

**Juan F. v. Malloy Exit Plan
Quarterly Report
January 1, 2015 – March 31, 2015
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**
January 1, 2015 – March 31, 2015

Section	Page
Highlights	3
<i>Juan F.</i> Exit Plan Outcome Measure Overview Chart (January 1, 2015 – March 31, 2015)	9
<i>Juan F.</i> Pre-Certification Review-Status Update First Quarter 2015	10
DCF Court Monitor's Office Case Review for Outcome Measure 3 and Outcome Measure 15	13
<i>Juan F.</i> Action Plan Monitoring Report	34
<i>Appendix 1</i> - Commissioner's Highlights from: The Department of Children and Families Exit Plan Outcome Measures Summary Report: First Quarter Report (January 1, 2015 - March 31, 2015)	45

Juan F. v Malloy Exit Plan Quarterly Report January 1, 2015 – March 31, 2015

Highlights

- The First Quarter 2015 findings regarding the Exit Plan indicate that the Department maintained compliance with 15 of the 22 measures. Of the seven measures that did not meet the established standards, the most critical deal with the Department's case planning process, meeting children's service needs, appropriate visitation with family members of the agency's in-home cases, excessive caseloads for Social Work staff and appropriate discharge outcomes (education, work, and military service) prior to discharge from DCF custody for older adolescent youth (ages 18+).
- The Court Monitor's quarterly review of the Department's efforts to meet the Exit Plan Outcome Measures during the period of January 1, 2015 through March 31, 2015 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 14 (Placement Within Licensed Capacity), Outcome Measure 15 (Children's Needs Met), Outcome Measure 17 (Worker-Child Visitation In-Home)¹, Outcome Measure 18 (Caseload Standards) and Outcome Measure 20 (Discharge Measures for Adolescents Exiting DCF Care).

Outcome Measure 10 (Sibling Placement) did not meet the measure under the definitions set forth in the 2004 Exit Plan. However, given the recent expansion of the exception group to include sibling groups of 3 or more siblings that was detailed in the previous report; this quarter's cohort meets the measure for the First Quarter 2015.

- There have been ongoing discussions with the *Juan F.* parties regarding efforts to achieve and pre-certify all remaining Outcome Measures. In particular, consensus was reached regarding the need for additional funding to expand specific existing services to address the well documented lack of availability for some services in areas of the state. While this consensus does not address all of the areas of need outlined in recent state plans, legislative reports or Court Monitor reports, it was an important step that also took into account the ability of the Department to ensure that the new levels of service would be available quickly and efficiently. Considerable effort was made to outreach to the various state groups that control both the development and the approval of the budget. The Court Monitor met in person and had regular communication with the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, members of the Appropriations Committee, the Children's Committee and many individual members of the legislature. At the time of the drafting of this report the state budget has been approved. Some of the critical

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.

services deemed necessary have been addressed in the budget but not at the levels required to fully increase programs to levels that would attend to the identified deficiencies. In addition, the budget calls for \$1.8 million in annualized rescissions that will negatively impact services needed by the *Juan F.* class. Furthermore, the budget will negatively impact the ability of the Department to immediately re-hire staff to replace those who separate from state service and considerably reduces available overtime. Utilization of overtime is critical in ensuring appropriate case management including visitation with at-risk children as well as providing for the recently legislated mandate for sibling visitation. Efforts are under way by the Department to implement the new level of services allowed by the budget while the other areas of concern outlined above are currently under discussion with impact and options being considered.

- The results for the 53 case blind-sample of Outcome Measure 3 (Case Planning) and Outcome Measure 15 (Needs Met) are not surprising given the staffing instability and excessive workloads that existed during the period under review (PUR). As previously discussed in our quarterly reports, the freeze in hiring last year resulted in hundreds of workers with caseloads in excess of the maximum standard. Excessive workloads compromise the quality of the Department's case management services, including the case record documentation. The freeze in hiring forced caseloads to be re-distributed. The transfer of cases disrupts the relationship between DCF Social Workers and the families they are attempting to assist. Excessive amounts of transfers have a very detrimental effect on case planning, the provision of services, and permanency efforts. Despite the best efforts of the regional management teams to minimize the impact; once the freeze was lifted, another round of transferring of cases occurred as 150 new staff were hired and then were assigned cases. In addition, the well documented gaps in service that already existed and have been identified in the recent Mental Health Report, numerous legislative reports, external reports and Court Monitor reviews were further exacerbated. This was due to the fact that many of the new staff hired were employed previously by the non-profit providers who service the families and children. When the non-profit providers lose this many staff in a brief period of time, service provision levels drop precipitously until they can hire and train new staff. Stability in the DCF workforce, prompt hiring to fill vacancies and adequate levels of community-based services are essential to promote the best possible outcomes for children and families.

According to the 53 case, blind-sample conducted for the First Quarter 2015, the Department's statewide result for Outcome Measure 3 (Case Plans), is 47.2%. The standard of 90% was not met for the First Quarter 2015. The Middletown and Willimantic Offices surpassed the benchmark standard with 100% of the reviewed case meeting the standard set forth in the methodology. This quarter, nine of the 53 case plans reviewed were not within the 180 day Administrative Case Review cycle established by federal and DCF guidelines. A total of seven (7) of the 53 cases (13.2%) lacked supervisory approval at the time of our review.

Outcome Measure 15 requires that all needs be met within the case for 80% of the children and families served. **The Department's statewide result for OM 15 (Needs Met), within the 53 case sample is calculated at a rate of 47.2%.** This means that the

standard (80%) was not achieved for the First Quarter 2015. Norwich and Willimantic were the only Area Office that met or exceeded the standard.

There were 306 unmet needs service needs captured this quarter throughout our reviews of the sample (n=53) during the prior six month period. Additionally, there were 12 instances in which reviewers felt that the case management was marginal or poor due to the lack of assessment or untimely referrals. In these instances the reviewers identified the DCF case management as the service need. As with prior quarters, the reported barrier to appropriate service provision was due to client refusal, the lack or delayed referrals, or the result of wait lists and internal provider issues. It is important to note that interviews with Social Workers and Social Work Supervisors indicates that some percentage of the categories of “lack of referral” or “delayed referral” are due to staff having knowledge that certain services are not readily available. Thus, the number of cases with unmet needs due to waitlists and provider issues is understated.

As with previous quarters, services noted through this methodology, as well as other review activities, that are not readily available in areas of the state include: in-home services, domestic violence services, extended day treatment, substance abuse services, emergency mobile services, supportive housing vouchers, foster and adoptive care resources, and outpatient mental health services.

- The Court Monitor did not conduct any reviews related to Pre-Certification of additional Outcome Measures this past quarter. Pre-certification has been utilized in order to advance the exit process from federal oversight. See page 10 for a summary of pre-certification activity.
- The Division of Foster Care's monthly report for March 2015 indicates that there are 2,008 licensed DCF foster homes. This is a decrease of 90 homes when compared with the Fourth Quarter 2015 report. The number of approved private provider foster care homes is 818 which is a decrease of 26 homes from the previous quarter. The number of private provider foster homes currently available for placement is 113.
- The number of children with the goal of Other Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (OPPLA) decreased by 41 from the 421 in February 2015 to 380 at the close of this quarter. While this goal may be appropriate for some youth, it is not a preferred goal due to its lack of formal permanent and stable relationships with an identified adult support, be it relative or kin. The Department has continued training for staff regarding Permanency Teaming, which is a collaborative approach to permanency planning for children/youth in foster care or at risk of entering the foster care system. Permanency Teaming policy and a practice guide were released last quarter. Permanency Teaming will be the primary means by which caseworkers engage a child's/youth natural network (birth parents, extended family, other important adults) in addition to professional supports and conduct ongoing case management activities. Individual conversations, joint meetings and large team meetings will be utilized in this effort and there is tremendous opportunity in implementing this effort to reduce the number of meetings currently held for other specific issues. The frequent large team meetings envisioned in

this approach will allow a number of topics to be addressed in a more holistic manner. When successfully implemented this process will result in a significant efficiency for children, parents, stakeholders and DCF staff with respect to time and travel and improving the clarity of plans and expectation through improved communication.

- As of February 2015, there were 106 *Juan F.* children placed in residential facilities. This is a decrease of 8 children compared with February 2015. The number of children residing in residential care for greater than 12 months was 26 which is the same total reported in February 2015.
- The Department continues to focus on the number of *Juan F.* children residing and receiving treatment in out-of-state residential facilities. As of June 2015, the number of children was 10 children compared to the 12 children reported for April 2014.
- The number of children age 12 years old or younger in congregate care as of May 2015 was 22 children the same as the previous quarter. Of the total, 7 are placed in residential care, 4 children reside in SAFE Homes, 8 children are placed in group homes and 3 are placed in shelter services.
- As of May 2015, there were four children aged 1 to 5 years of age residing in a Congregate Care placement. Three of the children were placed in medical care settings due to complex medical conditions and one child resided with their parent in a group home setting.
- The number of children utilizing SAFE Home temporary placements decreased to 9 as of May 2015 compared with the 13 reported as of February 2015. The number of children in SAFE Home overstay status (>60 days) during the First Quarter, was 7 children or 78%. There were 4 children with lengths of stay in excess of six months as of May 2015. The Department has made a shift in the use of the SAFE Home model to focus on shorter lengths of stay and increased collaborative work with families and stakeholders during the child's placement episode.
- There were 34 youth in STAR programs as of May 2015. This is 4 more than the 30 reported in February 2015 and 40 fewer than one year ago. Fifteen (44%) of these youth in STAR programs were in overstay status (>60 days) as of May 2015. There were three children with lengths of stay longer than six months as of May 2015. In the past, the lack of sufficient and appropriate treatment/placement services, especially family-based settings for older youth, hampered efforts to reduce the utilization of STAR services. Given the decision to find alternative community placement and treatment services and reduce the utilization of STAR services, a review of the planning and service provision for children diverted from this service should be considered to ensure that their needs are adequately being addressed.

