs of children, reduce discharge delays, avoid overcapacity placements, and ensure placement in the most appropriate and least restrictive setting.

- The number of children with the goal of Another Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (APPLA) decreased by 16 from the 629 to 613 this quarter. The Department's efforts to appropriately pursue APPLA goals for youth, including modifying the goal of children with an APPLA goal to a more preferred goal, and there is a continued age-out of older youth which contributes to the continued reduction in the number of children with APPLA over the last few years. In conjunction with the Child Welfare Group, the Department has begun an initiative that could be very beneficial to these children. This entails an individualized teaming of APPLA children conducted in an effort to identify visiting resources and supports within their kin and social networks, as well as the best permanency options available for these youth.
- The Monitor's quarterly review of the Department for the period of October 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012 indicates that the Department did not achieve compliance with seven (7) measures:
 - Treatment Planning (53.7%)
 - Reunification (57.6%)
 - Adoption (25.9%)
 - Sibling Placements (87.5%)
 - Children's Needs Met (53.7%)
 - Worker-Child Visitation In-Home (N/A)²
 - Caseload Standards (99.9%)
- The Monitor's quarterly review of the Department for the period of October 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012 indicates the Department has achieved compliance with the following 15 Outcome Measures:
 - Commencement of Investigations (94.9%)
 - Completion of Investigations (90.2%)
 - Search for Relatives (87.3%)
 - Repeat Maltreatment (4.9%)

² Outcome Measure 17 Worker-Child Visitation In-Home - Current automated reporting indicates the measure as statistically achieved, however this does not accurately reflect performance findings. The Outcome Measure 17 Pre-Certification Review indicated that compliance is not achieved. While DCF reports are numerically accurate based upon the algorithms utilized, user error in selection of narrative entry types, and a failure to demonstrate that workers are meeting the specific steps called for with the definition of 'visit' calls into question the automated report findings. As such, the Monitor will not indicate achievement of the measure based solely on the current reporting.

- Maltreatment of Children in Out-of Home Cases (0.2%)
 - Transfer of Guardianship (76.5%)
 - Re-Entry into DCF care (7.0%)
 - Multiple Placements (96.5%)
 - Foster Parent Training (100.0%)
 - Placement within Licensed Capacity (96.7%)
 - Worker-Child Visitation Out-of Home Cases (94.2% Monthly/99.1% Quarterly)
 - Residential Reduction (5.8%)
 - Discharge Measures regarding Education, Work, and Military Status (95.9%)
 - Discharge to DMHAS and DMR (100.0%)
 - Multi-disciplinary Exams (89.7%)
- The Department has maintained compliance for at least two (2) consecutive quarters³ with 12 of the Outcome Measures reported as achieved this quarter. (Measures are shown designating the number of consecutive quarters for which the measure was achieved):
- Commencement of Investigations (thirty-third consecutive quarter)
 - Completion of Investigations (thirty- third consecutive quarter)
 - Search for Relatives (twenty-eighth consecutive quarter)
 - Repeat Maltreatment (twenty- third consecutive quarter)
 - Maltreatment of Children in Out-of-Home Care (thirty-sixth consecutive quarter)
 - Transfer of Guardianship (sixteenth consecutive quarter)
 - Multiple Placements (eighteenth consecutive quarter)
 - Foster Parent Training (thirty-fifth consecutive quarter)
 - Visitation Out-of-Home (twenty-ninth consecutive quarter)
 - Residential Reduction (twenty-seventh consecutive quarter)
 - Discharge to DMHAS and DMR (fifth consecutive quarter)
 - Multi-disciplinary Exams (twenty-eighth consecutive quarter)

A full copy of the Department's Fourth Quarter 2012 submission including the Commissioner's Highlights may be found on page 43.

³ The Defendants must be in compliance with all of the outcome measures, and in sustained compliance with all of the outcome measures for at least two consecutive quarters (six-months) prior to asserting compliance and shall maintain compliance through any decision to terminate jurisdiction.

Statewide Measure	Positive Outcomes For Children																												
	Measure	Baseline	4Q 2012	3Q 2012	2Q 2012	1Q 2012	4Q 2011	3Q 2011	2Q 2011	1Q 2011	4Q 2010	3Q 2010	2Q 2010	1Q 2010	4Q 2009	3Q 2009	2Q 2009	1Q 2009	4Q 2008	3Q 2008	2Q 2008	1Q 2008	4Q 2007	3Q 2007	2Q 2007	1Q 2007	4Q 2006	3Q 2006	
1: Commencement of Investigation	>=90%	X	94.9%	95.7%	96.1%	96.6%	97.1%	97.3%	97.2%	97.2%	96.8%	97.4%	97.6%	97.4%	97.8%	97.6%	97.7%	97.6%	97.9%	97.4%	97.5%	97.8%	97.4%	97.0%	97.1%	96.5%	95.5%	98.7%	
2: Completion of the Investigation	>=85%	73.7%	90.2%	92.5%	92.4%	91.9%	93.3%	94.0%	94.4%	92.7%	90.0%	91.5%	92.9%	93.7%	94.3%	94.0%	91.8%	91.3%	91.4%	89.9%	93.7%	91.5%	92.9%	94.2%	93.7%	93.0%	93.7%	94.2%	
3: Treatment Plans	>=90%	X	53.7%	47.8%	63.0%	39.6%	44.4%	50.9%	N/A	81.1%	67.9%	66.0%	75.5%	86.5%	47.2%	53.8%	73.1%	65.4%	81.1%	62.3%	55.8%	58.8%	51.0%	30.0%	30.3%	41.3%	41.1%	54.3%	
4: Search for Relatives	>=85%	58%	87.3%	87.5%	89.5%	89.3%	92.8%	94.5%	94.5%	90.1%	88.8%	90.9%	91.2%	92.0%	90.0%	91.0%	91.2%	94.3%	94.3%	96.3%	95.8%	95.3%	93.6%	91.4%	93.8%	92.0%	91.4%	93.1%	
5: Repeat Maltreatment of In-Home Children	<=7%	9.3%	4.9%	4.3%	4.1%	4.3%	6.0%	6.1%	5.4%	5.7%	6.2%	6.5%	6.5%	5.8%	6.0%	5.4%	4.8%	5.8%	6.1%	5.7%	5.9%	5.7%	5.4%	6.1%	6.3%	7.4%	7.9%	7.9%	
6: Maltreatment of Children in Out-of-Home Care	<=2%	1.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.7%	
7: Reunification	>=60%	57.8%	57.6%	52.0%	61.1%	58.9%	65.8%	65.3%	73.1%	61.7%	64.9%	68.3%	67.1%	61.2%	71.4%	56.0%	71.9%	68.1%	69.6%	62.5%	64.4%	66.4%	61.0%	64.2%	67.9%	70.5%	61.3%	62.5%	
8: Adoption	>=32%	12.5%	25.9%	39.0%	34.3%	23.7%	33.6%	40.0%	32.7%	35.6%	38.5%	25.8%	36.0%	34.7%	35.2%	36.7%	33.2%	44.7%	27.2%	32.3%	33.0%	41.5%	35.5%	36.2%	40.6%	34.5%	33.6%	27.0%	
9: Transfer of Guardianship	>=70%	60.5%	76.5%	84.0%	76.7%	81.4%	83.1%	83.6%	78.4%	86.2%	87.3%	78.6%	74.6%	82.3%	76.3%	81.8%	75.7%	75.3%	64.9%	71.7%	70.0%	70.4%	80.8%	76.8%	88.0%	78.0%	76.4%	70.2%	
10: Sibling Placement	>=95%	57%	87.5%	87.5%	89.2%	88.5%	91.8%	89.3%	85.8%	86.7%	83.3%	81.9%	84.8%	85.6%	83.4%	84.7%	83.1%	83.4%	82.1%	82.6%	86.8%	86.7%	85.2%	83.3%	79.1%	84.9%	85.5%	84.8%	
11: Re-Entry into DCF Custody	<=7%	6.9%	7.0%	9.1%	6.8%	5.8%	6.4%	7.2%	4.4%	7.7%	6.3%	7.3%	6.7%	8.4%	7.8%	9.9%	8.8%	8.2%	8.2%	4.3%	7.5%	6.7%	7.6%	7.2%	8.5%	7.5%	8.2%	4.3%	
12: Multiple Placements	>=85%	X	96.5%	96.4%	96.6%	96.6%	96.4%	96.4%	96.1%	96.1%	96.1%	95.7%	95.8%	95.9%	95.4%	95.7%	95.8%	96.0%	95.8%	95.9%	96.3%	91.2%	92.7%	94.4%	96.0%	96.3%	95.0%	95.6%	
13: Foster Parent Training	100%	X	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
14: Placement Within Licensed Capacity	>=96%	94.9%	96.7%	95.8%	95.3%	97.7%	96.1%	95.2%	95.6%	96.8%	96.8%	95.4%	95.1%	96.9%	96.9%	96.3%	96.6%	96.6%	96.6%	97.0%	96.8%	96.4%	96.8%	96.9%	97.1%	96.8%	96.5%	96.7%	
15: Children's Needs Met	>=80%	X	53.7%	53.6%	61.1%	60.4%	55.6%	60.4%	N/A	58.5%	56.6%	58.5%	52.8%	67.3%	45.3%	55.8%	63.5%	61.5%	58.5%	62.0%	55.8%	58.8%	47.1%	64.0%	51.3%	45.3%	52.1%	62.0%	
16: Worker-Child Visitation (Out-of-Home)	>=85%(M)	X	94.2%	93.6%	92.7%	95.1%	92.3%	95.0%	95.1%	95.8%	95.3%	95.3%	95.7%	96.2%	95.8%	95.1%	95.7%	95.7%	95.0%	95.4%	94.9%	95.9%	94.6%	94.8%	94.6%	95.1%	94.7%	92.5%	
	=100%(O)	X	99.1%	98.7%	98.7%	99.2%	98.6%	99.0%	99.2%	99.2%	98.9%	98.9%	99.3%	99.6%	99.7%	99.0%	99.3%	99.2%	98.9%	91.5%	90.9%	93.1%	93.1%	92.8%	95.7%	93.3%	91.0%	91.5%	
17: Worker-Child Visitation (In-Home)	>=85%	X	N/A	N/A	85.8%	84.8%	85.9%	86.3%	89.7%	88.5%	89.7%	89.4%	89.7%	89.6%	88.5%	88.8%	89.6%	90.5%	89.7%	90.3%	91.4%	90.8%	89.9%	89.4%	90.9%	89.0%	89.2%	85.7%	
18: Caseload Standards	100%	69.2%	99.9%	100.0%	99.7%	99.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.6%	99.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
19: Reduction in the Number of Children Placed in Residential Care	<=11%	13.5%	5.8%	6.3%	6.9%	7.5%	8.5%	8.8%	9.8%	10.0%	9.9%	9.4%	10.1%	10.0%	9.9%	9.6%	9.7%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.4%	10.5%	10.9%	10.8%	11.0%	10.9%	11.0%	10.9%	
20: Discharge Measures	>=85%	61%	95.9%	89.2%	85.7%	86.9%	76.5%	88.0%	79.4%	82.9%	87.2%	88.5%	87.9%	86.0%	86.9%	80.0%	92.2%	85.3%	92.2%	93.0%	92.0%	92.0%	96.0%	95.0%	X	X	100.0%	100.0%	
21: Discharge of Mentally Ill or Mentally Retarded Children	100%	X	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.7%	92.0%	97.0%	96.1%	97.3%	98.1%	100.0%	97.6%	100.0%	97.2%	96.7%	95.0%	95.0%	98.0%	97.0%	96.0%	95.0%	X	X	97.0%	100.0%	
22: Multi-disciplinary Exams (MDE)	>=85%	5.6%	89.7%	95.5%	93.8%	90.0%	93.4%	93.3%	96.3%	91.9%	97.5%	96.1%	96.4%	95.7%	95.7%	91.4%	94.5%	93.6%	90.1%	94.0%	93.6%	98.7%	96.4%	95.2%	96.8%	91.1%	94.2%	86.0%	