- The Monitor’s quarterly review of the Department for the period of January 1, 2015 through March 31, 2015 indicates that the Department did not achieve compliance with seven (7) measures:
 - Case Planning (47.2%)
 - Reunification (59.8%)
 - Placement Within Licensed Capacity (95.4%)
 - Children's Needs Met (47.2%)
 - Worker-Child Visitation In-Home (N/A)²
 - Caseload Standards (87.3%)
 - Discharge Measures of Adolescents Exited DCF Care (83.7%)

- The Monitor’s quarterly review of the Department for the period of January 1, 2015 through March 31, 2015 indicates the Department has achieved compliance with the following 15 Outcome Measures:
 - Commencement of Investigations (95.1%)
 - Completion of Investigations (85.6%)
 - Search for Relatives (93.4%)
 - Repeat Maltreatment (5.7%)
 - Maltreatment of Children in Out-of-Home Cases (0.2%)
 - Adoption (32.9%)
 - Transfer of Guardianship (72.5%)
 - Sibling Placement (90.9%)
 - Re-Entry into DCF Custody (5.0%)
 - Multiple Placements (96.7%)
 - Foster Parent Training (100.0%)
 - Worker-Child Visitation Out-of-Home Cases (94.9% Monthly/99.0% Quarterly)
 - Residential Reduction (2.8%)
 - Discharge to Adult Services (100.0%)
 - Multi-disciplinary Exams (91.2%)

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.

- The Department has maintained compliance for at least two (2) consecutive quarters³ with 11 of the Outcome Measures reported as achieved this quarter:
 - Commencement of Investigations
 - Search for Relatives
 - Repeat Maltreatment of In-Home Children
 - Maltreatment of Children in Out-of-Home Care
 - Transfer of Guardianship
 - Multiple Placements
 - Foster Parent Training
 - Visitation Out-of-Home
 - Residential Reduction
 - Discharge of Youth to Adult Services
 - Multi-disciplinary Exams

A full copy of the Department's First Quarter 2015 submission including the Commissioner's Highlights may be found on page 45.

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		Juan F. Exit Plan Report Outcome Measure Overview																						
Measure	Measure	Base-line	Q2 2015	Q1 2015	Q4 2014	Q3 2014	Q2 2014	Q1 2014	Q4 2013	Q3 2013	Q2 2013	Q1 2013	Q4 2012	Q3 2012	Q2 2012	Q1 2012	Q4 2011	Q3 2011	Q2 2011	Q1 2011	Q4 2010	Q3 2010	Q2 2010	Q1 2010
1: Commencement of Investigation	>=90%	X		95.1%	94.5%	93.8%	93.2%	93.6%	94.7%	96.0%	96.2%	95.5%	94.9%	95.7%	96.1%	96.6%	97.1%	97.3%	97.2%	97.2%	96.8%	97.4%	97.6%	97.4%
2: Completion of the Investigation	>=85%	73.7%		85.6%	81.9%	78.6%	77.3%	77.6%	83.7%	92.5%	92.2%	89.1%	90.2%	92.5%	92.4%	91.9%	93.3%	94.0%	94.4%	92.7%	90.0%	91.5%	92.9%	93.7%
3: Treatment Plans	>=90%	X		47.2%	41.5%	46.3%	46.3%	51.9%	N/A	65.5%	63.0%	56.4%	53.7%	47.8%	63.0%	39.6%	44.4%	50.9%	N/A	81.1%	67.9%	66.0%	75.5%	86.5%
4: Search for Relatives	>=85%	58%		93.4%	89.3%	86.9%	85.1%	86.6%	88.3%	90.2%	85.3%	92.2%	87.3%	87.5%	89.5%	89.3%	92.8%	94.5%	94.5%	90.1%	88.8%	90.9%	91.2%	92.0%
5: Repeat Maltreatment of In-Home Children	<=7%	9.3%		5.7%	6.7%	6.5%	5.8%	6.3%	4.5%	4.9%	5.7%	4.4%	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: Maltreatment of Children in Out-of-Home Care	<=2%	1.2%		0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%
7: Reunification	>=60%	57.8%		59.8%	65.2%	71.3%	73.9%	60.2%	62.5%	62.4%	62.8%	56.3%	57.6%	52.0%	61.1%	58.9%	65.8%	65.3%	73.1%	61.7%	64.9%	68.3%	67.1%	61.2%
8: Adoption	>=32%	12.5%		32.9%	31.7%	30.2%	34.2%	44.0%	33.9%	32.8%	31.6%	29.5%	25.9%	39.0%	34.3%	23.7%	33.6%	40.0%	32.7%	35.6%	38.5%	25.8%	36.0%	34.7%
9: Transfer of Guardianship	>=70%	60.5%		77.8%	72.5%	73.2%	65.2%	67.6%	63.8%	77.3%	65.6%	77.6%	76.5%	84.0%	76.7%	81.4%	83.1%	83.6%	78.4%	86.2%	87.3%	78.6%	74.6%	82.3%
10: Sibling Placement	>=95%	57%		90.9%	90.6%	88.7%	89.3%	90.6%	89.9%	92.5%	88.0%	89.5%	87.5%	87.5%	89.2%	88.5%	91.8%	89.3%	85.8%	86.7%	83.3%	81.9%	84.8%	85.6%
11: Re-Entry into DCF Custody	<=7%	6.9%		5.0%	3.8%	7.7%	8.0%	4.8%	4.9%	5.5%	8.6%	7.4%	7.0%	9.1%	6.8%	5.8%	6.4%	7.2%	4.4%	7.7%	6.3%	7.3%	6.7%	8.4%
12: Multiple Placements	>=85%	X		96.7%	96.4%	96.5%	96.7%	96.8%	97.1%	96.6%	96.7%	96.4%	96.5%	96.4%	96.6%	96.6%	96.4%	96.4%	96.1%	96.1%	96.1%	95.7%	95.8%	95.9%
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%
14: Placement Within Licensed Capacity	>=96%	94.9%		95.4%	96.3%	95.3%	95.4%	96.0%	95.7%	96.2%	96.4%	97.1%	96.7%	95.8%	95.3%	97.7%	96.1%	95.2%	95.6%	96.8%	96.8%	95.4%	95.1%	96.9%
15: Children's Needs Met	>=80%	X		47.2%	52.8%	64.8%	59.3%	57.4%	N/A	67.3%	74.1%	61.8%	53.7%	53.6%	61.1%	60.4%	55.6%	60.4%	N/A	58.5%	56.6%	58.5%	52.8%	67.3%
16: Worker-Child Visitation (Out-of-Home)	>=85%(M)	X		94.9%	92.6%	93.4%	94.3%	94.9%	95.4%	94.6%	95.8%	95.9%	94.2%	93.6%	92.7%	95.1%	92.3%	95.0%	95.1%	95.8%	95.3%	95.3%	95.7%	96.2%
	=100%(Q)	X		99.0%	98.4%	98.4%	98.9%	98.8%	99.0%	98.8%	99.0%	99.2%	99.1%	98.7%	98.7%	99.2%	98.6%	99.0%	99.2%	99.2%	98.9%	98.9%	99.3%	99.6%
17: Worker-Child Visitation (In-Home)	>=85%	X		86.1%	83.3%	83.3%	83.9%	83.0%	85.3%	86.1%	88.6%	88.1%	84.1%	87.0%	85.8%	84.8%	85.9%	86.3%	89.7%	88.5%	89.7%	89.4%	89.7%	89.6%
18: Caseload Standards	100%	69.2%		90.6%	87.3%	84.5%	83.6%	94.5%	97.6%	99.9%	99.9%	99.8%	99.9%	100.0%	99.7%	99.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%
19: Reduction in the Number of Children Placed in	<=11%	13.5%		2.8%	2.7%	2.7%	3.4%	4.0%	4.2%	4.3%	4.9%	5.1%	5.8%	6.3%	6.9%	7.5%	8.5%	8.8%	9.8%	10.0%	9.9%	9.4%	10.1%	10.0%
20: Discharge Measures	>=85%	61%		83.7%	94.6%	93.8%	97.1%	90.9%	94.5%	85.7%	86.3%	86.5%	95.9%	89.2%	85.7%	86.9%	76.5%	88.0%	79.4%	82.9%	87.2%	88.5%	87.9%	86.0%
21: Discharge of Mentally Ill or Mentally Retarded Children	100%	X		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	90.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.7%	92.0%	97.0%	96.1%	97.3%	98.1%	100.0%
22: Multi-disciplinary Exams (MDE)	>=85%	5.6%		91.2%	93.3%	96.0%	91.8%	85.4%	85.1%	94.1%	93.6%	95.0%	89.7%	95.5%	93.8%	90.0%	93.4%	93.3%	96.3%	91.9%	97.5%	96.1%	96.4%	95.7%

Juan F. Pre-Certification Review-Status Update First Quarter 2015

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.