Outcome Measure 17 Worker-Child Visitation In-Home - Current automated reporting indicates the measure as statistically achieved, however this does not accurately reflect performance findings. The Outcome Measure 17 Pre-Certification Review indicated that compliance is not achieved. While DCF reports are numerically accurate based upon the algorithms utilized, user error in selection of narrative entry types, and a failure to demonstrate that workers are meeting the specific steps called for with the definition of 'visit' calls into question the automated report findings. As such, the Monitor will not indicate achievement of the measure based solely on the current reporting.

Juan F. Pre-Certification Review-Status Update Third Quarter 2012

Under the Revised Exit Plan (¶5), the Court Monitor is required to conduct what the parties and the Court Monitor refer to as a “Certification” review as follows:

The Defendants must be in compliance with all of the outcome measures, and in sustained compliance with all of the outcome measures for at least two quarters (six months) prior to asserting compliance and shall maintain compliance through any decision to terminate jurisdiction. The Court Monitor shall then conduct a review of a statistically significant valid sample of case files at a 96% confidence level, and such other measurements as are necessary, to determine whether Defendants are in compliance. The Court Monitor shall then present findings and recommendations to the District Court. The parties shall have a meaningful opportunity to be heard by the Court Monitor before rendering his findings and recommendations.

In recognition of the progress made and sustained by the Department with respect to a number of Outcome Measures, and the fact that the well-being of the *Juan F.* class members will be promoted by the earliest possible identification and resolution of the any quantitative or qualitative problems affecting class members that may be identified by the review required by Revised Exit Plan ¶5, the parties and the Court Monitor agree that it is in the best-interests of the *Juan F.* class members to create a “Pre-Certification” review process. It is expected that this “pre-certification” process may, in certain instances, obviate the need to implement the full certification review for certain outcome measures after sustained compliance is achieved for all Outcome Measures.

The “Pre-Certification” process that parties and the Court Monitor have created, and to which they have agreed, is as follows:

If DCF has sustained compliance as required by the Revised Exit Plan for at least two consecutive quarters (6 months) for any Outcome Measure (“OM”), the Court Monitor may, in his discretion, conduct a “pre-certification review” of that OM (“Pre-Certification Review”). The purpose of the Pre-Certification Review is to recognize DCF’s sustained improved performance, to identify and provide a prompt and timely opportunity to remedy any problem areas that are affecting the well-being of *Juan F.* class members, and to increase the efficiency of DCF’s eventual complete compliance and exit from the Consent Decree.

Other than conducting the Pre-Certification Review earlier than the review mandated by Revised Exit Plan ¶5, the Pre-Certification Review will be conducted in accordance with the provision for review as described in the Revised Exit Plan ¶5 unless otherwise agreed upon by the parties and the Court Monitor.

If the Pre-Certification Review does not identify any material issues requiring remediation, and no assertions of noncompliance with the specific Outcome Measures(s) at issue are pending at the time Defendants assert sustained compliance with all Outcome Measures, the Parties agree that the full review as per paragraph 5 of the Revised Exit Plan will not be required after the

Defendants assert sustained compliance with all Outcome Measures. Upon Defendants' assertion of sustained compliance with all Outcome Measures, the parties, with the involvement and consent of the Court Monitor, agree to present for the Court's review, any agreement to conduct less than the full review process required by Revised Exit Plan (§5) for any specific Outcome Measures, as a proposed modification of the Revised Exit Plan.

During the Fourth Quarter 2012, the analysis of OM 7 (Reunification) was conducted. The report on OM 7 (Reunification) will be included in the First Quarter 2013 Report. In addition, Pre-Certification of OM 4 (Search for Relatives) was begun. This report will also be included in the next report.

The *Juan F.* parties and the Court Monitor have determined that the results from eight of the nine completed pre-certification reviews have met the quantitative and qualitative standards set forth for each of them and are thus pre-certified while one Pre-Certification Review was determined to not meet either the quantitative or qualitative standard. While pre-certified, these reviews have identified systemic issues that undermine DCF's successful path to achieving timely outcomes for children. These issues are more prominent in some of the reviewed measures than others. Consistency in supervision, documentation of casework efforts and communication and collaboration with families and external stakeholders all were identified as issues that impede the quality of the Department's casework and require improvement. In brief, the results of pre-certification determinations to date are reported below.

Outcome Measure	Statement of Outcome	Status
OM 4: Search for Relatives	If a child(ren) must be removed from his or her home, DCF shall conduct and document a search for maternal and paternal relatives, extended formal or informal networks, friends of the child or family, former foster parents, or other persons known to the child. The search period shall extend through the first six (6) months following removal from home. The search shall be conducted and documented in at least 85.0% of the cases.	In Progress
OM 7: Reunification	At least 60% of the children, who are reunified with their parents or guardians, shall be reunified within 12 months of their most recent removal from home.	In Progress
OM 8: Adoption	At least 32% of the children who are adopted shall have their adoptions finalized within 24 months of the child's most recent removal from his/her home.	Pre-Certified
OM 9: Transfer of Guardianship	At least 70% of all children whose custody is legally transferred shall have their guardianship transferred within 24 months of the child's most recent removal from his/her home.	Pre-Certified
OM 12: Multiple Placements	Beginning on January 1, 2004, at least 85% of the children in DCF custody shall experience no more than three (3) placements during any twelve month period.	Pre-Certified
OM 14: Placement within Licensed Capacity	At least 96% of all children placed in foster homes shall be in foster homes operating within their licensed capacity, except when necessary to accommodate sibling groups.	Pre-Certified
OM 16: Worker/ Child Visitation (Child in Placement)	DCF shall visit at least 85% of all out-of-home children at least once a month, except for probate, interstate, or voluntary cases. All children must be seen by their DCF Social Worker at least quarterly.	Pre-Certified

Outcome Measure	Statement of Outcome	Status
OM 17: Worker-Child Visitation (In-Home)	DCF shall visit at least 85% of all in-home family cases at least twice a month, except for probate, interstate or voluntary cases. Definitions and Clarifications: 1. Twice monthly visitation must be documented with each active child participant in the case. Visitation occurring in the home, school or other community setting will be considered for Outcome Measure 17.	Not Pre-Certified on the quantitative or in relation to achieving the qualitative standards.
OM 20: Discharge Measures	At least 85.0% of all children age 18 or older shall have achieved one or more of the following prior to discharge from DCF custody: (a) Graduation from High School; (b) Acquisition of GED; (c) Enrollment in or completion of college or other post secondary training program full-time; (d) Enrollment in college or other post secondary training program part-time with part-time employment; (e) Full-time employment; (f) Enlistment full-time member of the military.	Pre-Certified
OM 21: Discharge of Mentally Ill or Developmentally Disabled Youth	DCF shall submit a written discharge plan to either/or DMHAS or DDS for all children who are mentally ill or developmentally delayed and require adult services."	Pre-Certified
OM22: Multi-disciplinary Exams	At least 85% of the children entering the custody of DCF for the first time shall have an MDE conducted within 30 days of placement."	Pre-Certified

Pre-Certification Next Steps

In discussion with the parties it was determined that prior to proceeding with additional statistically valid methodologies outlined in the Revised Exit Plan for the remaining outcome measures, the Court Monitor would establish the need for such intensive and resource heavy focused review efforts/evaluation, with proposals for conducting reviews of the remaining outcome measures to be shared with the parties for consideration and approval.

This work has been completed and the Court Monitor has begun the task of conducting additional reviews. Future reports will update both completed reviews and reviews in progress. As part of the discussion with the parties, steps are also in place to assist the Department in replication of the Congregate Care Discharge Review that was undertaken in early 2012 to assess the impact of the decline in the population in residential care due to diversion efforts and the discharges from that treatment/placement service. The review is set to begin in mid April 2013.

Review of Outcome Measure 3 and Outcome Measure 15 for the Fourth Quarter 2012

Statewide, the Fourth Quarter 2012 result for Outcome Measure 3 (OM3) - Case Plans, is 53.7%. This is slight increase over the prior quarter's result of 47.8% and represents 29 of the 54 case plans achieving the score of "Appropriate Case Plan". Region I achieved the highest combined regional performance with 71.4% across all sample cases scored.

Crosstabulation 1: What is the social worker's area office assignment? * Overall Score for OM3 * DCF Region

DCF Region	What is the social worker's area office assignment?		Overall Score for OM 3		
			Appropriate Case Plan	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	Total
Region I	Bridgeport	Count	4	1	5
		% within Area Office	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Norwalk/Stamford	Count	1	1	2
		% within Area Office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Region Total	Count	5	2	7
<i>% within Area Office</i>		71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	
Region II	Milford	Count	2	2	4
		% within Area Office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	New Haven	Count	3	2	5
		% within Area Office	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Region Total	Count	5	4	9
<i>% within Area Office</i>		55.6%	44.4%	100.0%	
Region III	Middletown	Count	2	0	2
		% within Area Office	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Norwich	Count	2	3	5
		% within Area Office	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Willimantic	Count	2	1	3
% within Area Office		66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
Region Total	Count	6	4	10	
	<i>% within Area Office</i>	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
Region IV	Hartford	Count	3	6	9
		% within Area Office	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Manchester	Count	3	1	4
		% within Area Office	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Region Total	Count	6	7	13
<i>% within Area Office</i>		46.2%	53.8%	100.0%	
Region V	Danbury	Count	1	1	2
		% within Area Office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Torrington	Count	1	1	2
		% within Area Office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Waterbury	Count	1	3	4
% within Area Office		25.0%	75.0%	100.0%	
Region Total	Count	3	5	8	
	<i>% within Area Office</i>	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%	
Region VI	Meriden	Count	1	1	2
		% within Area Office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	New Britain	Count	3	2	5
		% within Area Office	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Region Total	Count	4	3	7
<i>% within Area Office</i>		57.1%	42.9%	100.0%	

Fifty-three of the 54 case plans and case planning efforts were clearly accommodating of the family's primary language while one Waterbury case was unable to be determined from the information available in the review. While 90.7% of case plans were approved timely, five case plans were not approved by the Social Work Supervisors; three of these in the Hartford area. None of these five unapproved case plans were of the quality required to pass the review nor otherwise demonstrated supervisory oversight to the degree that the reviewer requested an override. This issue was again called to the attention of the Department.

Statewide scores are reflected in the initial column heading and again at the end of the table for ease of reference. This quarter, individual regions and individual offices fluctuated in areas of strength within various elements of case planning. However, as in the third quarter, only two domain areas were above the ninety percentile range for compliance with the set standards at the statewide level and the overall level for appropriate case planning fell well below the Exit Plan goal at 53.7%.

Case Summaries for Outcome Measure 3- Fourth Quarter 2012

What is the social worker's area office assignment?		Has the treatment plan been approved by the SWS? 90.7%	Reason for DCF Involvement 88.9%	Identifying Information 96.3%	Engagement of Child and Family (formerly Strengths, Needs and Other Issues) 64.8%	Present Situation and Assessment to Date of Review 57.4%	Determining the Goals/Objectives 68.5%	Progress 79.6%	Action Steps to Achieving Goals Identified for the Upcoming Six Month Period 57.4%	Planning for Permanency 90.7%	Overall Score for OM3 53.7%	
Region I												
Bridgeport	1	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan	
	2	yes	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan	
	3	yes	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan	
	4	no	Absent/Averse	Absent/Averse	Absent/Averse	Absent/Averse	Absent/Averse	Absent/Averse	Absent/Averse	Absent/Averse	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
	5	yes	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan	
	Norwalk	1	yes	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan*
	Stamford	1	yes	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
Total		85.7%	71.4%	85.7%	85.7%	71.4%	71.4%	71.4%	71.4%	85.7%	71.4%	

What is the social worker's area office assignment?			Has the treatment plan been approved by the SWS?	Reason for DCF Involvement	Identifying Information	Engagement of Child and Family (formerly Strengths, Needs and Other Issues)	Present Situation and Assessment to Date of Review	Determining the Goals/ Objectives	Progress	Action Steps to Achieving Goals Identified for the Upcoming Six Month Period	Planning for Permanency	Overall Score for OM3	
Region II	Milford	1	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan	
		2	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan*	
		3	yes	Marginal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		4	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
	New Haven	1	yes	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		2	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		3	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		4	yes	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		5	yes	Very Good	Optimal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan*
		Total		100.0%	88.9%	100.0%	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%	88.9%	66.7%	100.0%	55.6%

What is the social worker's area office assignment?			Has the treatment plan been approved by the SWS?	Reason for DCF Involvement	Identifying Information	Engagement of Child and Family (formerly Strengths, Needs and Other Issues)	Present Situation and Assessment to Date of Review	Determining the Goals/ Objectives	Progress	Action Steps to Achieving Goals Identified for the Upcoming Six Month Period	Planning for Permanency	Overall Score for OM3	
Region III	Middletown	1	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	<i>Appropriate Case Plan*</i>	
		2	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	<i>Appropriate Case Plan*</i>	
	Norwich	1	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		2	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		3	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	<i>Appropriate Case Plan*</i>
		4	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		5	yes	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan
	Willimantic	1	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan
		2	yes	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan
		3	yes	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
	Total			100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	60.0%	70.0%	70.0%	90.0%	80.0%	100.0%	60.0%

What is the social worker's area office assignment?			Has the treatment plan been approved by the SWS?	Reason for DCF Involvement	Identifying Information	Engagement of Child and Family (formerly Strengths, Needs and Other Issues)	Present Situation and Assessment to Date of Review	Determining the Goals/ Objectives	Progress	Action Steps to Achieving Goals Identified for the Upcoming Six Month Period	Planning for Permanency	Overall Score for OM3	
Region IV	Hartford	1	yes	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		2	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan*	
		3	no	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		4	no	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		5	no	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		6	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan*
		7	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		8	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan*
		9	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
	Manchester	1	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		2	yes	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan*
		3	yes	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		4	yes	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan
Total			76.9%	92.3%	100.0%	46.2%	46.2%	76.9%	69.2%	53.9%	76.9%	46.2%	

What is the social worker's area office assignment?			Has the treatment plan been approved by the SWS?	Reason for DCF Involvement	Identifying Information	Engagement of Child and Family (formerly Strengths, Needs and Other Issues)	Present Situation and Assessment to Date of Review	Determining the Goals/ Objectives	Progress	Action Steps to Achieving Goals Identified for the Upcoming Six Month Period	Planning for Permanency	Overall Score for OM3	
Region V	Danbury	1	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan	
		2	no	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
	Torrington	1	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		2	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
	Waterbury	1	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		2	yes	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		3	yes	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan*
		4	yes	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
	Total		87.5%	87.5%	87.5%	62.5%	37.5%	62.5%	75.0%	25.0%	87.5%	37.5%	
	Region VI	Meriden	1	yes	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
2			yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
New Britain		1	yes	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan	
		2	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan*	
		3	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		4	yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan*
		5	yes	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
Total		100.0%	85.7%	100.0%	87.5%	57.1%	42.9%	85.7%	42.9%	100.0%	57.1%		
Statewide		90.7%	88.9%	96.3%	64.8%	57.4%	68.5%	79.6%	57.4%	90.7%	53.7%		

* indicates the presence of a Court Monitor's Override to allow for overall appropriate score due to information presented in the case documentation or in conversation with the area office related to case planning that may be marginal within the identified area of the case plan document, but can be demonstrated to have been achieved via other avenues.

Outcome Measure 15 was achieved at a rate of 53.7%. This is a rate almost identical to that of the third quarter's 53.6% performance. This translates to 29 of the 54 cases reviewed being assessed as having all of the priority needs of the children and families identified during the period under review met timely and adequately. Several offices did meet or exceed this mark during the quarter: Bridgeport and New Haven achieved the 80.0% requirement. The two highest performing regions were Region II with 77.8% and Region I with 71.4%.