As of this First Quarter 2015 Report, no additional measures have been pre-certified. The total number of Outcome Measures that have been certified thus far is 14 measures.

Juan F. Pre-Certification Review		
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.	Pre-Certified October 2013
OM 5: Repeat Maltreatment of Children	No more than 7% of the children who are victims of substantiated maltreatment during any six-month period shall be the substantiated victims of additional maltreatment during any subsequent six-month period. This outcome shall begin to be measured within the six-month period beginning January 1, 2004.	Pre-Certified* July 2014
OM6: Maltreatment of Children in Out-of-Home Care	No more than 2% of the children in out of home care on or after January 1, 2004 shall be the victims of substantiated maltreatment by substitute caregivers while in out of home care.	Pre-Certified October 2014
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.	Pre-Certified April 2015
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 January 2013
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 January 2013
OM 10: Sibling Placement	At least 95% of siblings currently in or entering out-of-home placement shall be placed together unless there are documented clinical reasons for separate placements. Excludes Voluntary cases and children for whom TPR has been granted.	Pre-Certified April 2015

* Pre-Certification granted subject to verification of correction to ROM system reporting - release delayed to June 2014.

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 April 2012
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 April 2012
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 April 2012
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 January 2012
OM 19: Reduction in the Number of Children Placed in Residential Care	The number of children placed in privately operated residential treatment care shall not exceed 11% of the total number of children in DCF out-of-home care. The circumstances of all children in-state and out-of-state residential facilities shall be assessed after the Court's approval of this Exit Plan on a child specific basis to determine if their needs can be met in a less restrictive setting.	Pre-Certified December 2014
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 September 2011
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 September 2011
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 January 2013

Quarterly DCF Court Monitor Case Review Reporting for Outcome Measure 3 and Outcome Measure 15: First Quarter 2015

Statewide, the First Quarter DCF performance result for Outcome Measure 3 (OM3) - Case Plans is 47.2%, a slight increase from the prior quarter's result of 41.5%.

Crosstabulation 1: What is the social worker's area office assignment? * Overall Score for OM3					
Area Office			Appropriate Case Plan	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	Total
Region I	Bridgeport	Count	2	2	4
		%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Norwalk	Count	1	1	2
		%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
<i>Region I</i>			50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Region II	New Haven	Count	3	2	5
			60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	Milford	Count	1	2	3
		%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
<i>Region II</i>			50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Region III	Middletown	Count	2	0	2
		%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	Norwich	Count	4	1	5
		%	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	Willimantic	Count	3	0	3
		%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
<i>Region III</i>			90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Region IV	Hartford	Count	3	5	8
		%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	Manchester	Count	2	2	4
		%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
<i>Region IV</i>			41.7%	58.3%	100.0%
Region V	Danbury	Count	1	1	2
		%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Torrington	Count	1	1	2
		%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Waterbury	Count	0	6	6
		%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Region V</i>			20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
Region VI	Meriden	Count	1	1	2
		%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	New Britain	Count	1	4	5
		%	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
<i>Region VI</i>			28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
<i>Statewide</i>		Count	25	28	53
		%	47.2%	52.8%	100.0%

Middletown and Willimantic surpassed the benchmark standard of 90% or higher this quarter each with 100% of reviewed cases meeting the standards set forth in the methodology. As shown, Region III maintained the highest regional level of performance with 90.0%; while Region V was at the lowest level measured: 20.0%. This quarter, nine case plans were not approved timely from the prior approved case plan (based on the 180 day Administrative case review cycle and approval time frame guidelines established by departmental practice

guidelines). A total of 7 of the 53 case plans (13.2%) lacked supervisory approval at the time of our review.

Table 1: Outcome Measure OM3 Regional Quarterly Performance Comparison							
<i>Standard: 90%</i>							
	Region I	Region II	Region III	Region IV	Region V	Region VI	Statewide
1st Quarter 2015	50.0%	50.0%	90.0%	41.7%	20.0%	28.6%	47.2%
4th Quarter 2014	33.3%	11.1%	70.0%	41.7%	11.1%	71.4%	41.5%
3rd Quarter 2014	28.6%	55.6%	40.0%	41.7%	44.4%	71.4%	46.3%
2nd Quarter 2014	71.4%	33.3%	80.0%	25.0%	33.3%	42.9%	46.3%
1st Quarter 2014	28.6%	66.7%	80.0%	41.7%	22.2%	71.4%	51.9%
4th Quarter 2013	28.6%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	33.3%	75.0%	48.1%
3rd Quarter 2013	57.1%	77.8%	90.0%	46.2%	67.7%	57.1%	65.5%
2nd Quarter 2013	42.9%	88.9%	60.0%	50.0%	66.7%	71.4%	63.0%
1st Quarter 2013	37.5%	77.8%	70.0%	41.7%	55.6%	71.4%	58.2%
4th Quarter 2012	71.4%	55.6%	60.0%	46.2%	50.0%	57.1%	55.6%
3rd Quarter 2012	55.6%	54.5%	33.3%	64.3%	36.4%	55.6%	49.3%
2nd Quarter 2012	57.1%	66.7%	80.0%	45.5%	77.8%	50.0%	63.0%

The table below provides a case by case summary of the individual scores for each area office/region. The eight domains and an indication related to supervisory approval are provided for reference. Court Monitor overrides are signified by an overall score reported in italics. This quarter there were 12 overrides granted for Outcome Measure 3. A few were related to supervisory approvals being untimely but the reviewer found documentation which provided evidence of supervisory oversight otherwise being strong within the period under review. As in the past, the others were related to the lack of family feedback narratives being incorporated into the case plans, while evidence of family engagement was clear through other parts of the documentation.

Table 2: Outcome Measure 3 – 1st Quarter 2015

Table 2: Outcome Measure 3 – 1 st Quarter 2015													
Region and Area Office		Case Plan Approved within 25 Days of ACR?	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 I	Bridgeport	1	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	<i>Appropriate Case Plan</i>	
		2	N/A	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		3	No	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		4	No	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	<i>Appropriate Case Plan</i>	
		AO %	0.0%	75.0%	75.0%	50.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	
	Norwalk	1	N/A	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	<i>Appropriate Case Plan</i>
		2	Yes	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		AO%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	1000.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	
	Region I %		33.3%	100.0%	83.3%	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	

Region and Area Office		Case Plan Approved within 25 Days of ACR?	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	N/A	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		2	Yes	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan	
		3	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	TBD	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		AO %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%	33.3%	100.0%	33.3%	
	New Haven	1	Yes	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		2	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		3	Yes	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very good	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan	
		4	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		5	N/A	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		AO %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	60.00%	40.0%	100.0%	80.0%	100.0%	60.0%	
	Region II %		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	62.5%	50.0%	37.5%	100.0%	62.5%	100.0%	50.0%	

Region and Area Office		Case Plan Approved within 25 Days of ACR?	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	Norwich	1	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan	
		2	Yes	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		3	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		4	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	TBD	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		5	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan
		AO %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	60.0%	80.0%	80.0%	100.0%	80.0%	100.0%	80.0%
	Willimantic	1	Yes	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan
		2	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		3	Yes	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		AO %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Middletown	1	Yes	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	TBD	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		2	Yes	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		AO %	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Region III %		100.0%	90.0%	100.0%	80.0%	90.0%	90.0%	100.0%	80.0%	100.0%	90.0%

Region and Area Office		Case Plan Approved within 25 Days of ACR?	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	N/A	Poor	Marginal	Marginal	Poor	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		2	Yes	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		3	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		4	N/A	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Poor	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		5	No	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan
		6	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		7	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		8	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		AO %	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	12.5%	37.5%	50.0%	75.0%	25.0%	87.5%	37.5%	
	Manchester	1	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		2	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		3	N/A	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		4	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	TBD	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		AO %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%	75.0%	66.7%	75.0%	75.0%	50.0%	
Region IV %		85.7%	83.3%	83.3%	16.7%	41.7%	58.3%	72.7%	41.7%	83.3%	41.7%		

Region and Area Office		Case Plan Approved within 25 Days of ACR?	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	Waterbury	1	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	TBD	Marginal	Optimal	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		2	N/A	Absent/Averse	Absent/Averse	Marginal	Absent/Averse	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		3	Yes	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		4	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		5	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Poor	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		6	Yes	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		AO %	100.0%	66.7%	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	33.3%	40.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	
	Torrington	1	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Case Plan Appropriate
		2	N/A	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		AO %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	
	Danbury	1	Yes	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	TBD	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	Optimal	Case Plan Appropriate
		AO %	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%
	Region V %		100.0%	70.0%	80.0%	40.0%	20.0%	50.0%	44.4%	30.0%	80.0%	20.0%	