Crosstabulation 2: What is the social worker's area office assignment? * Overall Score for Outcome Measure 15 * DCF Region

DCF Region			Overall Score for Outcome Measure 15		
			Needs Met	Needs Not Met	Total
Region I	Bridgeport	Count	4	1	5
		% within Office	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Norwalk/Stamford	Count	1	1	2
		% within Office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	5	2	7
	% within Region	71.4%	28.5%	100.0%	
Region II	Milford	Count	3	1	4
		% within Office	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	New Haven	Count	4	1	5
		% within Office	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	7	2	9
	% within Region	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%	
Region III	Middletown	Count	1	1	2
		% within Office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Norwich	Count	2	3	5
		% within Office	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	Willimantic	Count	2	1	3
		% within Office	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Total	Count	5	5	10
	% within Region	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	
Region IV	Hartford	Count	2	7	9
		% within Office	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
	Manchester	Count	3	1	4
		% within Office	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	5	8	13
	% within Region	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%	
Region V	Danbury	Count	1	1	2
		% within Office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Torrington	Count	1	1	2
		% within Office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Waterbury	Count	1	3	4
		% within Office	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	3	5	8	
	% within Region	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%	
Region VI	Meriden	Count	1	1	2
		% within Office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	New Britain	Count	3	2	5
		% within Office	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Total	Count	4	3	7
	% within Region	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%	

The most problematic areas for meeting the service needs for the children and families sampled in the 54 cases were in the domains of Permanency: DCF Case Mgmt - Contracting or Providing Services to Achieve the Permanency Goal during the Prior Six Months (statewide score of 48.2 % which is up slightly from last quarter's 43.5%) and Well-Being: Mental Health, Behavioral and Substance Abuse Services (statewide score of 67.9% which is flat in relation to last quarter's 67.7%). All other individual domain areas were above the 80.0% threshold. While still above the 80% rate, we note a marked drop in the level of performance in Permanency: Securing the Permanent Placement - Action Plan for the Next Six Months - which dropped from 100% to 88.6%. Domain percentages are indicated in the column headings below and again at the end of the table. Regional performances are indicated at the bottom of each area case count in the summary.

Outcome Measure 15 - Fourth Quarter 2012 Summaries

	Area Office	Risk: In-Home 89.5%	Risk: Child In Placement 97.3%	Permanency: Securing the Permanent Placement - Action Plan for the Next Six Months 88.6%	Permanency: DCF Case Mgmt - Legal Action to Achieve the Permanency Goal During the Prior Six Months 90.7%	Permanency: DCF Case Mgmt - Recruitment for Placement Providers to Achieve the Permanency Goal during the Prior Six Months 88.6%	Permanency: DCF Case Mgmt - Contracting or Providing Services to Achieve the Permanency Goal during the Prior Six Months 48.2%	Well-Being: Medical Needs 88.9%	Well-Being: Dental Needs 87.0%	Well-Being: Mental Health, Behavioral and Substance Abuse Services 67.9%	Well-Being: Child's Current Placement 88.6%	Well-Being: Education 84.3%	Overall Score for Outcome Measure 15 53.7%	
Region I	Bridgeport	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Absent/ Averse	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Optimal	Needs Met	
		N/A	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Met	
		N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Needs Met*	
		Very Good	N/A	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Needs Not Met	
	N/A	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Needs Met	
	Norwalk	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Needs Met	
	Stamford	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Needs Not Met	
	Reg I Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	85.70%	75.0%	71.4%	85.7%	100.0%	71.4%	75.0%	71.4%	71.4%	
Region II	Milford	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Met	
		N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Met	
		Optimal	Optimal	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	N/A	Optimal	Needs Met*	
		N/A	Optimal	Very Good	Poor	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Marginal	Marginal	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Not Met	
	New Haven	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Needs Met	
		Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Needs Met*	
		Very Good	N/A	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Needs Not Met	
		N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Needs Met
		N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Needs Met*	
	Reg II Total	100.0%	85.70%	100.00%	87.50%	100.00%	44.40%	88.90%	66.70%	77.80%	100.00%	66.70%	77.80%	

	Area Office	Risk: In-Home	Risk: Child In Placement	Permanency: Securing the Permanent Placement - Action Plan for the Next Six Months	Permanency: DCF Case Mgmt - Legal Action to Achieve the Permanency Goal During the Prior Six Months	Permanency: DCF Case Mgmt - Recruitment for Placement Providers to Achieve the Permanency Goal during the Prior Six Months	Permanency: DCF Case Mgmt - Contracting or Providing Services to Achieve the Permanency Goal during the Prior Six Months	Well-Being: Medical Needs	Well-Being: Dental Needs	Well-Being: Mental Health, Behavioral and Substance Abuse Services	Well-Being: Child's Current Placement	Well-Being: Education	Overall Score for Outcome Measure 15	
Region III	Middletown	N/A	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Marginal	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Met*	
		Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met	
	Norwich	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Needs Not Met	
		Very Good	N/A	N/A	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Needs Not Met	
		N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Not Met	
		N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Needs Met	
		N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Met	
	Willimantic	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Needs Met*	
		N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	N/A	Needs Met	
		N/A	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Needs Not Met	
Reg III Total	100.0%	100.0%	83.3%	90.0%	83.3%	50.0%	90.0%	100.0%	70.0%	83.3%	75.0%	50.0%		
Region IV	Hartford	Marginal	N/A	N/A	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met	
		N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Marginal	Optimal	Marginal	Optimal	Very Good	N/A	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Not Met	
		N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Not Met
		N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Marginal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Not Met
		N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Met*
		Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Met*
		N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Not Met
		N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Not Met
		N/A	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Poor	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Not Met
	Manchester	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Optimal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Not Met
		N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Needs Met*	
		Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Marginal	N/A	Very Good	Needs Met*	
		N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Met
	Reg IV Total	66.7%	100.0%	90.0%	84.6%	100.0%	30.8%	84.6%	92.3%	58.3%	100.0%	100.0%	38.5%	

	Area Office	Risk: In-Home	Risk: Child In Placement	Permanency: Securing the Permanent Placement - Action Plan for the Next Six Months	Permanency: DCF Case Mgmt - Legal Action to Achieve the Permanency Goal During the Prior Six Months	Permanency: DCF Case Mgmt - Recruitment for Placement Providers to Achieve the Permanency Goal during the Prior Six Months	Permanency: DCF Case Mgmt - Contracting or Providing Services to Achieve the Permanency Goal during the Prior Six Months	Well-Being: Medical Needs	Well-Being: Dental Needs	Well-Being: Mental Health, Behavioral and Substance Abuse Services	Well-Being: Child's Current Placement	Well-Being: Education	Overall Score for Outcome Measure 15	
Region V	Danbury	N/A	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Met	
		Very Good	N/A	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Needs Not Met	
	Torrington	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Met	
		Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met	
	Waterbury	Marginal	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met	
		N/A	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Not Met	
		N/A	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Needs Not Met	
		N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Met*	
Reg V Total	66.7%	100.0%	60.0%	100.0%	80.0%	50.0%	87.5%	75.0%	75.0%	100.0%	85.7%	42.9%		
Region VI	Meriden	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Marginal	N/A	Optimal	Needs Met*	
		N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Marginal	Poor	Very Good	Needs Not Met	
	New Britain	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Met	
		N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Needs Not Met	
		Very Good	N/A	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Optimal	Needs Met
		N/A	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Needs Met*	
	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met	
Reg VI Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	57.1%	100.0%	100.0%	57.1%	50.0%	100.0%	57.1%		
Statewide	89.5%	97.3%	88.6%	90.7%	88.6%	48.2%	88.9%	87.0%	67.9%	88.6%	84.3%	53.7%		

* Indicates Court Monitor's application of the Override exception to achieve "met" status in one or more of the cases within the area office.

The individual needs identified in the cases sampled included the following 188 service needs:

Table 2: Unmet Needs

Unmet Need	Barrier	Frequency
Adoption Supports (PPSP)	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Anger Management - Child	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Anger Management - Child	Referred Service is Unwilling to Engage Client	1
ARG Consultation	Delay in Referral	6
ARG Consultation	UTD from Case Plan, narrative or Area Office Response Provided	2
Behavior Management	Provider Issue - untimely provision of services or gaps in service related to staffing, lack of follow through, etc.	1
Dental or Orthodontic Services	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	2
Dental or Orthodontic Services	Delay in Referral	1
Dental or Orthodontic Services	Insurance Issue	1
Dental or Orthodontic Services	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Dental Screening or Evaluation	Delay in Referral	2
Dental Screening or Evaluation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Domestic Violence Services - Perpetrators	Lack of Communication between DCF and Provider	1
Domestic Violence Services - Perpetrators	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Domestic Violence Services - Victims	Delay in Referral	2
Domestic Violence Services - Victims	Lack of Communication between DCF and Provider	1
Domestic Violence Services - Victims	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Education: IEP Programming	Approval Process	1
Education: IEP Programming	Delay in Referral	1
Educational Screening or Evaluation	Delay in Referral	5
Educational Screening or Evaluation	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	2
Family or Marital Counseling	Delay in Referral	3
Family or Marital Counseling	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	2
Family Preservation Services	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Family Preservation Services	Delay in Referral	1
Family Preservation Services	Lack of Communication between DCF and Provider	1
Family Reunification Services	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Family Reunification Services	Wait List	1

Unmet Need	Barrier	Frequency
Foster Care Support	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Group Counseling - Parents	Lack of Communication between DCF and Provider	1
Group Home	Delay in Referral	1
Health/Medical - Other Intervention (Blood Test - Oncology)	Delay in Referral	1
Health/Medical Screening or Evaluation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Health/Medical Screening or Evaluation	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Health/Medical Screening or Evaluation	Delay in Referral	1
Housing Assistance (Section 8)	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Housing Assistance (Section 8)	Delay in Referral	1
Housing Assistance (Section 8)	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Housing Assistance (Section 8)	UTD from Case Plan, narrative or Area Office Response Provided	1
Individual Counseling - Child	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	5
Individual Counseling - Child	Delay in Referral	1
Individual Counseling - Child	Lack of Communication between DCF and Provider	1
Individual Counseling - Child	Provider Issue - untimely provision of services or gaps in service related to staffing, lack of follow through, etc. (specifically poor relationship with child/therapist)	1
Individual Counseling - Child	Wait List	1
Individual Counseling - Parent	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	6
Individual Counseling - Parent	Delay in Referral	2
Individual Counseling - Parent	Lack of Communication between DCF and Provider	2
Individual Counseling - Parent	Provider Issue - untimely provision of services or gaps in service related to staffing, lack of follow through, etc.	2
Individual Counseling - Parent	Insurance Issues	1
Individual Counseling - Parent	Wait List	1
In-Home Parent Education and Support	Delay in Referral	2
In-Home Parent Education and Support	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
In-Home Treatment	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	2
In-Home Treatment	Provider Issue - untimely provision of services or gaps in service related to staffing, lack of follow through, etc.	1
In-Home Treatment	Wait List	1

Unmet Need	Barrier	Frequency
Inpatient Substance Abuse Treatment - Parent	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Job Coaching/Placement	UTD from Case Plan, narrative or Area Office Response	1
Life Skills Training	Delay in Referral	1
Matching/Placement Processing (Includes ICO)	Approval Process	1
Medication Management - Parent	Provider Issues - untimely provision of services related to staffing, lack of follow through, etc	1
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation - Child	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation - Child	Delay in Referral	1
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation - Child	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation - Parent	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	2
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation - Parent	Delay in Referral	2
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation - Parent	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Mentoring	Delay in Referral	1
Mentoring	Other: Parent failed to complete paperwork timely so that onset of service was delayed by two months	1
Mentoring	Provider Issues - untimely provision of services related to staffing, lack of follow through, etc	1
Mentoring	Wait List	1
Other Mental Health Service Necessary - ADHD Evaluation	Delay in Referral	1
Other State Agency	Lack of Communication between DCF and provider	1
Parenting Classes	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	2
Parenting Classes	Delay in Referral	1
Parenting Groups	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Preparation for Adult Living Services	Delay in Referral	1
Problem Sexual Behavior Therapy	Wait List	1
Psychiatric Evaluation - Parent	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Psychological or Psychosocial Evaluation - Child	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Psychological or Psychosocial Evaluation - Child	Other: Weather Conditions	1

Unmet Need	Barrier	Frequency
Psychological or Psychosocial Evaluation - Parent	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Psychological or Psychosocial Evaluation - Parent	Other: Court Process	1
Psychological or Psychosocial Evaluation - Parent	Provider Issues - untimely provision of services related to staffing, lack of follow through, etc	1
Relative Foster Care	Delay in Search/Referral to FASU	1
Sexual Abuse Therapy - Victim	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Sexual Abuse Therapy - Victim	Service Deferred pending completion of another	1
Social Recreational Program	Delay in Referral	1
Substance Abuse Drug/Alcohol Testing - Parent	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Substance Abuse Drug/Alcohol Testing - Parent	Lack of Communication between DCF and provider	1
Substance Abuse Outpatient Treatment - Child	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Substance Abuse Outpatient Treatment - Parent	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	4
Substance Abuse Outpatient Treatment - Parent	Lack of Communication between DCF and provider	2
Substance Abuse Prevention Program - Parent	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Substance Abuse Relapse Prevention Program - Parent	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	2
Substance Abuse Screening - Parent	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	2
Substance Abuse Screening - Parent	Lack of Communication between DCF and provider	1
Supportive Housing for Recovering Families (SHRF)	Delay in Referral	1
Supportive Housing for Recovering Families (SHRF)	Service Deferred pending completion of another	1
SW/Child Visitation	Delays by SW such that mandated visitation standard was not met during review period	9
SW/Child Visitation	Child Refusing	2
SW/Parent Visitation	Delays by SW such that mandated visitation standard was not met during review period	9
SW/Parent Visitation	Client Refusal	2
SW/Provider Contacts	Case Management/Supervision: Contacts below Benchmark/Policy	24
Therapeutic Foster Care	Delay in Referral	2
Therapeutic Foster Care	No Slots Available to Meet Child's Needs	1
Transitional Living Program	No Slots Available	1
		188

This quarter, there appeared to be a slight increase in the general engagement of families in case planning as narrated within the ACR, case planning and visitation documentation. A total of 64.8% of the cases showed very good or optimal engagement of families in the case planning process through documented discussions with the families and the Social Worker *throughout* the period under review.

Our reviewers reading of the ACR documentation, narratives and case plan feedback reflect that 72.2% of the cases did document a discussion (or in the case of in-home family cases the family meeting or formal case conference) of some (50.0%) or all (22.2%) of the needs that were identified as unmet in the just completed six-month planning cycle. The reviewers identified only one case where the planning process did not address any of the needs that were unmet from the last planning cycle. In nine cases, the reviewers indicated that all needs identified at the prior ACR were "fully achieved" or "no longer needed" and no longer needed to be planned for. In four cases, the plan reviewed was the initial case plan.

Table 3: Were all needs and services unmet during the prior six month discussed at the ACR and, as appropriate, incorporated as action steps on the current case plan?

Needs Unmet Incorporated into Current Case Plan	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes - All	12	22.2%	22.2%
Yes - Partially	27	50.0%	72.2%
No - None	1	1.9%	74.1%
N/A - There are no Unmet Needs	10	18.5%	92.6%
N/A - this is the initial plan	4	7.4%	100.0%
Total	54	100.0%	

In 13 of 30 cases (43.3%) in which SDM was conducted a need was identified in the current SDM identical to that which was identified on the prior case plan assessment. (This would indicate an unmet need for greater than 6 months for a family or individual.)

In 59.3% of the 54 case plans reviewed, it was the opinion of the Court Monitor's staff that there was at least one priority need that was evident from the review of the documentation that was not incorporated into the newly developed case plan document. In many of these cases where an ACR was held, the ACR Social Work Supervisor also identified these areas as Areas Needing Improvement.

Many needs were appropriately planned for via the objectives and action steps developed within the 54 case plans reviewed. To gain a sense of those areas that continue to be under assessed or overlooked the reviewers collect the data reflecting the needs unmet that are not carried forward. These 91 priority needs and the barriers related to each unmet need were:

Table 4: Unmet Needs Not Incorporated in Upcoming Six-Month Case Planning

Unmet Need	Barrier	Frequency
Adoption Supports (PPSP)	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
ARG Consultation	Delays in Referral	6
ARG Consultation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Dental of Orthodontic Services	Delay in Referral	1
Dental or Orthodontic Services	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	4
Dental Screening or Evaluation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	5
Developmental Screening or Evaluation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Domestic Violence Services - Perpetrators	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Domestic Violence Services - Victims	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	4
Educational Screening or Evaluation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Family or Marital Counseling	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Family or Marital Counseling	Delay in Referral	1
Family Preservation Services	Delay in Referral	1
Family Preservation Services	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Family Reunification Services	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Foster Care Support	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Foster Parent Training	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Group Home	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Health/Medical - Other Intervention (Blood work)	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Health/Medical Screening or Evaluation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	3
Health/Medical Screening or Evaluation	Delay in Referral	1
Housing Assistance (Section 8)	Delay in Referral	2
Individual Counseling - Child	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Individual Counseling - Child	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Individual Counseling - Parent	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Individual Counseling - Parent	Delay in Referral	1
In-Home Parent Education and Support	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Job Coaching/Placement	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Life Skills Training	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Life Skills Training	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Matching/Placement Processing (includes ICO)	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	3
Matching/Placement Processing (includes ICO)	UTD from case plan, narrative or Area Office Response	1
Medication Management - Parent	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation - Child	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation - Child	Delay in Referral	1
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation - Parent	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Mentoring	Provider Issues - Untimely Provision of Services or Gaps in Service Related to Staffing, Lack of Follow Through, etc.	1
Mentoring	Service Deferred Pending Completion of Another	1
Other Mental Health Need: ADHD Assessment	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Other: AAG Consultation/Legal Steps	Delays in Referral	1
Other: Visitation / Lifelong Ties	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Parenting Classes	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Parenting Group	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1

Unmet Need	Barrier	Frequency
Preparation for Adult Living Services	Delay in Referral	1
Psychological or Psychosocial Evaluation - Child	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Relative Foster Care	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Residential Facility	Delay in Referral	1
Sex Abuse Evaluation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Sexual Abuse Therapy - Victim	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Substance Abuse Screening - Parent	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Substance Abuse: Outpatient Treatment - Child	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
Substance Abuse: Relapse Prevention Program - Parent	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
SW/Child Visitation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
SW/Parent Visitation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
SW/Provider Contacts	Lack of Communication between DCF and provider	1
Therapeutic Foster Care	Delay in Referral	2
Therapeutic Foster Care	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Transitional Living Program (TLAP)	Client Referred but was subsequently discharged for noncompliance/missed appointments/or refusal of follow-up services	1
		91

The lack of identification of a service need or specific provider or service to engage with the client in the face of a known deficit area in order to achieve the clients' case goal accounts for the majority of the unmet needs in the forward planning. Routinely these are not incorporated going forward though discussed at the ACRs or family conferences. You will recall from earlier findings that at least 43% of the cases had the same needs present six months six months earlier. This lack of current assessment and forward thinking within the case planning needs to be considered by the area offices as they strategize to improve their performance for OM15. Many of the deficits we currently find within the case plans, when addressed, will improve the provision of services and rate of success in meeting the needs of children and families in the future.