Region and Area Office			Case Plan Approved within 25 Days of ACR?	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 VI	Meriden	1	N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Poor	Marginal	Not an Appropriate Case Plan	
		2	Yes	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Appropriate Case Plan	
		AO %	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	
	New Britain	1	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		2	Yes	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Appropriate Case Plan
		3	No	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	TBD	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		4	N/A	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		5	No	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Poor	TBD	Poor	Marginal	Marginal	Not an Appropriate Case Plan
		AO %	33.3%	100.0%	80.0%	40.0%	20.0%	20.0%	66.7%	20.0%	80.0%	20.0%	
	Region VI %		50.0%	71.4%	85.7%	85.7%	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	60.0%	71.4%	28.6%	
	Statewide %		84.8%	84.9%	88.7%	47.2%	47.2%	54.7%	82.2%	49.1%	88.7%	47.2%	

Outcome Measure 15

The First Quarter sample results of 47.2% is a decline from the prior quarter's result of 52.8% and remains significantly below the statewide goal of 80% set by Outcome Measure 15. Variance continues between the area offices and regions of the state:

"At least 80.0% of all families and children shall have their medical, dental, mental health and other service needs provided as specified in the most recent case plan."^[1]

Crosstabulation 2: What is the social worker's area office assignment? * Overall Score for Outcome Measure 15				
		Needs Met	Needs Not Met	Total
Bridgeport	Count	2	2	4
	% area office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Norwalk	Count	1	1	2
	% area office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Region I		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Milford	Count	1	2	3
	% area office	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
New Haven	Count	2	3	5
	% area office	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Region II		37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
Middletown	Count	1	1	2
	% area office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Norwich	Count	5	0	5
	% area office	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Willimantic	Count	3	0	3
	% area office	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Region III		90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
Hartford	Count	4	4	8
	% area office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Manchester	Count	2	2	4
	% area office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Region IV		50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Danbury	Count	1	1	2
	% area office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Torrington	Count	0	2	2
	% area office	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Waterbury	Count	0	6	6
	% area office	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Region V		10.0%	90.0%	100.0%
Meriden	Count	1	1	2
	% area office	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
New Britain	Count	2	3	5
	% area office	40.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Region VI		42.9%	14.3%	100.0%
Statewide	Count	25	28	53
	%	47.2%	52.8%	100.0%

^[1] Measure excludes Probate, Interstate and Subsidy only cases.

Norwich and Willimantic are the only Area Office that met or exceeded the measure. At the combined regional level, Region III achieved the 80% standard. Region V had the lowest scores for that region since we have been reporting on this measure.

Table 3: Outcome Measure 15 Regional Quarterly Performance Comparison							
<i>Standard: 80%</i>							
	Region I	Region II	Region III	Region IV	Region V	Region VI	Statewide
1st Quarter 2015	50.0%	37.5%	90.0%	50.0%	10.0%	42.9%	45.3%
4th Quarter 2014	50.0%	33.3%	70.0%	33.3%	55.6%	85.7%	52.8%
3rd Quarter 2014	85.7%	66.7%	60.0%	50.0%	55.6%	85.7%	64.8%
2nd Quarter 2014	85.7%	77.8%	80.0%	16.7%	44.4%	71.4%	59.3%
1st Quarter 2014	71.4%	55.6%	80.0%	25.0%	55.6%	71.4%	57.4%
4th Quarter 2013	28.6%	62.5%	60.0%	75.0%	33.3%	75.0%	57.4%
3rd Quarter 2013	57.1%	77.8%	90.0%	53.8%	66.7%	57.1%	67.3%
2nd Quarter 2013	85.7%	77.8%	80.0%	50.0%	100.0%	57.1%	74.1%
1st Quarter 2013	62.5%	77.8%	70.0%	41.7%	66.7%	71.4%	63.6%
4th Quarter 2012	71.4%	77.8%	50.0%	38.5%	50.0%	57.1%	55.6%
3rd Quarter 2012	33.3%	36.4%	60.0%	78.6%	27.3%	77.8%	53.6%
2nd Quarter 2012	71.4%	66.7%	70.0%	54.5%	77.8%	25.0%	61.1%

In the First Quarter 2015 there were 12 overrides granted by the Court Monitor to achieve Needs Met status. All of these were granted as a result of additional documentation provided by the Area Office in response to reviewers' emails for additional information.

The full table of case summaries is provided by area office below. The overrides are designated by individual case OM15 scores in italics.

Table 4: Case Summaries of Outcome Measure 15 Domain Performances by Individual Area Office, Region, Statewide

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
Bridgeport	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Needs Not Met
Bridgeport	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Optimal	Optimal	Marginal	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Bridgeport	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Needs Met
Bridgeport	N/A	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Needs Met
Area Office %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%
Norwalk	Optimal	N/A	N/A	Marginal	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Optimal	<i>Needs Met</i>
Norwalk	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Marginal	Marginal	Optimal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Area Office %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%
Region I	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	83.3%	100.0%	50.0%	83.3%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%

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
Milford	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Optimal	Absent/Averse	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Milford	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	<i>Needs Met</i>
Milford	Marginal	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Area Office %	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%	100.0%	33.3%
New Haven	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Met
New Haven	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	<i>Needs Met</i>
New Haven	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Absent/Averse	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Needs Not Met
New Haven	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Marginal	Poor	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met
New Haven	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Needs Not Met
Area Office %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	60.0%	80.0%	60.0%	75.0%	100.0%	75.0%	40.0%
Region II	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	62.5%	87.5%	50.0%	57.1%	100.0%	85.7%	37.5%

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
Middletown	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	N/A	Optimal	Needs Met
Middletown	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Needs Not Met
Area Office %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%
Norwich	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	<i>Needs Met</i>
Norwich	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	N/A	Very Good	<i>Needs Met</i>
Norwich	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Marginal	N/A	Very Good	<i>Needs Met</i>
Norwich	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Optimal	Needs Met
Norwich	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	<i>Needs Met</i>
Area Office %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%	60.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Willimantic	N/A	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Needs Met
Willimantic	Optimal	N/A	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	N/A	Optimal	Needs Met
Willimantic	N/A	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Needs Met
Area Office %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Region III %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	90.0%

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
Hartford	Poor	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Poor	Very Good	Marginal	Poor	N/A	Poor	Needs Not Met
Hartford	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Needs Met
Hartford	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	N/A	Needs Met
Hartford	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Hartford	Marginal	N/A	N/A	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Poor	Poor	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Needs Not Met
Hartford	Marginal	N/A	N/A	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Hartford	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Marginal	Needs Met
Hartford	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Met
Area Office %	33.3%	100.0%	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%	37.5%	62.5%	50.0%	42.9%	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Manchester	N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Manchester	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Needs Met
Manchester	N/A	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Poor	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Manchester	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	N/A	Optimal	Needs Met
Area Office %	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	75.0%	50.0%	50.0%	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%
Region IV	50.0%	66.7%	83.3%	75.0%	83.3%	41.7%	66.7%	58.3%	50.0%	83.3%	70.0%	50.0%

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
Danbury	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Danbury	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Marginal	Optimal	N/A	Needs Met
Area Office %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%
Torrington	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Marginal	Very Good	Optimal	Needs Not Met
Torrington	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Area Office %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Waterbury	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Needs Not Met
Waterbury	N/A	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Waterbury	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Marginal	Optimal	Marginal	Very Good	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Waterbury	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Poor	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Needs Not Met
Waterbury	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Waterbury	N/A	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Very Good	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	Optimal	Very Good	Needs Not Met
Area Office %	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	66.6%	33.3%	83.3%	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%	66.7%	0.0%
Region V %	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	100.0%	80.0%	40.0%	90.0%	50.0%	50.0%	80.0%	77.8%	10.0%

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
Meriden	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Needs Not Met
Meriden	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Optimal	Marginal	Optimal	Marginal	Optimal	N/A	Very Good	Needs Met
Area Office %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	100.0%	---	50.0%	50.0%
New Britain	Marginal	N/A	N/A	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Marginal	Very Good	Poor	N/A	Marginal	Needs Not Met
New Britain	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Very Good	N/A	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	N/A	Marginal	Needs Not Met
New Britain	Very Good	N/A	N/A	Optimal	N/A	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Marginal	N/A	Very Good	Needs Not Met
New Britain	N/A	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Optimal	Marginal	Very Good	Very Good	Very Good	Needs Met
New Britain	N/A	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Very Good	Optimal	Optimal	Needs Met
Area Office %	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	100.0%	40.0%	60.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	60.0%	40.0%
Region VI	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%	85.7%	100.0%	28.6%	57.1%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%	57.1%	42.9%
Statewide %	83.3%	91.7%	91.7%	90.6%	83.3%	50.9%	81.1%	66.0%	58.0%	91.3%	80.9%	47.2%

There were 227 unmet service needs captured this quarter through our reviews of the sample (n=53) during the prior six month period. Additionally there were 12 instances in which reviewers felt that the case management was marginal or poor due to the lack of assessment or untimely referrals. In these instances, the reviewers identified the DCF case management as the service need.

The unmet needs for the First Quarter included:

Table 5: Unmet Needs during First Quarter 2014 (n=53)

Unmet Need	Barrier	Frequency
Adoption Supports (PPSP)	Delay in Referral by DCF	1
Adoption Supports (PPSP)	DCF Failure to Assess Need during the PUR	1
After School Programs	Delay in Referral by DCF	1
ARG Consult	Delay in Referral by DCF	3
ARG Consult	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	5
ARG Consult	DCF Failure to Assess Need during the PUR	1
Behavior Management	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Care Coordination	DCF Failure to Assess Need during the PUR	1
Childcare/Daycare Program	UTD - Client Engaged in Service by End of PUR	1
DCF Case Management/Advocacy Support	Lack of timely assessment, delays in referrals during the PUR	(12)
Dental or Orthodontic Services	No Referral by DCF	1
Dental Screenings or Evaluations	Client Refused Service	5
Dental Screenings or Evaluations	Other – Child Hospitalized	1
Dental Screenings or Evaluations	Delay in Referral by DCF	2
Dental Screenings or Evaluations	No Referral by DCF	2
Dental Screenings or Evaluations	Lack of Communication between DCF and Provider	1
Dental Screenings or Evaluations	UTD from Case Plan and narrative	3
Dental Screenings or Evaluations	DCF Failure to Assess Need during the PUR	3
Developmental Screening or Evaluation	Client Refused Service	1
Developmental Screening or Evaluation	Delay in Referral by DCF	1
Developmental Screening or Evaluation	Lack of Communication between DCF and Provider	1
Domestic Violence Services :Victim	Lack of Communication between DCF and Provider	1
Domestic Violence Services: Victim	Client Refused Service	1
Domestic Violence Services: Victim	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	2
Domestic Violence Services: Perpetrator	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	4
Domestic Violence Services: Prevention	Client Refused Services	1
Educational Screening or Evaluation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Educational Screening or Evaluation	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	1
Educational Screening or Evaluation	Client Refused Service	1
Educational Screening or Evaluation	Provider Issue: Untimely provision of service, or gap in service related to staffing or lack of follow through on part of provider	1
Educational Screening or Evaluation	Lack of Communication between DCF and Provider	1
Family or Marital Counseling	Client Refused Service	2
Family or Marital Counseling	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	1
Family Preservation Services	Delay in Referral by DCF	2
Family Preservation Services	Referred Service is Unwilling to Engage Client	1
Family Reunification Services	Provider Issue: Untimely provision of service, or gap in service related to staffing or lack of follow through on part of provider	1
Foster Care Support	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	1
Foster Care Support	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1

Unmet Need	Barrier	Frequency
Head Start	Service Deferred Pending Completion of Another	1
Health/Medical Screening	Other: Child Hospitalized	1
Health/Medical Screening	Client Refused	4
Health/Medical Screening	Other: Mother has not yet secured appointment	1
Health/Medical Screening	DCF Failure to Assess Need during the PUR	1
Health/Medical Screening	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	1
Health/Medical Screening	UTD from Case Plan or Narrative	1
Housing Assistance (Section 8)	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	1
Housing Assistance (Section 8)	Client Refused Service	1
Housing Assistance (Section 8)	Wait List	1
IEP Programming	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	1
IEP Programming	Client Refused Service	1
Individual Counseling: Parent	Client Refused Service	9
Individual Counseling: Parent	Delay in Referral by DCF	1
Individual Counseling: Parent	Placed on Wait List	1
Individual Counseling: Parent	Hours of Operation	1
Individual Counseling: Child	Client Refused Service	9
Individual Counseling: Child	Delay in Referral by DCF	2
Individual Counseling: Child	Provider Issue: Untimely provision of service, or gap in service related to staffing or lack of follow through on part of provider	1
Individual Counseling: Child	Other: Child Moved from Area	1
Individual Counseling: Child	Other: Child Hospitalized	1
Individual Counseling: Child	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	1
Individual Counseling: Child	Service Deferred Pending Completion of Another	1
In-Home Parent Education and Support	Client Refused Services	5
In-Home Parent Education and Support	Delay in Referral by DCF	1
In-Home Parent Education and Support	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
In-Home Parent Education and Support	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	2
In Home Treatment	No Referral by DCF	3
In Home Treatment	Placed on Wait List	1
Job Coaching/Placement	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Maintaining Family Ties	Other: Adoptive Family would not allow any contact with birth family	1
Maintaining Family Ties	DCF Failure to Assess Need during the PUR	1
Medication Management: Child	Client Refused Service	1
Medication Management: Parent	Client Refused Service	1
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation: Child	Client Refused Service	1
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation: Parent	Client Refused Service	3
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation: Parent	Delay in Referral by DCF	1
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation: Parent	DCF Failure to Assess Need during the PUR	1
Mentoring	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	3
Mentoring	Client Refused Service	1
Mentoring	Delay in Referral by DCF	1
Other Mental Health Need: TFCST Therapy	DCF Failure to Assess Need during the PUR	1
Other In-Home Services: Family Based Recovery Program	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	1
Other In-Home Services: Legal (Probate Filing)	No Filing since 7/2012	1
Other OOH Service: Adoption Finalization Work	Other : Foster Mother – Medical Needs	1
Other OOH Service: Family Based Recovery Program	Delay in Referral by DCF	1
Other OOH Services: Legal	TPR filing delayed	1
Other OOH Service: Original Birth Certificate Needed Delay in Adoption	Original Birth Certificate Needed	1
Other State Agency (DMR, DMHAS, MSS, etc.)	Referred Service is Unwilling to Engage Client	1
Other State Agency (DMR, DMHAS, MSS, etc.)	Delay in Referral by DCF	2
Other State Agency (DMR, DMHAS, MSS, etc.)	Provider Issue: Untimely provision of service, or gap in service related to staffing or lack of follow through on part of provider	1

Unmet Need	Barrier	Frequency
Problem Sexual Behavior Therapy	Delay in Referral by DCF	1
Psychological/Psychosocial Evaluation: Child	Delay in Referral by DCF	1
Psychological/Psychosocial Evaluation: Child	DCF Failure to Assess Need during the PUR	1
Relative Foster Care	Delay in Referral by DCF	1
Sexual Abuse Therapy – Victim	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Social Recreational Programs	No Referral Made by DCF during the PUR	1
Social Recreational Programs	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Substance Abuse Services: Drug/Alcohol Testing - Parent	Client Refused Services	5
Substance Abuse Services: Drug/Alcohol Testing - Child	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Substance Abuse Screening/Evaluation: Child	Client Refused Service	1
Substance Abuse Screening/Evaluation: Child	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Substance Abuse Screening/Evaluation: Child	No Referral by DCF during PUR	1
Substance Abuse Screening: Parent	Client Refused Service	6
Substance Abuse Screening: Parent	Delay in Referral by DCF	2
Substance Abuse Screening: Parent	No Referral Made by DCF during PUR	2
Substance Abuse Screening: Parent	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Substance Abuse Screening: Parent	Other: Father became Whereabouts Unknown	1
Substance Abuse Treatment: Inpatient Treatment - Parent	Client Refused Services	1
Substance Abuse Treatment: Inpatient Treatment - Parent	DCF Failure to Assess Need during the PUR	1
Substance Abuse Treatment: Outpatient - Parent	Client Refused Service	2
Supportive Housing for Recovering Families (SHRF)	Placed on Wait List	1
Visitation: SW/Child	Visitation Standard Not Met by DCF	11
Visitation: SW/Parent	Visitation Standard Not Met by DCF	17
Visitation: SW/Parent	Client Refused Services	1
Visitation: SW/Provider Contacts	Contact Standard Not Met by DCF	8
Visitation: SW/Provider Contacts	Provider Refused Contacts	2
Visitation: SW/Provider Contacts	Lack of Communication between DCF and Provider	12
		227

During the First Quarter 2015 the level of engagement with families in case planning to achieve scores of Very Good or Optimal within our methodology as witnessed within the ACR documentation, case planning documentation and visitation documentation was 47.2%, this was even with Fourth Quarter 2014 results in this domain. (See Table 2 for details).

The reviewers noted that the ACR, case planning documentation and case plan did document a discussion of all (27.6%), or some (57.5%) of the needs that were identified of unmet in the prior six month period and were necessary to be incorporated into action steps going forward. There were 6 cases (12.8%) in which the reviewers indicated that there were no unmet needs carried forward from the prior period. There was one case (2.1%) in which none of the needs and services were incorporated into the case plan action steps going forward. There were also 6 cases for which this was the initial case plan and these were not included in the percentage calculations as they were too soon to rate.

In the 29 cases in which the SDM tools were incorporated, 12 or 41.4% were identical to that indicated on the prior case plan assessment. This would indicate that the unmet objective or need has been in place for the child or individual greater than six months.

In 60.4% of this case sample, there were one or more instances where there was an identified need referenced in the documentation or identified at the ACR or other meetings related to case planning that did not get captured appropriately as an objective with defined action steps within the case plan approved by the SWS. There were 79 instances where reviewers pointed to specific needs that were of a level that should have been captured within the case planning and were not. Additionally there were six cases in which the reviewers felt that provider contacts should be incorporated into the case plan action steps as this was a barrier in the prior period under review, and this was not done. Visitation with parents had been a barrier in five of the case plans and was not adequately addressed going forward.