JUAN F. ACTION PLAN MONITORING REPORT

February 2013

This report includes data relevant to the permanency and placement issues and action steps embodied within the Action Plan. Data provided comes from several sources: the monthly point-in-time information from LINK, the Chapin Hall database and the Behavioral Health Partnership database.

A. PERMANENCY ISSUES

Progress Towards Permanency:

The following table developed using the Chapin Hall database provides a longitudinal view of permanency for annual admission cohorts from 2002 through 2012.


Figure 1: Children Exiting With Permanency, Exiting Without Permanency, Unknown Exits and Remaining In Care (Entry Cohorts)

	Period of Entry to Care										
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total Entries	3100	3547	3204	3091	3407	2854	2829	2629	2692	2298	1844
Permanent Exits											
In 1 yr	1178 38.0%	1406 39.6%	1229 38.4%	1129 36.5%	1263 37.1%	1095 38.4%	1098 38.8%	1091 41.5%	1023 38.0%	700 30.5%	
In 2 yrs	1637 52.8%	2078 58.6%	1806 56.4%	1740 56.3%	1973 57.9%	1675 58.7%	1676 59.2%	1580 60.1%	1375 51.1%		
In 3 yrs	1964 63.4%	2385 67.2%	2093 65.3%	2013 65.1%	2324 68.2%	1974 69.2%	1944 68.7%	1790 68.1%			
In 4 yrs	2135 68.9%	2540 71.6%	2263 70.6%	2158 69.8%	2500 73.4%	2090 73.2%	2034 71.9%				
To Date	2303 74.3%	2704 76.2%	2365 73.8%	2248 72.7%	2601 76.3%	2143 75.1%	2064 73.0%	1843 70.1%	1555 57.8%	887 38.6%	343 18.6%
Non-Permanent Exits											
In 1 yr	274 8.8%	249 7.0%	231 7.2%	289 9.3%	259 7.6%	263 9.2%	250 8.8%	208 7.9%	196 7.3%	139 6.0%	
In 2 yrs	332 10.7%	320 9.0%	301 9.4%	371 12.0%	345 10.1%	318 11.1%	320 11.3%	267 10.2%	242 9.0%		
In 3 yrs	365 11.8%	366 10.3%	366 11.4%	431 13.9%	401 11.8%	354 12.4%	363 12.8%	365 11.8%			
In 4 yrs	406 13.1%	392 11.1%	403 12.6%	461 14.9%	449 13.2%	392 13.7%	406 13.1%				
To Date	499 16.1%	483 13.6%	489 15.3%	545 17.6%	500 14.7%	418 14.6%	407 14.4%	312 11.9%	251 9.3%	167 7.3%	61 3.3%

	Period of Entry to Care										
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Unknown Exits											
<i>In 1 yr</i>	106 3.4%	153 4.3%	129 4.0%	83 2.7%	76 2.2%	62 2.2%	60 2.1%	77 2.9%	129 4.8%	209 9.1%	
<i>In 2 yrs</i>	136 4.4%	193 5.4%	171 5.3%	124 4.0%	117 3.4%	98 3.4%	91 3.2%	141 5.4%	311 11.6%		
<i>In 3 yrs</i>	161 5.2%	220 6.2%	208 6.5%	163 5.3%	140 4.1%	125 4.4%	126 4.5%	194 7.4%			
<i>In 4 yrs</i>	179 5.8%	244 6.9%	234 7.3%	181 5.9%	167 4.9%	158 5.5%	166 5.9%				
<i>To Date</i>	253 8.2%	318 9.0%	291 9.1%	222 7.2%	208 6.1%	181 6.3%	172 6.1%	203 7.7%	344 12.8%	303 13.2%	61 3.3%
Remain In Care											
<i>In 1 yr</i>	1542 49.7%	1739 49.0%	1615 50.4%	1590 51.4%	1809 53.1%	1434 50.2%	1421 50.2%	1253 47.7%	1344 49.9%	1250 54.4%	
<i>In 2 yrs</i>	995 32.1%	956 27.0%	926 28.9%	856 27.7%	972 28.5%	763 26.7%	742 26.2%	641 24.4%	764 28.4%		
<i>In 3 yrs</i>	610 19.7%	576 16.2%	537 16.8%	484 15.7%	542 15.9%	401 14.1%	396 14.0%	345 13.1%			
<i>In 4 yrs</i>	380 12.3%	371 10.5%	304 9.5%	291 9.4%	291 8.5%	214 7.5%	235 8.3%				
<i>To Date</i>	45 1.5%	42 1.2%	59 1.8%	76 2.5%	98 2.9%	112 3.9%	186 6.6%	271 10.3%	542 20.1%	941 40.9%	1379 74.8%

The following graphs show how the ages of children upon their entry to care, as well as at the time of exit, differ depending on the overall type of exit (permanent or non-permanent).


FIGURE 2: CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN EXITING WITH AND WITHOUT PERMANENCY (2012 EXIT COHORT)



Permanency Goals:

The following chart illustrates and summarizes the number of children (which excludes youth ages 18 and older) at various stages of placement episodes, and provides the distribution of Permanency Goals selected for them.

FIGURE 3: DISTRIBUTION OF PERMANENCY GOALS ON THE PATH TO PERMANENCY (CHILDREN IN CARE ON FEBRUARY 1, 2013⁴)



⁴ Children over age 18 are not included in these figures.

Preferred Permanency Goals:

Reunification	Nov 2011	Feb 2012	May 2012	Aug 2012	Nov 2012	Feb 2013
Total number of children with Reunification goal, pre-TPR and post-TPR	1531	1495	1382	1300	1254	1242
Number of children with Reunification goal pre-TPR	1527	1494	1381	1298	1254	1242
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children with Reunification goal, pre-TPR, >= 15 months in care 	245	301	272	282	254	260
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children with Reunification goal, pre-TPR, >= 36 months in care 	40	43	41	40	31	30
Number of children with Reunification goal, post-TPR	4	1	1	2	0	0

Transfer of Guardianship (Subsidized and Non-Subsidized)	Nov 2011	Feb 2012	May 2012	Aug 2012	Nov 2012	Feb 2013
Total number of children with Transfer of Guardianship goal (subsidized and non-subsidized), pre-TPR and post TPR	228	229	223	272	259	258
Number of children with Transfer of Guardianship goal (subsidized and non-subsidized), pre-TPR	225	226	220	268	254	255
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children with Transfer of Guardianship goal (subsidized and non-subsidized , pre-TPR, >= 22 months 	49	43	31	58	63	69
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children with Transfer of Guardianship goal (subsidized and non-subsidized), pre-TPR , >= 36 months 	13	15	9	9	11	14
Number of children with Transfer of Guardianship goal (subsidized and non-subsidized), post-TPR	3	3	3	4	5	3

Adoption	Nov 2011	Feb 2012	May 2012	Aug 2012	Nov 2012	Feb 2013
Total number of children with Adoption goal, pre-TPR and post-TPR	1057	1042	1106	1117	1058	974
Number of children with Adoption goal, pre-TPR	626	583	573	528	500	496
Number of children with Adoption goal, TPR not filed, >= 15 months in care	98	94	88	106	112	130 (136)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reason TPR not filed, Compelling Reason 	4	6	6	10	6	2

Adoption	Nov 2011	Feb 2012	May 2012	Aug 2012	Nov 2012	Feb 2013
• Reason TPR not filed, petitions in progress	20	13	14	12	26	29 (30)
• Reason TPR not filed, child is in placement with relative	4	3	5	1	1	2
• Reason TPR not filed, services needed not provided	0	0	0	1	2	2
• Reason TPR not filed, blank	70	72	63	82	77	95(100)
Number of cases with Adoption goal post-TPR	431	459	533	589	558	478
• Number of children with Adoption goal, post-TPR, in care >= 15 months	398	425	493	549	522	453
• Number of children with Adoption goal, post-TPR, in care >= 22 months	349	359	406	457	437	374
Number of children with Adoption goal, post-TPR, no barrier, > 3 months since TPR	25	21	17	18	22	32
Number of children with Adoption goal, post-TPR, with barrier, > 3 months since TPR	120	112	115	123	124	103
Number of children with Adoption goal, post-TPR, with blank barrier, > 3 months since TPR	200	203	272	312	283	268

Progress Towards Permanency:	Nov 2011	Feb 2012	May 2012	Aug 2012	Nov 2012	Feb 2013
Total number of children, pre-TPR, TPR not filed, >=15 months in care, no compelling reason	343	422	390	435	422	456

Non-Preferred Permanency Goals:

Long Term Foster Care Relative:	Nov 2011	Feb 2012	May 2012	Aug 2012	Nov 2012	Feb 2013
Total number of children with Long Term Foster Care Relative goal	70	65	70	61	61	53
Number of children with Long Term Foster Care Relative goal, pre-TPR	61	54	61	52	55	46
• Number of children with Long Term Foster Care Relative goal, 12 years old and under, pre-TPR	10	5	7	7	9	5
Long Term Foster Care Rel. goal, post-TPR	9	11	9	9	6	7
• Number of children with Long Term Foster Care Relative goal, 12 years old and under, post-TPR	0	0	0	1	0	0

APPLA*	Nov 2011	Feb 2012	May 2012	Aug 2012	Nov 2012	Feb 2013
Total number of children with APPLA goal	751	711	671	634	629	613
Number of children with APPLA goal, pre-TPR	588	559	533	504	494	479
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children with APPLA goal, 12 years old and under, pre-TPR 	27	28	31	21	22	19
Number of children with APPLA goal, post-TPR	163	152	138	130	135	134
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children with APPLA goal, 12 years old and under, post-TPR 	8	8	7	7	11	11

* Columns prior to Aug 07 had previously been reported separately as APPLA: Foster Care Non-Relative and APPLA: Other. The values from each separate table were added to provide these figures. Currently there is only one APPLA goal.