Needs Not Incorporated into the Case Plans Developed for Upcoming Six Month Period

Unmet Need	Barrier	Frequency
Adoption Supports (PPSP)	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
ARG Consultation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	7
Care Coordination	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
DCF SW Advocacy/Case Management Other: Need to explore contact with birth family	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Developmental Screening or Evaluation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	11
Domestic Violence Services: Victims	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Educational Screening or Evaluation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Emergency Adult/Family Shelter	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Family or Marital Counseling	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Family or Marital Counseling	No Referral Made by DCF	1
Family Preservation Services	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Foster Care Supports	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Health or Medical Screening or Evaluation	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	6
Health or Medical Screening or Evaluation	No Referral by DCF During the PUR	1
Housing Assistance (Section 8)	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
IEP Programming	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Individual Counseling: Child	Client Refusing Service	1
Individual Counseling: Child	UTD from Case Plan or Narrative	1
Individual Counseling: Child	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	4
Individual Counseling: Parent	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
In-Home Parent Education and Support	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	5
IICAPS	UTD from Case Plan or Narrative	1
In-Home Treatment	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Other OOH Services: Legal	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Maintaining Family Ties	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Medication Management – Child	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation: Child	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Mental Health Screening or Evaluation: Parent	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	3
Mentoring	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	2
Other In-Home Services: Resource Management	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Other Medical Intervention: Vision/Examination	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Other State Agency Program: DMR, DMHAS, MSS, etc.)	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Parenting Classes	UTD from the Case Plan or Narrative	1
Psychological or Psychosocial Evaluation – Child	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Social Recreational Program	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Substance Abuse Screening: Child	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
Substance Abuse Screening: Parent	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	6
Substance Abuse Screening: Parent	Delay in Referral by DCF	1
Supportive Housing for Recovering Families (SHRF)	No Service Identified to Meet this Need	1
		79

JUAN F. ACTION PLAN MONITORING REPORT

May 2015

This report includes data relevant to the permanency and placement issues and action steps embodied within the Action Plan. Data provided comes from the monthly point-in-time information from LINK and the Chapin Hall 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 2014.


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

	Period of Entry to Care												
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Total Entries	3546	3202	3091	3407	2854	2829	2628	2693	2299	1856	2005	1932	296
Permanent Exits													
In 1 yr	1406 39.7%	1228 38.4%	1129 36.5%	1263 37.1%	1095 38.4%	1098 38.8%	1092 41.6%	1023 38.0%	705 30.7%	545 29.4%	493 24.6%		
In 2 yrs	2078 58.6%	1805 56.4%	1740 56.3%	1973 57.9%	1675 58.7%	1676 59.2%	1581 60.2%	1375 51.1%	1044 45.4%	830 44.7%			
In 3 yrs	2385 67.3%	2092 65.3%	2013 65.1%	2324 68.2%	1974 69.2%	1943 68.7%	1791 68.2%	1669 62.0%	1234 53.7%				
In 4 yrs	2539 71.6%	2262 70.6%	2158 69.8%	2499 73.3%	2090 73.2%	2033 71.9%	1894 72.1%	1764 65.5%					
To Date	2705 76.3%	2367 73.9%	2255 73.0%	2617 76.8%	2164 75.8%	2111 74.6%	1934 73.6%	1786 66.3%	1315 57.2%	943 50.8%	659 32.9%	377 19.5%	8 2.7%
Non-Permanent Exits													
In 1 yr	250 7.1%	231 7.2%	289 9.3%	259 7.6%	263 9.2%	250 8.8%	208 7.9%	196 7.3%	138 6.0%	93 5.0%	121 6.0%		
In 2 yrs	321 9.1%	301 9.4%	371 12.0%	345 10.1%	318 11.1%	320 11.3%	267 10.2%	243 9.0%	186 8.1%	131 7.1%			
In 3 yrs	367 10.3%	366 11.4%	431 13.9%	401 11.8%	354 12.4%	363 12.8%	300 11.4%	272 10.1%	210 9.1%				
In 4 yrs	393 11.1%	403 12.6%	461 14.9%	449 13.2%	392 13.7%	394 13.9%	326 12.4%	297 11.0%					
To Date	494 13.9%	506 15.8%	563 18.2%	528 15.5%	442 15.5%	446 15.8%	354 13.5%	313 11.6%	236 10.3%	161 8.7%	150 7.5%	78 4.0%	0 0.0%

	Period of Entry to Care												
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
<i>Unknown Exits</i>													
<i>In 1 yr</i>	150 4.2%	129 4.0%	83 2.7%	76 2.2%	62 2.2%	60 2.1%	76 2.9%	129 4.8%	208 9.0%	150 8.1%	151 7.5%		
<i>In 2 yrs</i>	190 5.4%	171 5.3%	124 4.0%	117 3.4%	98 3.4%	91 3.2%	140 5.3%	307 11.4%	411 17.9%	299 16.1%			
<i>In 3 yrs</i>	217 6.1%	208 6.5%	163 5.3%	140 4.1%	124 4.3%	125 4.4%	193 7.3%	395 14.7%	501 21.8%				
<i>In 4 yrs</i>	241 6.8%	234 7.3%	181 5.9%	167 4.9%	156 5.5%	167 5.9%	221 8.4%	433 16.1%					
<i>To Date</i>	324 9.1%	303 9.5%	236 7.6%	221 6.5%	200 7.0%	212 7.5%	255 9.7%	442 16.4%	520 22.6%	353 19.0%	291 14.5%	86 4.5%	3 1.0%
<i>Remain In Care</i>													
<i>In 1 yr</i>	1740 49.1%	1614 50.4%	1590 51.4%	1809 53.1%	1434 50.2%	1421 50.2%	1252 47.6%	1345 49.9%	1248 54.3%	1068 57.5%	1240 61.8%		
<i>In 2 yrs</i>	957 27.0%	925 28.9%	856 27.7%	972 28.5%	763 26.7%	742 26.2%	640 24.4%	768 28.5%	658 28.6%	596 32.1%			
<i>In 3 yrs</i>	577 16.3%	536 16.7%	484 15.7%	542 15.9%	402 14.1%	398 14.1%	344 13.1%	357 13.3%	354 15.4%				
<i>In 4 yrs</i>	373 10.5%	303 9.5%	291 9.4%	292 8.6%	216 7.6%	235 8.3%	187 7.1%	199 7.4%					
<i>To Date</i>	23 0.6%	26 0.8%	37 1.2%	41 1.2%	48 1.7%	60 2.1%	85 3.2%	152 5.6%	228 9.9%	399 21.5%	905 45.1%	1391 72.0%	285 96.3%

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 (2014 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 MAY 1, 2015⁴)

Is the child legally free (his or her parents' rights have been terminated)?				
Yes 649	No ↓ 2,632			
<i>Goals of:</i>	Has the child been in care more than 15 months?			
557 (86%) Adoption	No ↓ 1,574	Yes ↓ 1,058		
82 (13%) APPLA	Has a TPR proceeding been filed?			
4 (1%) Reunification	Yes ↓ 211		No ↓ 847	
3 (<1%) Relatives	<i>Goals of:</i>			
3 (<1%) Transfer of Guardianship	147 (70%) Adoption	Is a reason documented not to file TPR?		
	41 (19%) APPLA	Yes ↓ 258	No ↓ 589	
	15 (7%) Reunify	<i>Goals of:</i>	<i>Documented Reasons:</i>	<i>Goals of:</i>
	4 (2%) Relatives	114 (44%) APPLA	67% Compelling Reason	190 (32%) Reunify
	3 (1%) Trans. of Guardian: Sub/Unsub	57 (22%) Trans. of Guardian: Sub/Unsub	20% Child is with relative	135 (23%) Trans. of Guardian: Sub/Unsub
	1 (<1%) Blank	53 (21%) Reunify	10% Petition in process	123 (21%) APPLA
		24 (9%) Adoption	4% Services not provided	116 (20%) Adoption
		10 (4%) Relatives		22 (4%) Relatives
				3 (1%) Blank

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

Preferred Permanency Goals:

Reunification	Feb 2014	May 2014	Aug 2014	Nov 2014	Feb 2015	May 2015
Total number of children with Reunification goal, pre-TPR and post-TPR	1219	1312	1257	1328	1322	1275
Number of children with Reunification goal pre-TPR	1217	1311	1257	1328	1322	1271
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children with Reunification goal, pre-TPR, >= 15 months in care 	191	211	221	235	200	258
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children with Reunification goal, pre-TPR, >= 36 months in care 	38	37	38	43	45	36
Number of children with Reunification goal, post-TPR	2	1	0	0	0	4

Transfer of Guardianship (Subsidized and Non-Subsidized)	Feb 2014	May 2014	Aug 2014	Nov 2014	Feb 2015	May 2015
Total number of children with Transfer of Guardianship goal (subsidized and non-subsidized), pre-TPR and post TPR	257	261	269	294	304	326
Number of children with Transfer of Guardianship goal (subsidized and non-subsidized), pre-TPR	257	259	268	292	301	323
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children with Transfer of Guardianship goal (subsidized and non-subsidized , pre-TPR, >= 22 months 	82	78	86	86	90	95
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of children with Transfer of Guardianship goal (subsidized and non-subsidized), pre-TPR , >= 36 months 	15	16	25	29	29	25
Number of children with Transfer of Guardianship goal (subsidized and non-subsidized), post-TPR	0	2	1	2	3	3

Adoption	Feb 2014	May 2014	Aug 2014	Nov 2014	Feb 2015	May 2015
Total number of children with Adoption goal, pre-TPR and post-TPR	955	977	988	1030	1030	1071
Number of children with Adoption goal, pre-TPR	473	478	455	504	518	514
Number of children with Adoption goal, TPR not filed, >= 15 months in care	97	111	102	128	156	140
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reason TPR not filed, Compelling Reason 	6	3	1	3	7	7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reason TPR not filed, petitions in progress 	28	31	29	27	26	14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reason TPR not filed , child is in placement with relative 	3	5	2	6	5	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reason TPR not filed, services needed not provided 	3	4	3	3	2	0

Adoption	Feb 2014	May 2014	Aug 2014	Nov 2014	Feb 2015	May 2015
• Reason TPR not filed, blank	57	68	67	89	116	116
Number of cases with Adoption goal post-TPR	482	499	533	526	512	557
• Number of children with Adoption goal, post-TPR, in care >= 15 months	452	452	489	497	474	526
• Number of children with Adoption goal, post-TPR, in care >= 22 months	376	371	397	396	384	432
Number of children with Adoption goal, post-TPR, no barrier, > 3 months since TPR	16	13	13	13	13	17
Number of children with Adoption goal, post-TPR, with barrier, > 3 months since TPR	89	83	72	74	57	62
Number of children with Adoption goal, post-TPR, with blank barrier, > 3 months since TPR	284	279	333	344	245	244

Progress Towards Permanency:	Feb 2014	May 2014	Aug 2014	Nov 2014	Feb 2015	May 2015
Total number of children, pre-TPR, TPR not filed, >=15 months in care, no compelling reason	378	439	464	530	567	589

Non-Preferred Permanency Goals:

Long Term Foster Care Relative:	Feb 2014	May 2014	Aug 2014	Nov 2014	Feb 2015	May 2015
Total number of children with Long Term Foster Care Relative goal	58	56	52	52	50	47
Number of children with Long Term Foster Care Relative goal, pre-TPR	54	52	47	48	47	44
• Number of children with Long Term Foster Care Relative goal, 12 years old and under, pre-TPR	5	4	2	1	1	1
Long Term Foster Care Rel. goal, post-TPR	4	4	5	4	3	3
• Number of children with Long Term Foster Care Relative goal, 12 years old and under, post-TPR	0	0	0	0	0	0

APPLA*	Feb 2014	May 2014	Aug 2014	Nov 2014	Feb 2015	May 2015
Total number of children with APPLA goal	567	563	505	468	421	380
Number of children with APPLA goal, pre-TPR	448	451	400	370	331	298
• Number of children with APPLA goal, 12 years old and under, pre-TPR	18	16	9	6	2	6
Number of children with APPLA goal, post-TPR	119	112	105	98	90	82
• Number of children with APPLA goal, 12 years old and under, post-TPR	6	7	7	6	5	3

* 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:

	Feb 2014	May 2014	Aug 2014	Nov 2014	Feb 2015	May 2015
Number of children, with no Permanency goal, pre-TPR, >= 2 months in care	24	24	102	25	19	15
Number of children, with no Permanency goal, pre-TPR, >= 6 months in care	11	14	18	17	10	7
Number of children, with no Permanency goal, pre-TPR, >= 15 months in care	7	6	6	10	5	4
Number of children, with no Permanency goal, pre-TPR, TPR not filed, >= 15 months in care, no compelling reason	5	4	4	5	5	4

B. PLACEMENT ISSUES

Placement Experiences of Children


The following chart shows the change in use of family and congregate care for admission cohorts between 2003 and 2014.



The next table shows specific care types used month-by-month for entries between April 2014 and March 2015.


Case Summaries													
First placement type		enterApr1 4	enterMay 14	enterJun 14	enterJul1 4	enterAug 14	enterSep 14	enterOct1 4	enterNov 14	enterDec 14	enterJan 15	enterFeb 15	enterMar 15
Residential	N	9		3	1	2	5	1	5	3	4	4	
	%	5.2%		1.9%	0.5%	1.1%	2.8%	0.7%	3.8%	2.2%	3.2%	3.5%	
DCF Facilities	N	5	4	2	5	4	1	1	2	3	2	2	1
	%	2.9%	3.1%	1.3%	2.7%	2.3%	0.6%	0.7%	1.5%	2.2%	1.6%	1.7%	1.8%
Foster Care	N	90	62	66	88	90	81	63	61	49	57	54	28
	%	52.3%	47.7%	42.9%	48.4%	51.7%	46.0%	41.4%	46.9%	36.0%	45.2%	47.0%	50.9%
Group Home	N	2	2	1	4	3	2	2	2	1	2	2	1
	%	1.2%	1.5%	0.6%	2.2%	1.7%	1.1%	1.3%	1.5%	0.7%	1.6%	1.7%	1.8%
Relative Care	N	46	48	62	61	43	60	57	38	57	45	36	15
	%	26.7%	36.9%	40.3%	33.5%	24.7%	34.1%	37.5%	29.2%	41.9%	35.7%	31.3%	27.3%
Medical	N	2	2	7	3	5	4	3	10	7	7	7	4
	%	1.2%	1.5%	4.5%	1.6%	2.9%	2.3%	2.0%	7.7%	5.1%	5.6%	6.1%	7.3%
Safe Home	N	2	2	1	1	4			3	1			
	%	1.2%	1.5%	0.6%	0.5%	2.3%			2.3%	0.7%			
Shelter	N	9	3	5	12	8	6	4	1	6	3	3	3
	%	5.2%	2.3%	3.2%	6.6%	4.6%	3.4%	2.6%	0.8%	4.4%	2.4%	2.6%	5.5%
Special Study	N	7	7	7	7	15	17	21	8	9	6	7	3
	%	4.1%	5.4%	4.5%	3.8%	8.6%	9.7%	13.8%	6.2%	6.6%	4.8%	6.1%	5.5%
Total	N	172	130	154	182	174	176	152	130	136	126	115	55
	%	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 2003 through 2015 admission cohorts.

Children's Predominant Placement Type (by Entry Cohort)



The following chart shows monthly statistics of children who exited from DCF placements between April 2014 and March 2015, 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)		exitApr14	exitMay14	exitJun14	exitJul14	exitAug14	exitSep14	exitOct14	exitNov14	exitDec14	exitJan15	exitFeb15	exitMar15
Residential	N	1	8	8	11	5	3	1	3	5	3	3	1
	%	0.7%	6.2%	5.6%	5.9%	2.3%	1.6%	0.7%	1.7%	3.2%	3.0%	2.7%	2.5%
DCF Facilities	N	4	2	7	6	4	3	2	1	2	3	2	
	%	2.8%	1.6%	4.9%	3.2%	1.8%	1.6%	1.4%	0.6%	1.3%	3.0%	1.8%	
Foster Care	N	64	50	68	92	92	80	63	87	71	35	46	13
	%	44.4%	38.8%	47.2%	48.9%	41.8%	44.0%	45.7%	48.1%	46.1%	34.7%	41.8%	32.5%
Group Home	N	10	6	9	13	27	16	13	7	6	11	3	2
	%	6.9%	4.7%	6.3%	6.9%	12.3%	8.8%	9.4%	3.9%	3.9%	10.9%	2.7%	5.0%
Independent Living	N	8	3	2	6	7	4	6	2	1	1	2	4
	%	5.6%	2.3%	1.4%	3.2%	3.2%	2.2%	4.3%	1.1%	0.6%	1.0%	1.8%	10.0%
Relative Care	N	39	42	33	38	58	55	48	59	55	37	46	13
	%	27.1%	32.6%	22.9%	20.2%	26.4%	30.2%	34.8%	32.6%	35.7%	36.6%	41.8%	32.5%
Medical	N	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2		1	
	%	1.4%	1.6%	1.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.7%	0.6%	1.3%		0.9%	
Safe Home	N	4	4		2	4	1		2	2	1	1	
	%	2.8%	3.1%		1.1%	1.8%	0.5%		1.1%	1.3%	1.0%	0.9%	
Shelter	N	3	4	5	7	7	5	2	5	5	3		2
	%	2.1%	3.1%	3.5%	3.7%	3.2%	2.7%	1.4%	2.8%	3.2%	3.0%		5.0%
Special Study	N	8	7	7	10	15	14	2	10	3	6	6	4
	%	5.6%	5.4%	4.9%	5.3%	6.8%	7.7%	1.4%	5.5%	1.9%	5.9%	5.5%	10.0%
Unknown	N	1	1	3	2				4	2	1		1
	%	0.7%	0.8%	2.1%	1.1%				2.2%	1.3%	1.0%		2.5%
Total	N	144	129	144	188	220	182	138	181	154	101	110	40
	%	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 September 1, 2014 organized by length of time in care.