Missing Permanency Goals:

	Nov 2011	Feb 2012	May 2012	Aug 2012	Nov 2012	Feb 2013
Number of children, with no Permanency goal, pre-TPR, >= 2 months in care	17	25	24	21	21	22
Number of children, with no Permanency goal, pre-TPR, >= 6 months in care	8	10	11	16	13	11
Number of children, with no Permanency goal, pre-TPR, >= 15 months in care	5	6	5	9	11	9
Number of children, with no Permanency goal, pre-TPR, TPR not filed, >= 15 months in care, no compelling reason	3	3	2	6	9	3

B. PLACEMENT ISSUES

Placement Experiences of Children

The following chart shows the change in use of family and congregate care for admission cohorts between 2002 and 2012.




The next table shows specific care types used month-by-month for entries between January 2012 and December 2012.


Case Summaries

First placement type		enter Jan12	enter Feb12	enter Mar12	enter Apr12	enter May12	enter Jun12	enter Jul12	enter Aug12	enter Sep12	enter Oct12	enter Nov12	enter Dec12
Residential	N	13	9	11	7	5	8	4	12	8	4	5	3
	%	8.5%	6.1%	6.6%	5.0%	2.9%	5.4%	2.7%	6.8%	4.4%	2.3%	3.8%	2.9%
DCF Facilities	N	2	4	4	6	2		2	7	2	2	2	3
	%	1.3%	2.7%	2.4%	4.3%	1.2%		1.4%	4.0%	1.1%	1.2%	1.5%	2.9%
Foster Care	N	85	69	94	68	80	67	101	89	105	92	54	38
	%	55.6%	46.6%	56.3%	48.2%	46.5%	45.3%	68.7%	50.6%	58.3%	53.5%	40.9%	36.9%
Group Home	N	6	2			4	3	2	3	4	2	3	1
	%	3.9%	1.4%			2.3%	2.0%	1.4%	1.7%	2.2%	1.2%	2.3%	1.0%
Independent Living	N					1							
	%					.6%							
Relative Care	N	21	29	30	27	39	27	21	32	29	38	36	42
	%	13.7%	19.6%	18.0%	19.1%	22.7%	18.2%	14.3%	18.2%	16.1%	22.1%	27.3%	40.8%
Medical	N	4	3	1	7	8	7	2	5	8	1	1	
	%	2.6%	2.0%	.6%	5.0%	4.7%	4.7%	1.4%	2.8%	4.4%	.6%	.8%	
Safe Home	N	3	12	9	7	10	8	3	4	5	4	2	1
	%	2.0%	8.1%	5.4%	5.0%	5.8%	5.4%	2.0%	2.3%	2.8%	2.3%	1.5%	1.0%
Shelter	N	12	10	15	14	19	15	9	15	8	24	18	9
	%	7.8%	6.8%	9.0%	9.9%	11.0%	10.1%	6.1%	8.5%	4.4%	14.0%	13.6%	8.7%
Special Study	N	7	10	3	5	4	13	3	9	11	5	11	6
	%	4.6%	6.8%	1.8%	3.5%	2.3%	8.8%	2.0%	5.1%	6.1%	2.9%	8.3%	5.8%
Total	N	153	148	167	141	172	148	147	176	180	172	132	103
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The chart below shows the change in level of care usage over time for different age groups.



It is also useful to look at where children spend most of their time in DCF care. The chart below shows this for admission the 2002 through 2012 admission cohorts.



The following chart shows monthly statistics of children who exited from DCF placements between January 2012 and December 2012, and the portion of those exits within each placement type from which they exited.

Case Summaries

Last placement type in spell (as of censor date)		exit Jan12	exit Feb12	exit Mar12	exit Apr12	exit May12	exit Jun12	exit Jul12	exit Aug12	exit Sep12	exit Oct12	exit Nov12	exit Dec12
Residential	N	25	14	29	14	10	22	13	16	11	8	9	6
	%	15.0%	8.9%	14.8%	8.1%	5.1%	11.2%	7.1%	6.5%	7.4%	4.0%	6.5%	3.4%
DCF Facilities	N	2	3	2	3	2	4	6	6	2	2	1	4
	%	1.2%	1.9%	1.0%	1.7%	1.0%	2.0%	3.3%	2.4%	1.4%	1.0%	.7%	2.3%
Foster Care	N	61	74	82	89	85	88	78	132	63	103	70	85
	%	36.5%	46.8%	41.8%	51.4%	43.6%	44.7%	42.4%	53.4%	42.6%	52.0%	50.7%	48.9%
Group Home	N	14	8	17	10	17	17	14	16	6	13	6	13
	%	8.4%	5.1%	8.7%	5.8%	8.7%	8.6%	7.6%	6.5%	4.1%	6.6%	4.3%	7.5%
Independent Living	N	5	7	7	6	3		2		3	1	2	4
	%	3.0%	4.4%	3.6%	3.5%	1.5%		1.1%		2.0%	.5%	1.4%	2.3%
Relative Care	N	41	33	33	29	53	49	48	54	41	58	29	47
	%	24.6%	20.9%	16.8%	16.8%	27.2%	24.9%	26.1%	21.9%	27.7%	29.3%	21.0%	27.0%
Medical	N	1		3	1		1	2	1	2	1		
	%	.6%		1.5%	.6%		.5%	1.1%	.4%	1.4%	.5%		
Safe Home	N	2	3	3		6	4	2	7	1			
	%	1.2%	1.9%	1.5%		3.1%	2.0%	1.1%	2.8%	.7%			
Shelter	N	8	7	11	9	10	7	8	7	7	6	8	6
	%	4.8%	4.4%	5.6%	5.2%	5.1%	3.6%	4.3%	2.8%	4.7%	3.0%	5.8%	3.4%
Special Study	N	8	8	8	10	8	5	7	8	11	5	9	7
	%	4.8%	5.1%	4.1%	5.8%	4.1%	2.5%	3.8%	3.2%	7.4%	2.5%	6.5%	4.0%
Uknown	N		1	1	2	1		4		1	1	4	2
	%		.6%	.5%	1.2%	.5%		2.2%		.7%	.5%	2.9%	1.1%
Total	N	167	158	196	173	195	197	184	247	148	198	138	174
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The next chart shows the primary placement type for children who were in care on February 1, 2013 organized by length of time in care.