Primary type of spell (>50%) * Duration Category Crosstabulation										
			Duration Category						Total	
			30	90	180	< 365	< 545	< 1095	1095	
Primary type of spell (>50%)	Residential	Count	0	6	12	16	12	30	40	116
		% Row	0.0%	5.2%	10.3%	13.8%	10.3%	25.9%	34.5%	100.0%
		% Col	0.0%	2.6%	3.4%	2.2%	2.0%	3.2%	4.8%	3.1%
DCF Facilities	Count	1	3	6	12	9	1	0	32	
	% Row	3.1%	9.4%	18.8%	37.5%	28.1%	3.1%	0.0%	100.0%	
	% Col	1.8%	1.3%	1.7%	1.7%	1.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.9%	
Foster Care	Count	26	98	136	315	284	488	507	1854	
	% Row	1.4%	5.3%	7.3%	17.0%	15.3%	26.3%	27.3%	100.0%	
	% Col	47.3%	42.6%	38.9%	44.0%	46.7%	51.8%	60.6%	49.6%	
Group Home	Count	1	3	5	14	18	53	71	165	
	% Row	0.6%	1.8%	3.0%	8.5%	10.9%	32.1%	43.0%	100.0%	
	% Col	1.8%	1.3%	1.4%	2.0%	3.0%	5.6%	8.5%	4.4%	
Independent Living	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	
	% Row	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% Col	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.2%	
Relative Care	Count	17	87	141	268	202	261	74	1050	
	% Row	1.6%	8.3%	13.4%	25.5%	19.2%	24.9%	7.0%	100.0%	
	% Col	30.9%	37.8%	40.3%	37.4%	33.2%	27.7%	8.8%	28.1%	
Medical	Count	2	4	6	6	2	3	3	26	
	% Row	7.7%	15.4%	23.1%	23.1%	7.7%	11.5%	11.5%	100.0%	
	% Col	3.6%	1.7%	1.7%	0.8%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.7%	
Mixed (none >50%)	Count	0	0	0	10	9	38	104	161	
	% Row	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	5.6%	23.6%	64.6%	100.0%	
	% Col	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	1.5%	4.0%	12.4%	4.3%	
Safe Home	Count	0	0	2	1	7	3	1	14	
	% Row	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	7.1%	50.0%	21.4%	7.1%	100.0%	
	% Col	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.1%	1.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%	
Shelter	Count	3	7	3	15	8	1	0	37	
	% Row	8.1%	18.9%	8.1%	40.5%	21.6%	2.7%	0.0%	100.0%	
	% Col	5.5%	3.0%	0.9%	2.1%	1.3%	0.1%	0.0%	1.0%	
Special Study	Count	3	15	31	51	55	61	30	246	
	% Row	1.2%	6.1%	12.6%	20.7%	22.4%	24.8%	12.2%	100.0%	
	% Col	5.5%	6.5%	8.9%	7.1%	9.0%	6.5%	3.6%	6.6%	
Unknown	Count	2	7	8	8	2	3	1	31	
	% Row	6.5%	22.6%	25.8%	25.8%	6.5%	9.7%	3.2%	100.0%	
	% Col	3.6%	3.0%	2.3%	1.1%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.8%	
Total	Count	55	230	350	716	608	942	837	3738	
	% Row	1.5%	6.2%	9.4%	19.2%	16.3%	25.2%	22.4%	100.0%	
	% Col	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Congregate Care Settings

Placement Issues	Feb 2014	May 2014	Aug 2014	Nov 2014	Feb 2015	May 2015
Total number of children 12 years old and under, in Congregate Care	42	34	30	19	22	22
• Number of children 12 years old and under, in DCF Facilities	1	0	1	0	1	0
• Number of children 12 years old and under, in Group Homes	10	9	7	6	8	8
• Number of children 12 years old and under, in Residential	11	13	8	5	7	7
• Number of children 12 years old and under, in SAFE Home	17	11	14	8	6	4
• Number of children 12 years old and under in Shelter	3	1	0	0	0	3
Total number of children ages 13-17 in Congregate Placements	434	431	380	328	313	294

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												
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Total Entries	3546	3202	3091	3407	2854	2829	2628	2693	2299	1856	2005	1932	296
SAFE Homes/PDCs	630	453	394	395	382	335	471	331	146	68	56	30	0
	18%	14%	13%	12%	13%	12%	18%	12%	6%	4%	3%	2%	0%
Shelters	135	147	178	114	136	144	186	175	194	169	175	91	9
	4%	5%	6%	3%	5%	5%	7%	6%	8%	9%	9%	5%	3%
Total	765	600	572	509	518	479	657	506	340	237	231	121	9
	22%	19%	19%	15%	18%	17%	25%	19%	15%	13%	12%	6%	3%

	Period of Entry to Care												
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Total Initial Plcmnts	765	600	572	509	518	479	657	506	340	237	231	121	9
<= 30 days	308	249	241	186	162	150	229	135	103	60	63	37	3
	40.3%	41.5%	42.1%	36.5%	31.3%	31.3%	34.9%	26.7%	30.3%	25.3%	27.3%	30.6%	33.3%
31 - 60	181	102	114	73	73	102	110	106	57	44	41	27	3
	23.7%	17.0%	19.9%	14.3%	14.1%	21.3%	16.7%	20.9%	16.8%	18.6%	17.7%	22.3%	33.3%
61 - 91	121	81	76	87	79	85	157	91	54	39	38	18	3
	15.8%	13.5%	13.3%	17.1%	15.3%	17.7%	23.9%	18.0%	15.9%	16.5%	16.5%	14.9%	33.3%
92 - 183	107	124	100	118	131	110	124	136	84	56	57	24	0
	14.0%	20.7%	17.5%	23.2%	25.3%	23.0%	18.9%	26.9%	24.7%	23.6%	24.7%	19.8%	0.0%
184+	48	44	41	45	73	32	37	38	42	38	32	15	0
	6.3%	7.3%	7.2%	8.8%	14.1%	6.7%	5.6%	7.5%	12.4%	16.0%	13.9%	12.4%	0.0%

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	Nov 2013	Feb 2014	May 2014	Aug 2014	Nov 2014	Feb 2015	May 2015
Total number of children in SAFE Home	33	34	28	22	16	13	9
• Number of children in SAFE Home, > 60 days	22	23	20	17	16	12	7
• Number of children in SAFE Home, >= 6 months	8	10	10	12	8	9	4
Total number of children in STAR/Shelter Placement	73	70	59	49	43	30	34
• Number of children in STAR/Shelter Placement, > 60 days	46	40	30	27	30	16	15
• Number of children in STAR/Shelter Placement, >= 6 months	5	7	11	7	12	8	3
Total number of children in MH Shelter	1	1	1	1	1	4	3
• Total number of children in MH Shelter, > 60 days	1	1	1	0	0	2	3
• Total number of children in MH Shelter, >= 6 months	1	1	1	0	0	0	1

Time in Residential Care

Placement Issues	Nov 2013	Feb 2014	May 2014	Aug 2014	Nov 2014	Feb 2015	May 2015
Total number of children in Residential care	147	157	147	116	103	114	106
• Number of children in Residential care, >= 12 months in Residential placement	42	47	40	38	35	26	26
• Number of children in Residential care, >= 60 months in Residential placement	2	2	2	1	1	0	0

Appendix 1
Commissioner's Highlights from
The Department of Children & Families
First Quarter 2015 Exit Plan Report

Commissioner Statement First Quarter 2015 *Juan F.* Exit Plan Report

The first three months of 2015 represent not only the beginning of the Malloy Administration's second term but also a new start for the Department in its effort to reform the agency, improve outcomes for children and families, and achieve the goals of the *Juan F.* Exit Plan. Fortunately, the results of the reforms already established have been consolidated and strengthened.

The major trends underway are all positive and encouraging for our direction moving forward. Fewer children are in state care (a decrease of 754 as of June 1, 2015 or 16.1 percent lower than January 1, 2011), fewer children in care are living in group settings (836 fewer children as of June 1, 2015 or 58 percent lower than January 1, 2011) and a greater share of children in care are living with kin (36.1 percent as of June 1, 2015 compared to 21 percent in January 2011). Seventy-three percent of children in care are living in a family setting. We now have the highest percentage of children living with kin and the lowest percentage of children in congregate care since we have been measuring this data. This reflects a massive re-design of our work, including a family-centered, strengths-based and solutions-focused practice model, Differential Response, a priority on kinship care, child and family team meetings, and an overall approach that treats families as the primary answer instead of as the source of the problem. Respect and collaboration with families and providers are the guiding principles.

Challenges remain, of course. A new influx of social workers has brought significant relief to an overburdened staff, but that relief is just now being felt in full force. Services in some parts of the state and for certain specialized needs are still hard to access in a timely manner. As a result, certain Exit Plan outcomes have remained elusive – most particularly those measuring case planning and needs met.

I am optimistic, however, that statewide implementation of improvements initiated earlier in Region 3 will pull up performance in case planning in particular. Following the success of Region 3 in advancing quality case plans, each region is now placing a focus on increasing manager leadership and responsibility for quality case planning. The Administrative Case Review (ACR) Instrument is being used by CPS program managers to evaluate case plans – thereby elevating the engagement of the managers in this critical part of our work. In addition, the program managers are partnering with ACR staff to ensure that case planning is relevant to case practice and used actively with families during visits and all aspects of our work with families. We expect that if managers “dig in deep” in case planning, it will be reflected in supervision, case work, and an office culture that uses the plan as the basis for all activities and not simply a document to be filled out. Quality case planning also will help us improve our work in meeting children's needs.

In addition, I want to thank the Governor and the Legislature for supporting additional resources to enhance and expand community based resources to meet the needs of children and families. Outcome Measure 15, “meeting children’s needs,” is a reflection of the commitment of the entire community and the entire state, and I am pleased with the support we are obtaining in this effort. The Department is not alone in our work with families and their children. Our partners include private service providers, the schools, sister state agencies and local government and civic organizations. Thanks to all these partners, we have implemented many reforms and seen many important improvements in outcomes for children. We can maintain this forward movement if we stay focused and continue to collaborate with the many stakeholders who are invested in this work – most of all the families themselves.