Primary type of spell (>50%) * Duration Category Crosstabulation

			Duration Category							Total
			1 <= durat < 30	30 <= durat < 90	90 <= durat < 180	180 <= durat < 365	365 <= durat < 545	545 <= durat < 1095	more than 1095	
Primary type of spell (>50%)	Residential	Count	4	12	24	35	25	80	79	259
		% Row	1.5%	4.6%	9.3%	13.5%	9.7%	30.9%	30.5%	100.0%
		% Col	4.5%	4.8%	6.0%	5.5%	4.8%	8.3%	7.7%	6.7%
DCF Facilities	Count	3	4	8	7	3	3	5	33	
	% Row	9.1%	12.1%	24.2%	21.2%	9.1%	9.1%	15.2%	100.0%	
	% Col	3.4%	1.6%	2.0%	1.1%	.6%	.3%	.5%	.8%	
Foster Care	Count	29	107	184	305	239	470	579	1913	
	% Row	1.5%	5.6%	9.6%	15.9%	12.5%	24.6%	30.3%	100.0%	
	% Col	32.6%	42.8%	45.7%	47.9%	46.1%	48.8%	56.4%	49.2%	
Group Home	Count	1	7	8	10	23	50	106	205	
	% Row	.5%	3.4%	3.9%	4.9%	11.2%	24.4%	51.7%	100.0%	
	% Col	1.1%	2.8%	2.0%	1.6%	4.4%	5.2%	10.3%	5.3%	
Independent Living	Count	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	8	
	% Row	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%	
	% Col	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%	.3%	.2%	
Relative Care	Count	40	67	111	158	169	226	72	843	
	% Row	4.7%	7.9%	13.2%	18.7%	20.0%	26.8%	8.5%	100.0%	
	% Col	44.9%	26.8%	27.5%	24.8%	32.6%	23.5%	7.0%	21.7%	
Medical	Count	0	1	2	6	2	4	2	17	
	% Row	.0%	5.9%	11.8%	35.3%	11.8%	23.5%	11.8%	100.0%	
	% Col	.0%	.4%	.5%	.9%	.4%	.4%	.2%	.4%	
Mixed (none >50%)	Count	0	1	4	15	18	62	141	241	
	% Row	.0%	.4%	1.7%	6.2%	7.5%	25.7%	58.5%	100.0%	
	% Col	.0%	.4%	1.0%	2.4%	3.5%	6.4%	13.7%	6.2%	
Safe Home	Count	1	6	15	20	5	8	3	58	
	% Row	1.7%	10.3%	25.9%	34.5%	8.6%	13.8%	5.2%	100.0%	
	% Col	1.1%	2.4%	3.7%	3.1%	1.0%	.8%	.3%	1.5%	
Shelter	Count	6	27	24	31	5	3	0	96	
	% Row	6.3%	28.1%	25.0%	32.3%	5.2%	3.1%	.0%	100.0%	
	% Col	6.7%	10.8%	6.0%	4.9%	1.0%	.3%	.0%	2.5%	
Special Study	Count	5	16	20	45	28	50	31	195	
	% Row	2.6%	8.2%	10.3%	23.1%	14.4%	25.6%	15.9%	100.0%	
	% Col	5.6%	6.4%	5.0%	7.1%	5.4%	5.2%	3.0%	5.0%	
Unknown	Count	0	2	3	5	2	2	5	19	
	% Row	.0%	10.5%	15.8%	26.3%	10.5%	10.5%	26.3%	100.0%	
	% Col	.0%	.8%	.7%	.8%	.4%	.2%	.5%	.5%	
Total	Count	89	250	403	637	519	963	1026	3887	
	% Row	2.3%	6.4%	10.4%	16.4%	13.4%	24.8%	26.4%	100.0%	
	% Col	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Congregate Care Settings

Placement Issues	Nov 2011	Feb 2012	May 2012	Aug 2012	Nov 2012	Feb 2013
Total number of children 12 years old and under, in Congregate Care	105	90	78	55	58	43
• Number of children 12 years old and under, in DCF Facilities	2	5	5	5	4	5
• Number of children 12 years old and under, in Group Homes	28	24	23	21	22	17
• Number of children 12 years old and under, in Residential	34	25	15	10	7	5
• Number of children 12 years old and under, in SAFE Home	36	35	34	17	24	15
• Number of children 12 years old and under, in Permanency Diagnostic Center	0	0	0	0	0	0
• Number of children 12 years old and under in Shelter	5	1	1	2	1	1
Total number of children ages 13-17 in Congregate Placements	713	675	624	576	556	538

Use of SAFE Homes, Shelters and PDCs

The analysis below provides longitudinal data for children (which may include youth ages 18 and older) who entered care in Safe Homes, Permanency Diagnostic Centers and Shelters.

	Period of Entry to Care										
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total Entries	3100	3547	3204	3091	3407	2854	2829	2629	2692	2298	1844
SAFE Homes/PDCs	728 23%	629 18%	453 14%	394 13%	395 12%	382 13%	335 12%	471 18%	330 12%	146 6%	68 4%
Shelters	165 5%	135 4%	147 5%	178 6%	114 3%	136 5%	144 5%	186 7%	175 7%	193 8%	169 9%
Total	893 29%	764 22%	600 19%	572 19%	509 15%	518 18%	479 17%	657 25%	505 19%	339 15%	237 13%

	Period of Entry to Care										
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total Initial Plcmnts	893	764	600	572	509	518	479	657	505	339	237
<= 30 days	351 39%	308 40%	249 42%	241 42%	186 37%	162 31%	150 31%	229 35%	135 27%	103 30%	65 27%
31 - 60	284	180	102	114	73	73	102	110	105	57	53

	Period of Entry to Care										
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total Initial Plcmnts	893	764	600	572	509	518	479	657	505	339	237
	32%	24%	17%	20%	14%	14%	21%	17%	21%	17%	22%
61 - 91	106 12%	121 16%	81 14%	76 13%	87 17%	79 15%	85 18%	157 24%	91 18%	54 16%	39 16%
92 - 183	101 11%	107 14%	124 21%	100 17%	118 23%	131 25%	110 23%	124 19%	136 27%	84 25%	57 24%
184+	51 6%	48 6%	44 7%	41 7%	45 9%	73 14%	32 7%	37 6%	38 8%	41 12%	23 10%

The following is the point-in-time data taken from the monthly LINK data, and may include those youth ages 18 and older.

Placement Issues	Aug 2011	Nov 2011	Feb 2012	May 2012	Aug 2012	Nov 2012	Feb 2013
Total number of children in SAFE Home	79	63	60	63	45	49	31
• Number of children in SAFE Home, > 60 days	42	35	44	40	35	31	21
• Number of children in SAFE Home, >= 6 months	13	14	9	11	7	8	7
Total number of children in STAR/Shelter Placement	80	79	75	71	84	78	73
• Number of children in STAR/Shelter Placement, > 60 days	48	43	40	37	53	40	42
• Number of children in STAR/Shelter Placement, >= 6 months	3	11	7	9	9	9	10
Total number of children in Permanency Planning Diagnostic Center	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
• Total number of children in Permanency Planning Diagnostic Center, > 60 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
• Total number of children in Permanency Planning Diagnostic Center, >= 6 months	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total number of children in MH Shelter	2	5	2	1	2	1	1
• Total number of children in MH Shelter, > 60 days	1	4	2	1	1	1	0
• Total number of children in MH Shelter, >= 6 months	1	1	1	0	0	0	1

Time in Residential Care

Placement Issues	Aug 2011	Nov 2011	Feb 2012	May 2012	Aug 2012	Nov 2012	Feb 2013
Total number of children in Residential care	454	403	372	316	273	252	244
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children in Residential care, >= 12 months in Residential placement 	126	119	124	113	89	76	64
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children in Residential care, >= 60 months in Residential placement 	2	1	1	1	1	0	2

Appendix 1
Commissioner's Highlights from
The Department of Children & Families
Fourth Quarter 2012 Exit Plan Report

Commissioner Statement

The 4th Quarter 2012 *Juan F.* Exit Plan report corresponds to the close of the first two years of this administration -- a period marked by dramatic transformations in the work of the Department. Through the creativity, commitment and energy of our staff, the Department has implemented the Strengthening Families Practice Model and the Differential Response System (DRS). This strengths-based, solution-focused approach has helped us to change our relationship with families and children to one that is based on respect for their autonomy, responsibility, decision making, and capabilities. Investigations no longer commence with an unannounced visit unless safety requires it, and in 2012, almost four in ten accepted reports were diverted to the assessment track as the result of DRS.

When this administration began in January 2011, I expressed some very clear goals that reflected a broad consensus of families, advocates, policy makers, and other experts in child welfare. These goals included reducing the number of children in care, reducing the use of congregate care, reducing the use of out of state placements, and increasing the use of relative resources for children who must be in care. I am very proud of the work of our staff who have made remarkable strides in each of these areas:

- There are 738 fewer children in care as of March 2013 compared to two years ago -- a reduction of 15.4 percent;
- The percentage of children in care in a congregate setting dropped to 23.2 percent in March 2013 compared to 29.8 percent two years ago;
- There are 307 fewer children in an out of state placement as of March 2013 compared to January 2011 -- a reduction of 84.3 percent; and
- The percentage of children in relative care grew to 24.4 percent in March 2013 compared to 15.3 percent in January 2011. (Including special study homes, the percentage of children in a kinship home increased to 28.3 percent in March 2013 compared to 19 percent two years earlier.)

These trends evidence clear and rapid improvements in Connecticut's child welfare system and our staff's strong commitment to working as partners with families and communities. At the same time, we also see the significant challenges that remain to be addressed. Exit plan outcomes for treatment planning and needs met continue to fall short of the goals set in 2003. Too many children remain in congregate care -- and for too long. Too many children exit care without a permanent family. Adolescents, sibling groups, children with complex medical needs, and infants continue to challenge the capacity to provide suitable foster homes. These are difficult hurdles that we must continue to work to overcome. None of this is easy, but we must make additional strides to achieve success in these areas.

One of the most promising elements of the strength-based and solution-oriented approach we have taken is the systematic growth of the teaming practice throughout our work. A major reason for our success in reducing the use of congregate care -- initially for younger children and, then later, for older youths -- child and family teaming is an effective way to put into practice the principle of family participation in our planning and delivery of services. In February 2013, we completed training in the use of teaming in families when a removal is under consideration and implementation has commenced. Later this year, permanency teaming will be initiated as will permanency roundtables for individual children to provide staff with expert resources focused on permanency.

In addition, the CONCEPT trauma grant has enabled the Department to focus on the special needs of children in care resulting from the trauma they have experienced. As a result, all cases will be assessed for trauma by later this year. This will make a clear and positive difference on the quality both of our planning and service delivery.

When we consider the overall impact of these strength-based, solution-focused initiatives -- the Strengthening Families practice model, DRS, teaming, announced visits, and a trauma-informed lens to all our work -- there is no part of our work that has not undergone transformation in these past two years. Our staff can be rightfully proud of having carried these reforms forward and of the improvements in our work and outcomes for children and families. Much more work remains to be done to fully live up to the promise, but we have every reason to be confident that this promise will be realized on behalf of the children and families who richly deserve it.